

University of Groningen

Education in a Nation divided

Dekker, Jeroen J. H.; Amsing, Hilda T. A.; Wichgers, Inge J. M.

Published in:
School Acts and the Rise of Mass Schooling

DOI:
[10.1007/978-3-030-13570-6_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-13570-6_5)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2019

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Dekker, J. J. H., Amsing, H. T. A., & Wichgers, I. J. M. (2019). Education in a Nation divided: The Contribution of School Acts to the Development of Dutch Mass Schooling in the Long Nineteenth Century. In J. Westberg, L. Boser, & I. Brühwiler (Eds.), *School Acts and the Rise of Mass Schooling: Education Policy in the Long Nineteenth Century* (pp. 93-118). Palgrave MacMillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-13570-6_5

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.



5

Education in a Nation Divided: The Contribution of School Acts to the Development of Dutch Mass Schooling in the Long Nineteenth Century

Jeroen J. H. Dekker, Hilda T. A. Amsing
and Inge J. M. Wichgers

During the Enlightenment, according to people who called themselves Patriots, Dutch schooling was incompatible with their longing for one nation in a centralized republic. Elements that later on became characteristic of nineteenth-century schooling, such as special school buildings, teaching diplomas and whole-class teaching, were still missing and there was no overarching school system. While enrolments and probably the quality of schooling increased, so too did the criticisms as a result of changes to educational goals.¹ While schooling in the Dutch Republic was designed to educate children to become good Christians, and for a smaller proportion of the population to become good citizens, the Patriots aimed at inclusive citizenship and saw schooling as

J. J. H. Dekker (✉) · H. T. A. Amsing · I. J. M. Wichgers
University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands
e-mail: j.j.h.dekker@rug.nl

H. T. A. Amsing
e-mail: h.t.a.amsing@rug.nl

I. J. M. Wichgers
e-mail: i.j.m.wichgers@rug.nl

a tool for the making of the citizens of the new nation. In the words of G.C.C. Vatebender, rector of the Latin School in Gouda, a future carpenter should be educated to become not only a carpenter, but also “a human being”.² School reform was considered necessary³ and the reformers did their best to depict the eighteenth-century school as negatively as possible to contrast it with their own ambitions.⁴

In the first years of the Batavian Republic (1795–1806), philanthropic societies inspired by the Enlightenment dominated the educational debate and prepared blueprints for national school acts, introduced in 1801, 1803 and 1806. However, not everybody agreed with the idea of a nation state inspired by Enlightenment ideals. Orthodox Calvinists and Roman Catholics, two groups who together made up the majority of the population, were against the Enlightenment worldview and did not embrace a national primary school that conflicted with their own religious principles. Initially, the Orthodox Protestants tried to transform the national, moderate Protestant schools into Orthodox ones that would fit their idea of a Protestant nation. When this attempt failed, they changed their strategy, joined forces with their religious opponents, the Roman Catholics, and started a struggle for schools based on their own ideas about nation and government-funded education. This cooperative effort eventually resulted in the unique Dutch education system with public and private schools equally funded by the state.

This chapter focuses on arguments in the main parliamentary discussions about the Dutch primary school acts in the long nineteenth century. The Dutch case is of particular interest, not the least since it sheds light on the challenges of educational policy in a state divided by religious convictions, both between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism and between Orthodox and enlightened Protestantism. We address the questions of how, and why, several school acts were issued from 1801 and onwards, and how their content and intentions changed over time. We will also address the question of why, notwithstanding their fundamental differences of opinion, all parties regarded mass schooling as necessary for nation-building. In this chapter, we argue that they were all “believers in the nation”, even though they had different beliefs and interests in the nation and education for citizenship.⁵

Education and Nation-Building: The School Acts of 1801, 1803 and 1806

The School Acts of 1801, 1803 and 1806 were conceived during the birth of a new, centralized state and mirrored a European tendency towards regulating schooling on a national level.⁶ In 1795, the Dutch *ancien régime* ended with the collapse of the Republic of the Seven United Netherlands following the Batavian Revolution, which was supported by the Napoleonic army and inspired by the French Revolution. The Dutch Republic was a confederation, with the States General responsible for foreign affairs and the military, but for the rest characterized by regional sovereignty and local autonomy in which political and ruling positions were only open to the Calvinist nobility and burghers. Local interests were often more important than the interests of the Republic. The Batavian Revolution and the supporting Patriots aimed to replace the ruling class by a new one, inspired by the Enlightenment and focusing on political, cultural, social and economic reform.

The new Batavian Republic lasted from 1795 until 1806, a period in which the state's financial situation continued to deteriorate because of the Napoleonic wars. This would become the first major impediment to the ambitious reform plans. Another obstacle was the growing opposition from Orthodox Calvinists who did not agree with Enlightenment-inspired educational reforms and national health policies. Meanwhile, what had been the Napoleonic umbrella turned into a takeover when Louis Napoleon, Napoleon's brother, became king of Holland in 1806 and made it a centralized country along French lines. In 1810, Holland became part of France.⁷

A centralized state is not automatically a nation state. The Dutch "metamorphosis", to quote Van Sas, from a centralized state into a nation state took several decades, and according to Knippenberg and De Pater, it was the result of a combination of infrastructural, economic, political and sociocultural developments, stimulated by the new state through laws and regulations.⁸ The first steps towards unification were the unifying and centralizing of taxes, weights and measures according to the French model, and the abolition of the guild system.⁹

Education was considered essential for making citizens of a state and nation. According to adherents of the Enlightenment, the old schools were an outgrowth of the old regime, with stuffy buildings, disordered and inefficient methods, and arbitrary discipline.¹⁰ They wanted a new school system with a unified spelling and grammar for the nation's language, and with national values prevailing.¹¹

The school acts of the early nineteenth century were part of these efforts. These school acts set out national rules for all elementary schools (*Lagere School*) and, from 1806, these rules were monitored by a national school inspectorate. Among other things, the acts contained provisions about teacher certificates, teacher payment and school buildings.¹² Apart from creating a central school organization, the reformers also wanted to centralize the curriculum and teaching methods. With their emphasis on rational and efficient central control and the ideal of educating the masses to become citizens, these laws revealed their Enlightenment inspiration.¹³

The first act of 1801, issued by the Minister of Education (*Agent van Nationale Opvoeding*) Johannes van der Palm, made a distinction between public and private schools. The act only applied to public schools, run by municipalities that received funds from local or national government or from the church. It covered both schools in the cities and countryside, and schools for the poor, as educating the poor was considered a vital part of creating an enlightened nation state. Unlike the non-Christian—and often anti-Christian—French Enlightenment, the 1801 and 1806 acts stipulated that Dutch schools should be Christian in nature, but not belong to a specific church, in accordance with the constitutional principle of equality. Article Four of the 1801 Act explained how this could be achieved: “Anything that could undermine good moral codes and respect for the Supreme Being has to be carefully avoided in the textbooks and teaching methods; but anything dogmatic that is understood differently by the different religious communities must also be refrained from”.¹⁴ According to the act's supporters, this should guarantee the cooperation of all religious groups.

