

---

# ‘We imagined ourselves back under the German Occupation’

Generational transfer in the Dutch Trotskyist movement during the ‘long 1950s’

*Bart van der Steen and Ron Blom*

---

## **Abstract**

The extent of intergenerational transfer of political styles, values and attitudes within political movements during the 1960s is often overlooked, as previous studies have often focused on generational conflict. This contribution seeks to analyse processes of intergenerational transfer in detail through an analysis of the Dutch Trotskyist movement in the 1950s and 1960s. The Trotskyist movement appealed to youths precisely because of the continuity it represented with the politics and ideology of pre-war radical movements. As practices and mentalities were transferred from one generation to the following (and subsequently adapted and changed), Trotskyist youths were not only trained extensively in Marxist theory, but also taught to organise clandestinely and instilled with fears of infiltration and repression – fears that the older generation had carried with them since the 1940s. A second generational turnover within the movement in the late 1960s however illustrates how different groups focused on, and felt drawn to, different aspects of the Trotskyists’ pre-war history. Even more so, their varying views on the history of Dutch Trotskyism became itself part of misunderstandings between second and third generation Trotskyists, illustrating how dependent historical perceptions are on contemporary factors.

**Key words:** Political culture, Trotskyism, Netherlands, long 1950s, generational transfer

The concept of generational conflict has been central in many reconstructions and analyses of the 1960s youth revolts.<sup>1</sup> However, radical youths did not simply break with the attitudes and values of their parents and political predecessors.<sup>2</sup> Many were in fact inspired by the actions and

recollections of veteran activists, who had been politically active during the 1930s and 1940s. The recent past played an important role in the perceptions and politicisation of these youths. This is shown by the explicit ways in which radicals referred back to revolutionary movements from the 1920s and 1930s as well as continuous debates about the Second World War and fascism.<sup>3</sup> In the historiography of '1968', these forms of generational continuity have, however, received only little attention. As a result, the transfer of political programmes, styles and action repertoires from older activists to activist youths in the 1960s has often been neglected. Because of this, there exists only scarce knowledge on the workings of generational transfer within social movements.

The phenomenon of generational continuity and generational transfer of political styles, values and attitudes can be studied in detail through an analysis of the Dutch Trotskyist movement in the 1950s and 1960s. In this era, the Trotskyist movement appealed to youths precisely because of the continuity it represented with the politics and ideology of pre-war radical movements. This continuity was one of the main reasons for the renaissance of international Trotskyism in the 1960s.<sup>4</sup> The Trotskyist movement became especially sizable and influential in England and France,<sup>5</sup> but in the Netherlands, too, the Trotskyists played an important role in the build-up to the spectacular conflicts of the late 1960s.

The Trotskyist movement in the Netherlands has always been small but resilient, organising between dozens and hundreds of activists. A direct organisational continuity can be drawn from 1938 – when the Groep van Bolsjewiki-Leninisten (Group of Bolsheviki-Leninists, GBL) was founded – to the present organisation Socialistische Alternatieve Politiek (Socialist Alternative Politics, SAP). Although the Dutch Trotskyists never became as prominent as those in England or France, they did play an important role as instigator and catalyst of the 1960s youth revolt.<sup>6</sup> Trotskyist and Trotsky-inspired youths were the driving forces behind the anticolonial solidarity movement with the Algerian Front de Libération National (National Liberation Front, FLN), one of the first new social movements in the Netherlands.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, they had close contacts to the libertarian Provo movement, which became notorious for disrupting the wedding celebrations of crown princess Beatrix in Amsterdam in 1966. As the royal couple entered the city centre in a golden carriage in 1966, the Provos set off a smoke bomb, receiving international media attention.<sup>8</sup> Finally, the Trotskyists influenced emerging radical youth movements with their revolutionary Marxist ideas (The Dutch translation of Ernest Mandel's *Introduction to Marxist Economics* was a best-seller).<sup>9</sup>

