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HISTORY OF THE NONPROFIT SECTOR
IN THE NETHERLANDS

Introduction

This paper traces the origin and evolution of the Dutch nonprofit sector. Historians who have studied the sector, or parts of it, do not agree on exactly when one can reasonably speak of a Dutch nonprofit sector. Some pinpoint its origins in the formation of “organized philanthropy,” others look to the actions of individual, mostly well-to-do citizens seeking to “do good for society.” The interpretations vary on the type of nonprofit endeavor examined and on the observer’s perspective.

In a review of the literature, we try to ferret out the roots of the nonprofit sector and then carefully follow its development. Primary emphasis is on the relations between private initiatives and the state, and on how these have changed. The analysis is guided by the criteria of the structural-operational definition developed by the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project for classifying organizations as belonging to the nonprofit sector. In addition, we examine the functions fulfilled by private nonprofit organizations and how these have evolved.

In the first part of the paper we trace developments in the most prominent areas of the nonprofit sector, those of the greatest scale and significance. Many organizations were founded through the initiative of institutions or private individuals affiliated with churches. In other cases, prominent citizens set up services they believed would fulfil some social function, either for their own social class (e.g., the concert halls, theaters and museums erected from 1850-1900) or for lower classes. Philanthropists established housing societies to build dwellings for the working class, built hospitals and schools for the poor, gave monetary support to the needy and unemployed, and provided care to ex-offenders. Subsequently philanthropists established radio and television broadcasting organizations. Former charitable organizations were gradually transformed into professionalized welfare institutions.

The second part of the text is an analysis of developments using the “social origins” approach developed by Salamon and Anheier (1998), which classifies nonprofit sector regimes into selected models, i.e., liberal, social democratic, corporatist or statist. Previous analysis concluded that the 19th-century liberal model in the Netherlands evolved into the corporatist model of the 20th century. We investigate whether this conclusion is valid in the light of developments in previous centuries. Does this rudimentary characterization need refinement? Developments in the present day suggest a return to the liberal model. The autonomy of private institutions is being reinstated and the state is assuming a more hands-off approach, thereby expanding the room for private initiative. In the final part of this paper we take a closer look at particular areas of the nonprofit sector, i.e. housing and the environment which were selected for the impact analysis component of this project.

---

The Origins of the Nonprofit Sector

Health care

The “hospital” is one of the oldest services in the nonprofit sector, having originated in early Christian times. It provided “hospitality” to all who needed it: sick people, strangers, foundlings, orphans, and the elderly. Hospitals had strong ties to the church. The so-called guesthouses, of medieval origin, were hospitals for the care of the sick and/or infirm. Originally these hospitals, usually located at a convent, monastery or church, were places of refuge for needy strangers. Later some differentiation occurred, resulting in establishments such as god houses (hospices where care was given free of charge), pest houses, and madhouses. With the rise of urban settlements there was a movement on the part of administrators to bring these establishments under city authority. This led to a new type of institution, the public infirmary. Local variations developed over the years. In Amsterdam the word gasthuis came to designate a hospital for the sick, while in Utrecht it was a home for the elderly.

In the second half of the 19th century, hospitals underwent considerable changes due to rapid developments in medical research and the natural sciences. Medical treatment played an increasingly central role in the care of the sick. Ultimately the guesthouses were transformed from care and relief establishments to the modern, highly specialized technological medical centers they are today.

Notwithstanding the major role the church played in the emergence of the hospitals, Groenveld et al. have also called attention to the many private citizens who, individually or collectively, founded guesthouses (1997: 33-37). This occurred more in the southern part of the Low Countries than in the north. The oldest known hospital of this type was founded at Chièvres, near Brussels, in 1126. Its founders came from the highest stratum of society. Their aim was twofold: salvation for themselves and benevolence to others. A growing specialization of hospitals could already be seen in the 15th and 16th centuries in forms such as madhouses for urban lunatics and hofjes, small almshouses for the elderly enclosed in a courtyard.

Access to physicians, obstetricians, pharmacists and other representatives of today’s mainstream medicine was extremely limited far into the 19th century (see also van der Velden 1993: 47-85). The dispersion of providers throughout the country was very uneven, most being found in cities. Care was expensive, so demand was not high. Only the rich could afford medical assistance. Furthermore, it was not very efficient nor effective because the degree of organization was low and private practices were virtually inaccessible to the poor.

General hospitals, originally a municipal provision, existed only in small numbers in the early 19th century. In 1810 there were twenty in the Netherlands. This number grew to eighty by the end of the century. At that time hospitals were mainly places where poor people could recover from illness under better conditions than those at home (van der Velden 1993: 72).

Health insurance funds are one of the oldest forms of private initiative in the field of health care. Since state and private initiatives in health care were notably interlinked, as van der Velden has pointed out, it is all the more surprising to see that the health insurance funds had few political
connections, in contrast to strongly politicized organizations such as home nursing. One significant characteristic of this type of “old private initiative” was that they were usually set up by directly interested parties for members of their own group. Catholic funds restricted their own radius of action to the southern parts of the country.

After 1872 medical care was dominated by private initiative. The state kept its distance and left many matters to private organizations such as the White Cross. As Pennings has described it,

Partly under pressure from confessional parties and partly out of a need for economies, the state gave private organizations – the non-denominational White and Green Cross, the Catholic White-Yellow Cross and the Protestant Orange-Green Cross – all the room they needed.... The home nursing associations operated largely on their own financial means, derived from contributions, bequests and collections (Pennings 1991: 91-92).

The *raison d'être* of “modern private initiatives” (such as home nursing associations) was not so much caring for a certain group, but making care accessible to persons of limited means. “The associations were founded predominantly by people who believed that the care of the poor and indigent sick was deficient, from the point of view either of a well-functioning labor market or of social justice” (van der Velden 1993: 78). Van der Velden further shows that later, around the First World War, many private health care organizations fell prey to sectarianism.

Denominational associations were set up with the express intent of keeping both the state and the non-denominational organizations at bay. Whereas in 1880 no more than 13 home nursing associations existed, 12 of which were non-denominational, in 1920 there were 893 of which 739 were non-denominational. By 1930 these figures had risen to 1283 and 859, respectively (derived from Pennings 1991: 92).

In the period before 1940, health care was predominantly an affair of self-employed, well-organized professional medical practitioners and privately run organizations. The role of authorities, especially national ones, was mainly regulating the system, carrying out inspections and monitoring the population’s health conditions. (see also Boot & Knapen 1990: 247-277).

After the Second World War, a wide-ranging program of legislation was introduced to regulate the organization of health care, specifically the relationship between the state and private initiative. The most important laws in this package were the Public Health Act (GW), the Compulsory Health Insurance Act (ZFW), and the Exceptional Medical Expenses Act (AWBZ). The relationship between the state and private initiative was structured into consultative bodies. At a later stage, the state attempted by means of statutory measures to bring the costs of health care under control. In 1965 it enacted the Hospital Rates and Fees Act and in 1971 the Hospital Provision Act (WZV), superseded in 1982 by the Health Care Provisions Act. This procession of statutes shows that the need for cost control made relations between the state and private initiative the continuous focus of attention (they still are today). The state tried to achieve cost control by influencing the pricing of services and the planning and construction of facilities. However, private health care and its providers still enjoy considerable autonomy.
It can be concluded that the state, the national government in particular, steadily gained strength through statutory measures. These were aimed at acquiring or consolidating state influence over the course of affairs in a largely private health care sector. From the early 1960s to the late 1980s, many laws and policy memoranda were drafted with this outcome in mind. Although state pressure was consistently strong, the practical results failed to meet expectations. The late 1980s were a temporary turning point in the thinking about the role of the state in health care. Appeals were made for the state to step back and give more room to market forces, especially in the insurance system. The possibilities of market-led development were explored for several years, but the government soon reversed its steps. Since the mid-1990s the government has been attempting through statutory measures and consultation with health care professions to reach agreement on cost containment measures for the health care sector.

To summarize, the supply side of Dutch health care services is privately organized. In cases where publicly organized services exist – the municipal health services (GGDs) – they are in the hands of local authorities. Although the national government has made cost control one of its major policy goals, the funding of the health care system is through the insurance system, not the state.

Education

In the Middle Ages, the church provided primary education, both in urban and rural areas. Even later, when the laity became involved in education, religious influence was still considerable. But as the city burghers came to demand broader and higher-quality education for their children, the diversity of schools increased: kindergartens, elementary schools, French schools, Latin schools, colleges and universities. The official city schools were usually the best ones, but there were also special schools for the poor, evening schools, parish schools for the poor, Sunday schools, orphanage schools and others. Thus, education was available to every child, including the poor. Private individuals, churches and public authorities were all involved in organizing schooling, because they believed that good education for all was in the common interest. Vulnerable children such as orphans, street urchins and the indigent received the most attention (Groenveld et al. 1997: 194-225).

Orphan care attained a high level of quality. Three types of orphanages can be distinguished: those set up by the local authorities (e.g., the Almoner’s House in Amsterdam), those founded by Protestant welfare organizations or Catholic guardians of the poor, and those established by individual persons or small groups of private citizens (Groenveld et al. 1997: 86 ff).

