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After Liberation, the reopening of the university and the founding of a new political faculty took time. So it was only fifteen years after he had arrived in Amsterdam as an exile, that Baschwitz's dream of becoming a full professor finally came true. He started a press institute, a press library, and a rejuvenated press museum – the first nucleus of modern mass communication studies in the country. He also introduced the studies of persuasion and media effects, public opinion and polling.

At this point, it is worthwhile to note that the Dutch and continental university systems were slightly different from the U.K. and U.S. ones.¹

The wider historical context: Peace, and the new Cold War

After the Second World War, it soon became clear that the world was going to be dominated by two major blocs. The United States reconfirmed its status as the foremost power in the West. It facilitated the return of the Western European states to free markets and mutual cooperation, ultimately resulting in the founding of successive forerunners to the European Union. The huge Marshall Plan program in turn supported their reconstruction. This also stimulated trade, exchange, and the rapid adoption of American science and technology, including new social management techniques based on the use of new 'empirical-quantitative' methods of investigation. Also within Baschwitz's own circle of social scientists.

¹ After Kindergarten, there was six years of primary schooling, and then five or six years of secondary schooling ('HBS' or 'Gymnasium') in The Netherlands. Most university studies officially also had a five to six years curriculum, although it was quite usual to take more time. At one point a curriculum often had a 'propaedeuse' degree more or less a quarter of the way, and/or a 'candidate' degree more or less halfway. In the end, it often had an internship and then a 'scriptie' (thesis). This resulted in a 'doctoraal' (not doctorate) degree slightly more advanced than the current masters/graduate degree. It was (confusingly) called the 'doctorandus' degree (abbreviated as Drs.). This meant that it gave one the right to pursue a Dr. doctor's degree thereafter (slightly more advanced than a Ph.D.). But this was a completely separate exercise, undertaken at an individual level, only loosely supervised by a 'promotor' (responsible professor). This exercise had no fixed curriculum, usually no classes of any kind, and had to be built around a single 'original' scientific research project resulting in a substantial book publication, to be accepted by an independent commission. Theoretically this was meant to take four years, but in practice it often took six or more.
It soon became clear, however, that the Soviet Union would not evacuate the Eastern European countries it had conquered during the last stages of the war, and would not allow free elections there either. Churchill said in a famous speech that an ‘Iron Curtain’ had descended between Eastern and Western Europe. The 1948 coup in Czechoslovakia further confirmed this. This dynamic also translated into the interior and party politics of all Western countries: communists, ‘fellow travellers’, and leftists were regarded with growing suspicion and became increasingly isolated.

Upon the capitulation of Japan, nationalist leaders in Asia had tried to declare independence, but the Europeans were initially set on restoring their colonial empires. The Dutch soon reintroduced military service and sent a huge army to the vast colony of Indonesia to ‘restore order’ through so-called ‘police actions’ with large-scale bloodshed and excesses. It took them four years to recognize the new realities on the ground. A significant part of the Dutch economy had been geared to colonial trade. It had created imbalances in the development on both sides, which took time to correct.

The Netherlands themselves had been devastated by the war. It was initially claimed that 90 complete factories had been transferred to Germany, 30,000 machines, and that productive capacity had dropped by 40 percent. Damage was initially estimated at some 15 to 25 billion pre-war guilders, or half of the country’s pre-war wealth. Some of these estimates were later revised considerably downward. Some 230,000 people had been killed, of which at least 100,000 were Jews. Post-war policies aimed at rapid industrialization and re-industrialization, away from colonial trade and more toward technology and services. But this was easier said than done.\(^2\)

Many had expected there to be great political changes, but there were only minor reshuffles and then a return to ‘normal’: with a resumption of the pre-war ‘Rome and Red’ coalitions, dominated by the two major centrist parties of Catholics and Social Democrats. The former gained 31 percent of the parliamentary elections of 1946 and 1948, the latter 27-28 percent. The protestant vote was divided between two larger and two smaller parties, for a total of 23-24 percent, and the liberal-conservatives also gained a new foothold. The communists had played a significant role in the resistance, and got a surprising 10.6 percent in the first vote. But this soon withered to 7.7 percent in the second vote, and then further decreased as the Cold War got under way.

\(^2\) De Liagre Böhl a.o. (eds.), Luiten van Zanden. Also see: De Vries, Messing.
The ‘Randstad’ circle of major cities in the west, however, was considerably more left-leaning than the smaller towns and countryside in The Netherlands’ north, east, and south. In Amsterdam, the communists had triggered the heroic ‘February strike’ at the beginning of the war: a mass action of solidarity with the Jews, unique in occupied continental Europe. During the first municipal elections after Liberation, their party thus became the largest of the council with almost a third of all votes – although the next time they were reduced to the second largest, with only a quarter. The Social Democrats had slightly over 30 percent on both occasions. These shifting political realities had a major impact on Baschwitz’s immediate prospects at the ‘municipal’ university, as we will see below.

1946: ‘The future of Dutch civilization’

One of the most noteworthy figures during and after the war was Bernhard: the prince consort of (then still) Crown Princess Juliana. He was portrayed as having played a key military role in London and immediately thereafter; the ‘Prince Bernhard Fund’ had collected private money overseas to buy arms. After the war, this fund changed its focus to a restoration of ‘national values and norms’, and a revival of ‘Dutch civilization’ (as opposed to the past German, and possible future American, cultural influence).3

During the late summer of 1946, the Fund organized a major national conference, where mainstream opinion leaders met to discuss the overall situation after the war. The conference was held in Nijmegen near Arnhem: the eastern river-crossing points near Germany where some of the heaviest fighting and bombing had recently taken place. It was held in the auditorium of the Catholic university – one of the few major buildings left standing in the devastated centre.

The first day of the conference was devoted to the past, the second to the present, and the third to the future. Various social problems were addressed, which already included the newly emerging youth and media culture: the

3 More in Van Ginkel. The national institute was soon forced to close again, as it had been overly ambitious and spendthrift. Some of its self-assigned tasks were later revived in the Prins Bernhard Culture Fund or Anjerfonds (carnation fund, after his favourite flower and symbol). Bernhard later became controversial, for having considered pushing out his wife as head of state and becoming a caretaker himself, for numerous affairs and extramarital children, and for taking more than a million dollars in bribes from Lockheed.
influence of American movies, the dance craze, the dangers of advertising, and also of excessive leisure and criminality.\footnote{Quoted in Brouwer, De Fakkel van Baschwitz, p. 4.}

At this conference, Baschwitz was invited to give a major lecture on ‘The Aftermath’ of the occupation for the press. He again reminded his audience that the country had been one of the first major centres of European newsgathering and distribution. Freedom of the press in The Netherlands was thus built on ‘a proud old tradition’, but had sometimes been overly taken for granted. He repeated that the best period for the free press in Europe had been between 1880 and 1914. But the world wars and the rise of authoritarian regimes had brought censorship and propaganda.

This had led to mutual suspicion between the authorities, the press, and the public, he said. He therefore called for a restoration of confidence in the critical capacities of the public, the famous sober ‘common sense’ of the Dutch. The recent past and the underground press had proven, he said, that ‘the enemy could control the newspapers, but not the readers’. This speech further positioned him as the inevitable first future professor of press studies in the country. It was about time that this new career would finally take off, as he was more than sixty years old.\footnote{‘Naweeën van de doorstane gelijkschakeling – Pers, propaganda, openbare mening en de psychische depressie’. In Algra et al. Manuscript version of his contribution and notes in File 65 of the Baschwitz archives.}

Brouwer, his later successor as mass psychology professor, later claimed that Baschwitz had participated at least once in another power-broker initiative of the same Prince Bernhard, and attended one of his so-called Bilderberg conferences (named after the Dutch hotel were the first one took place). After his wife Juliana had acceded to the throne, the prince-consort was made the figurehead for regular confidential international meetings of the military, political, social, and economic elites of the Atlantic alliance, which were held under this Bilderberg name from the mid-1950s onwards. These meetings were comparable to the later Trilateral Commission and the current Davos Forum. I have not been able to confirm Baschwitz’s attendance, however.\footnote{In the printed text of Brouwer’s 1994 farewell lecture, De fakkel van Baschwitz, p. 6.}
German enemy subject?

In an elaborate letter to his eldest daughter, typewritten soon after Liberation, Baschwitz suddenly proved confident (even overconfident) about his immediate outlook and finances. In the autumn of 1945, Baschwitz had already been reinstated as ‘private lecturer’ in ‘press studies’ at the University, although he was still not directly paid by it. He had good prospects to be hired for the near future, but no money to wait it out. So the Amsterdam University Association (AUV) gave him a thousand guilders to help bridge this difficult period. But it added that this was ‘very exceptional’, and should not be seen as a precedent by others.

During the next summer, there was a proposal to promote him to paid ‘lecturer’ by the autumn of 1946, but the decision was only officially taken in early 1947 and applied retroactively. One might have expected him to be elated at this point, but he was disappointed and angry instead, as he apparently told his friend Romein. After a dozen years of waiting and hoping, he had still not been made a full professor. He even told people he had considered looking for a similar position elsewhere.

In spite of all reassurances from his colleagues, he had the desperate feeling that appointment to a chair might still be put off for years. Particularly because all kinds of new objections were now emerging against various groups of people: against Germans, against collaborators, but even against former members of the resistance.

The measures were imposed in a rather rigid style. When he asked for permission to publish a scientific information bulletin, for instance, the head of the criminal investigation bureau high-handedly demanded to know: ‘Primo: whether you are still subject of an enemy state. Secondo: whether in that case you are in possession of an official ‘non-enemy’ declaration.’