The fact that the Trotskyist movement did not become a prominent force within the Dutch activist scene of the 1960s and 1970s is often explained by the particularities of Dutch political culture during this era. Since the 1990s, several scholars have claimed that Provo played a central role in shaping Dutch political culture in general and especially on the left from the 1960s onwards. As Provo set a precedent of 'playful' interventions aimed at getting media coverage, to which the government ultimately responded in a non-repressive and constructive way, political space was created for a creative, 'soft' left, leaving far less space for a confrontational 'hard' left. Leninist or even anti-imperialist groups and organisations never played as prominent a role in Dutch 1960s and 1970s activist culture as they did in some surrounding countries.<sup>10</sup>

This paper aims to analyze how political styles, values and attitudes were transferred from one generation to another within the Dutch Trotskyist movement in the 1950s and 1960s. The concept of transfer is usually employed by social scientists and political historians to reconstruct and analyze the exchange of ideas, concepts and styles across geographical borders.<sup>11</sup> Migration historians, criminologists and psychiatrists have tried to explain the transfer of identities and family values, anti-social behaviour, and trauma respectively from one generation to another.<sup>12</sup> However, the present study focuses on the transfer of political styles, values and attitudes between generations of political activists. By focusing on how norms, values and attitudes were transferred within a single political movement, the present research lies closer to popular or collective memory studies. However, it takes on a more 'narrow' approach, in that it aims to reconstruct these processes of transfer within a delimited group, rather than societies or national cultures.<sup>13</sup> The Dutch Trotskyist movement lends itself perfectly for such a case study, because it involves a well-defined movement, with clear boundaries and comprising three active and well defined generations.

### **Researching generational transfer: concepts, sources and methods**

The concept of 'generation' is a viciously disputed topic amongst historians. There have been repeated complaints that events and processes are explained by referring to generational conflict or change, without providing explicit definitions or conceptualisations.<sup>14</sup> Paraphrasing Detlef Siegfried we could refer to generation as 'a label which means so much and explains so little'.<sup>15</sup> Karl Mannheim pioneered the field of generational research in the 1930s, making a distinction between generation 'an sich'

and 'für sich'; thus implying that the first could be 'objectively' defined and measured statistically, while the second was more of a subjective, *felt* relation to a specific group.<sup>16</sup> In the latter case, generation was a politically loaded term, not so much referring to all people of a certain age, but rather to a certain group who shared similar styles, values and attitudes, and assumed that they had gone through similar life-forming experiences. In this respect, generation was not simply a matter of age – or, as the New Left activist Jerry Rubin once put it: 'You're only as old as you wanna be. Age is in your head'.<sup>17</sup> The present contribution employs a more moderate definition of generation, relating it above all to organisation. In the history of Dutch Trotskyism, three moments can be discerned in which young people joined the movement: the mid-1930s, the late 1950s and the late 1960s. Not age per se, but rather the combination of being of similar age and joining the same organisation at a similar moment – and thus going through a similar process of getting to know the organisation and each other – together form the basis of our definition of generation in this paper. Using Mannheim's terminology, this constituted a 'generational unit'.

When social scientists study processes of transfer, their attention is not so much focused on the action repertoire (or some other political or cultural expression) of one group, but rather on how other groups adopt the repertoire of the first group and then 'domesticate' it to make it 'fit' their own local, social and temporal circumstances.<sup>18</sup> These processes of 'transfer/transformation' are inherently riddled with distortions, contradictions and misunderstandings. To grasp the complexities of such a process, especially when analyzing generational transfer, a focus on individual experiences is central. For this reason, rather than focusing on official party documents, this paper is based on a close reading of ego documents. This allows for a detailed analysis of the ways in which political styles, norms and attitudes were perceived, transferred and transformed.<sup>19</sup>