In the first half of the 19th century, Dutch education was dominated by a centralized national administration, a result of the Napoleonic occupation. The school laws of 1801, 1803 and 1806 declared publicly run education to be a government concern, thereby opening the door to state funding. The 1806 law provided for a public education system that would at once be Christian, Protestant and independent. Its aim was to give the common people “some very limited measure of development, and with it an awareness of their obligations to serve” (Kossmann 1986: 239). Popular education was thus another form of poor relief.
King Willem I gave his energetic support to the state schools after the end of the French occupation in 1813. The masses were to be made into citizens. The building of the unitary state required it. Popular education at the time was terminal education, and further education was reserved for the elite. Most elementary schools were public facilities funded entirely by the local authorities. Any other type of training was a matter for private (usually wealthy) individuals.

In 1857 the law from 1806 was revised and substantially improved. Parliament moved to have public elementary education develop towards religious neutrality. This triggered the founding of many orthodox Protestant and Roman Catholic schools. However, the revised act still reinforced the position of state schools vis-à-vis private ones. Idenburg (1964) referred to the 1857 Education Act as a milestone in the history of Dutch education, because it transferred education from autocratic rule to the constitutional state. Although the act regulated only public education, it created the basic conditions for the freedom of private education. Until 1860 the responsibility for elementary schools was borne by the municipalities, the local churches and the private school societies.

In the cities, public and parish schools for the poor working class and voluntary schools for the other classes existed side by side. The dominant view was that education for the poor was to be geared mainly to moral development – that is, it was to prepare them for a hard-working, subservient existence. The working-class child’s early habituation to labor, if possible in knitting, spinning or industrial schools, was looked upon positively by the elite. There was no clear-cut, uniform norm for all social classes concerning elementary school attendance (Veld 1987: 216).

After 1870 the national government steadily expanded its activities and interventions in the field of education. This was prompted mainly by its dissatisfaction with the way the educational apparatus functioned, as well as the meager interest of parents and municipal authorities. In 1878 the previous act was replaced by one introducing a large number of measures to stimulate school attendance. From then on, the centralizing tendency in government policy steadily increased.

The fundamental equality of all citizens formed a key issue in the public and political debates leading up to the enactment of the 1878 law. The education system had a role in shaping it. The emerging democratic principle of equality was at odds with the existing situation in which public education was funded with public funds and private education was not. This issue was one of the motives for the revisions of 1889, which formed the first steps towards equal treatment of public and private schools. After a long and vehement controversy, the various sides signed the so-called pacification in 1920. It declared that education was to be a matter of continual government attention, but that organizing it would be the prerogative of the different religious or ideological traditions.

School funding controversy dominated Dutch politics, especially in the period from 1850 to 1920. The struggle was over the content and organization of popular education, in particular elementary education. Particular issues included whether or not state schools should be allowed to give religious instruction (content), whether the state had the right to provide education, and whether that could be entrusted to private and confessional groups (organization). The conflation
of these two dimensions made the school struggle into a complex and protracted issue (see also van Tijm 1966). As noted, the peace was concluded in 1920.

Equal financial treatment of public and private education enabled the state to make qualitative demands – albeit with the appropriate discretion – for the infringement of freedom of education is a “mortal sin” in the Netherlands. Though the pacification of 1920 ended the school struggle, it did not spell the end of sectarianism in its typically Dutch form known as pillarization. In fact, the process continued unabated and spread to other areas of life.

Compulsory education acquired legal force in 1900 – much later than in other countries – because of the school struggle (Boekholt & Booy 1987: 155). The compulsory education bill passed by only one vote. The confessional parties felt it did not include enough measures to combat truancy, while the social democrats found the length of compulsory education, from age 7 to 13, too short. Veld (1987: 214) has pointed out that neither the direct nor indirect effects of the law were of much significance (see also Knippenberg 1986: 106-110). However, Veld underlines the importance of the principle it embodied: the right to determine the necessity and the duration of school attendance was extracted from the domain of parental authority and placed firmly in the hands of the state as representative of society.

The 19th century can be viewed as a period in which elementary education underwent significant improvement and increased enrollment. Achievement of one of the goals of the Enlightenment -- education for all -- came within reach (Boekholt & Booy 1987: 167-173). By the end of the century, a high level of participation was attained.

Until the Second World War, central government’s role in education was mainly a provider of funds. The government financially and administratively supervised education, while the educational world controlled content and structure. In education, this period is characterized as one of distributive policy. After the war, government expenditures on education mounted swiftly, and it became clear that the central government claimed an increasing share of responsibility while local authorities played a more modest role. This was accompanied by a policy reversal, a decisive swing towards constructive education policy (Boekholt & Booy 1987: 238-239). Dutch education made rapid strides. By 1975, one quarter of the population was occupied with some form of educational activity, and government spending on education correspondingly amounted to a quarter of the total state budget. This made education one of the largest fields in the nonprofit sector.

In summary, a fierce battle waged between the state and various confessional and ideological groupings for the control of education. Although peace was concluded in 1920, ensuring the equal financial treatment of public and private education, the issue of the control (or put differently, the freedom) of education remains a critical and perpetual theme in this sector. The relationship between the state and the private and confessional foundations and societies that provide education is still a precarious one.
The care of the weak

The care for weaker members of society has a long tradition in the Netherlands, a tradition inspired by the Christian love of one’s neighbor. But de Swaan (1988: 41-51) has shown how the desire for social control also motivated the elite to organize the care of the poor and needy from an early date. Workhouses were set up, especially in cities, to serve as relief centers for vagrants, sick people and beggars from the region (see also Section 1 above). The first such institution was the Rasphouse in Amsterdam, which opened its doors in 1596. Poor people, preferably healthy ones, were “confined” there to work, and the workhouse paid for itself from the yield of its inmates’ labor. Arguably, the workhouses served to maintain a reserve labor force.

As de Swaan (1988: 33) has shown, a city also needed workhouses “to prevent a resurgence of banditry endangering its supply-lines.” Since de Swaan’s analyses, more evidence (e.g. van Leeuwen 1992) has emerged confirming that poor relief was not based on idealistic motives alone. Even at a rather early stage, social and economic motives were also involved. Poor relief was a task for collective action and helped create a ‘regional relief equilibrium’ (de Swaan 1988: 32).

City authorities were in an early stage already very much involved in poor relief at different levels – not only financially, but also in matters of administration and policy. As Israel wrote about urban poverty in the 16th century, “It was not until the 1570s and 1580s that towns such as Leiden and Haarlem took measures to rationalize, standardize and centralize poor and sick relief under the control of civic government” (Israel 1995: 124).

Interestingly, Israel stresses the dominance of the local authorities in arranging for the care of the poor in the 17th and 18th centuries. He thus revises received wisdom about the virtual absence of the state from poor relief. Though recognizing that the various confessional groups did their own charity work, he emphasizes the strong influence local government had on the care arrangements. Far-reaching supervision by city authorities and the stringent regulation of municipal poor relief was a pervasive feature of the care system.

Not the least unusual feature of the Dutch civic welfare system which now took shape was its pluriform and divided confessional structure. Almost everywhere in Europe at the time, welfare functioned under the auspices of a single Church whether Catholic or Protestant. But in the Dutch context, the town governments not only took overall charge of the system, and funded many charitable institutions, but decided to what extent, and in what ways, the public Church, and also the other tolerated Churches, were to participate (Israel 1995: 354).

The underlying causes of this are set out in Israel’s book. The Dutch system was the outcome of a whole series of social, economic, religious and cultural choices. And as Israel adds, many such considerations were far removed from charitable motives. Economic necessity, bourgeois pride and competition between cities were just as important as charity, if not more so. Israel agrees here with observers like de Swaan and van Leeuwen.
In the 19th century a debate arose about the responsibility of government and of the public at large for providing care to the poor. The first statutory framework regulating poor relief (1854) laid down a hierarchy of responsibility: first the individuals themselves, then their families and relatives, then the church and last of all the state. The orthodox Protestants in particular, and to a lesser degree the Roman Catholics, argued that poor relief should be left entirely to private or religious charities, and preferably “to the mutual solidarity of fellow church members.” (de Rooy 1997: 268).

Poor relief can also be considered one of the precursors of social work, with material and non-material help closely interwoven (Veldheer et al. 1994: 155-156). In 1899, a total of 7,476 organizations were tallied in the Netherlands which concerned themselves in one way or another with the welfare of the “lesser class.” Around this time, material provision began to detach itself from non-material. A distinct system of social security began to evolve, and social work became an independent force (Michielse 1978: 67 ff).

Community Education. One organization of immeasurable significance to the education of the working class, and which has left its mark on the whole structure of Dutch society, is the Maatschappij tot Nut van ’t Algemeen (Society for the General Good) (see also Fritschy & Toebes 1996). The founding of the Nut in 1784 on the initiative of the Edam clergyman Jan Nieuwenhuyzen constitutes a landmark in the Dutch nonprofit sector. Its stated purpose was “the education and development of the ordinary people.” Nieuwenhuyzen launched his idea in a discussion group made up of regional preachers who were not part of the official church. The idea quickly bore fruit, and at the inaugural meeting on 16 November 1784 a second task was added to that of popular enrichment: “the improvement of the school system and the upbringing of the youth as the most important basis for the education, improvement and refinement of citizens” (Mijnhardt & Wichers 1984: 11). The motto “for the general good” implies that the founders had mainly the lowest levels of society in mind. Educating the people soon became the principal task of the society. Another objective was to disseminate the society’s ideas and plans, and efforts were made to set up chapters (called departments) all over the country. The plan of action adopted at the inaugural meeting asserted that it is not malicious intent, but sheer incapacity that leads people to incompetence and immorality. This dictum formed the inspiration to “unremitting effort towards community education,” as opposed to “condescending philanthropy.” The plan can be summarized as follows (Mijnhardt & Wichers 1984: 11):

1. A new organization shall devote itself to educating the underdeveloped and poor.

2. The members of the society shall be persons who, by virtue of their own cultivation and financial resources, are able to help, and who are also genuinely willing to help.