As a former journalist and new press scientist, he apparently needed official permission to act as the ‘final editor’ for the publication. So he dutifully sent an elaborate letter to the ‘Press Purge’ Commission, pleading

---

7 Isa letter: 1 August 1945, at the IISH.
8 Overman, p. 188-189.
9 Nomination: Notification by the Mayor and Aldermen, dated 26 February 1947, with regard to a Council decision of 15 January 1947, concerning his nomination starting 1 October 1946, ‘with an annual salary and pension base of 4,000 guilders per year’.
10 Angry: 5 July 1946, Consultation notebook No. 298, Romein archives (IISH).
his political trustworthiness. In his desperation, however, he had not been able to keep himself from embellishing his C.V. somewhat. Several of these slightly exaggerated claims then also seeped into the C.V’s he later submitted to the Amsterdam and Hague authorities for nomination as a full professor.12

In the wake of the war, many Dutch leaders and citizens had called for revenge. Some simply demanded the entire Ruhr area, the prime mining and industrial area of Germany. The Dutch minister of Foreign Affairs proposed that 10,000 km² be taken from Germany, preferably cleared of its inhabitants. The old Queen is said to have silently agreed. Later the claim was reduced by half, and then to only a few minor border corrections. But the Allies put their foot down. In the end, a payment of 125 million guilders in Wiedergutmachung reparations solved the issue.

But the Dutch Minister of Justice proposed that all 25,000 remaining Germans be expelled, a number later reduced to 17,000. Not only those that had come after 1940, but also those that had come after 1933 – like Baschwitz. Many of them had married Dutch, and had children with them. In the autumn of 1946, there were even night time raids (!) to round them up, and whole families were put in camps for months until their ultimate fate was decided. In the end, only 3,500 were effectively expelled.13

Baschwitz’s own nationality and status, and that of his close family, remained somewhat unclear. A small pressure group of non-tainted (ex-) Germans in limbo emerged, with a stencilled magazine and some noteworthy experts defending such intermediary cases. The Nazis had earlier declared the German nationality of Jewish refugees like Baschwitz to be null and void. That technically made them stateless. As more or less a Dutch civil servant at the institute and the university before and after the war, Baschwitz expected to automatically get Dutch nationality. But he did not. Only after a further ten full years of loyal service to the (public) university and the Dutch state, on the very eve of his retirement at the advanced age of seventy, did parliament adopt a proposal to naturalize him – along with 230 others.14

12 His letter mentioned Offenbruck rather than Offenburg as his birthplace. It said he had been an editor at the Frankfurter Zeitung for a year, and that he had officially been called as professor in Heidelberg in 1932 – but neither claim has so far been confirmed from other sources. It further underlined his credentials by adding that he had ‘personally been sought’ by the Gestapo in 1933 because of his ‘uninterrupted struggle in press and radio against Nazism’, and that he had ‘clandestinely continued to give lessons to advanced students, and to take exams’ while in hiding. The latter claims are probably slightly exaggerated, but true to some extent.
14 Algemeen Handelsblad, 29 June 1955.
1947: Moving out again, the fate of his family

The situation was even more complicated for Baschwitz’s close family. His wife had been considered Reichsdeutsch all along, and had a German passport. She had loyally continued to help him and others in hiding, however, in spite of her extremely modest and difficult circumstances. Yet, as soon as he had a paid university position and salary, Baschwitz moved out to live on his own again (although he apparently paid her some alimony thereafter). This reportedly alienated several common friends and acquaintances at first.

But he now decided to cross a major threshold to his new life as an academic. He left the Rivierenbuurt neighbourhood in the south of the city, where he had lived for 14 years altogether, at different addresses. He had good memories there, mostly about the early pre-war years. But also bad memories, of course, from the later pre-war years and the Occupation. Of the 17,000 Jews who had lived in the neighbourhood, 13,000 had been deported and most had not returned. It felt as if their shadows and ghosts were still around.

He now moved to the old city centre instead, to the fancy grachtengordel or canal belt, where most of the elite and many university professors lived. Albeit his new lodging was only on the outer/lesser Prinsengracht, at number 644: the upper half of a small but picturesque canal house, with a large balcony on the other side, on a piece of flat roof.

On one side was the large Maison Descartes on the Vijzelgracht, named after the famous French philosopher who had lived in The Netherlands in exile – later turned into the French consulate and cultural centre. On the other side, it was only a few houses away from the Nieuwe Spiegelstraat with its antique shops leading to the Rijksmuseum. But, most conveniently, it was also within easy walking distance of where his Press Institute was to settle. This made it easy to take lunch at home, prepared by his housekeeper.

Some people felt alienated and contemplated emigration. The war had left deep emotional scars in many neighbourhoods and families, and the Baschwitzes were no exception. Things had been done or said, or had not been done or said. The children felt that the separation of their parents was a very sad thing, especially after their mother’s continued loyalty during the war.

But they were adults now, in charge of their own lives. During the year of Liberation, the children had turned 25, 23, and 22 years of age, respectively. They had been considered half-Jewish and half-Aryan by the occupiers.
But now they were initially classified as full-German, and therefore as *unwelcome foreigners*, by the new ‘free’ administration.

During the last stage of the war, Baschwitz’s eldest son Hans had reportedly commanded a unit of the ‘Interior Forces’, the former resistance, and had risked his life. He was probably appalled to discover that after the war he might have trouble even getting an appropriate residence or work permit. He had not been particularly close with his father, and soon decided to leave. For a long time, I was unable to find out where he had gone, but was finally able to find traces … on the other side of the world.

He had probably heard that there were opportunities aplenty in the Dutch colonies. Not in the east – as a bloody war for independence had meanwhile broken out in Indonesia. But in the west, in the scattered small colonies of the Caribbean. It turned out that he was on the lists of ship passengers to and from Curaçao in the Dutch Antilles, which I found reproduced in the small local papers.

In the spring of 1947, he had left for Surinam or Dutch Guyana (on the Northern coast of South America), and briefly worked in gold mining. At the end of the next year, he left for Puerto Rico, and from there to the United States. When problems arose, his father Kurt may have had a close acquaintance intervene with the American consulate.15 Hans ended up in Massachusetts, where he ultimately became an insurance salesman (just like his grandfather), married and had two children.16

Isa in turn found work at the *Kriterion* cinema theatre, which was set up in Amsterdam to employ and house youngsters emerging from the resistance, and to allow them to take up or return to their studies. But she was called in by the authorities, because she did not have a work permit. She later said that she had put on her BS ‘interior forces’ uniform, to tell the civil servant that they should make a distinction between good Germans and bad Germans. With her usual bravura, she later even claimed to have said: ‘I worked for the resistance. What did you do during the war? Carry out orders?’ In the end, she was permitted to stay.

When she was later asked how she looked back on the resistance years, she had several answers. First of all, it stirred frightful memories: ‘The Central Station is not a place where I want to be, not even now’. But, on the

---

15 As suggested by Baschwitz’s letter of 28 February 1949 to thank Maarten Rooij (editor-in-chief of the authoritative daily *NRC*, later his press studies successor), for clearing up a ‘misunderstanding’, in file 6.

16 Hans married Hazel Williams and lived in Longmeadow, Massachusetts. He died in 1993. They had a son Kent, and a daughter Carol, who married the Reverend Peter Smith.
other hand, ‘We had very close friendships, [it was] a very warm time. We knew each other, trusted each other’. Still, ‘I would never do it again. I am so terribly disappointed about what developed in The Netherlands. We had thought everything would change, but it didn’t’.17

Her complicated post-war life reflected these contradictory feelings. She first took up the study of law, dropped it, and much later took it up again and finally went to work in a notary’s office. She got into a relationship and later said that when she wanted to marry, she bumped into the nationality issue again. She had her first son. Later she got into a second relationship and had a second son, but he soon died in an accident. At one point, her old illness played up again, and she had to have yet another operation. Finally she got into a third relationship, which remained stable.

But she had never been an easy person, and her wartime experiences had not made things any better. She was sometimes close to her father and sometimes remote again, becoming embroiled with her younger sister for long periods. In later life she gave a number of interviews that shed light on the early life of both her father and herself – as we have already seen.18

Baschwitz’s youngest daughter had a different character, and different experiences. After Liberation, as a child nurse, she apparently accompanied a group of Jewish children sent to Denmark to restore their health, and apparently stayed there for some time. She later married a psychiatrist teaching at the University of Leiden. She proved helpful in briefing Baschwitz’s first biographer Ebels-Dolanová and provided materials to the university library’s Baschwitz archives. In later years, she and her sons have provided even more.19

The founding of a ‘seventh’ faculty in Amsterdam

Even before the war, there had been a broad feeling that academic life should make room for the new social and political sciences. This was particularly true for the professors of the History Department within the Faculty for Literature and Philosophy at the (municipal) University of Amsterdam.

17 Video itw., at the Jewish Historical Museum, 2 hrs., 20 minutes, a.f.
18 The son from her first relationship is Bubo Damen, born in 1951, currently a film and theatre director in Amsterdam. Her second relationship was with A.J. Gundelach, who worked in the architectural office of Groenewegen & Mieras, and was close with Baschwitz for some time. Her third relationship was with economist David Teske. She died in 2002, in Amstelveen.
19 They married in 1955. Her husband was A.E.H.M. Bloklander, who was appointed as a scientific assistant in Leiden in the spring of 1959. They lived in nearby Oegstgeest. She died in 1992, he in 1995. Their sons’ names are Erik and Joris.
When he was finally to receive a university salary and become a professor, Baschwitz moved into a canal house on the Prinsengracht (second from left, upper half) – close to where his Press Institute was to land. (Snapshot probably taken by himself). Further to the left the Maison Descartes; somewhat further to the right the Nieuwe Spiegelstraat with its antique shops, leading to the Rijksmuseum.