The two main types of sources informing this study are autobiographies by and interviews with movement veterans. In past decades, debates have flourished over the ways in which these sources should be analyzed, and how to disentangle the relationship between the individual and the collective in them. An early contribution to this debate was presented by the Popular Memory Group in 1982, who held that memories are 'strangely composite constructions', so that private memories cannot 'be readily unscrambled from the effects of dominant historical discourses'.<sup>20</sup> Luisa Passerini furthermore emphasised that the present mindset of the person who is remembering is of great influence on the memories that are revived: 'Everyday life provides the raw material for the communication of

complex cultural information ... Real experience is subsumed by the symbolic framework'.<sup>21</sup> Consciously and subconsciously, people relate to the present and adapt their stories when retelling past experiences. The interaction between the individual and the collective was central in an oral history project led by Selma Leydesdorf on the Dutch flood of 1953. Her research showed how victims of the flood who shared their memories decades later, integrated stories and anecdotes from bestseller novels on the disaster into personal accounts and even presented the latter as personal memories.<sup>22</sup> Autobiographies are on the one hand presentations and interpretations of oneself, rather than simply 'truthful' recollections of past experiences. At the same time, they are constructions that reveal how culture informs both how events are remembered as well as the ways in which they are told.<sup>23</sup> Exactly because working with ego documents opens up a field of tension between the individual and the collective, it is such a rich source for analyzing what kinds of collective ideas, forms and attitudes are internalised and subsequently presented as interpretations of oneself.

Our approach is strongly connected to new approaches towards party history. In the Netherlands, the political historians Henk te Velde and Gerrit Voerman in particular have argued for a more cultural approach to political history and the history of political parties,<sup>24</sup> adopting concepts and methods from social sciences and anthropology to reconstruct and analyze the mentalities and attitudes of party members. It aims to discern what it meant to be a party member, and in what way membership was part of individual and collective identities. Te Velde has argued in favour of a focus on the 'sense of purpose that people historically connected to being part of a political movement' and focus on party culture. Voerman describes this as 'a combination ... of orientations, styles and forms'. In particular, Voerman claims that it is essential to analyze party culture in 'a broader social-cultural context' and focus on the 'interactional process between moral community, party and political domain'. We take this latter comment into account, by explicitly including the Dutch political culture of the 'long 1950s' in our analysis. However, we also claim that a cultural approach should above all be applied in analyzing the internal dynamics of political parties, and take our cue from recent contributions in this field.<sup>25</sup> In party history, too, the concept of generation is often invoked – mainly to explain internal conflicts – but rarely elaborated upon.

With regards to the historiography of Dutch Trotskyism, one can say that the topic has been relatively well covered. A series of books and theses reconstruct the organisational history of the movement from 1938 until the early 1960s.<sup>26</sup> One central weakness of the historiography, however, is

that it almost exclusively focuses on the political and organisational history of the movement. While more cultural approaches to the history of socialism and communism have played an important role in the revitalisation of labour history, historians of the Trotskyist movement have been slow to follow.<sup>27</sup> This article aims to promote new approaches to Trotskyist history, by focusing on the political culture of the movement and the transgenerational transfer of styles, values and attitudes, drawing from ego documents.<sup>28</sup>

### **Three generations of Trotskyist activists during the long 1950s**

The activities of the first generation of Trotskyists play an important role in explaining the movement's resilience. Politicised in the 1930s, many of them remained politically active until the late 1950s or later, thereby carrying the banner of permanent revolution well into the 1960s. During the mid-1950s, activists from the first generation managed to recruit several youths, who formed the second generation of Trotskyists. In the late 1960s, a new group of youths were politicised by new radical youth movements and subsequently flocked into the Trotskyist movement. When the latter moved on to found the Internationale Kommunistenbond (International Communist League, IKB) in 1972, most of the activists of the first and second generation had left. The IKB represented a political and organisational continuity, as it became a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International. Still, socially and culturally it signified a new start.

