

BA HISTORY THESIS



By a Return to God's Word
A Comparative History of the AR and CS

by
Titus Stam

Titus Stam, 6249582
Final Thesis, 30-3-2020
E-mail: t.j.d.stam@students.uu.nl
Thesis Supervisor: Dr. D. Brett
Words: 10429
Pages: 25

Summary

Confronted with worsening conditions of international capitalism and moral degradation of society at the hands of anti-clerical liberal governments in the late 19th century, both Dutch Protestants and German Austrian Catholics coalesced into two social confessional movements that would dominate the interwar politics of their respective societies. The Dutch AR and Cisleithanian CS, respectively led by charismatic democrats Ds. Abraham Kuyper and Dr. Karl Lueger, sought the moral emancipation of the *Kleine Luyden* or *Kleine Leute* from Liberalism and Capitalism. Although originating from fundamentally different confessions and societies, the leadership of these social confessional movements perceived their mission in similar rhetoric and solutions. Through an analysis of the rhetoric and policy preferences of the leadership, the trajectories of these parties on two issues, the Social Question and the Jewish Question, were compared through their opposition to the dominant liberal regime into mass-based political parties and eventual lynchpins of conservative coalitions in the *Fin de Siècle*. This analysis led to the conclusion that AR and CS had similar trajectories with regards to anti-capitalism, employing anti-capitalist rhetoric against liberal executives, only to increasingly cooperate with capitalists in response to a growing Socialist movement in both countries. On the other hand, the trajectory of anti-Semitic critiques differed between the AR and CS, while both were formulated in periods of personal political failure, Dr. Lueger's anti-Semitism provided a springboard to political power, while Ds. Kuyper's anti-Semitism proved controversial and counterproductive as a means to power in Dutch society.

Contents

Introduction	2
§1. Introduction	
§2. On Methodology, Sources and Validity	
§3. Historiography	
Chapter I. <i>Het Broedervraagstuk</i>: Kuyper and the Social Question	7
§1. Ni Dieu, ni maître	
§2. The Founding of the Anti-Revolutionary Party	
§3. Christian-Historical <i>Droite</i> and Anti-Revolutionary <i>Gauche</i>	
§4. The Rail Road Strikes	
Chapter II. <i>Defending the Mittelstand</i>: Lueger, the Social and Jewish Question	13
§1. From Liberal to Democrat to Anti-Semite	
§2. A Christian-Social Program	
§3. Bürgermeister Lueger	
Chapter III. <i>Het Joodse Probleem</i>: Kuyper and the Jewish Question	17
Conclusion	21
Bibliography	22
§1. Primary Sources	
§2. Literature	

Introduction

§1. Introduction: By a Return to God's Word

“The magic of iron machines causes the capitalist to see entirely materially, now too his wage labourer is nothing more than a meat machine which one, having become incapacitated, discards, or throws away, after they are worn down.”¹ – Ds. Abraham Kuyper, *Ons Program*, 1880. [Author's Translation]

“In any case we clearly see ... that some opportune remedy must be found quickly for the misery and wretchedness pressing so unjustly on the majority of the working class. ... by degrees, it has come to pass that working men have been surrendered, isolated and helpless, to the hardheartedness of employers and the greed of unchecked competition. ... so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the labouring poor a yoke little better than that of slavery itself.”² – Pope Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum*, 1891. [Author's Translation]

Confronted with ever worsening conditions of international capitalism in the Long Depression and the moral degradation of society at the hands of anti-clerical liberal governments in the late 19th century, both Protestants and Catholics saw themselves called to action to address society's ills. In the Netherlands and Cisleithanian Austria-Hungary, Protestants and Catholics, respectively, coalesced into two social confessional movements that would dominate the interwar politics of their respective societies.³ Both the Dutch *Anti-Revolutionaire Partij* [En. Anti-Revolutionary Party] and Cisleithanian *Christlichsoziale Partei* [En. Christian-Social Party] – henceforth referred to as AR and CS – sought the moral emancipation of the *Kleine Luyden* or *Kleine Leute* from their Sodom and Gomorra of “Liberalist” Anti-Clericalism and International Capitalism.⁴ Although originating from fundamentally different confessions and societies, the leadership of these social confessional movements perceived their mission in similar rhetoric and solutions; in the “re-Christianisation of society” or the “return to God's Word”:

“In the first place the social question is the question of the possibility of, and the means towards, the living re-Christianisation of society; only in the second place is it for us a question of viable reform of existing economic and social conditions. In the second place for this reason: because such reforms are not possible without liberating the peoples from spiritual and moral anarchy.”⁵ – Franz Schindler, *Internal Party Memorandum*. [Author's Translation]

“... we promise the relaxation and betterment of conditions [of the social question, red.] by a return to God's Word; restoration of the broken political balance and codification of the rights and costs under which wage labour is carried out.”⁶ – Ds. Abraham Kuyper, *Ons Program*, 1880. [Author's Translation]

Through analysis of the rhetoric and policy preferences of the leadership, these Social Christian movements will be compared and contrasted as they evolved through their opposition to the dominant liberal regime into mass-based political parties from 1888 onwards, and lynchpins of the *staatsbehoudende* [En. State-preserving] *Bürgerliche* or *Antithese* coalitions in the last decade of the *Fin*

¹ Abraham Kuyper, *Ons Program* [Our Program] (Amsterdam, J.H. Kruyt, 1880), 363.

² Pope Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum: On Capital and Labour*. http://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum.html [Last Accessed 12-12-2019]

³ Ivo Schöffer, *Veelvormig Verleden: Zeventien studies in de Vaderlandse Geschiedenis* [Pluriform Past: Seventeen studies in Dutch History] (Amsterdam: De Bataafsche Leeuw, 1987), 81-84; John W. Boyer, *Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna: Christian Socialism in Power, 1897-1918* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 450-451.

⁴ James D. Bratt, *Abraham Kuyper: Modern Calvinist, Christian Democrat* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2013), 221-225; Abraham Kuyper, “De Joden onder de Christen-natiën III.” [The Jews under the Christian Nations III], *De Standaard*, 12 October 1875; Karl Lueger, “Lueger's First Anti-Semitic Speech” in *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria*, ed. P.G.J. Pulzer (New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1964), 341-342.

⁵ Friederich Funder, *Aufbruch zur christlichen Sozialreform: Franz Schindler. Der Weggenosse Luegers und A. Lichtensteins* [Start of Christian Social Reform: Franz Schindler. Fellow Traveller of Lueger and A. Liechtenstein] (Vienna: Herold Verlag, 1953), 11-12.

⁶ Kuyper, *Ons Program*, 366.

de Siècle and the subsequent interwar period.⁷ More specifically, this paper shall seek to demonstrate how from a similar starting position, the party leaderships followed a shared trajectory on socio-economic rhetoric and policy preferences and a diverging trajectory on the place of their confession in society. The shared trajectory shall be described as a movement away from original anti-capitalist critiques and interventionist social and economic schemes to favourable capitalist rhetoric and *laissez-faire* policies. The diverging trajectory shall be described as the eventual acceptance of a pluralistic society by AR and its continued rejection by CS in response to the diverging world views present in their societies. This description shall be achieved by a qualitative analysis of primary sources produced by their respective party leaderships and secondary sources, with the aim of describing both the ideological and practical treatment of these issues by the leadership of both social confessional movements.

§2. On Methodology, Sources and Validity

However, before providing a description of the historical context of the social confessional movements, their ideological framework and their practical treatment of the social question and their confessions in society, the validity of the employed comparative methodology, the choice and the analysis of sources, and comparison itself must first be demonstrated.

In the pursuit of historical knowledge, general historical-comparative methodologies provide the benefit of balancing the particular developments within a single case against the background of common development within a larger number of cases. Central to such historical-comparative methodologies are Mill's methods of difference and concomitant variation. Through the method of difference, when a phenomenon occurs in one, but not both similar instances, "the circumstance in which alone the two instances differ" can be concluded to be "the effect, or the cause, or an indispensable part of the cause, of the phenomenon."⁸ This method will be employed to describe the diverging trajectories between the social confessional movement with respect to the broader shared trajectory of the social confessional movements. Furthermore, the within-case methodology allows for an ideographic explanation of causal determinants of particular and common developments in both social confessional movements.⁹ This paper thereby rejects an ability to provide a nomothetic explanation of the general development of social confessional movements within this era. Through a causal narrative structure, the aforementioned description of the distinct historical contexts and the development in rhetoric and policy preferences of the social confessional leaderships shall be set out.¹⁰

The primary sources central to aforementioned analysis in the evolution of rhetoric and policy preferences of the leaderships of the AR and CS include but are not limited to political programs, speeches, memoranda, legislation, and newspaper articles. The choice for sources involving the AR was influenced by the central importance of Ds. Abraham Kuyper, nicknamed *Abraham de Geweldige* [En. Abraham the Great] by friend and foe alike, to the foundation and conduct of the AR in this period.¹¹ His five-hundred page political programme *Ons Program* functioned both as founding document and ideological centrepiece of the AR. Kuyper's *Ons Program* can be seen as the advent of anti-revolutionary ideology and the starting line of its evolution. Kuyper further evolved the anti-revolutionary ideology through *De Standaard*, the daily newspaper of the AR, which he founded and

⁷ *Anti-Revolutionaire Partij* [Anti-Revolutionary Party], "Program van Actie bij de Stembus van 1888" [Program of Action at the Ballot Box of 1888] in *Politieke en Sociale programma's. Derde deel* [Political and Social programs. Third bind], ed. N. Oosterbaan (Utrecht: n.b., 1901), 66-70; John W. Boyer, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848-1897* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 219-221; Cisleithanian *Bürgerliche* coalitions were anti-socialist alliance incorporating Christian Social, German National and Young Czech bourgeois blocs; Dutch *Antithese* coalitions were anti-liberal and anti-socialist alliances incorporating Anti-Revolutionaries, Catholics and conservative Christian-Historicals.