Baschwitz’s friends and colleagues Posthumus and Romein, as well as educationalist Philip Kohnstamm, were prominent early advocates there; but they had the broad support of a much larger group. This support particularly came from those who sympathized with the anti-fascist Vigilance Committee, who felt the university should finally step out of its ‘ivory tower’. All felt that many national politicians had proven unprofessional and amateurish in the run-up to the war. They also noted that London, Paris, and Berlin had long had advanced schools of political science.20

During the war itself, several of these professors were interned together with other prominent compatriots as ‘hostages’ by the Germans, giving them ample time to further discuss these ideas. Small groups also met in private to develop them, or proponents knew each other from being in the

---

20 The origins of the faculty are discussed in greater detail in de Rooy’s introductory chapter in Goudsblom, de Rooy, and Wieten; in the second introductory chapter by Knechtmans & Keman in Gevers; and in an introduction by Alex Geelhoed in the brochure published by the ‘Werkgroep Andere Tijden’. All were issued on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the PSF, in 1997–98.
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resistance together. So as soon as the country and capital had been liberated, they began to push for the implementation of their ideas.

In mid-August 1945, the Military Authority allowed the re-opening of the university. The Academic Senate first met two days later. It demanded that representatives from all six existing faculties consider the possible founding of a seventh faculty. The proposal was finally accepted, in principle, in the spring of 1946. In the spring of 1947, a preparatory commission took up practical preparations, with Posthumus as its chairman, Romein as a key member, along with some ten others. Lecturers Presser (history) and Baschwitz (press) sat on this commission as well.

It was determined that the new faculty would have three sections. Section A would cover ‘Political Science’ and related subjects. Note that the English term was consistently used, rather than its Dutch equivalent Politieke wetenschap. American and English examples were explicitly recommended – no continental European ones. Section B would cover Sociology and related subjects. Section C would cover Social Psychology and Social Education. This latter section was (and remained) a bit ill defined, since a separate Psychology department was already under construction elsewhere.21

Furthermore there would be separate institutes devoted to the two new major world powers America (U.S.) and Russia (U.S.S.R.), regrouping country and regional expertise. The first later official printed ‘guide’ for the Political and Social Faculty PSF (p. 2) explicitly added, however, that students should not misinterpret this faculty as a mere ‘candy store’ where they could sample appealing subjects that really belonged in other faculties. Many subjects were to be covered by reassigning personnel. But at least two new ‘ordinary’ and two new ‘extraordinary’ professors should be added to the existing roll. The total extra cost to the university for offering a basic (half-way) ‘candidate’ degree was initially estimated at 41,000 guilders – a considerable sum during those lean years.22

21 Later incarnations of the C section used the terms like ‘Andragology’ and ‘Andragogics’. To indicate the education of, and help provided to, adults (comparable to éducation permanente and social work).

22 Appendices to the Minutes of the 9th meeting of the Preparatory Commission, 11 February 1946 (PSF archives). The Dutch doctoraal exam was more or less equivalent to a current masters degree, although it took at least a year more. In those days, the ‘candidate’ exam was often more or less half-way. Later, a propedeuse exam was introduced, more or less a quarter of the way, to have an earlier selection point.
How political must ‘Political Science’ be?

From the very start, the plan for the Political Science section (where Baschwitz’s ‘Press Science’ was to be primarily located) proved the most controversial. To many, it was unclear whether it would be based on an objective, down-to-earth, empirical approach to the science of politics, or on a normative, ‘engaged’, idealistic approach. Catholic and protestant, liberal-conservative and right-wing social democrats suspected the latter – in view of the section's most outspoken advocates. They considered Posthumus a radical socialist and Romein a ‘fellow traveller’ and former communist. (Remember, however, that almost one in three of Amsterdam’s citizens voted communist at the time, partly due to the party’s role in the resistance).23

The University of the capital Amsterdam had always been considered a leftist bulwark; the primarily social-democratic municipal aldermen and council had a considerable influence over it at the time, favoured a progressive staff and programs. The country’s oldest university in Leyden was both literally and figuratively closer to the seat of government in The Hague, its traditional elites, and particularly the liberal conservatives, by contrast. Protestants had their own university in the other, so-called ‘Free’ university of Amsterdam; Catholics had their own university in Nijmegen. (To be sure, they would all soon start their own ‘Political Science’ departments, with their own prime preoccupations).

Complications arose over the four possible chair-holders for the new PSF. The procedure, from first proposals to final appointments, was drawn out over several years. It began in 1946, when everybody was still ‘all united’ in post-Liberation euphoria: the Soviet Union had been an ally; the communists had played a major role in the resistance. The atmosphere shifted between mid-1947 and mid-1948, however, as the Cold War took off, the communist coup took place in Czechoslovakia, and the Dutch ‘police actions’ in Indonesia escalated, splitting the mainstream parties. By 1949, 23

In the spring of 1992, there was a retrospective exhibition on ‘The little Cold War’ and the founding of the PSF, at the Agnietenkapel university museum. The second Mrs. Baschwitz provided some of the materials. In 1998, upon the 50th anniversary of the faculty, there was a retrospective ‘golden jubilee’ conference, accompanied by two edited books (Goudsblom, de Rooy, and Wieten; Gevers). The press also gave attention to the event. A typical article based on interviews with former students: Eveline Brandt, ‘The Red Myth’, De Groene Amsterdammer, 7 January 1998.
then, the atmosphere had completely changed. The slightest hint of a ‘pink past’ now triggered suspicion of ‘covert infiltration’ or a ‘hidden agenda’.  

It is true that the first candidates for the four new chairs were all long-time associates of both Posthumus and Romein. Three had just come out of hiding as Jews, and three could also well be seen as radical leftists if not ‘fellow travellers’. First in line for the political science chair proper was Romein’s old comrade Jef Suys. He was soon attacked by Jan Barents, a former member of the protestant Christian Historical Union who had gone over to the social-democratic party, and had then been made the head of its ‘scientific bureau’ think tank.

The PSF procedure was then criticized: it was said that the proposal should have mentioned two candidates for each chair rather than one. So it was started all over again, but in the end a third candidate was appointed: Suys was replaced by his most vocal critic, Barents. According to some, Barents proved reasonably competent. Others, however, point out that at the height of the Cold War, he reportedly sent a private letter to the prime minister, suggesting the *preventive deportation* of a potential ‘fifth column’ of 500-1,000 leading communists.

This ‘parachuting’ of the right-wing social democrat Barents into the faculty caused some thirty leftist students to ostentatiously leave his first lecture. Posthumus and Romein, in turn, were outraged about the course of affairs and ultimately retired from the entire PSF effort in disgust. The candidate for the economy chair, Salomon Kleerekoper, and for the history chair, Presser, were also widely attacked as radical leftists, ‘fellow travellers’, hidden Marxists, and crypto-Communists.

**Delay through the Red Scare**

Curiously enough, Baschwitz was considered the only more-or-less non-controversial and unanimous candidate for the section. He kept a low

---

24 The House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) and senator Joseph McCarthy were driving forces in the U.S. at the time, and the mood soon spread to Western Europe and elsewhere.
25 See the chapters on Barents, Baschwitz, and Presser, in Goudsblom, de Rooy, and Wieten. This edited volume has chapters about all 13 of the first batch of professors in the new faculty, and the initial quarrels.
26 Letter, 22 May 1951. (General state archives, Willem Drees/Correspondence). Unearthed by Alex Geelhoed. Quoted in Werkgroep Andere Tijden, p. 27, n. 28.
27 Goudsblom, de Rooy, and Wieten p. 4, 7.
political profile, and tried to get along with all of the other candidates. Apparently, he once again submitted a slightly embellished C.V. since he was increasingly insecure about the eternal delays.

No one seemed to be aware of his overly patriotic (post-) WW I articles in German, or of his somewhat problematic book *Der Massenwahn* – either its first editions (in Gothic script, so somewhat harder to read for foreigners), or its last and revised edition (in modern script, but hardly distributed or even noticed abroad at the time).²⁸

Even more surprising was that some suspected Baschwitz of also somehow being a hidden leftist or a leftist tool. Before WW I, in Germany, he had been a progressive liberal. During the thirties, in The Netherlands, he had been close to several representatives of the similar *Vrijzinnig Democratische Bond*, which had merged with the social democratic party after the war. But now there was suddenly more.

In a private letter to a close colleague about the new faculty, the social-democrat right-winger Wim Thomassen branded all candidates as Crypto-communists – except for Baschwitz. But Thomassen took great care to note that Baschwitz’s first secretary Lie Heynen seemed to be a mole within the new faculty, as she occupied ‘a dangerously advanced communist position, trying to penetrate everywhere’. She was the editor of an anti-Franco information bulletin about Spain, was married to the noteworthy communist artist Peter Alma, and later became a peace activist.²⁹

²⁸ The C.V. was paraphrased in the official letter on the proposed nominations, which the Amsterdam mayor and aldermen sent to the Minister of Education and Sciences, dated 19 November 1947. (Ministry Archives, Box 30, file 51.141, unearthed by Alex Geelhoed). It said that his Ph. D. doctoral dissertation had received a ‘magna cum laude’ and repeated that he had worked for the well-considered *Frankfurter Zeitung* (which had had many Jews on its staff). It also said that he had actually been asked for the press chair in Heidelberg in 1932. None of these claims have been documented by other sources so far. Baschwitz also added that as the H.F. correspondent he had ‘collaborated’ with the (well-considered) Dutch *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* during the First World War, and emphasized that he had only worked for the D.A.Z. during the (liberal-conservative) ‘Stresemann era’ of the Weimar Republic. His publications did not mention his problematic *Der Massenwahn*. It also said that an English translation of *Du und die Masse* had already appeared (it had not, and never would) and announced two books ‘in preparation’ that were never completed.