3. The foremost instrument shall be the publication of elementary books for the less developed.

4. The society shall also campaign for the improvement of the school system.
This characterizes the activities the Nut was to undertake in the first hundred years of its existence. Emphasis was on implementation by the local departments and on organizing public lectures.

After the founding of the Nut in Edam, other towns and cities rapidly followed suit. Amsterdam was the first in 1785, followed by Rotterdam and Zaandam. Leyden came next in 1786, and Alkmaar, Utrecht and Gouda in 1787. Edam remained the seat of the executive until political problems arose: Edam had an Orangist town government while the society’s founders were Patriots, opponents of the prince. For security reasons, and not without some turmoil, the executive decided to move to the more free-thinking Amsterdam. The first general meeting was held there in 1787. From that point onwards, the Nut made rapid strides. By 1835 it numbered nearly 13,000 members spread over more than 200 departments. Although membership had grown only slightly in 1900, the number of departments had reached almost 300. Today, more than two centuries after its inception, the society still has about 25,000 members and 110 departments.

Many of the Nut’s activities have always been in education. It set up a national training school, published many school books, and established a book fund. In some places the Nut started elementary schools, the first in Leyden in 1792 and a year later in Dordrecht. It stimulated school attendance through incentives such as awarding prizes to pupils. Another approach to community education was the founding of lending libraries. The Haarlem chapter launched one in 1791, and their model was soon adopted by many departments throughout the country, laying the groundwork for the public library system. Besides schools and libraries, which targeted mainly children, the Nut also educated adults by organizing evenings and lectures. These may be regarded as forerunners of what is now called sociocultural education.

We can distinguish several phases in the more than two centuries of community education work by the Nut (which lives on today mainly in the form of school governing bodies). After its establishment phase, community education entered a period of flourishing expansion that lasted at least until 1870. Community education intensified its activities in education and instruction, and developed new ones as well. It undertook efforts aimed at fighting poverty and caring for the poor. One result was the founding of the first “box,” or workers’ health insurance fund, in Alphen aan den Rijn in 1809 (Mijnhardt & Wichers 1984: 28). This expanded the Nut’s activities to the health care arena, providing sick people with financial protection against unaffordable doctor’s bills. Many chapters began their own health insurance funds. The Nut thereby embarked on the path of material care.

At the instigation of King Willem I, who showed great interest in the Nut’s activities, savings banks for people of small means were set up in the early 19th century. The Nutsspaarbank in The Hague, founded in 1818, was one of the first such establishments (Hillenius 1996: 61). Dozens appeared within a few years’ time. The purpose was to teach adults how to handle their money and to encourage thrift.

A further key activity was petitioning the government to put an end to socially unacceptable conditions. The society drew attention, for example, to the sordid conditions in the prisons; it appealed for compulsory education (it had to wait over a hundred years before its
demands were satisfied), for the opening of workhouses to combat idleness, and for an end to degeneracy in the theater.

In 1870 the Nut reached a fork in the road. Social struggle broke out. Sweeping economic changes occurred, large-scale industry was on the rise, the problem of the poor became a “social question,” political parties were formed, the school funding controversy began – in short, the public debate took on an entirely different character than in previous years. The Nut had to determine its stance, and for the time being it chose the trusted medium of political pressure. In the final decades of the 19th century it published thorough-going reports about pressing social issues. Such reports did not miss their mark. Observers have deemed this period (1887-1914) the Decade of Reports. It formed one of the golden ages of the society. After the First World War, the Nut went on to develop activities in the field of public housing, and several of its departments set up housing associations that built so-called Nut-dwellings.

Whereas up to then the focus of the Nut had been on social issues, it shifted after the war to more cultural activities. Having essentially devoted 150 years to community education, the Nut abandoned its age-old goal of improving the social conditions of the working class (Mijnhardt & Wichers 1984: 115-146). Other social and political organizations, as well as the state, effectively took over that task. The Nut turned its attentions to cultural endeavors, quality improvements and innovations in the education system, and the development of radio, a new medium of mass communication. The latter ultimately linked up with one of the Nut’s original tasks in the form of Adult Education Radio (RVU), launched in 1931. The society also promoted amateur theater, which came back into the limelight around 1936.

Many of these activities were continued after the Second World War. There were also new post-war initiatives in cultural work, the visual arts and free expression. The rise of the welfare state in the 1960s heralded the decline of the Nut. The great collapse occurred in the 1970s, when countless services slipped out of its hands (Mijnhardt & Wichers 1984: 168-185). National and local authorities as well as the business sector took control of schools, libraries, savings banks and health care insurance schemes.

In summary, we can conclude that the Nut made an indispensable contribution to the development of Dutch society during the period of “bourgeois civilizing offensive.” The society was active in education, library work, community education in a more narrow sense, community care, and socioeconomic services such as savings banks and health insurance.

The Nut can be characterized as a humanistic organization with roots in Enlightenment thought. In a political sense it can be described, at the time of its founding around the turn of the 19th century, as free-thinking and democratic. The Nut consisted predominantly of left-liberals in pursuit of reform. In view of the close ties between its members and the dominant political elite of the era, it is no wonder many of their ideas and suggestions became concrete government measures. The Nut had significant influence on the structure of society, in the areas where it was active. The Maatschappij tot Nut van ’t Algemeen provided the groundwork for much voluntary relief work.
Youth Club and Community Center Work. The history of the settlement movement is shorter than that of relief for orphans, street children, thieves, the sick and the poor. The settlement movement originated in the late 19th century, along with a related activity, playground work. The first Dutch public playground was set up in 1879 by the Amsterdam Association for the Refinement of Popular Amusement. Due to a chronic lack of funds it had a troubled existence, which is not discussed here due to its limited scale.

The first settlement house, called Ons Huis (Our House), was opened in Amsterdam in 1892 by activists from the progressive-liberal movement. Its aim was to promote the moral development of young people, especially working-class youth who were not part of other organizations or movements. Such initiatives were closely tied to rapid economic growth in the second half of the 19th century and the modernization of Dutch society underway around the turn of the century. Other settlements soon opened their doors at Rotterdam and Leyden.

Such establishments were intended to lay the foundation for a new society, one in which moral values such as virtue, benevolence and beauty could be developed as a counterweight to the “vulgar society of money” (Nijenhuis 1987: 50). The legal form chosen for such initiatives – the association – should be seen in the light these goals (which were to prove too lofty). The idea was to recruit members from all levels of society, but these efforts failed. The middle and upper classes were over represented, and the executives were members of the bourgeois elite.

The settlements emphasized the intellectual, ethical and aesthetic development of the people who visited them. We can recognize many of the methods applied by the Nut – lectures and courses, providing legal advice and making books available to the public from an in-house lending library. People could also act in plays and attend concerts at the settlements. Although the work targeted the whole working-class family, in practice it was mainly the better educated workers, and especially the younger ones, who showed interest. Adults were not inclined to visit the settlement houses.

Public authorities initially took a passive attitude towards settlement houses. In 1914 the City of Amsterdam became the first local authority to subsidize some of the youth activities in Ons Huis. Shortly after the First World War, there was a modest expansion of activities. Settlements in urban areas increasingly targeted delinquent youth.

The movement also devoted itself to the moral development of rural people. In response to a survey on alcohol abuse, a village house was opened in Paterswolde, in the northern province of Drenthe. A number of community houses were started in the poor peat-cutting areas nearby. As well as material aid, the settlements gave courses on improving hygiene, preparing food, educating pre-school children and home economics. The Drenthe Community Development Foundation, established in 1925, was the prime mover. Settlement houses were also founded in other provinces, such as Friesland, Limburg and North Brabant. Those in the Catholic Limburg were religiously oriented settlements.

In the 1920s in Rotterdam and The Hague, youth clubs were set up that specifically targeted unskilled working youths. These clubs were distinct from the settlement houses. In Rotterdam, The Eagle (for boys) and The Seagull (for girls) were the major youth clubs, (they
would later merge after the Second World War) The Sparrow was the youth club in The Hague. In the predominantly Catholic town of Nijmegen, a Protestant affiliated youth work project for girls was initiated. Protestants in Rotterdam did likewise, though they did not label it as such. In this context the St. Francis Charity (SFL) in Amsterdam also deserves mention. Founded in 1894 by lay people and later taken over by priests, its goal was to guide working-class youth – and their parents – back to the church. The SFL also provided material aid. As Nijenhuis has observed, the pattern for today’s youth club and community center work was established during the Interbellum:

The settlement houses, village houses and community houses principally stressed the idea of community, and were neutral on religion. The youth clubs targeted the unorganized youth and were likewise neutral. The houses founded on a confessional basis wanted to convert their visitors, at least in the beginning.... The target group remained primarily the unorganized working-class youth, although the clubs tried to reach their parents and get them involved in the work of the organization. In addition, we see that the youth under age 12 were increasingly drawn in. In the 1930s, some organizations also undertook special projects for the unemployed youth. With the exception of the settlement houses, which generally attracted a ‘better’ working-class public, most organizations chiefly targeted the lower social classes (Nijenhuis 1987: 175).