⁸ John Stuart Mill, *A System of Logic, Vol. 1* (London: John W. Parker, 1843), 455.

⁹ Matthew Lange, *Comparative-Historical Methods* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2012), 10-12.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 40-64, 103-108.

¹¹ Schöffner, *Veelvormig Verleden*, 159.

edited throughout his political life. *De Standaard* served as the effective vehicle of the AR leadership, informing and forming the rank-and-file in regards to contemporary issues.¹² Specifically, the *De Standaard* article series *The Jews under the Christian Nations* in 1875 and Kuypers' 1880 oration *Sphere Sovereignty* document anti-revolutionary ideology with regards to pluralism and Dutch society.¹³ Finally, Kuypers' opening oration to the Christian Social Congress in 1891 and his speeches in the Dutch House of Representatives with regards to Rail Road Strikes of 1903 document the anti-revolutionary ideology with regards to the social question.¹⁴

The choice for sources involving the CS was influenced by a similar importance of Dr. Karl Lueger for the Christian Socials in Austria-Hungary. From his position in the Viennese *Gemeinderat*, Lueger became the popular lynchpin in a diverse anti-Liberal coalition of Catholic conservatives, democrats, anti-Semites and anti-Capitalists united first as *Vereinigte Christen* and later as the Christian Social Party, which would come to dominate Vienna, Lower Austria and Cisleithanian Austria-Hungary.¹⁵ Thus both Lueger public speeches and private letters on antisemitism and anti-Capitalism, collected in Richard S. Geehr's *I decide who is a Jew!*, shall provide the backbone of the analysis of the Christian Social position on universalism and the social question.¹⁶ These sources will be complemented by the analysis of the writings and speeches of Prince Alois von und zu Liechtenstein, one of Austria's earliest social reformers, Lueger's right hand man in the Cisleithanian parliament and successor as CS leader following Lueger's death in 1910.¹⁷ Specifically Liechtenstein's speech in 1891 in the *Reichsrat*, outlining the CS social program and its relation to anti-Semitism shall be analysed to illustrate Christian Social ideology with regards to the social question and universalism.¹⁸

Moreover, the source analysis of parliamentary proceedings, campaign speeches, legislation and newspaper articles produced by the leadership of both social confessional leaderships shall be informed by methodologies suggested in Miriam Dobson's and Benjamin Ziemann's *Reading Primary Sources: The Interpretation of Text from Nineteenth and Twentieth Century History*.¹⁹

The validity of the historical comparison between the AR and CS lies in both internal and external validities. The internal validity lies in their near contemporaneous rise as anti-liberal and anti-capitalist movements, which developed, under the leadership of "demagogues" or "prophets" as Ds. Kuypers and Dr. Lueger, into two of the first mass-based political parties in Continental Europe.²⁰ The external validity lies in the distinct development of a reformist or social confessional movement as a distinct and potent alternative to traditional conservatism and "ultramontanist" clericalism in their respective countries. Within Europe's other majority protestant countries, the United Kingdom, the German Empire and the Scandinavian nations, political Protestantism did not develop a distinct reformist or even political movements, with the closest example, Ds. Adolf Stoecker's *Christlichsoziale Arbeiterpartei* [En. Christian Social Workers' Party] barely obtaining a single seat in Wilhelmine Germany's

¹² Bratt, *Abraham Kuypers*, 81-85.

¹³ Kuypers, "De Joden onder Christen-Natiën" [The Jews under the Christian Nations], *De Standaard*, 8, 11, 12, 13 October 1875.

¹⁴ Abraham Kuypers, *Het sociale vraagstuk en de Christelijke religie* [The social question and the Christian religion] (Amsterdam: Wormser, 1892).

¹⁵ Richard S. Geehr, *Karl Lueger: Mayor of Fin de Siècle Vienna* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990), 13-15; Boyer, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna*, 219-224.

¹⁶ Richard S. Geehr (ed.), *"I decide who is a Jew!": The Papers of Dr. Karl Lueger* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982).

¹⁷ Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 71-72.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 85. From Kuppe, *Karl Lueger und seine Zeit*.

¹⁹ Miriam Dobson and Benjamin Ziemann (ed.), *Reading Primary Sources: The Interpretation of Text from Nineteenth and Twentieth Century History* (Abingdon-upon-Thames: Routledge, 2008).

²⁰ Henk te Velde, *Stijlen van leiderschap: Persoon en politiek van Thorbecke tot Den Uyl* [Styles of Leadership: Individual and politics from Thorbecke to Den Uyl] (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Wereldbibliotheek, 2002), 53-61.

Reichstag.²¹ The relation between Europe's Catholics and Political Christianity is more complicated, with Catholic participation in parliament either banned by the Pope, as in newly founded Kingdom of Italy, or subsumed by dynastic and constitutional issues, as in Spain, Portugal and France.²² It is only in three other nations, beside Cisleithanian Austria-Hungary, that outright political Catholic movements appeared, in Belgium and the protestant majority states of the Netherlands and Wilhelmine Germany. In the latter two, the predecessors of the *Rooms-Katholieke Staatspartij* [En. Roman Catholic State Party] and the *Zentrumspartei* [En. Centre Party] served primarily to protect the interests of the Catholic Church and its minority flock from Protestant and State encroachment, maintaining, according to Dutch and German Liberals, a "ultramontanist" pillar or tower-mentality, rather than a social reformist agenda.²³ In Belgium, the *Parti catholique* [En. Catholic Party] similarly represented Catholic Church interest in the School Struggle, while generally maintaining a conservative political agenda; a short-lived social confessional party founded around the teachings of Adolf Pastor Daens, the *Christene Volkspartij* [En. Christian People's Party] would attempt to reform or provide an alternative to the PC, but only found lasting influence in the arrondissement Aalst.²⁴ Hence, Cisleithanian Austria-Hungary and the Netherlands provide the only examples of the successful development of social confessional movements, distinct both from conservatism or ultramontanist Catholicism, and share a similar leadership, ground-breaking mass-base politics and a contemporaneous rise.

§3. Historiography

There exists no pre-existing particular historiography for the specific comparison of Social Christianity in Austria-Hungary and the Netherlands in de *fin de siècle*. Thus, this paragraph shall treat the historiography of both movements separately. Popular perception in Austria of Lueger's CS stresses its municipal achievements and championing of universal suffrage, ignoring, to a large extent, the anti-Semitic nature of the party and Hitler's paeans in *Mein Kampf* on the person of Lueger and his antisemitism.²⁵ On the other hand, historiography outside Austria stresses either the pioneering role of the Christian-Socials in the use of political anti-Semitism or focuses on its nature as a clerical conservative movement, akin to the German *Zentrumspartei*.²⁶ John W. Boyer, a specialist on the Christian-Social movement in Austria, contended such readings respectively overemphasize the role of anti-Semitism in building and maintaining the Christian Social coalition or the later role of conservative clergymen like Ignaz Seipel in the interwar CS for its *fin de siècle* history and identity.²⁷ Boyer contends the *fin de siècle* CS nature first and foremost as an "antiproletarian and anti-industrial" defensive movement of the Austrian *Mittelstand*, which employed anti-Semitism as a "defence mechanism against unwanted change".²⁸ This paper shall seek to nuance Boyer's contention by explaining the abandonment of the CS' anti-industrial and continued use of anti-Semitism in term of electoral and political gain, in light of diverging and converging trajectories of the AR.

With regards to its social or reformist character, conventional historiography describes the Anti-Revolutionary Party as divided. It came into existence as an outgrowth of confessional resistance against the advantaged position of the non-denominational state schools created by Liberal legislation in the 1878.²⁹ Despite the shared opposition to the liberal *Schoolwet* [En. School Law], the AR was divided

²¹ D.A. Jeremy Talman, "Adolf Stoecker: Anti Semite with a Christian Mission", *Jewish History* 9 (1995): 2, 98-104.

²² David I. Kertzer, *The Pope and Mussolini: The Secret History of Pius IX and the Rise of Fascism in Europe* (New York: Random House, 2014), 6-7.

²³ Ellen L. Evens, "Catholic Political Movements in Germany, Switzerland and the Netherlands: Notes for a Comparative Approach", *Central European History* 17 (1984): 2, 93; Schöffer, *Veelvormig Verleden*, 80-86.

²⁴ Lode Wils, *Het Daensisme: de opstand van het Zuidvlaamse platteland* [Daensisme: The Revolt of the South-Flemish countryside] (Leuven: Davidsfonds, 1960), 174-199.

²⁵ Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 13-14.

²⁶ Boyer, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna*, x.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid., x-xi.

²⁹ Bratt, *Abraham Kuiper*, 122-126.

between a *droite* and *gauche* with regards to suffrage, social policy and the treatment of Catholics.³⁰ In 1891, the AR's *droite* would leave the party over Kuyper and the *gauche*'s support Liberal proposal to extend the franchise.³¹ In his paper *Conservatism in the Netherlands*, Hermann von der Dunk argued that this split of the "aristocrats" – members of the AR's *droite* – from the AR ensured the party's reformist confessional nature in the subsequent decades.³² This paper shall seek to nuance von der Dunk's position, by recognizing both this seminal moment for the AR's reformist character and the trajectory towards "reactionary" conservatism, in von der Dunk's terms, of the AR with regards social legislation, in light of a similar struggle in the CS.