²⁹ More in the article on Heynen in the *Biografisch Woordenboek van het Socialisme en de Arbeidersbeweging in Nederland* BWSA. For the accusations against her, see Wim Thomassen’s letter to Nico Donkersloot, dated 29 October 1947. Both had been university professors of Dutch language and literature, and were social-democratic colleagues in parliament at this point. (Thomassen went on to become mayor of ever-larger cities, ultimately Rotterdam. Donkersloot later left, and joined the small ‘third way’ leftist Pacifist Socialist Party (PSP)). Donkersloot archive at the Netherlands Literary Museum, file D 6441, B2. Unearthed by Alex Geelhoed.
In the end, three of the four proposed appointments were made temporary and lower-level, for the time being. Only Baschwitz was approved right away, while feverish checks of the other three candidates’ deeper backgrounds were carried out by a wide range of investigators: from Jesuit priests to the intelligence agencies.30

The whole affair appeared to be unique in the annals of post-war Dutch education, science, and politics. This is the first time the political executive and elected representatives (both nationally and municipally) held up academic appointments for such ideological reasons. The social democratic party was profoundly divided over doing so, and the university senate and PSF preparation commission called the interventions a détournement de pouvoir or abuse of power.

In the end, the long standoff was finally resolved in early 1949, after new elections and a new cabinet replaced the conservative Catholic minister of education with a more liberal Catholic minister.31 But the birth pains of the new political and social sciences faculty long left their mark.

A number of young people had been in the resistance during the war, or were called up for the ‘police actions’ in Indonesia thereafter. Thus, many were unable to complete their secondary schooling, but were admitted to the university anyway – with certain conditions. Because of the earlier controversies, however, several professors now felt obliged to overburden their students, and to be overly strict in tests and exams.

The number of PSF students doubled during the first ten years, from nearly 300 to nearly 600: half of those studying in the A section of the new faculty. But these were also years of re-found freedom. Youngsters were not entirely focused on their formal obligations. According to some reports, only 9 percent of the very first generation got their masters degree in Political Science, taking an average of nine (!) rather than the foreseen five years.32

After the republication of his pre-war book Du und die Masse in both German and Dutch, the authorities finally recognized Baschwitz as the anti-communist that he had always been. At the height of the Cold War, around the mid-1950s, the chief of the Binnenlandse Veiligheids Dienst BVD (internal security service) asked him to give a lecture on riots and

---

30 A commemorative article by Arjen Fortuin in the university weekly Folia (3 September 1999) claimed that Baschwitz had fired its whole initial editorial staff after only nine issues, for ‘communist propaganda’.
31 This was Theo Rutten, later the main psychology professor during my own first two years in Nijmegen. More about him in a profile by Ruud Abma in Busato.
revolutions, linking the subject to events in Russia, China, and their vassal states. The ‘recreational society’ of the Interior Ministry served as a cover. When as many as two hundred people announced their attendance, however, the meeting had to be hastily moved from the Ministry to the larger Parliament buildings at the Binnenhof.  

Baschwitz, Presser, and War documentation

The denominational press had widely participated in the McCarthyist witch-hunt of the other PSF candidates: ‘The Roman catholic weekly De Nieuwe Eeuw [The New Century] thought it best the three appointed professors would move to Eastern Europe right away. [Protestant daily] Trouw wrote: “The communists remain set on the student youths of Amsterdam’s seventh faculty. Under the breakthrough motto: Rather Russian than Popish!” Note that none of the three candidates were actually communist party fans at this point in time, nor were any of them uncritically pro-Russian.  

Presser’s biographer added: ‘All this weighed heavily on Jacques. In spite of the support of the student protests [...] There even was a “Committee 23 February 1948” to defend the professors. He felt hurt [...] His sensitivity was heightened, because it was during these same days that he finally learned, that [his beloved young wife] Dé had perished in Sobibor’ – she had been sent to the gas chamber upon arrival. Kurt Baschwitz and his eldest daughter Isa felt dearly for him.  

Meanwhile, Presser was invited to write the official history of the persecution of the Dutch Jews. The Institute for War Documentation had been founded immediately on Liberation Day, to collect information and testimonies about the occupation years – like those already quoted from Anne Frank. Today, the Institute has 16 million pages, with all kinds of war-time documents and files ordered in 18,000 boxes, covering 2.35 kilometres of shelves.

The new Institute was headed by Dr. Loe de Jong, who had worked for the information and radio services of the Dutch government in London. I have already mentioned that de Jong’s twin brother and the latter’s wife had been caught during an escape attempt and never returned. De Jong then developed

33 The chief was L. Einthoven. The event took place on 17 October 1955. The four pages of Baschwitz’s notes, with thirteen related questions to be treated, marked ‘Den Haag’, are in file 159.
34 More in the master’s thesis Ga dan zelf naar Siberië written jointly by Max van Weezel and Annet Bleich (both earlier political science students, later noteworthy journalists), published by SUA in Amsterdam in 1978.
35 van der Zee, p. 210-11.
into the authority on the war and related issues throughout the 1950s and 1960s. He published an encyclopaedic book series, in 14 parts and 29 volumes, and created a long series of television documentaries with 21 instalments.

The persecution of the Jews, which both Baschwitz and Presser had experienced first-hand, had been particularly horrifying. Estimates are that some 20,000-30,000 had gone into hiding, but that only half of those survived. Some 107,000 had been deported, of whom only 5,000 had returned. The returnees were often emotionally crippled, spoke little about their experiences, and were given little room to relate their stories. Everyone had supposedly suffered, so strangely the Holocaust did not stand out so very much yet.

There were also feelings of guilt. Why had so many been deported from The Netherlands (75 percent), as opposed to Belgium (40 percent) or France (25 percent)? Was it the population density and urbanization, the well-organized nature of the civic registers, the relative perfection of the original I.D. papers, even before the war? Or was it the fact that so many Dutch officials had obediently carried out orders and so many citizens had looked away? In time, these became controversial issues.36

Presser received his assignment for this study on the persecution of the Jews in January 1950, on top of his other work, but was still initially expected to complete it by 1952. He began to collect testimonies and documents, but could not get beyond the very first paragraph and page of the book. He kept thinking about his adored young wife, who had simply been deported and gassed. It was only after he had published a partly fictional small account about the Westerbork transit camp that his writer’s block lifted.

From then on, he set himself the task of writing at least one page a day. Kurt and Isa Baschwitz were both alluded to in this book, but not mentioned by name.37 Kurt’s archives have a copy, with a personal dedication ‘with affection’ inscribed by the author, to Isa and her then-husband. The monumental two-volume book only came out in the mid-1960s; a one-volume, abbreviated translation into English in 1968. It was praised as well as criticized for its sometimes highly emotional tone.

Starting with its famously resounding first paragraph.

This is the story of murder – of murder on a scale never known before, with malice aforethought and in cold blood. The murderers were Germans, their victims Jews – in the Netherlands they mounted up to a hundred

36 According to a recent comparative study by Pim Griffioen & Ron Zeller, quoted in Vastenhout, p. 6, n. 3.
thousand, less than 2 percent of the total of those killed by the Nazis in the course of their final solution of the Jewish problem [...] Many of the murderers were mere thugs and illiterates, but others were educated men with an undeniable love of literature, art and music; many were good family men, not without sensibility; most of them celebrated Christmas.\textsuperscript{38}

Only after closely reading the book did the full scale and depth of the horror finally sink in completely for the general public. The giant killing machine that had held the whole of Europe in its grip twenty years earlier. It was only after reading it that Baschwitz was further confronted with the fact that he had indeed only very narrowly escaped certain death at that time.

**At last: Professor of press studies**

Amsterdam was the largest city in the country and also the formal capital, although The Hague was the seat of government and of parliament. Cosmopolitan Amsterdam was also the cultural and the press capital. Most major newspapers had their national headquarters along its own ‘Fleet Street’: the former canal of the Nieuwezijds Voorburgwal, right behind the Royal Palace – with the central Dam square on the other side.

Even before the war, private press lecturers Lievegoed (Leiden) and Baschwitz (Amsterdam) had begun to lobby the major newspapers, the organization of newspaper publishers, and the association of journalists to support a common initiative for an institute and/or house of press studies. Now, at last, this dream slowly began to turn into a reality.

When Baschwitz was finally able to hold his inaugural lecture as professor in 1948, on ‘The intelligence of the newspaper-reading public’, he once again defended ordinary citizens against disparaging views. This was the central theme of his entire life’s work. The broadening of literacy and universal suffrage also helped lead to more informed choices, he said.\textsuperscript{39}

He conceded that the sensationalist tabloids had become much bigger than the serious broadsheet papers, for instance in Great Britain, but added that the latter had nevertheless expanded their circulation in comparison to earlier times. Education and book production had also progressed. He mentioned that the media now extended to radio and movies. With mass

\textsuperscript{38} Presser, *Ashes*, opening page.

\textsuperscript{39} Files 111-112 show he collected facts and figures on these scores.
communication and audience research taking off in the United States, there was now a more nuanced and differentiated view of the public.