The first national elementary education act laid the foundation for the establishment of a national school inspectorate and introduced general regulations on buildings, school times, teacher conduct,

punishments and rewards, and teaching methods. In the schools of the *ancien régime*, pupils of different ages and abilities were placed together in one class, but taught individually. According to the Council of Internal Affairs in 1802, the quality of that education was often deplorable. Young farm workers, often barely able to read and write themselves, acted as teachers. While being educated, almost eighty children breathed the fetid air in small rooms with low ceilings; “and we need to *stay silent in shame* at the uncleanliness of those airless rooms with their lack, not only of comfort, but of the *basic necessities*” [italics in original].¹⁵ The new law sought to end this. Instead of individual teaching, whole-class teaching was introduced in age-homogeneous classes. This, the reformers argued, would adapt teaching to the pupils’ needs and abilities and would encourage understanding rather than the “humiliating, stultifying old teaching method” of learning by rote.¹⁶ The classroom would become a child-friendly environment, with corporal punishment banned from 1820 onwards. The act also put an end to uneducated farmers acting as teachers: teachers now had to pass standard national exams.¹⁷

The Education Act of 1801, conceived in a period of economic and financial decline, encountered budgetary problems and resistance from churches, local governments and parents, in particular because of the new curriculum, textbooks and teaching methods.¹⁸ Despite this resistance, an even more far-reaching act was adopted in 1803. All schools were now declared to be public schools and had to satisfy the regulations. However, this stipulation was expensive, and it sparked even more opposition, in particular from local governments, which contested the act and refused to cooperate.

In 1806, with regional sovereignty eventually abolished, a new education act, prepared by the General-Director for Schooling, Adriaan van den Ende, was introduced by the *Wetgevend Lichaam*, the parliament of the Batavian Republic from 1801 to 1806, consisting of 35 members, indirectly elected representatives of the regions. Less ideological and more pragmatic than its two precursors, it emanated a sense of reality by again making a distinction between public and private schools. Private schools, which did not have public financial support, needed state approval and had to follow the regulations of the law, including control

by the new school inspectorate.¹⁹ Public schools, funded by the government, were intended for the masses. The majority of private schools had to be financed by parents and were therefore only attended by children from the upper classes. Some private schools, however, were funded by philanthropic societies, as the Society for the Common Good, founded in 1784, dominating the educational debate around 1800 and establishing private schools for the masses as forerunners of educational reform.²⁰

Nevertheless, this third school act was also based on the Enlightenment notion that all people, notwithstanding differences in social, cultural and religious background, should be educated in general Christian and moral virtues.²¹ As a result, religious education in accordance with specific denominations such as Calvinism, Lutheranism, other Protestant denominations and Roman Catholicism was banned during regular school hours. From now on, denomination-based religious education had to find a place outside the school. The Christian God was not totally absent from the classroom, however: general religious education, in practice moderate Protestantism, was considered crucial for making good citizens.²²

The main idea behind this non-dogmatic education was that it should unite the different Christian groups and so contribute to the dreamed-of nation state guided by a general Christianity rather than specific denominations.²³ By taking Jesus as an example, pupils needed to understand “what mankind is, has to be and can be”.²⁴ Although not formally prohibited, private denominational schools—unlike the schools of the Philanthropic Society for the Common Good—were seldom granted the permission needed to open their doors. Thus, proponents of the new law had no intention of promoting private education if it did not match their ideological ambitions.²⁵

The implementation of the 1806 Act, effective until 1857, was rather successful in terms of increasing teaching quality and contributed to some growth of school attendance with enrolments increasing from c. 60 to 68% of the school-age population.²⁶ Yet regional studies indicate that old and new types of school often coexisted for a long time. Non-dogmatic Christian education was chameleon-like, taking on more or less the flavour of the dominant regional religion.²⁷ As a result, although

most headmasters were still Protestant, in regions with a large Catholic majority, such as the south and part of the eastern Netherlands, sometimes Roman Catholic headmasters were appointed. Moreover, school inspectors were not always successful at preventing Catholic and Orthodox Protestant schools from operating contrary to the idea of general religious education. In the meantime, the number of public schools grew substantially, which contributed to educational reform, as did the already-mentioned private schools for children of the masses funded by the Society for the Common Good.²⁸

Implementing Freedom of Education 1806–57

The Enlightenment-based assumption behind the 1806 Act, that a general Christian education would unite the nation, eventually did not work. The reason for this was that it brought together the Orthodox Protestants and Roman Catholics in their struggle against the liberal ideas of nation and citizenship, notwithstanding their internal differences on those issues. The Orthodox Protestants considered the Netherlands a Calvinist nation, and indeed, ruling positions during the *ancien régime* were only open to Calvinists, despite equal numbers of Roman Catholics and Calvinists in the population (each about 40%). It was therefore no surprise that support for liberal ideas on citizenship and education declined as soon as the majority of the population increased their power, which happened during the nineteenth century. This process underwent different stages.

The Orthodox Calvinists took the initiative.²⁹ With the foundation of the Batavian Republic in 1795, they lost their dominant position in society and schooling. A general Christian education, however, was unacceptable to them as they did not share the horizontal anthropological notions of enlightened Protestantism, with its greater focus on human beings than on God; it was incompatible with their faith, which was based on the Bible and the Heidelberg Catechism. According to them, the religion as propagated by King William I and the ideological foundation of public schools was tantamount to superstition, like the Roman Catholic belief in saints.³⁰ Because of these objections,

Orthodox Calvinist parents established illegal schools, which was fiercely criticized by adherents of public schools.