With regards to anti-Semitism in the AR, anti-Semitism in relation to Kuyper is not mentioned in *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij, 1829-1980*, the most recent and complete history of the AR, and is mentioned only in passing in Bratt's biography of Kuyper as a temporary lapse, but something to which he was opposed.³³ This paper, in contrast, seeks to advance the analysis of Bart Wallet in *Kuyper en de Joodse Kwestie* and I. Schöffler in *Abraham Kuyper and the Jews* that Kuyper abandoned political anti-Semitism because of the lack of electoral gain in Dutch society from political anti-Semitism, in contrast to Lueger in Cisleithanian society.³⁴

³⁰ George Harinck, Roel Kuiper and Peter Bak, *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij, 1829-1980* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2001), 80-81.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 90-92.

³² Willem von der Dunk, "Conservatism in the Netherlands," in *Journal of Contemporary History* (1978): 4, 752.

³³ Harinck, Kuiper and Bak, *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij*; Bratt, *Abraham Kuyper*, 330-332.

³⁴ Bart Wallet, *Kuyper en de Joodse Kwestie*. [Kuyper and the Jewish Question]

<https://research.vu.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/1538643/Kuyper+en+joodse+kwestie.pdf> [Last Accessed 12-12-2019]; Schöffler, *Veelvormig Verleden*, 159-171.

I

Het Broedervraagstuk: Kuiper & the Social Question

“The fraternal bond between members of a single corporation has been replaced by the isolation of the individual against the centralization of capital, of which the owner has become more unscrupulous and harsher in proportion to his alienation from the faith. So came about the white slave markets of civilized Europe. ... Hence the labourer has descended to a condition of material misery which put the pitiful condition of the slave populations of pagan Antiquity in its shadow.”³⁵ – Ds. Abraham Kuiper, “The Social Question” in *De Standaard*, 1872. [Author’s Translation]

“As long as you feel your human heart beating in your bosom, and if the ideal of our holy Gospel has ever exalted you, every better aspiration in you has to rail against the current plight [The Social Question, red.]. After all, if it so continues, than it become *less* of a heaven and it becomes something more of *hell* on earth.”³⁶ – Ds. Abraham Kuiper, *The Social Question and the Christian Religion*, 1891. [Author’s Translation]

Even before his election to the House of Representatives in 1874, Ds. Abraham Kuiper had acquired a reputation of a “criminal” or even “demonic” firebrand for his rhetoric. Accusing the capitalist bourgeoisie for discarding labourers as mere meat machines and causing misery not seen in the history of the Christian world, Kuiper set himself apart as a man “of the people,” out of place in The Hague Establishment.³⁷ This was exemplified upon his parliamentary entry, when his proposals for a Chamber of Labour for the protection of those “who carry their capital in themselves, in their arms and muscles” was met with sneers from the parliamentary benches.³⁸ A seemingly true *tribunus plebis*, Kuiper had been one of the few prominent Anti-Revolutionaries to support a repeal of the Strike Ban just two years prior, calling it a just “remedying means of power” of and for the weak, the labourers, against low wages and poor working conditions imposed by unscrupulous capitalists.³⁹ However, not even two decades later, Kuiper, now Prime Minister, would, in response to the Rail Road Strikes of 1903, outlaw strikes in large sections of the economy with the infamous blood laws. The strikes, were, according to Kuiper, “a rash attack ... on society ... a means of power already approved for exercise of political tyranny.”⁴⁰ Had Kuiper forsaken his role as *tribunus plebis* and colluded with trade and banking capital “to forever herd the labourers to their kennels” or had he not been as “black a reactionary, as he had been painted?”⁴¹ To answer this question and to describe the trajectory of anti-revolutionary position on the Social Question, this chapter shall examine Ds. Abraham Kuiper’s rhetoric and policies from their ideological origins in the 1870s, through party struggles in the 1890s, to their actual application in the first decades of the 20th century.

§1. Ni Dieu, ni maître

Already in the twelfth issue of the recently founded *De Standaard*, Kuiper addressed “the want and misery ... of our highly enlightened but sickly age,” the so-called Social Question and its cause, namely the French Revolution.⁴² For although the “liberalists” did celebrate the *cri de guerre* of “liberté, égalité,

³⁵ Abraham Kuiper, “*De Sociale Kwestie I*” [The Social Question I], *De Standaard*, 16 April 1872.

³⁶ Kuiper, *Het sociale vraagstuk* [The social question], 25-26.

³⁷ Jeroen Koch, *Abraham Kuiper: een biografie* [Abraham Kuiper: a biography] (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Boom, 2006), 145-147.

³⁸ H.E.S. Woldring, “De sociale kwestie – meer dan een emancipatiestrijd” [The social question – more than an emancipatory struggle], in *Abraham Kuiper: Zijn volksdeel, zijn invloed* [Abraham Kuiper: His people, his influence], ed. C. Augustijn, J.H. Prins, H.E.S. Woldring (Delft: Meinema, 1987), 131.

³⁹ I.J. Brugmans, *De arbeidende klasse in Nederland in de 19^e eeuw (1813-1870)* (Den Haag: Martinus Nijhof, 1929), 258; Abraham Kuiper, “*De Sociale Kwestie II*” [The Social Question II], *De Standaard*, 17 April 1872.

⁴⁰ *Verslag der handelingen van de Tweede Kamer der Staten Generaal* (hereafter HTK) [Parliamentary Proceedings, House of Representatives, 1903, 926. <https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/0000361841> [Accessed 15-3-2020]

⁴¹ Woldring, “De sociale kwestie” [The social question], 133-139.

⁴² Kuiper, “*De Sociale Kwestie I*” [The Social Question I], 16 April 1872.

fraternité” as the fundamental thought of the Revolution, Kuyper argued the root principle of the Revolution to be the far more nefarious “Ni Dieu, ni maître.”⁴³ Through its anticlericalism, the Revolution had “[s]evered the horizon of *eternal life* ... thus causing a search *in the secular* [for happiness, red.] ... in which money is the measure of all value and for money everything was for sale.” There could be no other consequence of this Revolution and *cri de guerre* than “social distress,” as it idolized “Mammon,” the possession of capital, as the greatest good of society, and incited competition of all against all for the acquisition of wealth.⁴⁴ Thus, the French revolutionaries had not simply abolished the historical securities of certain employment and fixed wages ensured by the guilds with such laws as the *Loi Le Chapelier*, they had “destroyed that organic fabric [of Christian society], broke up social bonds, and left, in the end, ... nothing but the solitary, selfish and self-serving individual.”⁴⁵

Kuyper described the society of Mammon-worshipping individuals, which he believed emergent among Europe's societies, in a speech to the confessional trade union *Patrimonium* in 1891. Kuyper decried how the “[m]ercantile gospel of *laissez-faire, laissez passer*” had introduced the Darwinian laws of “*struggle for life*” from the Animal World in all human social bonds, through a “*struggle for money*.”⁴⁶ Furthermore, the unparalleled inequality that had until then been limited to the Jews, between “owners of billions and ... ant-poor worriers,” had become the social condition of the whole of Europe, without the mediating solidarity of the Jews.⁴⁷ However, in a break with traditional conservatism, Kuyper came to the conclusion that neither individual *caritas*, nor the Churches, as they had failed Christ's mission to protect the meek, could effectively provide a comprehensive solution to the Social Question.⁴⁸ The State, although it was the last called to action, would have to act. Indeed, it would be nothing short of dereliction of its duty if it did not strive to do justice in society. For, as Kuyper described in his speech to the working men of *Patrimonium*:

“No, it [the social distress caused by the Social Question, red.] need *not* remain so, it *can* get better. And that improvement is undoubtedly – I do not shy away from the word – on the *socialist* road, provided that you do *not* understand socialist as the program of social democracy, but only pronounce this beautiful word in itself ... one of God's desired *community*, a living human *organism*.”⁴⁹ [Author's Translation]

Even though the State was called upon to answer the *Broedervraagstuk*, the Fraternal Question, the dual heritage of the French Revolution, the Social Question and secular individualism through “socialistic” means, Kuyper's ultimate aim transcended both the State and the Question.⁵⁰ His aim was above all the return to the “human, scientific, that Christian truth” that had been denied in French Revolution, the return to God's Word.⁵¹

§2. The Founding of the Anti-Revolutionary Party

With the death of Groen van Prinsterer in 1876, the Anti-Revolutionaries in the Netherlands were left divided, if not leaderless.⁵² Kuyper, Van Prinsterer's preferred successor, was controversial both within and without the Anti-Revolutionary movement and had suffered a mental breakdown just weeks before before van Prinsterer's death.⁵³ At the same time, *Jonkheer* Alexander de Savornin Lohman, a rising star in the Dutch Anti-Revolutionary movement and Kuyper's temporary replacement as editor after his

⁴³ Woldring, “De sociale kwestie” [The social question], 128-129;

⁴⁴ Kuyper, *Het sociale vraagstuk* [The social question], 21.

⁴⁵ Kuyper, “*De Sociale Kwestie I*” [The Social Question I], 16 April 1872; Kuyper, *Het sociale vraagstuk* [The social question], 20. [Author's Translation; Original Emphasis]

⁴⁶ Kuyper, *Het sociale vraagstuk* [The social question], 21. [Author's Translation; Original Emphasis]

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 22.

⁴⁸ Woldring, “De sociale kwestie” [The social question], 124-125.

⁴⁹ Kuyper, *Het sociale vraagstuk* [The social question], 25.

⁵⁰ Kuyper, “*De Sociale Kwestie I*” [The Social Question I], 16 April 1872.

⁵¹ Kuyper, *Het sociale vraagstuk* [The social question], 26; Harinck, Kuiper and Bak, *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij*, 68.

⁵² Koch, *Abraham Kuyper: een biografie* [Abraham Kuyper: a biography], 161-170.