A major figure of the Dutch press was later to recall Baschwitz’s steadfast defence of media audiences, too often dismissed as uneducated, uninterested, and purely entertainment-oriented.40 At the end of his lecture, Baschwitz thanked the many colleagues who had been important to him. Including his Jewish colleagues Cohen and Van den Bergh, who had helped him as an exile in the 1930s, and Presser, who had been a close friend. He also included Bonger, who had committed suicide upon the invasion, and Frijda, who had been deported and killed. The war still loomed large.41

Ten months later, the Mayor and a hundred distinguished guests came to open his ambitious ‘House of the Press’ in a spacious three-century-old building at Keizersgracht number 604: halfway along the fancy second canal of the three or four that formed the iconic semi-circle around the centre of town. The location was also halfway between the aforementioned ‘Fleet Street’ of Nieuwezijds Voorburgwal and Baschwitz’s new home on the Prinsengracht. The ‘House of the Press’ succeeded Vrij Nederland in that building; the underground paper had turned into a post-war weekly.

The founding of a cluster of press-related institutions

The Press House hosted a whole cluster of press-related institutions with both public and private funding, brought together under one umbrella by Baschwitz’s quiet diplomacy. The first and foremost of these was the new Institute for Press Studies. Baschwitz boasted that it attracted no less than an estimated 250 outside visitors every week. One-third of its outside financing came from the Municipality of Amsterdam, egged on by the head of its new press and promotion department, Piet Mijksenaar, who wanted to emphasize the role of the city as the prime press centre of The Netherlands.

The other two-thirds of the financing came from the organization of newspaper publishers. Another outside supporter was the Federation of Dutch Journalists (associations), through its chairman Maarten Rooij – the pre- and post-war editor-in-chief of the quality Rotterdam liberal

40 Henk Jan Schoo, who had studied education in the U.S. He first became a key figure in the founding of parenting and psychology magazines. Then he worked for a major press publisher (Weekbladpers), a monthly (Intermagazine), a weekly (Elsevier), and a daily (de Volkskrant). See his column of 15 November 2003, reprinted in Schoo.
41 Also see Ebels-Dolanová, p. 151.
daily *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* (and later the immediate successor of Baschwitz as professor of press studies).

Rooij had also inaugurated a second institution, a central national Press Library, a little earlier. We have already seen that immediately after the war, Baschwitz had sought to re-establish relations with Anton Lievegoed, his pre-war colleague as private lecturer on the press in Leiden, and thereby the head of the Government Press Service. However, he had died in mid-1946. His widow donated his private library about press studies to Baschwitz’s new cluster. The library initially had only 700 volumes, but within 15 years it had expanded to some 10,000 volumes on all of the new, interrelated fields.42

The House also came to host the Press Museum, which had earlier been located in the nearby antique Korenmetershuisje (Corn Measuring House) – also on the aforementioned Nieuwezijds Voorburgwal. The museum had emerged from the private collections of newspapermen before the war and covered some 10,000 newspaper files at the time, including precious copies of the very earliest publications from the 17th century.

Baschwitz now acceded to its board, and helped it obtain further subsidies and support. Today, its collection and catalogue has been merged with that of the International Institute of Social History, which had employed Baschwitz before the war as a newspaper expert.

One student from the earliest days was Hans Daalder. In his memoirs, he wrote that Baschwitz ‘lectured in a very human way, but not very systematically. Only later did people become aware of the important insights he had offered’. He reported how Baschwitz had quickly interrupted his own first student presentation, after he had begun by explaining what he would unfortunately not be able to discuss – rather than what he would. ‘In the German-accented Dutch that characterized him, he said: “Herr Dalder, Schtopp! Don’t excuse yourself! That only demoralises [demotivates] the audience”.

Baschwitz later invited him to his home for the oral exam, sitting him in a chair while warning that it was not very solid. Indeed, the armrest soon fell off. The probably slightly embarrassed Baschwitz concluded with: ‘Well, you know everything, I will give you the mark’.43

---

42 Hemels adds that the national press library was a collaborative project with Nijmegen (*De Journalistieke Eierdans*, p. 135-136); also see Anschlag, p. 75-76.

43 Daalder, p. 20-21, 35. Daalder did a master’s thesis with Baschwitz about newspaper coverage of the Korean conflict.
Daalder recommended the study to Johan Goudsblom, later a professor of sociology in Amsterdam. His recent memoirs report a mass psychology exam with ‘the amiable émigré’ Baschwitz around the mid-1950s. It did not go very well; he passed with a meagre six minus (out of ten). However, Baschwitz’s assistant Brouwer revealed the reason to Baschwitz: Goudsblom’s mother had just had a serious operation (she died a few days later). A while later, Goudsblom was offered another chance, and passed with an eight or nine. ‘And the good Baschwitz seemed even more delighted [with that] than myself’.44

The provisional first staff of the institute consisted of a very small group. Since sugar products were no longer rationed, Baschwitz used every pretext to bring or order cakes, pastries, and other sweets as a kind of belated revenge for the earlier lean times. The library itself was managed by Dick H. Couvéé, who wore a dustcoat because of all the old newspapers in the attic. His wife Lili Jampoller ran the secretariat. Daalder himself became one of the first two student assistants. But he soon moved on to assist Barents at the political science chair instead (and later became a professor in that field himself, at Leiden University).

Baschwitz’s earliest scientific assistant at the Press Institute was Ms. Jacoba de Boer. She had just completed a Ph.D. thesis/Doctoral dissertation about ‘The place of the broadcasting organization(s) in public life in The Netherlands until 1940’, which had been accepted the year after Liberation, in 1946. The formal supervisor was Baschwitz’s faculty ‘mentor’ Posthumus, who may have acted as a proxy for him. In it, she thanks Baschwitz for his special ‘interest’: strangely between somewhat mysterious and suggestive quotation marks. The commercial book edition was then defined as a ‘first volume’; it announced a second volume sequel that never came about. She stayed at the Press Institute for a limited number of years, and in the end migrated all the way to the (then still rather primitive) French Mediterranean island of Corsica. She told other staff members she had at one time had a romance or fling with Baschwitz.45

---

45 Decades later, during the 1970s, staff member Ben Manschot also prepared a Ph.D. thesis/Doctoral dissertation on the uniquely pluralist Dutch broadcasting system (based on audience associations). He went looking for the missing second volume, the materials possibly already collected for it, and the author herself. During a trip to the French island with his friends and colleagues Ms. Conny van der Maesen and Ms. Adje Kaiser, he then checked with the authorities about the whereabouts of a Dutch citizen named Jacoba de Boer. His pronunciation of the dual middle sound did not immediately ring a bell, but then they reportedly exclaimed: ‘Ah, Djacobaa
Saturday courses for practicing journalists

After a tentative first academic year, less improvised coursework for both practising journalists and university students finally started in earnest in September 1948. The next year, scouts travelled to journalism schools in Great Britain and the United States, and reported about their curricula. It would take almost two further decades, however, before The Netherlands could provide a real full-time education to aspiring journalists: first a curriculum of several years in Utrecht and other professional schools, and then one-year post-graduate university programs in Rotterdam and Groningen.46

By contrast, Baschwitz’s early journalism courses were only part-time, given during a single five-hour stretch on Saturday afternoons to suit the schedule of those who worked the rest of the week and/or came from elsewhere. The numbers of participants proved far larger than expected. He proudly pointed out that ‘no less than fifteen editors and reporters came from Amsterdam, but three times as many from elsewhere – alone or in small groups. During those days, the canal displayed cars with number plates from all parts of the country – Rotterdam, Arnhem, Leeuwarden’. Further, the 60 participants were varied and represented all (ideological) currents, he added proudly.47

At some point, Baschwitz and his colleagues even contributed to attempts to develop similar initiatives elsewhere, such as in the Northern university city of Groningen. But he emphasized time and again that journalism could not be learned in the school benches, but only in the workplace. The profession had seen a rapid influx of new collaborators during these years: both the young and the not-so-young.

deboweer’ and pointed them to an address somewhere on the Southern coast. It turned out she was now making jewelry. At first she refused to receive them, but then relented and said the materials collected for the second volume had long remained stored, but had by then been thrown away.

She proved initially reticent to say much more about the reasons for her ultimate departure from Amsterdam, but in the end revealed the romance or fling. Later staff member Jo Bar doel heard the story at the time, but shared it with me only very much later – when I met him by pure coincidence and told him I was about to complete this biography. Unfortunately, both Dr. Manschot and Dr. van der Maesen had meanwhile died, whereas Dr. Kaiser was in a revalidation centre and hard to reach for me (from France). But Prof. Bar doel was kind enough to go check with her, whether our understanding of the original story had been correct. She confirmed it was. (E-mail correspondence with the author, late June/ early July 2017)

46 Baschwitz’s archives have copies of such ‘scouting’ reports by R.F. de Fremery (in files 42-44). Hemels has provided complete histories of the takeoff of the later initiatives, from 1966 onwards (see De journalistieke eierdans; ‘Kommunikationswissenschaft’, etc.).

Many came from the former underground press, or from its post-war incarnations. Many had therefore not had a chance to acquire the relevant diplomas. The course provided them with basic knowledge: about the press itself, and about related fields in social and political science. Colleagues like the historian Presser contributed as well, as did experienced journalists like Henri Knap. The typewritten notes of some diligent students from those days have been conserved.48

Most students were happy with the courses, and went on to become serious journalists. But there were a few exceptions. One reminisced:

I got a terrible damper at the Institute of Press Science in Amsterdam. It had professor Baskowitz [sic] and Henri Knap of Het Parool, who could review a piece [...] A class of some hundred people was listening, and

those two said: ‘There is a guy who dared write about some movie missy. […] That seems to be unfit for a decent newspaper!’