In the 1930s, we can observe the first tentative steps towards professionalization. A limited number of employees were hired who had undergone professional training at various schools of social work. Those schools were set up on a modest scale around the turn of the century after progressive liberals introduced social work – assistance provided by specifically trained personnel. The first Dutch social work school, Karthuizer, was founded in 1899 (again in Amsterdam), signaling the start of the professionalization of social work. Analysis of living conditions and expert treatment of individual cases were its key aims.

The clubs and settlement houses operated on scanty funds. The public authorities continued to keep their distance. The national government provided no funding, and only a few local authorities provided assistance, most prominently in Amsterdam. However, confessional agencies received funding from the churches and the SFL was supported by the Congregation of the Sacred Hearts. In 1928 the organizations began cooperating and set up the Dutch Federation of Settlement Houses (NVB).

The public authorities entered the picture after 1945. They began subsidizing community work and from then on played a central role in the further development and direction of community work. Government financial interventions led to shifting objectives. In the 1950s the emphasis was combating antisocial behavior, but in the 1960s it turned to activating neighborhood people around local politics. Neighborhood work and community development work was promoted heavily. This massive expansion, combined with still strong sectarianism led to a situation where each “pillar” had its own youth clubs and community houses.

Government efforts resulted in the creation of nationwide supervisory bodies, one for each pillar, that distributed the subsidies. In the 1970s these merged, with the temporary exception of the NVB, to form SALCO; and in 1978, under pressure from the central authorities, all of them
combined to form an organization called GAMMA.

The professionalization process in the sector continued, with growing numbers of professionally trained staff, many of them from social work schools. Funding of youth clubs and community center work became increasingly openhanded, and from 1970 onwards the work was subsidized in large part by the state.

Summarizing, we note that settlement work, and later youth clubs and community center work, originated in the progressive liberal and social democratic movements and was seen as an instrument of social reform. The early involvement of the Amsterdam municipal government in the funding of Ons Huis can also be seen in this light. Confessional efforts, though not entirely absent, do not appear significant. Given its political origins, youth clubs and community center work cannot be situated within the charity tradition.

Welfare work in recent times

Welfare work made rapid strides after the Second World War. One stimulus for this was the creation in 1952 of the Ministry of Social Work, revamped in 1965 as the Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Work. This provided the central state authorities an increasingly strong voice in the development of welfare work. By means of the subsidy instrument, the central state authorities steered its implementation at the local level. Central policymakers achieved success in areas where private actors had been leading figures. In the initial post-war years, welfare work centered around the reconstruction of the country, and later it concentrated primarily on fighting poverty.

The concept of welfare work came into vogue in the mid-1960s and was assigned a role in the reform of society envisaged mainly by “the Left.” Just as settlement work in the 19th century was intended as a counterweight to “vulgar society,” welfare work aimed to reform capitalist society into an open and relaxed community, where an equitable distribution of knowledge, power and income could be achieved. Welfare work continually expanded, no longer just targeting vulnerable groups in society, but promoting the well-being of all members of society. Encouraging democratic participation and personal growth for every individual were key motivating principles of both welfare work and government welfare policy.

A remarkable characteristic of the organizational structure of welfare work is that it still bears the marks of its charity background. The legal forms chosen, the association and the foundation, are reminiscent of its Christian origins, although mergers in the welfare sector in the late 1980s have left little of their Christian identity intact. Van Doorn has observed that the origins of the welfare work of today lie in early poor relief, which was long the domain of private organizations and individuals. The social security system, in contrast, has its roots in early unemployment relief. Van Doorn argues that the strongly pillarized nature of the organizational and policy structures of welfare work – still discernible today – are the most telling evidence for his conclusion. Such structures are not apparent in the social security system. Early poor relief was a task for charitable, predominantly church organizations, while unemployment relief can be considered a public task from an early date (van Doorn 1992; see also de Rooy 1997). From its origins as “poor relief,” the former evolved via the introduction of “social work” towards the end
of the 19th century to become “welfare work” after the Second World War. The 1960s and 1970s were the period of greatest fluorescence.

Before the social democrats began politically intervening in welfare work in the 1970s, van Doorn characterized the prevailing relationship between the state and private initiative as “master of their own house, and the house as a public charge.” In other words, the state had little or no influence over the welfare organizations, even though it was their main source of funding. In the mid-1970s, the government coined the motto “to pay is to say” in an attempt to consolidate the financial and substantive responsibility for welfare work. In effect the position of the state was strengthened at the expense of private initiative (whose work had meanwhile become less sectarian). The ensuing struggle lasted ten years. The outcome was that the local authorities were entitled to influence and steer the activities of welfare agencies, but in practice they have yet made little use of this prerogative.

The relations between public authorities and private initiative run as a common thread through the history of welfare work and welfare policy. In the post-war period, when the state’s financial involvement in welfare work became all-pervasive, the state sought to gain a say in matters. State-private relations can be regarded as a crucial theme (see van Doorn 1990: 299; Hueting & Ney 1989). The fact that today’s welfare work originated in a system of poor relief based mainly on Christian charity explains in part the never-ending debate in the Netherlands about the relationship of private initiatives to the state. A virtually constant battle has raged between these two camps about the power over the welfare domain.

Van Doorn (1990: 299) cites as one of the most conspicuous characteristics of the post-war period “the exceedingly dominant role of moral arguments in justifying and legitimizing practically every activity in the welfare sector.” Such morally charged arguments stand out in comparison with early 20th-century social work. The social democratic welfare workers were no different in this respect than their Christian counterparts; they wanted to make welfare work an instrument for social change (van Doorn 1990: 298). To that end, the social democratic welfare workers proposed a planning system that would have conferred great power upon the local authorities to regulate welfare agencies. Because no political consensus could be reached, such a system was never introduced. The government did transfer certain of its own tasks and responsibilities to the local authorities to enable them to channel welfare work in a direction desired by local politicians. However, given the autonomy still enjoyed by the welfare agencies, and in view of the higher degree of professionalization attained by such agencies in recent decades, exercising such influence is a troublesome undertaking for the local authorities.

We can conclude that welfare work, as heir to the legacy of poor relief, still has strong confessional overtones although social-democratic influences are traceable. The charitable nature of care to the poor is still reflected today in the organizational structure of welfare work, and this lends the relationship between the state and private initiative a special character.
Art and culture

Many facilities for the arts have been established by art lovers, which include private citizens, merchants, bankers and traders (see also Veldheer 1994: 181-195). One striking thing is that the Dutch nobility have never played a major part. Compared to other countries, the Netherlands had no court culture. No courtly aristocracy showed off its power and riches in prestigious parties in splendid palaces. Instead, the self-assured bourgeoisie developed cultural initiatives in the Netherlands. They founded drama societies and orchestras, theaters, cultural societies and journals. One such society, Felix Meritis, established in 1777, devoted itself to paintings and music as well as to commerce and physics. The best known example is the establishment of the Concertgebouw and its orchestra in Amsterdam in 1888. Another illustration can be found in Haarlem, where construction began in 1780 on the Netherlands’ first museum, Teylers Museum. Pieter Teyler van der Hulst had bequeathed the establishment of a scientific institute with a research collection. It was a recurrent pattern: private collectors willed funds to found a museum to house their collections and make them accessible to the public. The Amsterdam Stedelijk Museum is built upon the legacy of Suasso and a gift from the merchant van Eeghen. The construction of the Rijksmuseum in 1885 was a joint initiative of private citizens and local and national government. These are a few of the innumerable examples of private initiatives for the creation and maintenance of cultural facilities. It was maintenance that posed a financial problem in many cases, leading the state – initially local authorities but eventually also national ones – to enter the picture.

The role of private individuals as art patrons is clear (see also Smithuijsen et al. 1990). As Kempers has pointed out,

Nobility, patriciate and rich entrepreneurs stood at the cradle of most art museums, and they were rewarded for their generosity with eternal recognition. They donated or sold their collections with the intention of having them exhibited in a venue accessible to the public. They sometimes provided funds for the construction and management of the building as well. The whole Dutch museum system is built on such gifts.... The founders regularly referred to education and refinement, in combination with cultural preservation, as the motivating force in their openhandedness. The transfer of art objects to public authorities was often conceived as part of a more comprehensive civilizing offensive (Kempers, in Smithuijsen et al. 1990: 74).

Until recently, the preservation of art and culture was a concern for a few inspired individuals. In the late 19th century an observable shift took place from patronage by private individuals to public authorities. With increasing frequency, appeals were made to state institutions to contribute financially to the maintenance of cultural facilities. Today, at the end of the 20th century, the government appears unwilling to provide support and is encouraging a shift to commercial market support (see also Smithuijsen et al. 1990: 246-259). Although public financial involvement is great, the cultural sector is controlled by private individuals – administrators, advisers, organizers, activists, and artists.
In summary, the art world was dominated by private, often individual initiatives until far into the 20th century. The state was then more or less compelled to act under the pressure of private actions (bequests etc), financial necessity, or ‘social’ wrongs. By virtue of the classical rights of expression, state intervention has always been circumspect about content of the art, but its financial involvement is still considerable.