⁵³ Harinck, Kuiper and Bak, *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij*, 48.

mental breakdown, wrote in *De Standaard* that, after the equalization of public and Christian education, the necessity of a political Anti-Revolutionary Party seized to exist.⁵⁴ Not a wholesale return to God's Word, but the end of the *Schoolstrijd* [En. School Struggle] was the aim of De Savornin Lohman. This contradiction at the heart of the Dutch Anti-Revolutionary movement exposed by the Van Prinsterer's death would be the foundation of a rivalry between Kuiper and De Savornin Lohman, which had far-reaching implications in the AR's response to the Social Question.

Central to understanding the rivalry between Kuiper and De Savornin Lohman is the School Struggle. Ever since the Constitution of 1848, in which general education was declared an area of government policy, Liberals had favoured non-denominational public schools over denominational Catholic or Protestant schools.⁵⁵ The Dutch Government, generally dominated by various Liberal currents from 1848 to 1901, only supported non-denominational education, to the chagrin of Orthodox Protestant and Catholic notables, who founded their own private denominational schools.⁵⁶ The Anti-Revolutionary notables tried and failed to break the Liberal dominance in the legislature in every election from 1848 onwards. After every electoral defeat, calls for political organisation became more pronounced. In 1871, Kuiper, already a well-known vicar in Amsterdam, called for a party with a broad program, including unconditional state-sponsorship of denominational schools, but also suffrage expansion and the freedom of the Church from government intervention.⁵⁷ However, the "democratic" nature of political organisation and the call for suffrage expansion was met with little enthusiasm by the mainly aristocratic Anti-Revolutionary notables.

It would take a declaration of war against the denominational school for the Anti-Revolutionaries to unite.⁵⁸ The new Liberal Primary Education Law of 1878, which introduced higher hygienic, safety and educational demands for all primary schools, without providing the funds for the denominational schools to meet these demands, would seemingly mean the end of the independent denominational school.⁵⁹ The Anti-Revolutionary finally united. Following a national petition in which the Anti-Revolutionaries collected over 305.000 signatures, the Anti-Revolutionary Party was founded on 3 April 1879 in Utrecht, with Kuiper as President of the Central Committee.⁶⁰

§3. Christian-Historical *Droite* and Anti-Revolutionary *Gauche*

The pressured marriage between the aristocratic notables and Kuiper's *Kleine Luyden* [En. Little Men] in the Party, quickly began to show cracks. Already in December 1880, De Savornin Lohman writes to Kuiper expressing his concern over Kuiper's attempts to control the AR group in the House of Representatives, writing: "You repel elements that could and should cooperate. You kill, much more than you are aware of, any independence [within the party, red]."⁶¹ The Party was increasingly divided along socio-political and religious lines.⁶² The *Droite* or "aristocrats", which included De Savornin Lohman, held usually little interest in the political emancipation of the Little Men and were more conservative than their *Gauche* counterparts, rejecting parts of AR's *Our Program*. These aristocrats generally originated from the upper classes, acquiring their Membership of Parliament from their

⁵⁴ Koch, *Abraham Kuiper: een biografie* [Abraham Kuiper: a biography], 171-173; Harinck, Kuiper and Bak, *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij*, 67; *Jonkheer* is the lowest rank of nobility in the Netherlands, making De Savornin Lohman an untitled aristocrat. Its German equivalent is the more well-known *Junker*.

⁵⁵ Harinck, Kuiper and Bak, *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij*, 21-32.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 33.

⁵⁷ J.H. Prins, "Kuiper als partijleider" [Kuiper as Party Leader], in *Abraham Kuiper: Zijn volksdeel, zijn invloed* [Abraham Kuiper: His people, his influence], ed. by C. Augustijn, J.H. Prins, H.E.S. Woldring. (Delft: Meinema, 1987), 97-98; Harinck, Kuiper and Bak, *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij*, 48-51.

⁵⁸ Koch, *Abraham Kuiper: een biografie* [Abraham Kuiper: a biography], 178.

⁵⁹ Harinck, Kuiper and Bak, *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij*, 69-72.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 71; The 305.956 signatures the Petition collected was larger than the Dutch Electorate at the time, showing the School Struggle to live beyond the largely upper middle class electorate.

⁶¹ J.H. Prins, "Kuiper als partijleider" [Kuiper as Party Leader], 101.

⁶² Harinck, Kuiper and Bak, *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij*, 79-83.

surname, rather than political campaigning. The *Gauche* or “democrats” mostly supported franchise expansion and the application of *Our Program* in full. Although Kuyper undoubtedly positioned himself with the *Gauche*, he attempted to maintain both wings within the party.

The survival of a united AR was doomed by its own success, both in Parliament and among the working-class. In the General Election of 1888, the Anti-Revolutionaries and Roman Catholics won a majority in Parliament on a program of amending the 1878 Primary Education Law.⁶³ Aeneas, Baron Mackay, a diplomat and *Droite* Anti-Revolutionary, was asked to form a Government. The Liberals, now in opposition, saw the writing on the wall, and proposed a compromise that saw the position of denominational schools improved, but still severely lacking in comparison to the public non-denominational schools. With one of principal aims of the Anti-Revolutionary movements achieved, the *Droite*'s commitment to the forced marriage weakened significantly. The final nail in the divided party's coffin was the growing strength of the Christian Trade Union *Patrimonium*. Unsatisfied with the meagre social legislation of Cabinet-Mackay, the *Patrimonium* Leadership threatened to form an independent Christian Workers' Party.⁶⁴ Kuyper eventually succeeded in dissuading the Christian workers, after which he gave his 1891 speech on the *Social Question and the Christian Religion*, recommitting the party to more extensive social change and an expanded suffrage to include all literate *patresfamilias*.⁶⁵

Kuyper's commitment to franchise extension was tested in 1892, when the left-liberal Minister Tak van de Poortvliet introduced legislation that would give the vote to all literate independent adult men.⁶⁶ With a single stroke, the franchise would be given to over half a million adult men. Kuyper, although still maintaining his own proposal, saw it as a step in the right direction and endorsed the legislation. De Savornin Lohman and most aristocratic AR representatives rejected Kuyper's position. When a General Election was called in 1894 to break the parliamentary deadlock over the Law-Tak, ten AR representatives, led by De Savornin Lohman, signed a manifest describing the legislation as unacceptable, thereby openly contradicting Kuyper's and the broader AR's position. The *Droite*, including the first AR Prime Minister, Mackay, would leave the party as its Congress declared itself against “conservatism of all tastes” and in favour of “final suffrage-expansion.”⁶⁷ Two years later, with the indispensable help of Kuyper and the AR, the liberal Samuel van Houten successfully introduced legislation doubling the size of the franchise to over 600,000, or nearly half of the adult male population. The AR had recommitted itself to Little Men, abandoning its “aristocratic” wing, and set out to introduce its ambitious Social Christian program in Government.

§4. The Rail Road Strikes

The AR was vindicated in 1901, when the party won twenty-four of the one hundred seats in Parliament. Kuyper, the man “of the people,” the *tribunus plebis*, was asked to form a Government. The Liberals, having been forced to the opposition benches by the Confessionalists for only second time since 1848, watched tensely what this Abraham the Great would achieve with his newly found power.⁶⁸ The first Throne Speech of Cabinet Kuyper, saw Queen Wilhelmina express her continued interest in “the material side of the social question.”⁶⁹ She further committed the Cabinet to the continued introduction

⁶³ Harinck, Kuiper and Bak, *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij*, 88.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 90.

⁶⁵ Kuyper, *Het sociale vraagstuk* [The social question]; Harinck, Kuiper and Bak, *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij*, 91.

⁶⁶ Koch, *Abraham Kuyper: een biografie* [Abraham Kuyper: a biography], 365.

⁶⁷ Harinck, Kuiper and Bak, *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij*, 92.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 108.

⁶⁹ Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, “Troonrede 1901” [Throne Speech 1901], in *Troonredes, Openingsredes, inhuldigingsredes 1814-1963* [Throne Speech, Opening Speeches, Inauguration Speeches 1814-1963], ed. Ernst van Raalte (The Hague: Staatsuitgeverij, 1964); Throne Speeches were, similar to the Monarch Address at the British State Opening of Parliament, used to introduce the Government's agenda for the coming legislative year. Since 1848, they were written by the President of the Council of Ministers; in the case – Prime – Minister Kuyper.

of the Liberal Work Accident Law and its extension to fishermen and agricultural workers. Her last comments regarding the Social Question were her announcement that the Kuyper Government would introduce mandatory insurance for sickness, disability and old age. Although the Netherlands would be one of the first European countries to follow Wilhelmine Germany's national insurance schemes, these insurances were far from controversial and largely product of proposals from the previous Liberal Governments and civil service.⁷⁰ Thus, Kuyper, having achieved power, hardly seemed to break from the incremental mold of his Liberal predecessors in his first two years in office.

In January 1903, after similar strikes by dock workers in Amsterdam, the Amsterdam railroad workers laid down their work to strike against low pay, long work hours, work on Sunday, and the employment of non-unionized personnel to break union solidarity.⁷¹ Within days, it had developed into a General Strike of Dutch railway workers. On 31 January 1903, the railway companies capitulated to the demands of their workers. The Socialist press applauded this first great victory of the modern working-classes. The *Standaard*, joined by much of the general press, denounced the strikes a political power-grab by revolutionaries against the national interest. Indeed, a month after the strike, *De Standaard* claimed wages were now *too* high for the Railroad Companies to remain profitable.⁷² *De Nederlander*, the newspaper of De Savornin Lohman, went even further, calling for a return of the 1872 Strike Ban for railway workers. In response, the board of the Dutch Union of Rail and Streetcar Workers stated that all railway workers should be prepared to lay down their work to prevent the legislature from passing such a strike ban. This only inflamed the issue, as Kuyper denied the economic origins of the strike, decrying it as nothing short of "a rash attack ... on society ... a means of power already approved for exercise of political tyranny."⁷³ Originally Kuyper wanted to tie anti-striking legislation to legislation to improve the working conditions of the workers covered. However, upon the advice of fellow Anti-Revolutionary Ministers and the Cabinet's legal counsel, De Savornin Lohman, he decided against it.⁷⁴ The railway workers would gain no ground.