I stood up and said: ‘I am Henk van der Meijden, and Audrey Hepburn is the most successful Dutch actress in the whole world. You may think it is unfit for a newspaper, but I will continue!’ Then I walked out.

He did indeed go on to build a huge career on showbiz, with a full daily gossip page in the largest daily De Telegraaf, his own weekly celebrity magazine, a club, and finally an entire theatrical production company of his own.

University students of political and press science

Baschwitz’s courses for the students of the new political and social sciences faculty of the university took place during the rest of the week; on Wednesday evenings, there were also lectures open to public. Baschwitz invited noteworthy practitioners, such as Robert Peereboom who had just published an introductory book, The Daily. Peereboom had succeeded his father as the director and chief editor of the Haarlems Dagblad, which claimed to be the descendant of one of the oldest newspapers in the entire world.

‘Press, propaganda and public opinion’ was an optional subject for the ‘candidate’ degree (halfway to graduate) in the entire faculty, and was also taught by Baschwitz in various separate parts. The first trimester had weekly courses on both the former and the latter elements. The literature lists provided in the first printed PSF ‘study guide’ (1949-50), and in Baschwitz’s ‘annual reports’, provide an idea of the orientation of the faculty in those days.

The obligatory readings in Dutch covered the newspaper, its history, and radio (by Baschwitz, Schneider, and Jacoba De Boer, respectively). Recommended reading in English involved then-current standard literature from the U.S. and the U.K. From the second trimester onwards, there was a weekly two-hour ‘colloquium’. For the final ‘doctoraal’ (masters) exam,

---

49 The name slip may be partly Freudian, identifying him as ‘some kind of arch German’. Blaskowitz was the name of the general who had finally signed the German capitulation in The Netherlands, on 6 May 1945 in Wageningen, after demanding a day’s delay ‘to think about it’ (Van Liempt, De oorlog, p. 311).

50 Interview in the ‘PS’ weekend supplement of Het Parool, 29 August 2015, p. 14. (Audrey Hepburn made her successful film debut with the 1953 movie Roman Holiday. She had been born in Belgium, daughter of a Dutch baroness and a British banker).

51 Anschlag (p. 77) has an overview of Baschwitz’ courses, 1948-1957.
‘press institutions’ was an obligatory subject. Its literature included the post-war reports of both the American and British press commissions.\textsuperscript{52} An early poll about their professional aspirations established that many of the students in the A section wanted to become journalists, rather than politicians or civil servants.\textsuperscript{53} One PSF student was Rob Wout: later a famous political cartoonist under the pseudonym Opland for the daily \textit{de Volkskrant} and the weekly \textit{De Groene}. Wout used a very thick black pen, and a characteristically simple and naïve style, to skewer The Hague politicians.

For the fifth anniversary of the PSF, Baschwitz reportedly arranged an invited lecture about ‘the psychology of the audience’ by Wim Kan. Kan later evolved into the main stand-up comedian of those days, performing in major theatres, and was later famous for his annual radio conferences about current affairs on New Year’s Eve – which also ridiculed many an almighty politician in The Hague.

However, some students of political science (and of press studies) did indeed go on to become leading politicians. Two of them, on opposite sides of the political spectrum, became members of both the second and first chamber of parliament, later floor leaders, and ultimately influential ministers.

One was Ed van Thijn (b. 1934), who had been in hiding as a Jewish child during the war and narrowly survived the Westerbork transit camp at the end. He was to become part of the Labour party during its leftist days, later also the Mayor of Amsterdam, and was the keynote speaker during a later Baschwitz commemoration.\textsuperscript{54}

The other was Hans Wiegel (b. 1941), who did not complete his degree. Instead, he built the youth league of the liberal-conservative party and helped to make it a major factor on the right. He then became the youngest MP, later a key government figure, and ultimately the Royal Commissioner for the province of Friesland in the north. Both Van Tijn and Wiegel later fondly remembered their early PSF days.

In his inaugural lecture for the Press Institute, Baschwitz had shown a gift of foresight, saying: ‘If one of our students would even rise to minister, this

\textsuperscript{52} PSF Study guide & Stencilled/mimeographed annual report. Stadsarchief, Archief 281, Inv. Nr. 128, L 17/5.

\textsuperscript{53} One poll about the students’ professional aspirations was taken by Baschwitz’s first assistant Hans Schravendijk. The raw data are still available in files 40 and 41 of the archives.

[university preparation] would spare the chief of the information service at his department many irritations and many vain efforts’. And it did.\textsuperscript{55}

**Advanced students and later staff**

Baschwitz’s later students and assistants quickly familiarized themselves with the new empirical-quantitative methods of investigation that had further developed in the U.S. around the war-years. These included readability tests, content analyses of newspaper coverage on topical issues, and statistical techniques in general. The surviving attendance lists for Baschwitz’s colloquia include many familiar names, of people who later became noteworthy journalists or academics.\textsuperscript{56}

I already mentioned that ‘press studies’ was a minor, and could not be done as a major (for the final graduate or masters exam). The first student who managed to become an exception was Marten Brouwer. He had begun in the Political Science A section, had then switched to the Social Psychology C section, but had finally approached the supervisory commission for special permission to do a ‘free program’ built around Baschwitz’s press studies.\textsuperscript{57}

Baschwitz was soon able to hire another ‘scientific assistant’. This was Hans van Schravendijk, who also came from the Social Psychology C section and had undertaken the first student polling. He but was soon lured away, however, by one of the first Dutch polling agencies: Gallup-affiliate Nipo. He was then succeeded by the aforementioned Marten Brouwer (1929-2001). The latter was later to assure the succession for one half of Baschwitz’s dual task within the 7th or PSF faculty, in a separate ‘mass psychology’ chair (more below).

\textsuperscript{55} Typescript, p. 3. (Note that there are several versions).
\textsuperscript{56} Journalists: John Jansen van Galen, who went to work at the *Algemeen Handelsblad*, and then at a wide range of other outlets. Rita Beeuwkes, later Kohnstamm, who became a noted developmental psychologist, and also the main force behind The Netherlands’ major parenting and psychology magazines (*Ouders van nu; Psychologie Magazine*). Academics: apart from his assistants and students discussed here, Rob Kroes, who became a professor of American Studies in Amsterdam, and Rob Mokken, who became a professor of political science. As well as Sybren Pietersma, who became a major university administrator.
\textsuperscript{57} File 8 has the first job application notes he sent immediately after a personal visit, just before his graduate exam in mid-1950. He was the son of an author and professor of the Frisian regional language at Groningen University, and had himself briefly been on the Amsterdam editorial staff of *Je Maintiendrai/De Stem van Nederland* after the war. It soon folded into the other and larger former illegal paper *Vrij Nederland*. He was called up for military service, but soon rejected. This permitted him to return to Baschwitz after Van Schravendijk had left. (Brouwer in Goudsblom, de Rooy, and Wieten, p. 25-36).
Another early assistant was Hans Daudt (1925-2008), who went on to succeed Barents as the main professor of Political Science within the PSF. He remembered that in everyday interactions, Baschwitz ‘made a great impression on his collaborators of those years for his sober and wise judgment. His example taught them a critical attitude toward the delusions of the moment [“waan van de dag”]. He stimulated them to do empirical research to check – if things were really as everyone thought they were’.  

Baschwitz, Brouwer and Daudt were close at the time. Isa Baschwitz’s son Bubo told me that at the end of the day he often played pool with the assistants in a café on the nearby Rokin avenue. Brouwer quoted Daudt as joking about press science: ‘This is the only academic institute where one is at work, when one just reads the newspaper in the morning’.  

Brouwer and Daudt both eagerly studied and adopted the vocabulary and new quantitative empirical techniques of social research in the United States.

Media effects and audiences: UFOs and charity campaigns

As a professor of mass psychology, Baschwitz was regularly approached by both Dutch and foreign media to comment on media hypes and scares – or even hoaxes. One example was an ‘encounter of the third kind’, which a film projectionist had reported to the West German police. He said that he had suddenly noticed a bluish light in the sky, in the middle of the night. An ‘unidentified flying object’ (UFO) or ‘flying saucer’ had hovered above the ground for six minutes before landing, he claimed. He had allegedly seen, from only sixty meters away, that four dwarf-like extra-terrestrials (or aliens) had clambered out.

Such sensationalist reports changed dimensions in the audio-visual age, with instant reporting and the further spread of the electronic media – first of radio, then of television. ‘Press science’ thus expanded to include broadcasting and movies as new forms of mass communication. Just before the war, ‘private lecturer’ Baschwitz had apparently already followed the discussions about possible ‘radio research’ between representatives of the different broadcasting organizations, then sponsored by the Ministry of the Interior and others.

58 Obituary, Het Parool, 9 January 1968 (File 2).
59 From Brouwer in Goudsblom, de Rooy, and Weiten, p. 31.
60 ‘Fliegende Untertassen’, Westfälische Nachrichten, 12 October 1954. Half-page article with comments by Baschwitz, about the reports from Rinkerode/Abersloch.
After the war, charity events accompanied by huge broadcast campaigns provided highly appropriate subjects for his studies of both mass communication and mass psychology. Baschwitz apparently wrote a small report about the 1951 ‘Haak in’ (Link up) mass campaign by the protestant NCRV radio association, which was meant to benefit the newly founded ‘Queen Wilhelmina Fund’ for cancer research. Some 50,000 people visited on the last day of the event alone, and the campaign raised 2.5 million guilders – a huge sum for those days.61

Then television came along. Before the war, the Philips electrical company in Eindhoven had already experimented with the new medium. But when national broadcasts finally started in 1951, there were only 3,000 receivers throughout the country. After news broadcasts started (on alternate days!) in 1956, there were only an estimated 30,000. But when the first ‘actualiteiten-rubrieken’ or news background programs followed around 1960, the threshold of a million receivers had already been crossed.