Orthodox Protestants were, however, divided. Some, like Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer, were of the opinion that the state and the nation should be based on the Protestant Confession of Faith, with the Heidelberg Catechism as a foundation document.³¹ Others, like J.J.L. van der Bruggen, a future member of the Dutch government and responsible for the School Act of 1857, defended the notion of a state remaining neutral towards all denominations and keeping its distance from religious matters. The former longed for the revival of the Protestant schools from the Dutch Republic, while the latter opted for Protestant schools alongside neutral public schools.³²

For Catholics, the starting situation was different.³³ The Batavian Revolution resulted in civil rights for all denominations, an enormous step forward compared to their position in the Dutch Republic. With still limited power—no dioceses or episcopate and only a few churches—they were initially indebted to the liberals and often supported them politically. However, whereas the general Christian schools were not Protestant enough for the Orthodox Calvinists, they were too Protestant for the Catholics. Although politically loyal to the Dutch state, they were spiritually loyal to the Pope, who resisted all reforms based on Enlightenment ideas. Therefore, from the 1830s onwards, the Catholics also longed for their own schools.³⁴

In the run-up to the constitution of 1840, both the plea for Catholic schools and objections against the non-dogmatic character of public schools became national issues.³⁵ The constitution did not change the requirements regarding education, but the new King William II, who enjoyed a good relationship with Joannes Zwijsen, future Catholic archbishop of Utrecht, set up a commission to investigate Catholic complaints.³⁶ This led to the Royal Decree of 2 January 1842, containing several measurements to meet the objections, such as the possibility to check and dispose of textbooks that contained anti-Catholic texts.³⁷

In 1848, with liberal and sometimes socialist revolutions breaking out all over Europe, the King, anxious about what could happen in his own country, switched within 24 hours “from conservative to liberal” and asked the liberal politician Johan Rudolph Thorbecke to draft a

new constitution. In the constitution, written within a week, Thorbecke stipulated a series of citizen freedoms, among them freedom of education.³⁸ This was a seemingly unexpected gift for Roman Catholics and Orthodox Protestants—unexpected because they saw the liberals as the main supporters of the existing educational regime and seemingly because Thorbecke was a man of liberal principles, who did not want the state to force specific ideological views, including his own, on the population.

According to this new constitution, citizens could set up their own schools with their own ideological background. All teachers were still required to pass an exam and all education, private and public, was under the control of the national school inspectorate. The constitution continued to favour public schools by stipulating their sufficient supply, but it moved away from the early nineteenth-century notion that educational homogeneity was necessary to create citizens for the Dutch nation state.³⁹ With this constitutional guarantee of the freedom of education, Thorbecke followed his liberal principles by placing the primary responsibility for schooling in the hands of local governments and individual citizens.⁴⁰

The constitutional freedom of education was translated into educational legislation in 1857 under the responsibility of the Orthodox Protestant Minister J.J.L. van der Brugghen and approved by parliament. Although an Orthodox Protestant, he shared Thorbecke's view—unlike his grassroots supporters—that the state should remain neutral towards religious groups in order to respect the constitutional freedom of education.⁴¹ He therefore stipulated that public schools should no longer educate children based on any form of neutral Christianity, but should refrain from religious education. From now on, religious education was not the responsibility of the state but only of the church. According to Van der Brugghen, mixed public schools remained “the best means to create unity of public spirit, and unity of religiousness”.⁴² The justification for this state task was nation-building; in the words of the liberal M.H. Godefroi: “the duty to combat intolerance, to promote fraternization of the sons of the same fatherland, to pull down the barriers between religious denominations: that is the interest, the mission, the duty of the State”.⁴³

However, parliamentary opponents of neutral public schools feared “irreligious schools”⁴⁴ and “popular education torn loose from Christianity”.⁴⁵ In their view, this endangered nation-building, since this act “would lay the foundation for a period of irreligiousness and dehumanization of our nation, leading to the decay of the social order”.⁴⁶ However, the idea of neutral schools was not as absolute as it seemed. Also, under the new law a Christian spirit was essential to the upbringing of young people: the assumption that the Dutch nation was a Christian one was not abandoned.⁴⁷

The fundamental issue of freedom of education was resolved. From now on, citizens could set up their own schools in a constitutional way. Yet, as said above, the character of the public school did not change fundamentally, and public schools continued to adapt themselves to regionally dominant religious identities.⁴⁸ Public schools therefore remained an acceptable institution for many parents as long as private schools were not funded by the state and therefore too expensive for parents who were already paying taxes for public schools.⁴⁹

Although state subsidies were also considered for private denominational schools in the initial bill, this remained a bridge too far. Some private school supporters considered state intervention a threat to the freedom of those schools,⁵⁰ while adherents of public schools felt that financial support for private schools was incompatible with the liberal principle of non-intervention in private affairs. Moreover, financial support that made private schools more successful could harm public schools and thus their educational mission of contributing to a nation state.⁵¹ Because many parents continued to find public schools acceptable and private schools received no financial support from the state, few private denominational schools were initially founded.⁵²

This situation changed radically from the 1870s, when a new political debate about education began, this time with Calvinists and Roman Catholics joining forces. Pope Pius IX’s encyclical letter *Quanta Cura* (How much Care?) of 8 December 1864, which was an outright attack against liberalism and secularism, was a game changer for the Dutch Catholics. Following the Pope, they now rejected public education and decided to establish their own schools, supported by the bishops, who were available again from 1853 with the restoration of the ecclesiastical

hierarchy. In the meantime, the Orthodox Protestants found a new leader, Abraham Kuyper, formerly a Calvinist clergyman who increased his group's power across a range of areas, including media, politics and education. These Roman Catholic and Orthodox Protestant ambitions were also triggered by liberal plans to increase state intervention in education.⁵³

Protestants and Roman Catholics Together: The School Act of 1878

Both the Catholics under their episcopal leadership and the Orthodox Protestants led by Kuyper wanted to put a stop to the constitutionally preferential treatment of public schools. To that end, Kuyper founded the first Dutch political party, the Anti-Revolutionary Party in 1878.⁵⁴ He also established the so-called Anti-Education Act League and wrote articles in *De Standaard*, the newspaper he founded. In doing so, he mobilized Orthodox Protestants for the cause of education.⁵⁵ Roman Catholic resistance together with Kuyper's political movement reached a climax in 1878 in reaction to the proposed new education act by the Liberal Minister Kappeyne van de Cappello.