On 25th February 1903, Minister Kuyper introduced three legislative proposals in the House of Representatives. The first created a railway brigade to allow the continuity in rail traffic in times of distress, the second created a Royal Commission to investigate the working conditions of the railway workers and the third criminalized all strikes that would negatively affect the national interest. In his closing remarks on the proposed legislation, Kuyper stated:

"Nobody desires reaction here; the Government and Chamber invariably continue to steer to reforming our social conditions; however, the Ship of State cannot with our consent be boarded. In the understood interest of all parties legal authority must remain unimpaired."⁷⁵ [Author's Translation]

The Social Democrats, both in- and outside the Chamber, decried Kuyper's "blood laws." Minister Kuyper seemed to have become the liberal he decried in opposition; a man who simply reinforced the police and troops to quell working class dissent.⁷⁶ The Union of Rail and Streetcar Workers kept their word and in the night of 5 April 1903, the railway workers went out on strike again. However, the unions were divided and army protected those who crossed the picket line. Within days, the strike had fizzled out. The socialist labour movement had been dealt a hard blow, but so had Kuyper's social image.⁷⁷ Two

⁷⁰ Plemp van Duiveland, L.J.. "De Kuyperkoers" [The Kuyper Course], *Onze Eeuw* [Our Age] (1902): 633-639; Woldring, "De sociale kwestie" [The social question], 140.

⁷¹ Woldring, "De sociale kwestie" [The social question], 134-135.

⁷² N.B., "Lotsverbetering" [Life Improvement], *De Standaard*, 23 February 1903. <https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=MMKB23:001815045> [Accessed 28-3-2020]

⁷³ *HTK* [Parliamentary Proceedings, House of Representatives, 1903, 926. <https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/0000361841> [Accessed 15-3-2020]

⁷⁴ Woldring, "De sociale kwestie" [The social question], 137.

⁷⁵ *HTK* [Parliamentary Proceedings, House of Representatives, 1903, 926. <https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/0000361841> [Accessed 15-3-2020]

⁷⁶ Woldring, "De sociale kwestie" [The social question], 133-136.

⁷⁷ Harinck, Kuiper and Bak, *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij*, 109.

years later, with the Blood Laws fresh in their memory, the Socialists back Liberals over the AR *en masse*, contributing to Kuyper's fall from power.

Thus, to answer the question poised at the start of this chapter, had Kuyper abandoned the Little Men once in power? Not necessarily. Although Kuyper was certainly less radical in government than in opposition, showing few new initiative with regards to the Social Question, he continued the efforts of his – Liberal – predecessor. His anti-strike legislation and his lack of new initiatives with regards to the Social Question can be explained by the fact his overarching aim was not simply the resolution of the Social Question, but the Rechristening of Dutch society. Thus when the organic state authority is seemingly threatened by socialist revolutionary agitation, Kuyper felt forced to respond, even while recognizing the plight of the railway workers and seeking to improve their lot. It was only upon the advice of other AR ministers that he decided to remove this olive branch. This may be most telling observation of AR, as Jeroen Koch made in his biography of Kuyper, that without Kuyper, the AR lost its reformist, even sometime revolutionary, élan.⁷⁸ After Kuyper, ideological rigidity, disguised as consistency, became the norm.

⁷⁸ Koch, *Abraham Kuyper: een biografie* [Abraham Kuyper: a biography], 573-579.

II

Defending the Mittelstand: Lueger, the Social & Jewish Question

“The body of mankind bleeds from innumerable wounds. Eyes look up beseechingly to Him, flayed and crowned with thorns, who died for the people. They in turn acknowledged the religion of love, of justice and mercy in contrast to the theory and relentless hegemony of the powerful over the weak. They also acknowledged the religion of the poor and the oppressed. Their hearts were comforted again, and they spoke once more that beautiful greeting that a pious mother ... had taught them, ... the greeting that I believe will become the victory cry for all mankind – the greeting with which I too welcome you: Praised be Jesus Christ!”⁷⁹ – Dr. Karl Lueger at the *Linz Katholiekentag*, 1894.

“Antisemitism is nothing other than the Social Question, it is its local manifestation wherever the social survivors serve the predominant part of Judaic tribesmen, that is, they [Social Survivors, red.] defend themselves against them [Jews, red.] in a committed manner”⁸⁰ – Prince Alois von und zu Liechtenstein, *The Christian Social Reform Program*, in the Imperial Council, 1891.

When Dr. Karl Lueger received confirmation of the Emperor of his election as Mayor of Vienna in 1897, he had successfully brought down both the Liberal monopoly on power in Vienna and forced the Imperial Government to accept his conformation, as an anti-Semite anti-Liberal.⁸¹ No small feat for a man originally elected as a Left Liberal to the Municipal Council in 1875. The alliance with which Lueger successfully broke the Liberal thirty-six year hold on the mayoralty was a diverse alliance including anti-Semitic artisans, conservative *Intelligenz-curia* [En. Intelligentsia curia] and clergy from the Viennese pastors to Pope Leo XIII.⁸² In this chapter, the importance of the Social and Jewish Questions in mobilizing and maintaining this alliance shall be jointly examined, as in *Fin de Siècle Vienna*, these Questions were highly interrelated. However, before examining the role of these Questions in the Christian Social Party, Lueger's transformation from Left Liberal to Christian Social shall be described.

§1. From Liberal to Democrat to Anti-Semite

Born in a lower middle class or *Bürger* family, Dr. Karl Lueger was the essential Viennese *Streber*, or social climber.⁸³ He began to build a reputation as an attorney from 1867 onwards, defending impoverished Socialists and others out of his own pocket, with later Christian Social Deputy Mayor Jozef Porzer describing his waiting room as “filled with people on whose faces poverty could be read” with “[a]ll being graciously received and advised.”⁸⁴ Around 1872, after a brief stint as member of a populist Democratic club, the ambitious young attorney joined the *Liberal Bürgerklub*, at the urging of his friends. However, as a later biographer described, although “[L]ueger certainly began his career on the Liberal camp; he alone was not Liberal in the sense of the time.”⁸⁵ Indeed, upon entering the Municipal Council as Liberal in 1875, Lueger quickly developed himself as a muckraker and an antagonist of the Liberal establishment of Mayor Cajetan Felder.⁸⁶ After forcing Mayor's resignation over a corruption scandal concerning a Viennese graveyard in 1878, Lueger had established himself as

⁷⁹ Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 86.

⁸⁰ Prinz A. Von und zur Liechtenstein, “Christlichsozialen Reformprogramm” [Christian Social Reform Program], in *Karl Lueger und seine Zeit* [Karl Lueger and his time], ed. Rudolf Kuppe (Vienna: Österreichische Volksschriften, 1933), 256-258.

⁸¹ Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, 362-385.

⁸² P.G.J. Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria* (New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1964), 179; Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 79-99.

⁸³ Connolly, P. J. “Karl Lueger: His Rise to Power.” *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 3, no. 11 (1914): 280-91. www.jstor.org/stable/30092494. [Accessed 30-3-2020]

⁸⁴ Connolly, P. J. “Karl Lueger: His Rise to Power.” *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 3, no. 11 (1914): 262. www.jstor.org/stable/30092494. [Accessed 30-3-2020]; Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 38-39.

⁸⁵ Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 37.

⁸⁶ Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, 193-198.

a prominent councillor, to the left of the Liberal establishment.⁸⁷ It is at this moment that Lueger developed his first democratic and anti-capitalist rhetoric, calling for extensive franchise expansion and calling for an “incipient campaign against public exploitation by the large unregulated capitalist enterprises such as the private railroads and the Vienna gas monopoly.”⁸⁸ Indeed, in the same year, he even praised the incipient Austrian Social Democracy for its idealism.

Although Lueger's anti-capitalist and anti-corruption platform strengthened his popularity in Vienna, it did not suffice to break the Liberal hold on power. Disgruntled by personal conflict and failure to capture power, Lueger split from his anti-establishment liberal United Left, thereby abandoning Liberalism as an ideology, in favour of populist Democratism.⁸⁹ In 1884 municipal election, friendless, factionless and at the nadir of his popularity, Lueger's career, which had seemed to promising not even six years ago, seemed at an end. However, with the support of prominent anti-Semites, including the aforementioned Jozef Porzer, who were attracted by his attacks on “foreign, unregulated capitalism,” he maintained his seat with the skin of his teeth.⁹⁰ However, already a year later, with his newly found allies, he could fight for a seat in the Imperial Chamber of Deputies. Lueger campaigned against an establishment Liberal with a platform of universal suffrage, and the protection of workers from “big industry.”⁹¹ His constituency of lower middle-class shopkeepers, artisans, petty bureaucrats, and some workers only just barely carried him to Imperial Council in 1885, showing the necessity of a larger coalition and allies. One of the first of these allies would be parliamentarian Prince Aloys von und zu Liechtenstein, an anti-Liberal Catholic social reformer, who would lead the Christian Socials in the Imperial Council, even chairing the party after Lueger's death in 1910. In 1887, Lueger sought to expand his coalition by appealing to the anti-Semitism of the Viennese working class and lower clergy, in his first openly Anti-Semitic speech.