Baschwitz’s staff and students increasingly delved into these new forms of media and their audiences. His assistant Brouwer prepared an early report on the social effects of television advertising; his students Johan Goudsblom and Rob Mokken looked into the published qualitative and quantitative research on the question from the U.S. (Mokken had a talent for numbers and became involved in the math centre, then the Central Bureau of Statistics, as well as becoming a professor of research methodology in political science).

Brouwer’s later team did an elaborate study about the 1962 ‘Open het Dorp’ (Open the Village) campaign by the liberal AVRO broadcasting association. This campaign meant to build a special village near the city of Arnhem that would accommodate handicapped people. Some 400 national artists participated in the unprecedented 24-hour telethon broadcast, which raised more than 12 million guilders. Social and mass psychology obviously played a role in all such cases.

Links to social and mass psychology

From the very first post-war plans for a PSF faculty onwards, there were differences of opinion concerning the C section, which was supposed to be devoted to social psychology and social education. At that point it had still

61 Algemeen Handelsblad, 25 & 26 May; the medical journal Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde NTvG, 9 June 1951. Twelve page typescript report in German, Baschwitz archives, File 130.
been unclear how ‘social psychology’ ought to be defined and delineated; the newer Anglo-American literature was only just arriving and beginning to sink in, so the pre-war continental approach still prevailed initially. The same held for ‘mass psychology’, as a subsumed or separate subject.62

During the pre-war years, the newly emerging fields of press studies and psychology had provisionally been placed under the large umbrella of the Faculty of Literature and Philosophy in Amsterdam. But after the war, they evolved into separate departments that were organizationally far apart. Yet they were also both meant to contribute to the PSF C section.

Psychology pioneer Géza Révész had come from Hungary (where he had been the Ph.D. dissertation supervisor of the aforementioned Karl Mannheim’s wife). Through the heritage of the partially Germanophone Austrian-Hungarian dual monarchy, Révész was very much oriented towards German experimental psychology. He maintained that social

62 One interesting broad overview of mass psychology was provided in a post-war book by Paul Reiwald, who had fled from Germany to Switzerland. It was translated into Dutch in 1952. For the history of social psychology in general, see Sahakian.
psychology should be taught by a proper psychologist (i.e., not by an economist like Baschwitz), and seen as an intermediary domain between individual psychology and sociology.

Baschwitz, by contrast, claimed that his pre-war book *Du und die Masse*, which was soon to be republished with only minor changes, covered both social and mass psychology. He said its ‘historical starting points’ lay in ‘the study of mass crime’ (i.e. the aforementioned Italo-French or ‘Roman’ school of the 1890s). This study of mass crime had led to ‘suggestion as the key problem’, he said.

Its further subjects were, according to him: ‘rebellion, revolt, mass persuasion, propaganda, newspapers, radio and movies, origins of the power of the state, the leader, the union, the political party, public opinion, [and] advertising’ in all their forms. Its method was primarily historical, he said. It ‘employed psychology and sociology’ but differed fundamentally from experimental psychology (i.e., the domain of Révész).63

But meanwhile Révész had been succeeded by his pupil Hubert Duijker, who veered toward the very latest in American and experimental approaches. He then also became the prime social psychology lecturer in the PSF C section (alongside a ‘group psychologist’). He assigned literature by such luminaries as Kurt Lewin, Gardner Murphy and Theodore Newcomb, and Muzafer Sherif.64

Meanwhile, Baschwitz’s press chair and teaching commitment were first extended to include ‘propaganda and public opinion’ and then ‘mass psychology’ as well.65 The latter three elements later got a separate chair and institute, under Baschwitz’s former assistant Marten Brouwer, who had meanwhile done a Ph.D. dissertation on stereotypes.66 Brouwer also briefly went to the U.S., and proposed a ‘mycelium model’: a metaphor for interconnected audience reactions and the resulting media effects.

---

63 Minutes of the Preparatory commission, 10 and 17 December 1945.
64 See the chapter about him in Busato.
65 Anschlag (p. 77) made an overview schedule of the different regular courses that Baschwitz gave from 1948-1957, on the basis of the successive University Yearbooks.
66 Duijker and Brouwer became my own M.A. supervisors in later years. I myself came to Amsterdam in 1965-1966, after completing a half-way ‘candidates’ degree in Nijmegen. I did my graduate in social psychology with Duijker (although he called it ‘behavioural psychology’ at the time). But for me a large part was in fact mass psychology, public opinion, and propaganda, which I studied with Brouwer, with press science as a further optional subject, then given by Rooij.
The post-war emergence of public opinion research

Meanwhile, public opinion research and polls had become the most revolutionary new subjects. They entailed an entirely new social technology, ranging from sample surveys to attitude ‘measurement’ and scaling. They supposedly permitted the ‘exact’ comparison of the orientations of different groups, at different times, before and after a communication effort – whether commercial or political. And therefore they allowed the testing and fine-tuning of messages within the wider framework of an emerging multi-media society.

Before the Second World War, Baschwitz had already spoken and written about ‘public opinion’. But, for him (as for most other experts) this had in practice meant ‘press opinion’. It was only in the press, that the volatile opinion of the mass public seemed to condensate, to become material and ‘objectively’ observable.

Where were they observable? First in the professional journalists’ part of the newspaper: the editorial comments, statements by authorities, and news articles and their headings – particularly on the front pages. Second, in the readers’ letters, to some extent, though these were often heavily truncated and redacted. ‘Monitoring’ public opinion thus primarily meant studying files of press clippings; ‘influencing’ public opinion primarily meant producing press releases, giving press conferences, and maintaining ongoing relations with journalists. So the emerging ‘press studies’ had indeed already included ‘public opinion’ – but mostly in this limited form.

Industrialization and urbanization had meanwhile led to entirely new needs for information about individuals’ constantly shifting psycho-social orientations. First in immigrant North America, then also in the more traditional Western Europe. Information was needed about economic markets, social categories, political electorates, military morale, and media audiences. In two detailed earlier studies, I have explored why and how this gradually gave rise to more elaborate social surveys and then opinion polls, first in the U.S. before the war, and in The Netherlands thereafter. Baschwitz’s personal files contain Dutch press clippings about the earliest American initiatives by Gallup, Roper, and company from just before the

---

67 See my ‘Social orientations’, p. 220-244, in Jansz & Van Drunen (eds., 2004), and my De Uitvinding, p. 53-96.
war, but the occupation had largely interrupted further news and developments on the European continent.  

So Baschwitz was vaguely aware that something was brewing in the field. Immediately after Liberation, in late 1946, he and a colleague gave lectures on 'public opinion' for the Dutch Sociologists Association, which were also published in the first volume of their brand-new yearbook. The lectures were attended by a significant number of post-war Dutch social science pioneers from Amsterdam and elsewhere, and gave rise to a lively discussion on the manifestation of 'the invisible mass'. Baschwitz even included a reference to the pivotal collection of essays *L’Opinion et la Foule* by French ‘mass psychologist’ Gabriel Tarde, which he had previously overlooked.

In his lecture, he reviewed the ideas of Enlightenment philosophers and politicians, as well as some pre-war sociologists and social psychologists, including English-language authors like Ellwood and McDougall. His literature mentioned the more recent books by William Albig and Hadley Cantril. But apparently he had not yet been able to actually see, read, and digest these works, as he failed to explicitly identify the two major technical breakthroughs that had arisen in the U.S. Namely, the improvement of population ‘sampling’ methods by Gallup et al, and attitude ‘scaling’ techniques by Louis Leon Thurstone et al.

Collaboration with the first polling agencies

At this point, there were only two embryonic polling agencies in the country – and Baschwitz got in touch with them immediately. One published a brochure about the state of affairs with regard to polls in The Netherlands, the other a periodical bulletin – first bi-weekly, then monthly.

The first, the Netherlands Statistics Foundation (NSS), was initially more oriented towards governmental research. Baschwitz was even invited to join its board; he sent his first graduate student to do an internship and then get a job there. The NSS had originally emerged out of a collaboration

---

68  Daily *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 2 September 1938; Daily *De Telegraaf*, 15 March 1939; weekly *Haagsche Post*, 12 August 1939 (File 104).
69  He referred to the 4th edition, about the visible and the invisible mass. More about the significance of Tarde in the last chapter of my study *Crowds, psychology and politics*. Tarde’s son was one of the first to organize an opinion poll in France, although it was rather tentative and unscientific.
1946-1957: FOUNDER OF INSTITUTIONS

between the Central Bureau of Statistics and the innovative Mundaneum Institute for graphic design run by Germanophone exiles.\textsuperscript{71}

During the summer of 1945, Baschwitz had already been asked to advise on an NSS ‘Liberation poll’, which had asked the Dutch how they now felt about the former occupiers, the Germans, but also about their sympathies for the respective later liberators – for the U.S. and the U.K., as opposed to the Soviet Union. Many such investigations were inspired and/or paid for by American and/or embryonic common defence initiatives during these years – for obvious strategic reasons. The NSS later joined another international network, while its Dutch results were published by the large newsweekly \textit{Elseviers}.\textsuperscript{72}

The second polling agency, the Netherlands Institute of Public Opinion (NIPO), had emerged out of tentative market research for a cookie producer. NIPO soon joined the international network of the Gallup agencies; its Dutch results were first published by the daily \textit{Het Parool}, and then by a range of others. Baschwitz invited the NIPO director to give a lecture at the university. The largest Dutch corporations, such as Unilever and Philips, had also gradually begun to do more sophisticated consumer research.