This act of 1878 retained the idea of a neutral public school based on Christian fundamentals, which opponents considered a “watered-down Christianity”.⁵⁶ In the parliamentary debates preceding the act, doubts about its neutrality continued since according to M.C. Bichon van IJsselmonde “there is no education without upbringing; no upbringing without morality; no morality without religion; no religion without faith”.⁵⁷ Thus, school education could not be separated from family education and religion. Members of parliament (MPs) opposed the view held by advocates of public schools that private schools would weaken the unity of the nation, for “to claim that our private schools sow discord is a statement that cannot be proven. The unity that our opponents [liberals] want to impose on the nation by force is an artificial one”.⁵⁸ Notwithstanding this discussion of principle, it seems that the main issue was not the character of public schools themselves but, with freedom of education already attained in 1848, financial support for private schools.

This 1878 Education Act was, in some ways, a continuation of the School Act of 1857. While the 1857 Act had led to several improvements regarding the curriculum, teacher salaries, teachers' qualifications and the teacher–pupil ratio,⁵⁹ this policy was strengthened with the School Act of 1878. It stipulated new curriculum requirements, such as the inclusion of plain needlework for girls, the need to formulate a lesson plan and new regulations on school size, teacher–pupil ratios and school buildings. And for the first time, a Dutch school act included a chapter on “promoting school attendance”. But compulsory education continued to face practical obstacles, such as the budget and a scarcity of teachers, and arguments of principle. Religious parents perceived compulsory education as a state infringement of their parental authority. Compulsory education was instead a practice applied to the poor, who could be forced to send their children to school in return for poor relief.⁶⁰ The new regulations to enhance the quality of education were expensive and could not be paid for by local government alone. Central government therefore stepped in. State intervention and social policy were slowly adopted by left-wing liberals from about 1870 onwards. From 1878, 30% of the costs of primary education would be covered by state subsidy, with the rest to be paid by local government.⁶¹

The new quality requirements also applied to private religious schools, but without financial support, which made it more difficult for them to stay afloat. According to the liberals, the primacy of public education as laid down in the constitution of 1848 meant that subsidies could only be granted to public schools.⁶² Moreover, the state had to refrain from giving subsidies to private schools “since every financial compensation from the public purse, however small, would turn a private school into a public one”.⁶³

Obviously, that argument did not convince the adherents of private schools. Several MPs pointed out the unfair position of private schools compared to public ones. Sending children to public schools was free because of the state subsidy, but parents who sent their children to private schools had to pay twice over. W.A. Schimmelpenninck van der Oye pointed down to this perceived unfairness: “It is a parody [...] when you lavishly pour millions from the national treasury, collected from all citizens, into public schools, and you do away with tuition, so

that many parents are tempted to not send their children to our schools, where they have to pay”.⁶⁴ The financial support of public schools made fair competition between public and private schools impossible and, according to proponents of private schools, as for example the Catholic A.J.H. Van Baar, it was contrary to the liberal principles of their opponents: “After all, it is a liberal principle *par excellence* that the results, not the means, are what matters. So, compete by providing good education and in a loyal manner, but don’t oppress or kill your competitors!”⁶⁵

In sum, the quality requirements of the school act led to a clash between liberals and religious groups. According to Orthodox Protestants, the liberals changed from defenders of mixed public schools into defenders of “sectarian schools for progressives”.⁶⁶ Positions were now taken, and no compromises were sought. In response to the debate, the Minister of the Interior, Th. Heemskerk, declared in 1877:

The fact that the government feels entitled to complain is not based on egotism or conceit; what hinders it most is that it doesn’t even seem to want to, or feel the need to bring about a revision of the education act in which both the majority [the liberals] and the minority [the confessionals] can reconcile themselves. The majority seems to deny all grievances of the minority, and has no objection to making a completely one-sided law; the minority seems to have chosen the motto: *all* (which is completely unattainable) *or nothing*, preferring the position of passive spectator to joining the debate, as if there is no room for persuasion or conviction.⁶⁷

Kuyper’s Anti-Education Act League was the driving force behind a massive protest in which Orthodox Protestants and Roman Catholics united to resist the privileged position of public schools. The movement collected almost half a million signatures for a petition to King William III asking him not to sanction the 1878 Act. Under the constitution, the King could not refuse his signature, but the petition was an important moment in the Dutch struggle for private schools: it marked the beginning of a process of full state funding for private schools.⁶⁸

The Start of State Support for Private Schools: The School Act of 1889

After the 1878 School Act was adopted, the religious groups did not rest, but raised money to found more private schools. Protestants and Catholics joined forces in parliament on several social policy matters, including education. At the same time, the liberal camp became fragmented: right-wing liberals opposed greater state intervention, while left-wing liberals promoted more social policy. Furthermore, a growing number of liberal parliamentarians realized that many people wanted to send their children to schools that reflected their own worldview. Although some liberals held on to the position expressed as “in the neutrality of the public school I defend the neutrality of the State”, others argued that some compensation would make sense.⁶⁹ In the meantime, the balance of power changed in 1887 when suffrage was extended, thereby ending the monopoly held by liberal governments since 1848.