“Whether Democrat or anti-Semite, the matter really comes to one and the same thing. The Democrats in their struggle against corruption come up against the Jews at every step, and the anti-Semite, if they do want to carry out their economic programme, have to overcome not only the bad Jews but the bad Christians also ...”⁹²

With the Democrats in Vienna increasingly weakening, Lueger again displayed his political ambition, by aligning Anti-Semitism and Democratism together.⁹³ His program of anti-capitalism, anti-Semitism and universal suffrage was aimed at the working-classes, while a Liberal threat to confiscate Church property provided Lueger the opportunity to appeal to the lower clergy:

“Quite shamelessly the Liberal organs threaten the confiscation of the property of the Church ... And Now I ask: is the title of property of the conscious, living hand stronger or more sacred than the title of the property of the Church. Surely not? And so it is more than extraordinary if one were to confiscate the property of the comparatively poor priests and through this help the rich of another denomination [Jews, red.]”⁹⁴

The speech marked a water shed in Viennese politics. The same year, Lueger's Democrats, anti-Semites and small clergy, a cross-section of the Austrian *Mittelstand*, successfully coalesced to defeat a sitting liberal parliamentarian for the first time since 1870.⁹⁵ These *Vereinigte Christen* [En. United Christians] would prove a short-lived alliance, but a important springboard for Lueger's formation of the Christian Social Party in 1891, as it showed the electoral strength of this coalition. Lueger found

⁸⁷ Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, 197-201; Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 54-55.

⁸⁸ Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 55.

⁸⁹ Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, 199-202.

⁹⁰ Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 64-65.

⁹¹ Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, 212.

⁹² Karl Lueger, “Lueger's First Anti-Semitic Speech,” 341.

⁹³ Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 71-73.

⁹⁴ Karl Lueger, “Lueger's First Anti-Semitic Speech,” 341-342.

⁹⁵ Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 71-73.

his winning coalition, both in Vienna and the Imperial Council, now he needed to develop his program from anti-Semitic and anti-capitalist rhetoric to truly become an alternative to Liberal dominance. Otherwise, in the Vienna's complicated three curia electoral system, Lueger would be denied a majority, in spite of his working class popularity, through the Liberal dominance in the upper and middle class First and Second Curia's.⁹⁶

§2. A Christian-Social Program

In response to the ever growing Social Democratic movement in the Dual Monarchy, Liechtenstein recognized the appeal of the anti-Liberalism of these Viennese anti-Semites to the Social Democratic constituency.⁹⁷ In 1889, Liechtenstein resigned from the Imperial Council to re-enter in 1891 as a member of Karl Lueger's Christian Social club. With public opinion transfixed on the Social Question after Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* and the Emperor's subsequent call for a solution to the Social Question, Liechtenstein outlined the Christian Social Program.⁹⁸ Liechtenstein called for the abolition of usury, relief for peasants, protection of small businesses, but most importantly, he describes the Jewish Question as an essential part of the Social Question.

"Religion and descent are not his motives. It is not the Jews who are to blame for the laws that we gave ourselves, based on Manchester-ideas. Where these laws prevail, Jews work together to exploit. There is no Christian bank owner in Vienna[,] the Christians have no influence on the stock exchange, in confiscation, etc. Antisemitism is nothing other than the social question, it is its local manifestation wherever the social survivors serve the predominant part of Judaic tribesmen, that is, they [Social Survivors, red.] defend themselves against them [Jews, red.] in a committed manner."⁹⁹

Where-ever the ideas of Manchester capitalism took hold, the Jews would exploit the Christian masses, worsening the Social Question which the Emperor and Pope would have addressed. However, as Lueger explained the same year in Moravia:

"The Christian Social Program does not aim to incite, but rather to reconcile; it is not a fight of all against all; but rather an harmonious formation of different interest groups against the stratification of human society by professions and occupations."¹⁰⁰

This was to be achieved by universal suffrage, higher tariffs, to protect farmers, Sunday rest for all workers and protection from arbitrary termination. But most importantly, through the exclusion of Jews, "[t]he leaders of the liberals, Capital, exploiters of property and inciters of classes" from political, judicial and military offices, as "peace and quiet" would return. The Christian Social answer to the Social Question had aspects of all strides of Lueger's diverse coalition, from Democrats fighting for suffrage, to Anti-Capitalism fighting for better conditions for workers, and, of course, anti-Semitism, which formed the most explicit part of the Program.

§3. Bürgermeister Lueger

Victory came for the Christian-Social Party in 1897. After winning all Municipal Elections in Vienna from 1895, Emperor Franz Joseph, after personal intervention from the Pope, confirmed Lueger as Mayor of the Imperial Capital upon his fifth election.¹⁰¹ Lueger's Christian Social Party had broken Liberal dominance, but in so doing, had become a lynchpin in the *staatserhaltende* [En. State-preserving] *Bürgerliche* coalition against the ever growing Social Democratic Party in Vienna's industrial districts.¹⁰² Now the question arose to what extent Lueger would pursue his radical policies

⁹⁶ Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism*, 80-90; Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, 228.

⁹⁷ Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, 227-231.

⁹⁸ Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 85.

⁹⁹ Von und zur Liechtenstein, "Christlichsozialen Reformprogramm" [Christian Social Reform Program], 256-258.

¹⁰⁰ Geehr (ed.), "*I decide who is a Jew!*," 325-328.

¹⁰¹ Boyer, *Political Radicalism*, 403-410.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 219-221.

and his program of “municipal socialism,” with his political opponents increasingly coming from the left rather than the right.

Although Lueger successfully pursued his program of municipal socialism, constructing socialized gas-, street car and electrical works, he retired much of his anti-Semitic and anti-Capitalist agenda. [5-21] When Lueger was criticized for employing a Jewish company for supplying the pipes for the municipal gas works, he flaunted his previously exclusionary rhetoric, saying: “sad ... that things [have] gone so far that we cannot finish our labours without the Jews.”¹⁰³ Adding, opportunistically in anti-Capitalist rhetoric: “you will see that the first battle we in Vienna have to fight is against the English Gas Company, and that we must win.”¹⁰⁴ Lueger seemingly used anti-capitalism and anti-Semitism as rhetorical tool against opponents, rather than convictions to be pursued in office. For all the achievements of municipal socialism, it was the Viennese upper class that benefited most.¹⁰⁵ The working-class districts were last to be electrified, with rates set far above the wages of the average worker, as Lueger refused to raise taxes on the upper middle class curia that had afforded him his majority.¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, due to the central importance of landlords to the Christian Social Party, little municipal housing was constructed to protect their stranglehold on the Viennese housing market.¹⁰⁷ In 1903, the man who had railed against “foreign unregulated capitalism,” argued that “you won’t have noticed opposition in principle from me towards capital,” ensuring capital “will always find a protected place here [In Vienna, red.] and will also receive sufficient support.”¹⁰⁸ Increasingly, Lueger retired from anti-Capitalist rhetoric, to distance himself further from the growing anti-capitalist Socialist movement. The anti-Semitic rhetoric remained, according to Lueger-biographer Richard S. Geehr, reckoning it as a central aspect in “maintaining and extending power.”¹⁰⁹

Thus, Karl Lueger and his Christian Social Party, although originally an “antiproletarian and anti-industrial” coalition of the *Austrian Mittelstand*, increasingly abandoned anti-industrialism or anti-capitalism, as the result of new-found support among the Viennese upper-classes, while maintaining anti-Semitic rhetoric as a central means of maintaining and extending power.

¹⁰³ Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 149-150.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Boyer, *Culture and Political Crisis*, 5-21;

¹⁰⁶ Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 149-150.

¹⁰⁷ Boyer, *Culture and Political Crisis*, 5-21; Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 91.

¹⁰⁸ Geehr, *Karl Lueger*, 91.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 182.

III

Het Joodse Probleem: Kuyper & the Jewish Question

“Even more, public opinion is discovering the incredible influence exerted this day and age by the Jews on the fortunes of Europe. It has now been discovered that, under the cloak of liberalism, the Jews have indeed become lords and masters on our continent...”¹¹⁰ – Ds. Abraham Kuyper, “Liberalists and Jews” in *De Standaard*, 1878. [Author’s Translation]

And above all, the Jewish question, which with us is a theoretical problem, carries in the East such a such a grippingly serious character, dripping as it is here [The Orient, red.] in shed blood.”¹¹¹ – Ds. Abraham Kuyper, *Om de Oude Wereldzee*, 1907. [Author’s Translation]

In the 1907 account of his Oriental travels, *Om de Oude Wereldzee* [En. *Around the Old World Sea*], Abraham Kuyper described his travels to some of the first Zionist settlements in Palestine, lauding the colonists’ thrift and their quick development of Judea.¹¹² In the same book, he dedicated an entire chapter of nearly one-hundred page to what he called *het Joodse Probleem* [En. The Jewish Problem] in Europe.¹¹³ This dual description of Jews fuelled debate on the possible anti-Semitism of Abraham Kuyper after the Second World War. The Anti-Semitism of the 19th and 20th centuries is generally divided into four dimensions, religious, ethnic, economic and political, which shall be used to contextualize Kuyper’s writings. Furthermore, these writings shall be placed in the context both of the religious dimension of Orthodox Protestant-Jewish relations in the Netherlands.

Even before Kuyper, Groen van Prinsterer and other Anti-Revolutionaries had a complicated relationship towards the Dutch Jews. Although they did not deny the original favour of the Jewish Nation as God’s Chosen People, the Netherlands had taken up the mantle to become the Second Israel, after the Diaspora, the First Coming of Christ, and the Reformation.¹¹⁴ “The Jewish Faith could not exist,” as Kuyper put it, “if Christianity was to become the Faith of Humanity.”¹¹⁵ The preferred progression for the Dutch Jews was, in the eyes of Orthodox Protestantism, to leave the Jewish Nation and convert to the True Faith. Before conversion, Jews could not truly be integrated as members of any Christian Nation. It is on this basis that Groen rejected the judicial that was granted to the Jews in 1796 by the Batavian Republic, as it denied the separate nationhood of the Jews.¹¹⁶ However, as Jewish hostility against Orthodox Protestant conversion attempts grew from in the second half of the 19th Century, resulting in the murder of a vicar in 1858, van Prinsterer arrived at another solution. The Jewish community could be respected as a nation within the Calvinist nation, as an ally in battling the Liberal non-denominational public schools. However, the Jewish community, unlike the Orthodox Protestants and Catholics, dismantled their denominational school system with little protest, generally aligning themselves with the Liberals in politics. The Dutch Jews would not become the converts or the allies that the Anti-Revolutionaries before Kuyper had sought.