**Sport and recreation**

Although a description of the nonprofit sector is not complete without sport and recreation, it is difficult to find data on the emergence and development of such activities. Historically the ancient Olympic Games exerted significant influence on the rise of sport competitions in many nations. Computing time in Olympiads, the Greeks put the date of the first games in 776 BC. In 394 AD the series of 293 Olympiads came to an end, abolished by the Emperor Theodosius. It was not until the year 1896 that the games were revived in Athens under the initiative of Pierre de Coubertin. They have flourished ever since and represent the finest moment in the career of an athlete.

Basic to de Coubertin’s aspirations was the so-called Olympic ideal he had formulated – to promote the harmonious physical and spiritual education of the youth, to show respect for the achievements of one’s adversaries, and to strengthen ties of friendship between peoples. ‘The most important thing is not winning, but taking part’ is one of the games’ key slogans.

In 1871 Jan ter Gouw published a review of popular amusement in the Netherlands. According to his review only horse races, ice-skating and sailing were of a national character. Beyond that there was a great diversity of activities in cities, villages and regions. These activities were taken not so much for winning but for pleasure. The upper classes predominantly played these games.

In the last decennia of the 19th century sports grew in popularity. Many organizations were formed; national organizations were created for uniformity in game rules and oversight. We also see the emergence of competition. Between 1847 and 1900 nine Sports Federations were founded: sailing and rowing (1847), gymnastics (1868), ice-skating (1882), cricket (1883), swimming (1888) football/soccer and athletics (1889), playing fives (1897), hockey (1898) and tennis (1899).

The introduction of the word “sport” stems from a letter by Simon Gorter, dated from 1866 in which he describes the way the English upperclass spent their wintertime in the south of France, on the Mediterranean (Van Bottenburg 1994). For the Dutch elite, England was a great influence. Many Dutch spent part of their lives in Britain. The *jeunesse dorée* studied at English universities and learned many sports. The diffusion of these sports in the Netherlands, together with accompanying life-styles, occurred throughout the Dutch upper-class. When the practicing of sports became a mass phenomenon, only the traditional Dutch sport of ice-skating survived. *Korfbal* also continued, but on a much lesser scale.

---

2 With thanks to Joep de Hart for his permission to make use of some of his data.
The first Dutch rugby and soccer club, the renowned HFC, was started in Haarlem in 1879 by lawyers, a physician, a real estate agent, a vicar and entrepreneurs. This group of friends was introduced to the game in England. Similar initiatives were taken in other towns, and within a decade or two there were many sporting clubs. Competitions were created, matches were played and from that moment on the practicing of sports, especially soccer, grew immensely. The popularity of soccer grew fast after the Second World War, as did club membership. Soccer is now the most widely practiced sport in the Netherlands, both actively and passively.

Only limited data is available on the total scale of the sport sector. In 1994 the Netherlands numbered 55,400 sports clubs. By comparison, in the same year there were 8,300 educational associations and 37,800 associations for care or welfare (Berg 1996). The amount of participants grew from 30,000 in 1900 to 994,000 in 1954 to 1,565,000 in 1963. At the beginning of the nineties 4,313,000 sportsmen and women were counted, in 1996 there were 4,497,000 people active in sports.

To summarize, many sports clubs, especially football clubs, were set up in the late 19th century. That implies the existence of a social and cultural climate in which sports and games could prosper. Sports and active recreation have attracted increased attention ever since.

Civic organizations, ideology, politics, and trade unions

Societies. When the previously-described Nut was founded in the late 18th century, the phenomenon of societies was already widespread. Enlightenment ideas had stimulated the creation of a wide variety of clubs, including reading clubs, musical societies, drama societies, disputing societies and scientific societies. The distinction between these and the Nut was that most were discussion clubs with no explicit social objectives. Participation was more for entertainment and relaxation than for educational purposes, although taking part in a debating club could certainly enhance one’s rhetorical skills. Most societies did have their activities in areas such as culture, education or science.

Political Organizations. In the domain of politics, the first electors’ associations came into being around 1850. Electors’ associations were rather loose collections of individuals who banded together on the occasion of council or parliamentary elections in order to gain a seat. They were the forerunners of the political parties set up towards the end of the century. Consensus on substantive issues was hardly attempted; the qualities of the person were what counted. Electors’ associations drew up recommendation lists of candidates to endorse. The competition between electors’ associations involved people more than programs. A single candidate could, upon request or even without asking, receive the support of more than one association. Many associations did have an explicit social identity, such as liberal, anti-evolutionist, Roman Catholic, conservative or Orangist. Others represented more limited interests, such as those of local wine and spirit merchants.

In the 1870s, the electors’ associations began developing into political parties. The first group to form a party, in 1879, were from the orthodox Calvinist church. The party was called the Antirevolutionary Party (ARP), and was led by Abraham Kuyper. Its success was due partly to the struggle being waged by the confessionals against the government’s liberal educational
policies. The socialists formed in 1892 the Social Democratic Federation, the predecessor of The Social Democratic Labor Party (SDAP), formed in 1894. This party had strong ties to municipal politics (Pennings 1991: 90; Veldheer 1994). The Roman Catholics, strong in the south of the country, had trouble achieving party formation as a result of obstruction by the southern provincial governments, which viewed it as a “northern aspiration.” The liberals started their political organization in 1885 with the foundation of the moderately progressive Liberal Union. In 1901 the more radical Free-Thinking Democratic Federation (VDB) emerged. In 1921 the moderately progressive liberals reorganized their political factions and founded the Freedom Federation (VB).

After the second world war the political landscape changed again: in 1946 the Labor Party was formed, followed in 1948 by the liberals, who founded the People’s Party for Freedom and Democracy. In 1946 the Catholic People’s Party was founded, the ARP and CHU continued their organizations until 1980. In that year the three parties merged into the Christian Democratic Appeal (CDA).

**Guilds.** Guilds were originally associations of individuals, usually practicing the same trade. Guilds existed in Germany as early as the 5th century, and the name was in use in the Netherlands by the 8th century. The old German guilds held banquets and drinking sessions, originally with heathen rituals and later with Christian religious acts and displays of charity, for example to honor the patron saint of the guild or a deceased member. Throughout the Middle Ages the guilds kept this function. Later a wide variety of new guilds formed. Alongside the older religious and charitable guilds, guilds arose in the world of commerce, for merchants and artisans. There were other guilds for artists, soldiers, and students.

The emergence of guilds was related to the growth of centers of trade and industry. Therefore guilds were tied strongly to urban communities. *Merchant guilds* grouped together traders from one city (e.g. Tiel in 1018). They had their own administrative structure and justice system. From the 11th century onwards they were instrumental in the rise of city autonomy. In some places these guilds developed into local governing bodies. In the 13th century guilds declined as they relinquished power to city governments. The well-known hierarchy of apprentice, journeyman and master originated in the merchant guilds; only the masters were full members.

**Cultural Guilds.** Mostly chambers of rhetoric, were of a different order. They devoted themselves to writing poetry and later to making theater. In the 15th century, artists started many guilds in various Dutch cities, including Dordrecht, Gouda, The Hague and Haarlem, under the patronage of St Luke.

The *archers’ guilds* were formed in cities in the 13th century as special companies of crossbow archers (later longbow archers), armed and paid by city government as civic guards. In the 14th century archers guilds held regular exercises and organized competitions. Many longbow archers’ associations with roots in these guilds are still found in the southern Low Countries.
By far the most important of such organizations were *trade guilds*, which may be viewed as government-recognized economic groupings with some measure of self-government. Their foremost purpose was to promote the common economic interests of their members, with due regard for the public interest (see also Lourens & Lucassen 1996). Trade guilds were therefore public-law organizations. Their chief instrument of power was coercion – all artisans were required to join them and to abide by their statutes. One condition of membership was citizenship of the city where the artisan wanted to work. Citizenship could be acquired by marriage or inheritance, or it could be purchased (see Bos 1997).

Guilds came to play an active political role in most cities. Almost 400 of them operated in the Netherlands around 1500, and the number quickly grew with increasing urbanization and vocational differentiation. In 1560 there were 564 guilds and by the end of the 17th century about 1,300. Most trade guilds dated after 1600. However, guilds were abolished by French instigation at the end of the 18th century – not on economic, but political grounds. The remolding of the Dutch Republic into a unitary state meant there was little room left for autonomous cities and locally oriented guilds. Close involvement in city economies and politics was an integral characteristic of the guild system, and local variations were considerable (Bos 1997).

The trade guilds served a number of functions in the urban community. First and foremost they were organizations promoting economic interests. In exchange for the support they received from the local authorities, the trade guilds shouldered responsibility for defending the city and for the maintenance of canals, city walls and towers. In addition, they served as civic guards, enforcing peace and quiet, order and safety in the city. Within the guild there were organized social and cultural activities.

The ascent of the guilds in the 16th and 17th centuries occurred for two reasons. First of all, they were the forerunners of trade unions. Second, it was the trade guilds that established relief funds (called boxes or purses) for members in financial straits. In this sense, guilds can be regarded as the precursors of social relief arrangements based on mutual solidarity. This should be qualified slightly, however, in that such care arrangements were not one of the guilds’ core activities.

**Institutional roots of the nonprofit sector**

Although the description of the developments in the different fields of nonprofit activity have highlighted differences, there are several common characteristics as well. These main characteristics are briefly discussed here.