The first step towards subsidizing private education was the adoption of the Education Act of 1889 under a religious parliamentary majority. The public school, intended as “a breeding ground for tolerance”, could only satisfy the adherents of enlightened Christianity and could therefore, according to the Orthodox Protestant Minister E. Mackay, be called a “sect school of the modernists”. It was wrong to allow the state to privilege such a school, aimed at a minority of the population, since the only concern of the state should be to support proper education for all.⁷⁰ By contributing to teacher salaries (a more substantial subsidy was beyond their financial means), the principle of state subsidy for private schools was acknowledged, and so, according to the Catholic H.J.A.M. Schaepman, “with regard to education the Dutch nation would be [...] not a neutral, but [...] a paternally caring nation”.⁷¹ Furthermore, tuition for public school education was made mandatory, except for the poor.⁷²

This first step towards subsidizing private schools provided relief. However, it did not stop tensions among the denominational parties who wanted full funding of education, while the doctrinal liberals continued to oppose any state intervention in private education.⁷³ The liberal spokesman H.J. Smidt feared that this law “takes an axe to the roots

of our neutral public school, and will slowly but surely erode and work loose the cement of our unity, state neutrality towards churches and denominations".⁷⁴ In the meantime, the educational agenda after 1889 became dominated by another pressing educational issue, the introduction of compulsory education.⁷⁵

The Compulsory Education School Act of 1900

Already in 1857 politicians had discussed the establishment of compulsory education. This would have been a great step forward in achieving the enlightened mission of educating the masses, but it did not happen for several reasons. The liberals argued that the state should abstain from deciding whether children should go to school, while the confessionals feared that such an obligation would benefit public schools and weaken private ones.⁷⁶

However, the introduction of compulsory education elsewhere reduced fears about loss of parental authority and state pedagogy. Examples from abroad, such as the UK and France, showed that compulsory education could become a normal part of social policy, also covering the struggle against child neglect and criminality.⁷⁷ Although the conservative Catholic P.J.F. Vermeulen spoke of "the overstated significance attached to uniform school knowledge, which most will never use and which will be forgotten in a much shorter time than the time needed to learn it",⁷⁸ many politicians emphasized the need for compulsory education to develop the nation and democracy.⁷⁹

With 50 votes in favour and 49 against, the adoption of the Compulsory Education Act of 1900 in parliament was a close call. Fear of state interference in family matters was not over. Vermeulen fulminated: "If a mother of a poor family was confined to her sickbed and she needed the help of her nimble ten-year-old daughter to take care of her and her younger brothers and sisters, the law demands that priority be given to the school".⁸⁰ But H. Goeman Borgesius, Liberal Minister of the Interior, argued that the sacrifice of some individual freedom was needed in the interests of society and the nation:

Robinson Crusoe, wandering about his island, was free, with nobody to disturb him in his loneliness. But we, as citizens of a civilized society, are bound by laws and regulations because we belong to an organization where the rights of individuals are restricted because of the rights of others, and where all members of the community have to sacrifice a small part of their freedom, precisely because they are members of the community.⁸¹

Behind the fear of state intervention was the growing discontent about insufficient financial support for private schools. According to its opponents, the act served liberal, not national interests, since it “turns the neutral state into the mass educator of the Dutch nation”, as the Orthodox Protestant A.E. van Kempen put it.⁸² However, the Education Act of 1900 made education mandatory for all children aged 7–13. Although the Netherlands, in practice, had achieved comparatively high levels of school enrolment in public and private schools, rising from ca. 1860 to 1900 from 80 to 90% of the school-age population, the decision of implementing compulsory education was taken comparatively late.⁸³ The main reason why the Netherlands lagged behind several other European countries was the Dutch struggle for full funding of primary education in public and private schools. According to the Liberal MP Th.M. Ketelaar: “Again and again we talked about funding, about neutrality and the like, but the actual practice of schooling was too often neglected”.⁸⁴

The School Act of 1920

State subsidies for private education gradually increased after compulsory education was implemented. Now that Kuyper’s principle of “sphere sovereignty, meaning that his orthodox Protestant group should enjoy as much as possible autonomy”,⁸⁵ funded in a “fine ideal of freedom”,⁸⁶ was a political reality and the power of the denominational parties further increased, the liberals accepted that one school for one nation was no longer realistic. The School Act of 1920 ended the nineteenth-century struggle for financial equality of private and public education.

The act stipulated financial equality between public and private schools as part of the “pacification” laid down in the constitutional revision of 1917. This revision was an exchange deal between liberals and religious parties, between financial equality for private and public schools—a confessional desire—and universal suffrage—a liberal request. From now on, public and private schools could compete with equal weapons.⁸⁷

This decision was an acceptance of the reality of a nation divided, held together by a system of so-called pillarization: a society characterized by unity in religious and political diversity summarized by the four pillars of Dutch society: the Catholic, Orthodox Protestant, socialist and liberal ones. Each pillar did have its own political party—and the Catholic and Protestant pillars also its own church and own schools—apart from youth organizations, newspapers, sport clubs, trade unions and even broadcasting. The elite arranged the balance between national unity and autonomy to each pillar.⁸⁸

The act of 1920, together with the Compulsory Education Act of 1900, laid the foundation for a unique educational system combining compulsory education with parental freedom to choose the school for their children according to their worldview, without needing to consider the financial implications. The 1920 Act responded to an increasing demand. Just after the School Act of 1878 with no subsidy for private schools was implemented, the number of private religious schools started to grow,⁸⁹ and numbers rose still further after the subsidy began in 1889. The consequences were spectacular: the percentage of children attending public schools dropped from 62 in 1910 to 45 in 1930, to 34 in 1950 and 33 in 2000.⁹⁰ This was foreseen by Liberal MP P. Otto, who feared a splintering of education and rising costs: “I admit that it’s the only way. We just are *a nation divided* [italics by the authors], a nation of denominations, a nation of denominational divisions. This can be seen in matters of religion, but also in matters of politics. This requires some sacrifices”.⁹¹

The Making of a Nation by Accepting a Nation Divided

The Dutch school acts resulted in a school system which, at the beginning of the twentieth century, educated almost all, namely 90%, of the school-age population (6–12) to become citizens of a nation state.⁹² It was a story of success, found in many other European countries, but also a story of frustrated ideals. Adherents of Enlightenment ideals long tried to impose a single school system on one concept of the nation. This attempt frustrated religious groups that opposed these ideals—Orthodox Protestants and Roman Catholics. While all believed in a Dutch nation, the nation they specifically believed in was coloured according to their opposing world views.

For Orthodox Protestants, the general Christian schools of the liberals, based on moderate Protestantism and aimed at creating a unity of public spirit, were not Protestant enough. They therefore initially tried to roll back the aims and practices of the liberal 1806 school act and to restore the situation of the Dutch Republic when they ruled the country, including its schooling. For the Roman Catholics, the general Christian schools were problematic because they were too Protestant. However, they had to deal with the dilemma of being loyal to the liberals, to whom they owed their civil rights in 1798, and to the Pope, who rejected the enlightened public schools. Their educational dispute, or *schoolstrijd*, was first and foremost about the right to establish their own schools and only then about state financial support, with Catholics and Orthodox Protestants, old ideological opponents, working together.