In this national context, Kuyper published the article-series *The Jews under the Christian Nations* in *De Standaard* in 1875. Frustrated by the possibility of a Liberal Jewish candidate being elected to the House of Representatives in a majority Christian district in Amsterdam, Kuyper set out to prevent the

¹¹⁰ Abraham Kuyper, “Liberalisten en Joden I” [Liberalists and Jews I], *De Standaard*, 11 October 1878.

¹¹¹ Abraham Kuyper, *Om de oude wereldzee. Deel I* [Around the Old World Sea. Volume I] (Amsterdam: Van Holkema & Warendorf, 1907), 239.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 445-446.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 239-324.

¹¹⁴ Schöffner, *Veelvormig Verleden*, 159-161.

¹¹⁵ A. De Bruijne, “Abraham Kuyper’s Suprising Love of the Jews,” *Journal of Reformed Theology* 11 (2017): 2, 27.

¹¹⁶ Schöffner, *Veelvormig Verleden*, 162.

candidate's election.¹¹⁷ In this four piece article-series, Kuyper, like Anti-Revolutionaries before him, denied Dutch Jews could every fully integrate in or represent the Calvinist Dutch nation. The Jews, until conversion, would remain alien to Dutch society, due to their self-imposed isolation.¹¹⁸ He went further, however, than his Anti-Revolutionary predecessors, by attacking the supposed outsized influence of the Jewish Nation in European politics. In the third of his four articles, Kuyper accused the European Jews of controlling the stock exchanges, press and courts, concluding his article: "Do not forget: If you do not count the Slavic peoples, its *only one million* Jews who stretch their nets over the whole of Europe."¹¹⁹ However, the reason for the outsized influence of this small group of upper-class Jews, was, according to Kuyper, the rejection of both Orthodoxy and Conversion.¹²⁰ In Kuyper's estimates, they made up no more than one eighth of the European Jews, but through the national emancipation made possible by the French Revolution, this "[c]osmopolitan fraternity through capital and pen, in school and court, all over Europe, ... virtually rules over war and peace."¹²¹ Thus, in this article series, Kuyper employed Anti-Semitic tropes, both within and without the usual Anti-Revolutionary discourse for political gain, namely, in an attempt to deny a Liberal Jew a seat in parliament.

Kuyper veered further from traditional discourse in 1878. Hampered by years of personal misfortune and political frustration, culminating in the passage of the Liberal Primary Education Law of 1878, Kuyper published the scathing article-series *Liberalists and Jews* in *De Standaard*.¹²² His opening remarks were clear:

"Even more, public opinion is discovering the incredible influence exerted this day and age by the Jews on the fortunes of Europe. It has now been discovered that, under the cloak of liberalism, the Jews have indeed become lords and masters on our continent..."¹²³

Kuyper went on to deplore that "after virtuous reconnaissance of the terrain," an adequate reduction of that influence to "a just proportionality" was impossible. The reason for this lay, according to Kuyper, in the fact that society did not desire a new struggle against the Jews, as the Christians, saddled with guilt for previous crimes against the Jews, refused to criticize this development.¹²⁴ After the French Revolution placed the "circumcised and baptised citizen" as equals before the law, Kuyper warned, the Jews would rise above the law, organizing themselves against the Christian nation. Again, Kuyper repeated his accusation that Jews controlled the stock markets, courts and press, with which they formed a "well disciplined ... phalanx" that controlled public opinion. However, Kuyper's criticism of Jewish influence now extended beyond the practicing Jews, to both Jewish converts and accused Jews, with "the names of Disraeli [Converted Jew, red.], of Gambetta [Accused of Jewishness in French Right-Wing Press, red.], and of Lasker" and so many others" serving as an example, according to Kuyper, of Jewish influence in politics.¹²⁵ Even former Jews, like Disraeli, through their Jewish ethnicity, were still

¹¹⁷ Bart Wallet, *Kuyper en de Joodse Kwestie*. [Kuyper and the Jewish Question]

<https://research.vu.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/1538643/Kuyper+en+joodse+kwestie.pdf> [Last Accessed 30-3-2020]

¹¹⁸ Kuyper, "De Joden onder Christen-Natiën I & II" [The Jews under the Christian Nations, I & II], *De Standaard*, 8, 11 October 1875.

¹¹⁹ Kuyper, "De Joden onder Christen-Natiën III" [The Jews under the Christian Nations, III], *De Standaard*, 12 October 1875; Original Emphasis.

¹²⁰ Kuyper, "De Joden onder Christen-Natiën II" [The Jews under the Christian Nations, II], *De Standaard*, 12 October 1875.

¹²¹ Kuyper, "De Joden onder Christen-Natiën II & III" [The Jews under the Christian Nations, II & III], *De Standaard*, 11, 12 October 1875.

¹²² Schöffer, *Veelvormig Verleden*, 165.

¹²³ Kuyper, "Liberalisten en Joden I" [Liberalists and Jews I], *De Standaard*, 11 October 1878.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*

¹²⁵ Kuyper, "Liberalisten en Joden II" [Liberalists and Jews II], *De Standaard*, 14 October 1878. Benjamin Disraeli, Conservative Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in 1868 and from 1874-1880, was baptised as a child after his father renounced Judaism. Leon Gambetta, French Republican and Prime Minister from 1881-1882 was accused of being a Jew by the French (Extreme-)Right on the basis of his close friendship with several

suspicious, in Kuyper's, indeed, in the subsequent article in this article series Kuyper stated: "We do not hesitate for a moment, explain for a significant part of their disproportionate influence from their idiosyncrasies and talents. A Jew is a different person than a Caucasian."¹²⁶ But the true strength of the Jewish Nation was that Jews remained Jewish, even if they, as a consequence of the French Revolution, abandoned their faith and turned to liberalism, unlike Christian nations, who were lost. For, as Kuyper stated in his third article:

"At the station of life where the [sic] Christ is rejected, but some vague godliness still temporarily remains, the Jew is in his yard and place, the Jew is the man of the moment, the Jew is the leader, and therefore it cannot be other than in this period of what is called by "modern theology", apostate Christendom, in spite of her intentions and intent to do so, had to let the Jewish ... rule."¹²⁷

Even if the upper-class Jews increasingly rejected Orthodoxy, they remained Jews and thereby acquired a "spiritual majority" over all Christians that had been led away from Orthodoxy and Christ.¹²⁸ This thoroughly anti-Semitic indictment of the Dutch Jews in one the largest newspapers of the Netherlands did not remain unchallenged. There was general outcry in the press, especially in the conservative liberal *Handelsblad*, which Kuyper accused of being a Jewish-Liberalist press organ in response.¹²⁹ However, as the outcry carried on and accusations of anti-Semitism became harder to convincingly refute, Kuyper grew increasingly silent in the public debate on the affair. The factors that contributed to his retreat are three-fold. Firstly, public anti-Semitism being generally was regarded as "not-done" in Dutch society, especially with such a clear political nature as *Liberalists and Jews*. Secondly, anti-Semitism became more unattractive mobilizing force in Dutch society, as the reports of violent pogroms in Russia increased from the 1880s onwards. Lastly, the political costs of anti-Semitism as a political mobilizing tool against the Liberal Government far outweighed its benefits as the Catholic and aristocratic Protestant Orthodox increasingly coalesced to strengthen the anti-revolutionary opposition to the new 1878 Primary School Law, removing the necessity of political anti-Semitism.¹³⁰

However, more than three decades later, then travelling Eastern Europe as an ignominiously defeated and retired Prime Minister, Kuyper had seemingly wavered little from his views in 1875 and 1878. In *Around the Old World Sea*, a personal description of the Orient, Kuyper spends nearly one hundred pages describing what he calls the "Jewish Problem" without any direct political aim.¹³¹ The Jewish Problem, according to Kuyper, was a permanent problem "for the peoples in whose midst Jews lived" in how to work with the Jews.¹³² The problems of prostitution, smuggling and usury remained insoluble as long as the Jews lived in the midst of these peoples. For Russia, the nation with the largest Jewish population in Europe, Kuyper expressed support for Jewish colonization of Siberia as a solution to the permanent Jewish Problem, removing the Jews from the midst of the Eastern European peoples.¹³³

In conclusion, Kuyper employed all four dimension of anti-Semitism in his three major writings upon the Jews, Jews under the Christian Nations, Liberalists and Jews and *Around the Old World Sea*. Jews, according to Kuyper, were religiously, political, ethnically and economically distinct form the Christian peoples of Europe and had, after their equalization in the French Revolution, assumed more and more power on the Continent. In both 1875 and 1878, Kuyper had employed anti-Semitic rhetoric to serve political aims, while seemingly radicalizing his discourse in response to political failure in opposition.

prominent Jews. Eduard Lasker is the only "real" Jew, in religious sense, in Kuyper's summary. Lasker was a prominent German Left Liberal parliamentarian in the Wilhelmine Reichstag.

¹²⁶ Kuyper, "Liberalisten en Joden III" [Liberalists and Jews III], *De Standaard*, 16 October 1878.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Kuyper, "Liberalisten en Joden IV" [Liberalists and Jews IV], *De Standaard*, 17 October 1878.

¹³⁰ Schöffer, *Veelvormig Verleden*, 164-168.

¹³¹ Bratt, *Abraham Kuyper*, 330-332.