First, the Christian-inspired love of one’s neighbor lies at the heart of many citizen initiatives. The spread of welfare organizations was spurred not only because the Netherlands is a very religious country, but also because of the diversity of religious groups. (As the saying goes: one Dutchman a church, two Dutchmen a schism.) As a result of religious differentiation there has been an enormous growth in organizations of private initiative. This development began in the late second half of the 19th century and culminated in the first two decades of the twentieth century: each religious group or pillar had its own organizations such as churches, schools, newspapers, political party, trade-union, associations for sports, and so on. The pillarization was until recently
the most dominant characteristic of the nonprofit sector in the Netherlands. In the second half of the 20th century, at the beginning of the sixties, this dominance weakened.

Secondly, the role of the bourgeois, middle-class elite must be mentioned as a force of civilizing society. Especially in the education of the poor, the arts and other forms of culture, the bourgeois took many initiatives: building schools, libraries, museums, and theaters. The bourgeois also founded organizations aimed at educating the poor, not only in teaching reading and writing but also good citizenship. Nowadays there are still traces to be seen of those organizations. This “bourgeois civilizing offensive” has been a major force in the development of the nonprofit sector. It may be described as the earliest form of civil society.

Thirdly, the rise of the state and of its intervention in society have steadily been growing from the 19th century up until present. This growing intervention has shifted the balance between church-related organizations and public organizations. Private organizations came increasingly into the sphere of influence of the government, local as well as national. The balance between state-intervention and one’s own responsibility is still a delicate one, although the introduction of the market-mechanism recently changed the character. The state-intervention in private organizations was restricted by the principle of subsidiarity (as the Roman Catholics called it) or sovereignty (as the Reformed called it); Both subsidiarity, i.e., sovereignty mean that matters can be handled by the private organization itself, and don't belong under the jurisdiction of government. This one explanation of the delicate balance between the responsibilities of the state and private organizations.

Fourthly, there has been growth in political organizations and political parties at the end of the 19th century. Those parties had close ties with other social organizations whose goals were to contribute to building society and its members. This bond between social and political organizations gave a great influx to the growth of social organizations because they managed to get heard by important politicians. Many of their members had close ties with the political circuit, some were politicians themselves.

Fifthly it must be noted that there were several motives of the groups of citizens mentioned here for interfering in society by providing economic assistance. Economic necessity (i.e giving money to the poor in order to enhance their spending power), one’s own interests (i.e giving money to the poor on order to prevent them from stealing), and charity indicate some of the motives for intervention.

**Periodization**

By examining the rise of organizations that played key roles in the nonprofit sector, we can distinguish three periods. The first was the period up to 1870. It was characterized by numerous initiatives – by churches, philanthropists, art patrons, the bourgeoisie, and local authorities. Exactly what share each group had in terms of contributions to the community is hard to determine. What is apparent is the intertwinement of the city authorities with private and church groups in the funding and sustaining of welfare facilities or organizations. Such initiatives were often broad in scope, extending to health care, poor relief and education.
Around 1870, under the influence of progressive liberals, the state came sharply into the picture. The second period, 1870 to 1945, was characterized by a gradual transition from church-related to publicly funded initiatives, but at the same time it was the heyday of pillarization. The state, and especially the local authorities, occupied an increasingly central place, as did the various social-political blocs. We furthermore see all manner of clubs and societies springing up which, influenced by Enlightenment thinking, were devoted to the education and cultivation of their members – debating clubs, reading clubs, science clubs, drama clubs and music clubs, to mention a few. It was also the zenith of the Society for the General Good (the Nut).

The third period, from 1945 to the present, has seen a marked expansion of central government influence, extending across virtually all areas of care and welfare – education, social security, health care. The distributive function of the state came into its own. Simultaneously with the rise of the welfare state, the system of pillars began to crumble. This process of depillarization is still underway today. This has, moreover, been the era of corporations, particularly in the area of housing. Political parties have also taken on a more influential role in the creation of the welfare state since 1962. This third period is therefore well summarized by the phrase “collectivization of the social welfare system.”

**Theoretical analysis**

**The key concept of pillarization**

The pillarization process, which started in the second half of the nineteenth century, was key in influencing the shape and size of the Dutch nonprofit sector. (Cf. Lijphart, 1968; Bax, 1988). Pillarization (Verzuiling in Dutch) is the process by which groups of citizens organize themselves along religious and political lines. Pillarization took place in all socioeconomic, political and cultural spheres. The result was a great variety of denominational organizations such as political parties, labor unions, housing associations, newspapers, broadcasting associations, and also schools, hospitals and sport clubs.

The number of pillars in Dutch society is still debated and hinges largely on the definition of a pillar. There were at least two and perhaps up to five pillars. Catholic organizations formed the most encompassing and homogeneous pillar. Also the existence of a Protestant or Calvinist pillar has rarely been contested, but this pillar remained more diverse, probably because it was never controlled by a single hierarchic church. Also, separate networks of organizations developed, from a loose liberal Protestant one to several tighter orthodox clusters. With regards to the major Protestant churches, the Calvinists became more pillarized than the Dutch Reformed, who were the largest (but also quite heterogeneous) Protestant denomination. Whether the liberals and the
socialists had formed a pillar of their own is still a matter of discussion. Some claim that these groups had formed too few organizations in too little areas to deserve the label of a pillar.

Others, who find full vertical integration the most distinctive characteristic of a pillar, state that the socialist and liberal pillars were not true pillars because the first lacked upper classes while the latter failed to attract lower classes.

Liberal organizations were often non-religious. They became pillarized through selective membership and inter-organizational links, not because of a positive ideological identity. One may say that because of the encompassing denominational segregation in many areas, socialist and liberal organizations functioned as pillars (Van Holthoon 1988; cf. Middendorp 1991: 12-24). Each pillar or denomination had its own newspapers, economic interest organizations, and radio and television broadcasting association. In the educational realm, the socialists and liberals were content with the public schools, while the Calvinists and Catholics wanted institutions of their own.

One of the most prominent perspectives on the causes of pillarization considers it to be the result of the emancipation of socially or economically deprived population groups. Pillarization was the road the Catholic minority, the Calvinists, and laborers took to achieve emancipation or full citizenship. These three groups began the process, and the Dutch Reformed, the religious majority, and the liberals formed pillarized organizations of their own primarily in response to the efforts of the three unprivileged groups. Thus existence of pillars are questioned for the denominational groups that formed the traditional political and economic elite.

Other explanations for pillarization are social control and protection (for these and more perspectives, see Bax, 1988; Dekker and Ester, 1996; and Hoogenboom, 1996). Mainly the confessional elites wanted to protect their fellow believers from the vices of modernization and secularization. The social control perspective views pillarization as a deliberate attempt of traditional and new elites to sharpen the religious and political divisions in society to strengthen their position.

It may well be argued that pillarization contained all three elements simultaneously: emancipation for the socialist laborers, and for all Catholics and Calvinists (from lower to upper class), and social control by the elites of all denominations over their flock. Needless to say these motives may have been present with different groups and individuals. The protection perspective is heavily associated with the Dutch Catholic Church which stimulated the creation of Catholic organizations in virtually every sphere. The clergy forbade the parishioners to join profane let alone religious non-Catholic organizations. As a result, a host of Catholic clubs were formed, in a wide range of areas, including sports and recreation. The clergy assigned a priest to each organization to ensure Catholic character. The interference could be significant. One Catholic priest, who later became the bishop of Haarlem, stated that unfortunately there were not enough priests to give every Catholic family daily spiritual guidance (Rogier, 1978: 217).
Nonprofit Theories

The Role of the State. Based on the historical development of the Dutch nonprofit sector we conclude that the relationship with government is better characterized by cooperation than conflict. In general, there has been a positive government attitude towards private initiatives. There has never been a strong centralistic state in the Netherlands. The country has its origins in a loose and decentralized federation. When faced with new challenges, the state often took a liberal laissez-faire position. Thus many new issues were voluntarily left to the private sector. In the last 100 years the state built up support of the nonprofit sector. In some cases, such as education, the support was only granted after a fierce political struggle. In other cases, such as cross organizations, support was given because the state acknowledged the results of nonprofits in fighting infant mortality and tuberculosis. Along with the increase in financial support, the nonprofit sector became less independent and more vulnerable. The sector’s weaknesses showed when government decided to cut back support.

Government encouraged the nonprofit sector in different ways. One significant way is through the favorable tax treatment of nonprofits. In general, nonprofits are exempt from company and value added taxes and they are entitled to more favorable gift and death duties. In addition, individuals and companies that give money to nonprofits may deduct the donations from their personal or company tax. Second, the legal status of a nonprofit has often been a condition in order to qualify for public or government subsidies and grants. Finally, government has in recent years privatized some of its agencies and transformed them into private nonprofits. For instance, soon there will be no government social housing and health providers.

Government financial support to the nonprofit sector has different forms. The four main forms of government support are tax benefits (see above), statutory payments, grants or subsidies, and the receipts from a quasi-tax in health insurance. The relative importance of these financial sources varies in each field. Statutory payments are very important in education, while subsidies are prevalent in culture, sports and recreation. Public financial support to nonprofit organizations has a long history. There are sixteenth century examples of local governments subsidizing religious poor relief institutions in adverse times. Notwithstanding these and other examples, the financial support of government to nonprofits is mainly an issue of the last hundred years or so. From then on the state increasingly showed its concern for the social issues invoked by the rise of industrialization and urbanization. The support for social housing and cross organizations are examples.