In several steps, marked by new constitutions in 1848 and 1917 and a series of school acts, liberals had to compromise their ideals. This started with a shift in educational power in the 1848 constitution, which opened the possibility of founding private schools. A political solution then became possible through a shift of political power: a more democratic suffrage system saw liberals losing MPs and the religious groups gaining more. With the 1917 constitution and the 1920 Education Act, this resulted in an acceptance of the reality of a nation

divided, reflected in an ideologically differentiated and pillarized school system of public and private schools, funded by the state.

Notes

1. Frijhoff, “Van onderwijs,” 24–25, 27; Frijhoff, “La réforme.” On the quality of teachers, see Roosenboom, *De dorpschool*.
2. Boekholt and de Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 80, 83–84; Dekker, *Het verlangen*, 265; Los, *Opvoeding*.
3. Klock, Mijnhardt, and Koolhaas, *1800*, 271.
4. Buijnsters, 2001, 14–15; Boekholt, *Het ongeregelde verleden*.
5. The quote is from the title of the book edited by Dagnino and Grazi, *Believers of the Nation*.
6. Tröhler, Popkewitz, and Labaree, *Schooling*; Tröhler, “Curriculum History.”
7. Knippenberg and De Pater, *De eenwording*, 13; Lenders, *De burger*, 24–32.
8. Knippenberg and De Pater, *De eenwording*, 13; Van Sas, *De metamorfose*, 175–94.
9. Lenders, *De burger*, 31.
10. *Ibid.*, 79.
11. Hulshof, Kwakernaak, and Wilhelm, *Geschiedenis van het talenonderwijs*, 111–12.
12. Lenders, *De burger*, 12. On teacher training, see Van Essen, *Kwekeling*.
13. Lenders, *De burger*, 9, 48.
14. Van Hoorn, “De Nederlandse schoolwetgeving,” 87–96.
15. Ter Gouw, *Beknopt historisch overzicht*, 58.
16. *Ibid.*, 66.
17. Lenders, *De burger*, 37–38, 40.
18. *Ibid.*, 40–41; Braster, *Passie*, 18.
19. Lenders, *De burger*, 21, 40–44.
20. *Ibid.*, 41–44; Dekker, *Het verlangen*, 270–72; Dekker, “Philanthropie et rééducation”.
21. Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 136; Lenders, “Van kind,” 11.
22. Lenders, *De burger*, 44.
23. Jans, “The Politics,” 97–115.
24. Braster, “Het openbaar onderwijs,” 128.

25. Ibid., 129.
26. Knippenberg, *Deelname*, 78, Fig. 5.1. Until 1862, the enrolment rates are of the estimated population aged 5–14; after 1862, it is only possible to deliver enrolment rates of the population aged 6–12, for which primary education in the nineteenth century was intended.
27. Braster, “Het openbaar onderwijs,” 127.
28. Lenders, *De burger*, 46–47.
29. See Bruin, *Het ontstaan*; Langedijk, *Bibliographie*.
30. Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 136; Dekker, *Het verlangen*, 277.
31. Toes, *De toets*, 27–60; Dekker, *Het verlangen*, 51.
32. Braster, “Het openbaar onderwijs,” 128; Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 144.
33. Raeds, “A Prudent Search;” Dagnino, “A Dutch Traditionalism?”
34. Kox, *Kweekplaats*, 41–58; Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 132–34.
35. Dodde, “*Een speurtocht*,” 258; De Haan, “Het onderwijs,” 182–217.
36. Kox, *Kweekplaats*, 51.
37. Exalto, *Van wie*, 45–53; Braster, “Het openbaar onderwijs,” 129.
38. Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 144.
39. Kruithof, “Toegankelijk,” 1998; Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 144–50; De Haan, “Van staatszorg,” 98; Dekker, “From Imaginations,” 62.
40. Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 144.
41. Ibid., 138–39, 212; De Haan, “Van staatszorg,” 96.
42. Proceedings of the Lower House (PLH) [Handelingen van de Tweede Kamer], Preliminary Report Commission Lower House [Voorloopig Verslag der Commissie van Rapporteurs] 1855–1856, 29 April 1856, 717. The PLH form part of the Proceedings of both houses of Parliament [Handelingen van de Eerste en Tweede Kamer van de Staten-Generaal].
43. PLH 1855–1856, 2 May 1856, 40.
44. PLH 1855–1856, 27 February 1856, 610.
45. PLH 1855–1856, 13 March 1856, 9.
46. PLH 1855–1856, 27 February 1856, 610.
47. Braster, “Het openbaar onderwijs,” 133; PLH 1855–1856, 30 November 1855, 242.
48. Dodde, “*Een speurtocht*,” 259; De Haan, “Het onderwijs,” 96.
49. Braster, “Het openbaar onderwijs,” 134–35.

50. Exalto, *Van wie*.
51. Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 213; De Haan, “Het onderwijs,” 96.
52. Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 213.
53. *Ibid.*, 214; De Haan, “Het onderwijs,” 97–98.
54. The Roman Catholics followed in 1896 with the *Rooms-Katholieke Staatspartij*.
55. Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 214.
56. De Jonge, PLH 1877–1878, 19 June 1877, 982.
57. PLH 1877–1878, 18 June 1877, 958.
58. Schimmelpenninck van der Oye, PLH 1877–1878, 17 June 1877, 953.
59. Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 151.
60. *Ibid.*, 152.
61. *Ibid.*, 152–53; Dekker, *Het verlangen*, 297–303.
62. See e.g. explanation by the Minister of the Interior Th. Heemskerck: PLH, Tweede Kamer 1876–1877, 120.9, 30 August 1877; Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 219.
63. PLH, Letter of Explanation Revision Law 13 August 1857 [Memorie van Toelichting], 1877–1878, 130.3, 10.
64. PLH 1877–1878, 17 June 1877, 953.
65. PLH 1877–1878, 18 June 1877, 966–67.
66. De Haan, “Het onderwijs,” 97.
67. PLH, Response to the Preliminary Report [Memorie van Beantwoording] 1876–1877, 120.9, 30 August 1877, 93.
68. Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 215–16.
69. *Ibid.*, 219. The quote is from S. van Houten (liberal), PLH 1888–1889, 22 August 1889, 1307–10.
70. Partial Revision Law of Primary Education, 17 August 1878 (Law Gazette 127), 1888–1889, Number 89.10, 10–11.
71. PLH 1888–1889, 22 August 1889, 1317–18.
72. Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 219; Partial Revision Law of Primary Education, 17 August 1878 (Law Gazette 127), 1888–1889, number 89.10; 21–22.
73. Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 220.
74. PLH 1888–1889, 23 August 1889, 1336.
75. Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 221.
76. *Ibid.*, 152.
77. Dekker, *The Will*, 110–11.