¹³² Koch, *Abraham Kuyper: een biografie* [Abraham Kuyper: a biography], 508-509.

¹³³ Kuyper, *Om de oude wereldzee*, 308-316.

It was only in response to a growing outcry against his anti-Semitism and the lessening value of anti-Semitism as a political mobilizing tool that Kuyper grew silent on Dutch Jews. After a forced retirement from political life, Kuyper again wrote on the Jewish Problem without direct political aims with a recognizable similarity to his previous writings, suggesting consistency in belief from 1875 to 1907.

Conclusion

This conclusion shall deal both with the separate historiographies of the CS and AR and their leadership and the comparison of trajectory of both on the Social and Jewish Question.

Firstly, Lueger and the CS. As Boyer in his *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna* and *Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna* contended the CS was first and foremost as an “antiproletarian and anti-industrial” coalition of the Austrian *Mittelstand*, build by the political operator Dr. Karl Lueger. However, following Lueger’s confirmation as Mayor of Vienna, there is a visible abandonment of anti-Capitalist discourse, as a means to maintain an increasingly anti-Socialist coalition for electoral purposes. Anti-Semitism still remained as a means for Lueger and the CS to maintain and extend political power.

Secondly, Kuyper and the AR. With regards to the Social Question, Hermann von der Dunk described the split between the AR’s *gauche* and *droite* over franchise extension as seminal moment ensuring the AR’s reformist confessional nature in the subsequent decades. While the AR subsequently played an important role in the doubling of Dutch electorate through franchise extension, when it acquired power it hardly deviated from liberal consensus on the Social Question. Subsequently, believing to face the threat of a socialist revolution in the Railway Strikes of 1903, AR ministers refused to grant any concessions to the strikers, in spite of Kuyper previously recognizing the difficult position of the strikers. The reformist nature of the AR was thus shown to be highly dependent on Kuyper’s influence, with the AR becoming increasingly conservative after Kuyper’s departure. With regards to the Jewish Question, Kuyper had employed anti-Semitic rhetoric to serve political aims, while seemingly radicalizing his discourse in response to political failure in opposition. It was only in response to a growing outcry against his anti-Semitism and the lessening value of anti-Semitism as a political mobilizing tool that Kuyper grew silent on Dutch Jews. After a forced retirement from political life, Kuyper again wrote on the Jewish Problem without direct political aims with a recognizable similarity to his previous writings, suggesting consistency in belief from 1875 to 1907, silenced by an uninterested society.

In conclusion, the CS and AR had similar trajectories with regards to anti-capitalism, as both formulated anti-liberal critiques of capitalism, while in opposition to Liberal dominated Executive, while increasingly moving together with capitalists in response to a growing Socialist movement in both countries, once the CS and AR had acquired power in the person of Dr. Karl Lueger and Ds. Abraham Kuyper. With regards to the Jewish Question, the differing trajectories of Dr. Lueger and Ds. Kuyper can be explained by the differing responses of their respective societies to anti-Semitism. Both formulated their anti-Semitic critiques in periods of personal political failure, however, whereas Dr. Lueger’s Anti-Semitism provided a springboard from his political nadir to the Viennese Mayoral Office, Ds. Kuyper’s Anti-Semitism proved counterproductive, as condemnation from the Dutch press, brought him little, while the growing opposition to the 1878 Primary Education Law proved to be a far more effective springboard to *het Torentje*, the office of the Dutch Prime Minister.

Bibliography

§1. Primary Sources:

Anti-Revolutionaire Partij [Anti-Revolutionary Party]. “Program van Actie bij de Stembus van 1888” [Program of Action at the Ballot Box of 1888]. In *Politieke en Sociale programma's. Derde deel* [Political and Social programs. Third bind]. Edited by N. Oosterbaan. Utrecht: Publisher Unknown, 1901.

“I decide who is a Jew!”: The Papers of Dr. Karl Lueger. Edited by Richard S. Geehr. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982.

Kuyper, Abraham. “De Joden onder Natiën” [The Jews under the Christian Nations]. *De Standaard*, 8, 11, 12, 13 October 1875.

Kuyper, Abraham. “De Sociale Kwestie” [The Social Question]. *De Standaard*, 16, 17 April, 1872.

Kuyper, Abraham. *Het sociale vraagstuk en de Christelijke religie*. [The social question and the Christian religion] Amsterdam: Wormser, 1892.

Kuyper, Abraham. “Liberalisten en Joden” [Liberalists and Jews]. *De Standaard*, 11, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23 October 1878.

Kuyper, Abraham. *Om de oude wereldzee. Deel I* [Around the Old World Sea. Volume I]. Amsterdam: Van Holkema & Warendorf, 1907.

Kuyper, Abraham. *Ons Program*. [Our Program] Amsterdam: J.H. Kruyt, 1880.

Lueger, Karl. “Lueger’s First Anti-Semitic Speech”. In *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria*. Edited by P.G.J. Pulzer. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1964.

N.B.. “Lotsverbetering” [Life Improvement]. *De Standaard*, 23 February 1903.
<https://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=MMKB23:001815045> [Accessed 28-3-2020]

Pope Leo XIII. *Rerum Novarum: On Capital and Labour*. http://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum.html

Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands. “Troonrede 1901” [Throne Speech 1901]. In *Troonredes, Openingsredes, inhuldigingsredes 1814-1963* [Throne Speech, Opening Speeches, Inauguration Speeches 1814-1963]. Edited by Ernst van Raalte. The Hague: Staatsuitgeverij, 1964.

Verslag der handelingen van de Tweede Kamer der Staten Generaal (hereafter HTK) [Parliamentary Proceedings, House of Representatives,] 1903, 926.
<https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/0000361841> [Accessed 15-3-2020]

Von und zur Liechtenstein, Prinz A., “Christlichsozialen Reformprogramm” [Christian Social Reform Program]. In *Karl Lueger und seine Zeit* [Karl Lueger and his time]. Edited by Rudolf Kuppe. Vienna: Österreichische Volksschriften, 1933.

§2. Literature:

Bratt, James D. *Abraham Kuyper: Modern Calvinist, Christian Democrat*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2013.

- Boyer, John W. *Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna: Christian Socialism in Power, 1897-1918*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Boyer, John W. *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848-1897*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Brugmans, I.J. *De arbeidende klasse in Nederland in de 19^e eeuw (1813-1870)*. Den Haag: Martinus Nijhof, 1929.
- De Bruijne, A. "Abraham Kuyper's Surprising Love of the Jews." *Journal of Reformed Theology* 11 (2017): 2, 24-46.
- Evans, Ellen L. "Catholic Political Movements in Germany, Switzerland, and the Netherlands: Notes for a Comparative Approach". *Central European History*, 17 (1984): 2, 91-119.
- Funder, Friederich. *Aufbruch zur christlichen Sozialreform: Franz Schindler. Der Weggenosse Luegers und A. Lichtensteins* [Start of Christian Social Reform: Franz Schindler. Fellow Traveller of Lueger and A. Liechtenstein]. Vienna: Herold Verlag, 1953.
- Geehr, Richard S. *Karl Lueger: Mayor of Fin de Siècle Vienna*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990.
- Harinck, George, Roel Kuiper and Peter Bak. *De Anti-Revolutionaire Partij, 1829-1980* [The Anti-Revolutionary Party, 1829-1980]. Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2001.
- Kertzer, David I. *The Pope and Mussolini: The Secret History of Pius IX and the Rise of Fascism in Europe*. New York: Random House, 2014.
- Koch, Jeroen. *Abraham Kuyper: een biografie* [Abraham Kuyper: a biography]. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Boom, 2006.
- Lange, Matthew. *Comparative-Historical Methods*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2012.
- Mill, John Stuart. *A System of Logic, Vol. I*. London: John W. Parker, 1843.
- Plemp van Duiveland, L.J.. "De Kuyperkoers" [The Kuyper Course]. *Onze Eeuw* [Our Age] (1902): 633-639.
- Prins, J.H. "Kuyper als partijleider" [Kuyper as Party Leader] In *Abraham Kuyper: Zijn volksdeel, zijn invloed* [Abraham Kuyper: His people, his influence], 95-122. Edited by C. Augustijn, J.H. Prins, H.E.S. Woldring. Delft: Meinema, 1987.
- Pulzer, P.G.J. *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1964.
- Schöffner, Ivo. *Veelvormig Verleden: Zeventien studies in de Vaderlandse Geschiedenis* [Pluriform Past: Seventeen studies in Dutch History]. Amsterdam: De Bataafsche Leeuw, 1987.
- Telman, D.A. Jeremy. "Adolf Stoecker: Anti-Semite with a Christian Mission". *Jewish History*, 9 (1995): 2, 93-112.
- Te Velde, Henk. *Stijlen van leiderschap: Persoon en politiek van Thorbecke tot Den Uyl* [Styles of Leadership: Individual and politics from Thorbecke to Den Uyl]. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Wereldbibliotheek, 2002.

Von der Dunk, Willem. "Conservatism in the Netherlands." *Journal of Contemporary Politics* 13 (1978): 4, 741-763.

Wallet, Bart. *Kuyper en de Joodse Kwestie*. [Kuyper and the Jewish Question]
<https://research.vu.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/1538643/Kuyper+en+joodse+kwestie.pdf>

Wils, Lode. *Het Daensisme: de opstand van het Zuidvlaamse platteland*. [Daensisme: The Revolt of the South-Flemish countryside] Leuven: Davidsfonds, 1960.

Woldring, H.E.S. "De sociale kwestie – meer dan een emancipatiestrijd" [The social question – more than an emancipatory struggle]. In *Abraham Kuyper: Zijn volksdeel, zijn invloed* [Abraham Kuyper: His people, his influence], 123-145. Edited by C. Augustijn, J.H. Prins, H.E.S. Woldring. Delft: Meinema, 1987.