Restrictions imposed on the nonprofit sector by government are usually of a regulatory nature. Naturally there are the usual legal restrictions concerning the creation and management of nonprofits, but these are common practice in many countries and not typical for the Netherlands. However, when public financing is involved, government regulations limit the autonomy of nonprofits (see also Burger et al., 1997).

The Role of Religion and the Church. Religion and religiousness have been of major importance to the Dutch nonprofit sector. The sector’s early origins can be traced to church related activities in poor relief, health care and education. In addition, the religiously inspired
pillarization in the nineteenth century boosted sectarian nonprofit activities. Thus religion was a major factor in the creation and development of the Dutch nonprofit sector.

Religious considerations inspired the founding of early nonprofit organizations. A religiously inspired sense of compassion and the drive to save souls motivated churches and religious orders to provide poor relief, education and health care. Various churches had institutions of their own. As soon as religious diversity emerged in the sixteenth century, religious nonprofit organizations reflected this diversity. For instance, in poor relief it was customary for individuals to turn to the church for support.

Many nonprofits with denominational names are actually more non-secular in their activities. The role of religion in the nonprofit sector today is limited. Religion is still significant in private education, in certain welfare organizations and in some of the major international assistance organizations. The latter are the only ones that are closely related to churches.

The Role of Heterogeneity. Religious heterogeneity has been an important factor in the development of the Dutch nonprofit. The Netherlands has a long and ongoing history of religious diversity: from the advent of Protestantism in the sixteenth century to the rise of Islam in the past several years. The importance of religion has decreased over recent years as a shrinking segment of population considers themselves affiliated with a church.

The Netherlands has long been a country of immigrants. However, ethnicity was not a major issue. The last thirty odd years or so have shown a further diversification in the ethnic and racial structure of the population. Ethnicity has not been a relevant factor in the shaping the nonprofit sector.

The Dutch nonprofit sector has not only religious origins. A significant part originated from nonreligious and nonsectarian initiatives. A sectarian but nonreligious component that has received little attention in our discussion is the socialist pillar. From the end of the nineteenth century, socialist organizations emerged in politics, labor, newspapers, broadcasting, and housing, but not in education and health care.

The nonsectarian origins of the Dutch nonprofit sector are also important. The Nut, established in the 18th century, was a nonsectarian humanistic organization that became active in many areas such as education, social work, poor relief, health insurance, banking (page ...). Many of the new private hospitals in the nineteenth century were nonsectarian. The cross organizations started on a nonsectarian basis. Even after the spread of pillarization the majority were still nonsectarian. Today many nonprofits are nonsectarian and the number is likely to grow even further. Some of the nonsectarian nonprofits are the result of mergers between denominational agencies. Privatized government departments are mainly nonsectarian as well. The largest nonprofit organization in the Netherlands, the Automobile Association, is also nonsectarian.

Social Origins Theory

As the developments traced above demonstrated private groups and organizations, mostly with a religious identity, played a leading role in the emergence and growth of the Dutch nonprofit
sector. At the same time, municipal authorities involved in activities developed by private
initiative at a very early date. In some areas of endeavor – particularly poor relief, education,
health care and the guild system – the local authorities (in this case the city governments) were
rather tightly interlinked with private initiative. This notwithstanding, the general picture remains
that the origins of the Dutch nonprofit sector lay in private, confessional initiative. Later, in the
17th and 18th centuries, non-religiously inspired movements such as the progressive liberals
undertook action as part of a “bourgeois civilizing offensive.” Although up to this time the public
authorities did play a role, their involvement was fragmentary and inconspicuous. It was not until
the second half of the 19th century that the national authorities started to gain significant influence
in the nonprofit sector. That influence has been growing steadily ever since. Very recently, there
have been moves towards a more hands-off approach on the part of government.

In an earlier paper (Burger et al., 1997), we tentatively interpreted developments in the
Netherlands in terms of the four models proposed by Salamon and Anheier (1998). Our cautious
conclusion was that a liberal model of social welfare, prevailing in the 19th century, evolved into a
corporatist model in the 20th century. We further noted that the pendulum is now swinging back
slightly towards the liberal model as a consequence of processes such as privatization and hands-
off government.

That conclusion now needs refinement in the light of the material presented in this paper,
which has taken developments from before the 19th century into account. The revisions pertain
mainly to the role of public authorities and to the changing relations between them and private
initiative over time. We have shown, for example, that as early as the Middle Ages the authorities
in cities were closely engaged in the care of the poor, not only financially, but also in organization
and policy. In contrast, authorities long remained aloof from any intervention in artistic endeavors.
In the interim we have also seen different varieties of public involvement, which can be
distinguished further by the extent of central and local involvement. It was predominantly the
authorities in cities that were active in areas where private organizations earned their spurs. The
motives behind such government interventions are not always clear. Sometimes they appear to
have been prompted by a socially felt need to intervene, sometimes by a desire to exercise social
control, and sometimes by financial necessity. More insight into such motives is needed.

Another factor is the degree of organization of private initiatives. This, too, varied from
field to field. While it was inspired individuals – merchants, civil servants, politicians, and art
patrons – who created and funded cultural facilities, poor relief was mainly the responsibility of
church organizations. In the face of the high demand for help, the churches did not always
succeed in raising the needed funding, and public authorities often had to help out. The frequent
financial involvement of public authorities in poor relief did not yet lead to a commensurate
degree of intervention in its content. Ultimately, however, state funding took on such proportions
that continued aloofness was no longer justifiable. That point was reached around the turn of the
century. From that time on, state intervention expanded, finally culminating in task definitions laid
down by law.
One of the most crucial characteristics of the nonprofit sector has thus been the deep intertwining between private initiative and the local, and later the national, government authorities. Although the intensity of their interaction was different in each field of activity, it can certainly be regarded as a characteristic feature of the whole nonprofit sector in the Netherlands. We have found very early evidence of such interdependence in the history of health care, poor relief and education, while in areas such as welfare work and culture it arose at a much later date. Still today this intertwining of the state and private initiative in the nonprofit sector remains a vital factor in its functioning.

A key factor to be considered is the class structure of Dutch society. Traditionally the aristocracy has been weak and did not play a very important role in the making of society. Clergymen and the bourgeoisie (merchants and urban professionals) were the prominent “society-builders.” For a long time they were the two powers, because the working class was not well organized and the aristocracy was not very strong in size and societal impact.

In the second half of the 19th century of the industrial revolution changed class structure. The antithesis between capital and labor was actualized by captains of industry versus working class heroes. Political parties were formed, organized along the line of these interests plus the religious dimension. Three mainstreams developed: the socialists, the liberals and the religious parties. The power of government steadily grew both locally and nationally. A new class of civil servants arose. The intertwining between the state and society increased as well. At the end of the 20th century this interconnectedness reached its peak. Currently there is a tendency within politics to withdraw from society and leave matters to the public and the market as much as possible.

These changes in the structure of Dutch society have altered its functioning. First of all, the role of the local and national government grew gradually from marginal to dominant during the course of two centuries. This steadily growing involvement with society has impacted on the nonprofit sector. Although for a long time the principle of subsidiarity was adhered to, especially in the fields of culture and education, the financial commitment of the state, eventually led to more control by the state. The authority of the central government gradually increased and the nonprofit sector fell more and more within the sphere of influence of the government.

Secondly the interference of the elite bourgeoisie with the education of the people took place on a relatively large scale in the 19th century. This gradually diminished in the 20th century. State-financed schools opened, and every pillar had its own school. This brilliant formula was possible because the leading politicians belonged to the religious parties that dominated the political process. As we mentioned before it was the heyday of pillarization in the Netherlands.

These developments touched the nonprofit sector. Because of the growing financial commitment of the government to the nonprofit sector, there was a growing desire by non-religious politicians and civil servants to play a role in the decision-making within the sector. They campaigned under the slogan, “He who determines the policies, will pay.” In other words, financing an organization should result in a say about the matters of the organizations. Gradually some governmental concern came about, but in general the authority and the professional autonomy of nonprofit institutions remained unaffected.
Some Particular Areas: Social Housing and Environmental Organizations

Social Housing

In the Netherlands, (social) housing demonstrates a close private-public partnership as well as pillarized initiatives in the nonprofit sector. It may be used to demonstrate the development of publicly funded private organizations which were put under government regulations and, ultimately, given renewed “autonomy” as government stepped back. We divide the history of housing into three stages. The first stage (up to 1900) is characterized by the dominance of private initiatives and private funding of philanthropic social housing projects. The second stage (1901-1940) witnesses the strong interference of government, particularly in providing finances for private housing organizations. The third stage (1945-present) encompasses the growing role of state regulation and the subsequent gradual state withdrawal and regained autonomy for private organizations.

The First Stage (up to 1900): The Dominance of Private Philanthropy. The prehistory of social housing is located in the pre-modern era when well-to-do citizens established homes for the poor, elderly, sick or orphans. These homes were designated for vulnerable groups and not for ordinary working people. The history of (social) housing organizations starts in the nineteenth century. The urban population of the Netherlands grew quickly from the second half of the nineteenth century onwards. Large families had to live in one room apartments in the city slums or in new but poorly constructed apartment buildings. Elite citizens, concerned with the housing conditions of laborers and fearful of working class diseases that flourished in dreadful conditions, created in the middle of the nineteenth century housing associations that aimed to build solid, decent and “healthy” homes. The early initiatives came from and were funded by the bourgeoisie. Often the associations were given a starting capital at low interest rates.