78. PLH 1899–1900, 28 February 1900, 1040–41.
79. See, for example the liberal A. Kerdijk, PLH 1899–1900, 2 March 1900, 1073.
80. PLH 1899–1900, 28 February 1900, 1043.
81. PLH 1899–1900, 6 March 1900, 1097.
82. PLH 1899–1900, 28 February 1900, 1048.
83. Knippenberg, *Deelname*, 78, Fig. 5.1.
84. PLH 1899–1900, 27 February 1900, 1021; Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 153–54.
85. Boekholt and De Booy, *Geschiedenis*, 221; Dekker, *Het verlangen*, 369–77.
86. Minister De Visser. Letter of Response [Memorie van Antwoord], 1919–1920, 86.5, 151.
87. Cf. A.F. de Savornin Lohman. PLH 1919–1920, 14 April 1920, 1817.
88. The classic study on Dutch pillarization is Lijphart, *The Politics*. Cf. Blom, “Pillarisation,” 153. On the Catholic pillar, see Righart, *De katholieke zuil*; Blom, “Education,” 213–16.
89. Mentink, “‘Vergeten’ onderwijsrecht,” 82.
90. Braster, “Het openbaar onderwijs,” 137.
91. PLH 1919–1920, 13 April 1920, 1796; Blom, “Education,” 213–16. Nowadays, the proportion of private to public schools is seventy to thirty per cent.
92. For enrolment figures in the nineteenth century, see Knippenberg, *Deelname*; Dasberg and Jansing, “Het socio-culturele leven in Nederland 1844–1875,” and “Het socio-culturele leven in Nederland 1875–1895/1895–1914.”

References

- Blom, Hans C.H. “Pillarisation in Perspective.” *West European Politics* 23, no. 3 (2000): 153–64.
- Blom, S. “Education.” In *1650–2000. Accounting for the Past*, edited by Douwe Fokkema and Frans Grijzenhout, 197–227. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2004.
- Boekholt, Pieter Th.F.M. *Het ongeregelde verleden. Over eenheid en verscheidenheid van het Nederlandse onderwijs*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1998.

- Boekholt, Pieter Th.F.M., and E.P. de Booy. *Geschiedenis van de school in Nederland vanaf de middeleeuwen tot aan de huidige tijd*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1987.
- Braster, Sjaak. "Het openbaar onderwijs als kameleon. Over christelijke en maatschappelijke deugden en het nationale onderwijsbeleid in Nederland, 1801–1920." In *Tot burgerschap en deugd. Volksopvoeding in de negentiende eeuw*, edited by Nelleke Bakker, Rudolf Dekker, and Angélique Janssens, 123–37. Hilversum: Verloren, 2006.
- Braster, Sjaak. *Passie en pragmatisme: de onderwijsinspectie en de opkomst en ondergang van het klassikaal onderwijs*. Utrecht: Inspectie van het onderwijs, 2011.
- Bruin, André A. de. *Het ontstaan van de schoolstrijd. Onderzoek naar de wortels van de schoolstrijd in de Noordelijke Nederlanden gedurende de eerste helft van de 19^e eeuw*. Den Haag: Nederlands Historisch Genootschap, 1985.
- Dagnino, Roberto. "A Dutch Traditionalism? J.G. le Sage ten Broek and the Reception of the Maistre, de Bonald, and Lamennais in the Netherlands, 1816–1834." In *Believers in the Nation: European Religious Minorities in the Age of Nationalism (1815–1914)*, edited by Roberto Dagnino and Alessandro Grazi, 53–75. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2017.
- Dagnino, Roberto, and Alessandro Grazi. *Believers in the Nation: European Religious Minorities in the Age of Nationalism (1815–1914)*. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2017.
- Dasberg, Lea, and J.W.G. Jansing. "Het socio-culturele leven in Nederland 1844–1875, onderwijs." *AGN* 12 (1977): 210–31.
- Dasberg, Lea, and J.W.G. Jansing. "Het socio-culturele leven in Nederland 1875–1895/1895–1914, Onderwijs." *AGN* 13 (1978): 129–44, 361–72.
- Dasberg, Lea, and J.W.G. Jansing. *Meer kennis meer kans. Het Nederlandse onderwijs 1834–1914*. Haarlem: Fibula van Dishoeck, 1978.
- Dekker, Jeroen J.H. *Het verlangen naar opvoeden. Over de groei van de pedagogische ruimte in Nederland sinds de Gouden Eeuw tot omstreeks 1900*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2006.
- Dekker, Jeroen J.H. "From Imaginations to Realities: The Transformation of Enlightenment Pedagogical Illusions of the Dutch Republic into Late 19th-Century Realities of the Dutch Monarchy." In *Schooling and the Making of Citizens in the Long Nineteenth Century*, edited by Daniel Tröhler, Thomas Popkewitz, and David Labaree, 50–69. New York: Routledge, 2011.