Although it may be understandable that some of the older activists took a step back after thirty years of activism, it is rather surprising that the second generation resigned from politics so early. A key characteristic of Dutch Trotskyism has after all been its continuing appeal and ability to keep its activists mobilised for decades. This has been the case for both the first and the third generation. A possible explanation may lie in the incomplete integration of the second generation within the Trotskyist movement. Traumatised by the German occupation (1940-1945) and made paranoid by the politics of clandestine 'deep entryism' in the social democratic movement during the 1950s, the first generation grew increasingly committed to clandestine forms of organisation. In doing so, it closed itself off from newcomers. Trotskyist youths, as a consequence, organised independently in socialist youth groups. There, they tried to mobilise new activists, without mentioning their adherence to the Trotskyist movement. Although this is part of the explanation, we should note that it was an explicit political choice of the Trotskyists to

recruit among socialist youth movements. Furthermore, while the youths organised independently, they stayed in close contact with Trotskyist veterans. It seems rather, that the youths of the 1950s had grave difficulties connecting with the youths of the 1960s, who had been politicised under very different circumstances.

This research focuses on political radicalism in the 1950s and early 1960s in the Netherlands. Traditionally, the era is seen as dominated by an oppressive social, political and cultural consensus. Colonial war with Indonesia, the rise of the Cold War and the adoption of Keynesian economic policy led to the integration of the social democratic labour movement into the political establishment. The labour party became part of the government in 1946, while the trade unions were integrated into official economic policy. This severely limited opportunities for political protest outside of the official socialist movement.<sup>29</sup> This became even more true as a result of the increasing political and social isolation of the Stalinist communist party during this period. The communist-led trade union Eenheidsvakcentrale (Unity Trade Union Congress, EVC) counted 180,000 members in 1945, but was never officially recognised and began disintegrating from 1949 onwards.<sup>30</sup> The communist party had won ten percent of the vote in 1946, but was ignored in parliamentary debate, ousted from local government and started losing votes steadily from the 1950s onwards.<sup>31</sup>

One factor in particular explains the absence of sizable opposition movements in the Netherlands during the 1950s, and that is the 'pillarized' structure of Dutch society in the 1950s.<sup>32</sup> The historian Frieso Wielenga has described pillarization as the 'subcultural segmentation' of society along political and religious divides. It meant that the socialist, catholic and protestant pillars had 'their own party, trade union and media'. Simultaneously, 'terrains that were not directly related to specific views on life and politics (sport, leisure, cultural activities, etc.) gained a pillarized character'.<sup>33</sup> Combined, this led to great political stability and little space for radical political movements. Only in the 1960s would this system be subverted by processes of 'depillarization', the rise of new political parties the emergence of new social movements, and of a new generation of politicians who employed a more confrontational style.

Recently, the 1950s have received renewed attention from Dutch historians. The main historiographical debates revolve around the question whether the 1960s posed a radical break with the previous era or rather gradually grew out of the 1950s.<sup>34</sup> Polemically, the debate has revolved around the concepts of the 'long 1950s' and the 'long 1960s'. The former emphasises the economic change and cultural renewal that was already

taking place during the 1950s, and thus relativises the novelty of political, social and cultural changes unfolding in the 1960s. The latter stresses that, although the groundwork of many developments were laid in the 1950s, it was only in the 1960s that they started to interact and boost each other to form an explosive political cocktail. The historian Siep Stuurman has proposed a very helpful conceptual framework, arguing that although the 1950s were characterised by political stability, traditional attitudes and opinions were already being silently undermined.<sup>35</sup> The Dutch Trotskyist movement fits this conception neatly. Although it was small and seemingly ineffectual during the 1950s, their actions laid the groundwork for many of the radical movements to follow.

### **Entryism and 'illegalitis': the first generation**

When the GBL was founded in 1938, it brought together only a handful of youths. In 1939, it participated in the regional elections in Zuid-Holland and received 644 votes. The youths did not split from the communist party – as most Trotskyist groups and parties around the world had done – but from the *Revolutionair Socialistische Arbeiderspartij* (Revolutionary Socialist Workers Party, RSAP). The RSAP was a small party which had already split from the communist party in 1927 and by the late 1930s organised a thousand members.<sup>36</sup> The GBL was thus an offshoot-of-an-offshoot and their resulting marginal position would greatly affect their group culture. A second factor influencing the group culture was the young age of the activists, their focus on political education and belief in the power of the written word.