The Second Stage (1901-1940): Government Funding of Private Housing Projects. Genuine concern for the living conditions of the working class, fear of infectious diseases, rejection of appalling and low quality apartments buildings, and the inability of local governments to act appropriately inspired the Law on Housing of 1901. The law was a landmark in the history of social housing and ultimately boosted private nonprofit activities in the area. Among other things, newly built homes had to meet a number of quality standards. Local governments could clear the slums by expropriating the owners or by forcing them to maintain their properties, and so-called “admitted” private housing organizations were promised financial aid from central or local governments (Vreeze, 1993, 127). Admitted organizations, or corporations as they are often called, could be either associations or foundations. Their activities had to serve the interests of social housing alone. As a result of the Law of 1901 the number of social housing corporations increased sharply in the following decades. In less than twenty years their number grew from three in 1904 to about thirteen hundred in 1922 (Van Dieten, 1993: 12). The activities of the associations and foundations also expanded. Between 1901 and 1940 more than one million homes were built. Private corporations erected about 10 percent (Van der Cammen, 1993, 45). Pillarization also affected the area of social housing, but the pillarized corporations, mainly socialist and Catholic, never dominated the field and did not build entire “pillarized” neighborhoods.
The Third Stage (1945-present): The Rise and Decline of Government Interference. After the Second World War the role of government became larger. One of the major concerns of postwar government was the construction of new homes. Due to war damages and fast population growth the country needed many new homes. For some time housing was priority number one (Woningnood Volksvijand Nummer Een). Activities were geared towards maximizing new buildings. The quantity of houses was considered more important than the quality. Housing corporations were kept on a rather short leash and instructed to build vast quantities of houses. Government supplied the finances and the corporations built and managed the newly constructed homes. Government also intervened with rent prices. The increases in rent were to be set by government (a practice introduced during the German occupation). Government also intervened with the distribution of homes. As a result of these developments corporations increasingly became the executive arm of government. The independence the corporations previously enjoyed was greatly diminished. Nevertheless, housing corporations received generous rewards for their cooperative attitude: all remaining loans from government were remitted in 1965. As the number of new homes grew every year, the scale of the corporations became larger: more homes, more tenants, more personnel, and increasing levels of professionalization.

A few figures may illustrate the growth of nonprofit housing. Table 1 presents the number of homes owned by private corporations and by municipal housing departments. The social housing sector, which consists of these two actors, has always been dominated by corporations. The decline in the number of dwellings owned by municipal organizations after 1971 reflects the political preference for corporations that developed in the 1960s. From then on new homes were built mainly by corporations. The social housing sector is large in the Netherlands. Half of the approximately six million homes in 1995 are rental homes and more than two million are owned and managed by corporations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: The Number of Homes Owned by Corporations and Municipal Housing Services, 1920-1995 (x1000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Housing Departments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Volkshuisvesting; CBS, Statistisch Jaarboek, 1997, 181.

From the 1970s onwards the corporations regained their former independence. Government, busy controlling expenditures, decided to step back. Long-term financial ties were cut. Now corporations can no longer rely on state loans or subsidies in constructing new homes, nor can they divert their investment risks to government. Government also unfastened the leash that directed the corporations in the area of rent prices. Instead of setting the annual rent increases, (central) government now determines the maximum rate of increase. The corporations...
have the choice of any increase below that level. Now the money for maintenance and investments has to come from rent revenues. Although endowed with a state dowry, many private nonprofit housing corporations feel a need to operate like a commercial enterprise. Their survival depends on their ability to generate sufficient income, while maintaining a strong commitment to low-priced social housing. In the years ahead corporations need to find a balance between these two objectives (Gerrichhauzen, 111).

An important recent development is the gradual disappearance of municipal housing departments. Due to privatization these local institutions have the choice between merging with existing private corporations, selling their homes to private corporations, changing legal form into a private corporation, or dissolution. Of the about two hundred municipal housing departments in existence in 1990, only twenty-three have not yet made their choice.

**Environmental Organizations**

We divide the history of environmental organizations into three stages. Environmental organizations in the first period, from 1900 until the 1960s, were generally initiatives from well-to-do elites geared towards the acquisition and conservation of nature. In the 1960s the coverage and basis of support changed. Environmental pollution also came into focus and, along with society as a whole, the organizations democratized as the basis of support broadened to other sections of the socioeconomic scale. Growing professionalization and institutionalization best characterize the third stage that started in the 1980s. The environmental movement increasingly operates within the consultation networks and has become an accepted consultation partner for government as well as for industry.

**The First Phase 1900-1960: The Conservationist Elite.** The first environmental organizations were established around the turn of the century. The conservationist aim is clearly present in the names of the early organizations. The first environmental organization was the association for the protection of birds (*de Nederlandse Vereniging tot Bescherming van Vogels*), established in 1899. Two years later the natural-historical association (*de Nederlandsche Natuurhistorische Vereniging*) was founded. This organization had a hand in the creation of the natural monuments association (*de Vereniging tot Behoud van Natuurmonumenten*), which resulted from the protest against the City of Amsterdam's intention to dump its waste at a nearby lake (*het Naardermeer*). The initial purpose of the newly established organization (1905) was to buy the lake site and conserve its natural habitat. The attempt resulted in the first large nature reserve that served as a model for later acquisitions. *Natuurmonumenten* expanded its territory (*werkterrein*) from the *Naardermeer* to nature conservation in the entire country. Today, the *Naardermeer* is still renowned for its bird population, and *Natuurmonumenten* is the largest environmental organization in the Netherlands in budget and in membership. The people that initiated, managed and financed the conservationist organizations came mainly from the country's urban and rural elite. For instance, landlords, biologists and Amsterdam patricians dominated *Natuurmonumenten* (Nas, 1997: 28-29, 153).

**The Second Phase 1960-1980: Local and International Challenge and Response.** The basis and the focus of environmental organizations changed in the 1960s. Whereas organizations in the first stage were primarily concerned with conservation, the focus shifted to the growing pollution
of water, land and air in the 1960s. As the fast economic growth in this period augmented the pollution generated by industries, the protests became louder. Many protests had a local character and were often a response to the expansion of industries or government plans to extend the infrastructural networks. In contrast to the first phase, the base of support was broader. Besides scientists, the local population joined the rallies. Although local action groups flourished in the early 1970s, the environmental concerns were not solely local, but also regional, national, and international. After the oil crisis and the report of the Club of Rome, the attention shifted from pollution towards the threatening depletion of energy and natural resources. The environmental movement played a leading role in the protest against nuclear energy and plants. The second half of the 1970s showed an increased interest in the welfare of animals. In this period Greenpeace Nederland, which directed its first activities against the clubbing of seals, and several organizations concerned with the well-being of animals in the bio-industry were established. During this time a division of roles between environmental organizations became clear. There were those who stayed mainly conservationist, while others became more activist or educationalist.

The Third Phase 1980-to The Present: From Actions to Words, a New Private-state Partnership? The first half of the 1980s was a difficult period for the environmental movement. Economic difficulties and rising unemployment diminished the interest in environmental concerns in the media as well as in the eyes of politicians and the public. The environmental organizations were faced with a decrease in membership and with increasing difficulties in mobilizing people for actions and demonstrations. Faced with the decline in member participation, many groups reorganized, professionalized and sought more direct contacts with government and later also with industry. As a result, the main activities were increasingly diverted from actions and demonstrations to legal procedures and participation in discussions and consultations. The environmental movement is now institutionalized. Clashes between the environmental movement and industry have been moved from the endangered areas or the pollution-radiating factory plants to the negotiating table. The dialogue strategy has resulted in a number of voluntary agreements with industry, for instance those on the reduction of the use of tropical hard wood and pesticides.

In the second half of the 1980s the interest in environmental issues rose again. The nuclear disaster in Chernobyl and television campaigns of the three major organizations Natuurmonumenten, Wereld Natuur Fonds (World Wildlife Fund Nederland), Greenpeace Nederland helped to increase the interest as well as the number of memberships and donors. By 1995 the environmental movement had more than three million members and is currently the largest social movement in the Netherlands.

The institutionalization of the environmental movement in the Netherlands stands out in international comparisons. In comparison to other countries in Western Europe, the Netherlands has the highest percentage of memberships and donors, but the lowest percentage of activists (Nas, 1997: 42). Support for environmental organizations in the Netherlands increasingly consists of checkbook activism (giro-activisme). Government in the Netherlands seems to have an open mind towards the environmental movement. The positive attitude is reflected in the state subsidies for environmental organizations that are the highest in the Netherlands.
Considering the institutionalized nature of the environmental movement and its comparatively generous support by government, we may witness the shaping of a new private nonprofit and state partnership along familiar lines. Like in the traditional areas such as education and social housing, a positive attitude and state subsidies created a strong and long-lasting partnership. However, the creation of a new public-private partnership has become more unlikely since government has recently diminished the level of subsidies. Furthermore, government has proven to be less responsive to pressure from environmental organizations. As a result, they now seem to prefer direct agreements with industry.
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