- Dekker, Jeroen J.H. “Philanthropie et rééducation, XVIIIe-XIXe siècles: Le modèle néerlandais.” In *Philanthropies et politiques sociales en Europe (XVIIIe-XXe siècles)*, edited by Colette Bec, Catherine Duprat, Jean-Noël Luc, and Jacques-Guy Petit, 45–61. Paris: Anthropos-Economica, 1994.
- Dekker, Jeroen J.H. *The Will to Change the Child: Re-education Homes for Children at Risk in Nineteenth Century Western Europe*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Dodde, Nan. L. *‘Een speurtocht naar samenhang.’ Het rijkschooltoezicht van 1801 tot 2001*. Den Haag: Inspectie van het Onderwijs, 2001.
- Essen, Mineke van. *Kwekeling tussen akte en ideaal. De opleiding tot onderwijzer(es) vanaf 1800*. Amsterdam: SUN, 2006.
- Exalto, John. *Van wie is het kind? Twee eeuwen onderwijsvrijheid in Nederland*. Amsterdam: Balans, 2017.
- Frijhoff, Willem. “Van onderwijs naar opvoedend onderwijs. Ontwikkelingen van opvoeding en onderwijs in Noord-Nederland in de achttiende eeuw.” In *Onderwijs en opvoeding in de achttiende eeuw. Verslag van het symposium, Doesburg 1982*, 3–39. Amsterdam: APA, 1983.
- Frijhoff, Willem. “La réforme de l’enseignement secondaire dans les départements hollandais.” In *Napoléon et les lycées. Enseignement et société en Europe au début du XIXe siècle*, edited by Jacques-Olivier Boudon, 165–93. Paris: Nouveau Monde Éditions, 2004.
- Gouw, Jan ter. *Beknopt historisch overzicht van onze nationale schoolwetgeving*. Amsterdam: C.L. Brinkman, 1862.
- Haan, Ido de. “Het onderwijs in de Grondwet. Van staatszorg tot vrijheidsrecht.” In *De eeuw van de grondwet. Grondwet en politiek in Nederland 1789–1917*, edited by N.C.F. van Sas and H. te Velde, 182–217. Deventer: Kluwer, 1998.
- Haan, Ido de. “Van staatszorg tot vrijheidsrecht. De schoolstrijd in de Nederlandse politiek en samenleving.” In *Tot burgerschap en deugd. Volksopvoeding in de negentiende eeuw*, edited by Nelleke Bakker, Rudolf Dekker, and Angélique Janssens, 81–103. Hilversum: Verloren, 2006.
- Hulshof, Hans, Erik Kwakernaak, and Frans Wilhelm. *Geschiedenis van het talenonderwijs in Nederland*. Groningen: Uitgeverij Passage, 2015.
- Jans, Jasper. “The Politics of History Education. Teaching National Belonging in the Netherlands, 1830–1880.” In *Believers in the Nation: European Religious Minorities in the Age of Nationalism (1815–1914)*, edited by Roberto Dagnino and Alessandro Grazi, 97–115. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2017.

- Kloek, Joost, Wijnandt Mijnhardt, and Eveline Koolhaas. *1800: Blauwdrukken voor een samenleving*. Den Haag: Sdu Uitgevers, 2001.
- Knippenberg, Hans. *Deelname aan het lager onderwijs in Nederland gedurende de negentiende eeuw*. Amsterdam: Instituut voor Sociale Geografie Universiteit van Amsterdam, 1986.
- Knippenberg, Hans, and Ben de Pater. *De eenwording van Nederland*. Nijmegen: Sun, 1988.
- Kox, Ton. *Kweekplaats van katholieke deugd. De onderwijsstrategie van de Congregatie van de Fraters van Tilburg tussen 1844 en 1916*. Tilburg: Stichting Zuidelijk Historisch Contact, 2014.
- Kruithof, Bernard. “‘Toegankelijk voor alle kinderen’. De grondwet van 1848 en het lager onderwijs.” In *Om de toekomst van het protestantse Nederland*, edited by G.J. Schutte and J. Vree, 152–72. Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1998.
- Langedijk, Dirk. *Bibliographie van den schoolstrijd 1795–1920*. Den Haag: Dr. Abraham Kuyper Stichting, 1931.
- Lenders, Jan. *De burger en de volksschool. Culturele en mentale achtergronden van een onderwijshervorming, Nederland 1780–1850*. Nijmegen: SUN, 1988.
- Lenders, Jan. “Van kind tot burger. Lager onderwijs en de vorming tot burgerschap in de negentiende eeuw.” In *Tot burgerschap en deugd. Volksopvoeding in de negentiende eeuw*, edited by Nelleke Bakker, Rudolf Dekker, and Angélique Janssens. Hilversum: Verloren, 2006.
- Lijphardt, Arend. *The Politics of Accommodation: Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.
- Los, Willeke. *Opvoeding tot mens en burger. Pedagogiek als Cultuurkritiek in Nederland in de 18^e eeuw*. Hilversum: Verloren, 2005.
- Mentink, Dick. “‘Vergeten’ onderwijsrecht. Over overheidszorg en de relatie tussen school en opvoeding.” In *Tweehonderd jaar onderwijs en de zorg van de Staat*, edited by P. Boekholt, H. van Crombrugge, N.L. Dodde, and J. Tyssens, 75–86. Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum, 2002.
- Proceedings of the Lower House (PLH) [Handelingen van de Tweede Kamer], forming part of the Proceedings of both houses of Parliament [Handelingen van de Eerste en Tweede Kamer van de Staten-Generaal].
- Raedts, Peter. “A Prudent Search for Equality. The First Emancipation of Catholics in England and the Netherlands.” In *Believers in the Nation: European Religious Minorities in the Age of Nationalism (1815–1914)*, edited by Roberto Dagnino and Alessandro Grazi, 1–17. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2017.

- Righart, Hans. *De katholieke zuil in Europa. Het ontstaan van de verzuiling onder katholieken in Oostenrijk, Zwitserland, België en Nederland*. Amsterdam: Boom, 1986.
- Roosenboom, Henk Th.M. *De dorpsschool in de Meijerij van's-Hertogenbosch van 1648 tot 1795*. Tilburg: Zuidelijk Historisch Contact, 1997.
- Sas, Niek C.F. van. *De metamorfose van Nederland. Van oude orde naar moderniteit, 1750–1900*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2004.
- Toes, Richard. *De toets der kritiek. Het reformatorisch voortgezet onderwijs en de onderwijsvernieuwingen (1970–2005)*. Apeldoorn: Labarum Academic, 2015.
- Tröhler, Daniel. "Curriculum History or the Educational Construction of Europe in the Long Nineteenth Century." *European Educational Research Journal* 15, no. 3 (2016): 279–97.
- Tröhler, Daniel, Thomas Popkewitz, and David Labaree eds. *Schooling and the Making of Citizens in the Long Nineteenth Century: Comparative Visions*. New York: Routledge, 2011.