The interested academics founded the \textit{Vereniging voor Opinie-onderzoek}, a national association for opinion research, which had its first meeting in mid-November 1945. It also published an eight-page brochure titled ‘What is opinion research?’, and organized a series of three radio broadcasts on the subject in January 1946.

On the one hand, the association tried to mobilize support from institutions and corporations (both public and private) that were hungry for updated and reliable information, especially after the great disruptions of the war. On the other hand, it tried to introduce the new techniques at universities – again, first in Amsterdam. It even offered Baschwitz to hold a poll about opinions concerning the controversial PSF in Amsterdam.\textsuperscript{73}

The new dean of the municipal university was made chairman of the association; another Amsterdam professor was his deputy, and still others were made members of the board. The association soon published an Information bulletin (\textit{Medelingenblad}), that was meant to evolve into a regular publication with ever new findings on \textit{Mensen en Meningen} (‘People and Opinions’).

\textsuperscript{71} It originally specialized in new elementary iconic visual representations called ‘Isotypes’ – today overly familiar worldwide. It was originally run by three German-speaking exiles, but two of them had been able to flee onwards to Great Britain before the occupation.

\textsuperscript{72} See the brochure by B.M. Sweers, \textit{Vrije Meeningen in een Vrij Land} (Amsterdam-Brussels: Elsevier 1946). More about this in my book \textit{De Uitvinding}; and in Brouwer, \textit{De fakkel van Baschwitz}.

\textsuperscript{73} Letter, 13 March 1946 (File 104).
Interestingly enough, others soon voiced scepticism about ‘the shadow side’ of the new techniques and their social impact. The front page of the influential weekly *Vrij Nederland* carried the large headline ‘The tyranny of King Gallup – Oracle of Delphi’ over an article that discussed the so-called ‘bandwagon’ effect (that people tend to be drawn to an announced winner). In the end, it claimed, this might lead to the prevalence of only one candidate.74

**The first links across borders**

But even more important were the overseas connections that were being built. According to a floor plan from the spring of 1948, Baschwitz’s assistants were sharing the available rooms in the department with colleagues that had popped up out of the blue: international public opinion researchers assigned there.

The newly founded United Nations in New York had set up UNESCO, its branch for education, science, and culture, in Paris. It also promoted the adoption of the new American social science techniques in Europe. The newly founded World Association for Public Opinion Research (WAPOR) was looking for a foothold in Western Europe – and landed in Baschwitz’s department.75

‘Forecasts’ of electoral outcomes were somewhat problematic (and still are today, for a number of reasons). Before the war, large-circulation press publications had begun to ask their subscribers about their political preferences – but had failed to ‘correct’ for their specific demographic profiles (so-called ‘weighing’ or re-calibration of a sample).

In the mid-1930s, Baschwitz had read about a primitive French poll that named Marshall Pétain (the supposed WW I victor) as the preferred leader.76 In 1936, the American *Literary Digest* magazine had incorrectly predicted the victory of Alf Landon over Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And now, in 1948, many pollsters using the new more ‘scientific’ methods of sampling

---

74 On the other hand, there is also an opposite ‘underdog’ effect, however. Paul Stern, *Vrij Nederland*, 3 April 1948.
75 More in two articles in the Spring 1957 issue of *The Public Opinion Quarterly*.
76 WW I hero and subsequent WW II ‘Vichy’ traitor. (His lieutenant, later general, Charles de Gaulle did not figure in the list at all). *Le Petit Journal*, quoted by the Paris correspondent of Baschwitz’s preferred daily *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 14 January 1935. (Clipping in his personal archives, file 129).
were wrong again: they predicted a Thomas E. Dewey victory over Harry S. Truman.

Only a few days later, Baschwitz used his Saturday lecture for journalists to discuss the probable technical reasons for this failure. One was that the ‘quota system’ of sampling had probably contributed to excessive ‘interviewer bias’. The reasons laid out by Baschwitz did indeed correspond to the findings of the later investigatory committee and discussed by a subsequent conference of experts.\textsuperscript{77}

In 1951-52, Baschwitz undertook a major social survey and opinion research project himself, together with a newly appointed Amsterdam professor of geography and ethnology.

At the end of the war, Germany had had eleven million displaced persons, who needed to be resettled – and to fit in. Many fled the hostile northeast (Russian-occupied zone) or even the southwest (French zone), to the less hostile northwest (British zone) – in particular, to the states of Schleswig Holstein and Niedersachsen. The study by the two scholars was meant to help by investigating the outlook and acceptance of refugees in the rural area of Fallingbostel (in the triangle between the major Northern cities of Hannover, Bremen, and Hamburg).\textsuperscript{78}

Meanwhile, the press library ordered all of the new American books that it could lay its hands on, in all related fields. Students or outsiders sometimes produced abstracts that helped Baschwitz, whose English was still poor.\textsuperscript{79} His assistants further exploited this literature to produce a ‘state of the art’ inventory of recent major U.S. studies on public opinion and attitude measurement, mass communication and media effects.\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{77} Furthermore De Jonge of the NSS and Baschwitz said in the Dutch press that eight factors might have played a role (Daily \textit{De Tijd}, 9 November 1948). Compare: Mosteller et al. (Committee), \textit{The Pre-election Polls of 1948} (New York: SSRC 1949). The latter quoted by Brouwer in Goudsblom, de Rooy, and Wieten, p. 28-29.

\textsuperscript{78} K. Baschwitz & H.D. de Vries Reilingh, \textit{Menschen ohne Heimat}. Partly subsidized by the Prince Bernhard Fund, also within the framework of the renewed cultural relations between the two countries. Offered to the German federal minister for ‘Vertriebene, Flüchtlinge und Kriegsgeschädigte’ (and published by A.W.R. & Pax in The Hague, 1955). Also see Ebels-Dolanová, p. 185, 219-220.

\textsuperscript{79} His personal archives contain August 1945 typescript summaries of a guide by Gallup and a brochure of the American Institute of Public Opinion AIPO by history graduate J. Visser and a 30-page summary of Cantril’s \textit{Gauging Public Opinion} by Ms. M.J.C. Beijen (who apparently also served as a pollster for one of the agencies) (File 104).

\textsuperscript{80} M. Brouwer & H. Daudt, fifty-plus item reference list, with their chapter in the 1956 \textit{liber amicorum} for Baschwitz’s retirement.
U.S. introductory and more advanced texts, as well as articles from the new *Public Opinion Quarterly*, became standard fare for the regular colloquia given by both Baschwitz and his assistants – who also began to experiment with newspaper readership and radio listening surveys, or even ‘media uses’ in general. Some students experimented with polls on international affairs, then went on to apply these techniques for their internships or theses.

The Polls and Steinmetz research archives

Many students of Baschwitz, the PSF, and adjacent disciplines found their way into the booming new business of opinion and market research between the early 1950s and early 1960s. By that time, there were already well over a dozen commercial agencies in The Netherlands, with an estimated combined turnover of twenty million guilders. They did close to a thousand projects per year, and conducted well over a million interviews. But of course larger administrations and companies soon hired their own specialists as well, and managed relevant projects in-house.81

It became important not to duplicate each other’s work and to learn from others’ mistakes – so it was imperative to store and index previous results. The answers to commercial research questions usually had to remain largely confidential or hidden from competitors, but answers to additional ‘general’ and political questions were often made available for ‘secondary analysis’.

At a trade conference during the mid-1950s, Gallup announced that it would give Baschwitz’s group 5,000 guilders to make an inventory of the first decade of all results concerning international relations. (The equivalent of some 17,000 euros in 2017).82 So Baschwitz’s assistant Brouwer dutifully built an archive of such results from all over the world, for WAPOR. This led to an overview book the next year, and then to founding of the English-language *Polls* journal, which signalled the outcomes of new public opinion research on these scores.

Later, Baschwitz supported the creation of a mathematical, calculation, and computer centre for the social sciences. For some time, it was housed
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81 Details in my 1993 book *De Uitvinding*, p. 76-77, referring back to Brouwer’s report on *The 1963 production of sample surveys in continental Europe*, as well as Harm ’t Hart, and various trade magazines.

82 *Daily Het Vrije Volk*, 3 September 1955. During a trade conference at the ‘Hoge Vuursche’, also mentioned in the *Algemeen Handelsblad*. 
in the same canal house on the Herengracht where the mass psychology and public opinion institute also found a home. I remember the heavy punch card sorters that were used. Previous surveys could sometimes be re-analysed or combined, in view of newly emerging and slightly different research questions.

This then also led to the founding of the *Steinmetz* archives to store data sets: named after an earlier founder of Dutch sociology. Today, this role has been transferred to the Data Archiving and Networking Services (DANS) of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences.83

---

83 The Steinmetz foundation officially started on 27 November 1964. Marten Brouwer asked his former student Harm ‘t Hart (later a professor in Utrecht) to be its coordinator. Today, another reason for secondary analysis or replication may be to check whether the original interpretations were correct after all – also in view of the controversy over scientific journals’ *publication bias*. See my 2013 Dutch book *From Big Brother to the Brain Hype* about the last quarter century of psychological practice, in particular p. 100-109.