One of the activists would later remember how the group discussed politics. 'Harry could argue fiercely with his hoarse voice. He did not accept compromises and his enthusiasm was boundless. Theo, his best friend in those days, had rather an opposite personality. He was the picture of calm. He was able curl up quietly on the couch, while the debates around him intensified. He would read a newspaper or a book, while simultaneously turning on the radio to listen to the news on some foreign radio station – still being able to follow all the conversations in the room. Every now and then, he would interrupt his uncurbed friend, with a calm that only he could muster, with a counter argument that testified his knowledge on a specific topic. Directly after, he would dive into his literature'.<sup>37</sup>

The focus on the written word became especially clear during the German occupation. The group consisted of no more than fifty activists, but all the same managed to publish three newspapers.<sup>38</sup> They went to great

lengths to distribute them throughout the country.<sup>39</sup> Members were also involved in other (non-violent) resistance activities, but rather on an individual basis. The movement focused its energies on the underground press.

The German occupation proved to be extremely traumatic for the Trotskyists. As the leadership of the RSAP was arrested and executed in April 1942, the youths lost family members and close friends. The Hague activist Andries Dolleman lost his father, while the Amsterdam Trotskyist Sal Santen lost his father in law, Henk Sneevliet – the leader of the RSAP. Their deaths were experienced as a command to continue the resistance.<sup>40</sup> The same was true for the Rotterdam Trotskyist and Spanish Civil War veteran Piet van 't Hart. He had been a member of the leadership of the illegal RSAP and was arrested before April 1942. He was released in May 1942, only to find out that his comrades had been executed weeks earlier. Together, they formed the Trotskyist resistance organisation Comité van Revolutionaire Marxisten (Committee of Revolutionary Marxists, CRM).<sup>41</sup> After the War, many more Trotskyists had to mourn family members. The Jewish activists Sal Santen, Maurice Ferares and Max Plekker had lost almost all of their family members to the Holocaust.<sup>42</sup>

The direct postwar years were dedicated to building up a new political party, the Revolutionair Communistische Partij (Revolutionary Communist Party, RCP). After this project failed, several activists quit, while the remaining members opted for a strategy of 'deep entryism' within the social democratic movement. In 1952, the RCP was officially disbanded. In the early 1950s, the Cold War, the invention of the nuclear bomb and the Korea War made the Trotskyists fearful of a Third World War. According to their analysis of the situation, there was no more time to build independent parties. Workers would 'instinctively' look for protection by supporting the mass labour parties. The Trotskyist goal therefore became to 'be with the masses', so as to lead them at the moment of the expected radicalisation. In a retrospect, Santen stated: 'We expected that the radicalization would occur within the existing mass organisations and wanted to be a part of that'.<sup>43</sup> In his autobiography *Adiós compañeros!*, he described the way that Michel Raptis (alias Pablo), the international leader of the Fourth International, analyzed the situation in 1952: 'Imperialism has set course to a Third World War which will become a possibility from 1953 onwards. That clash [will] have the character of a war/revolution, the end struggle between counter revolution and revolution on a world scale, and in that complicated form, the world revolution itself'.<sup>44</sup>

For this strategy to be successful, however, the Trotskyists deemed it imperative to keep their affiliation to the Trotskyist movement strictly

secret. Clandestine ways of meeting, which had been adopted during the German occupation, were taken up again years after the World War and soon became second nature to the activists. For some Trotskyists, the war would never be over. Ellen Santen remembered the effects of working clandestinely on her family, as her father Sal Santen was one of the leading members of the international movement as well as of the Dutch section: 'It seemed as if the illegality of the occupation years continued ... Again we were "different"'.<sup>45</sup> Critical members would later state that the movement was caught in a state of 'collective psychosis' and was obsessed by 'illegalitis'; the habit of doing things in a clandestine way.<sup>46</sup>

The situation got more tense, as the Dutch secret service Binnenlandse Veiligheidsdienst (Internal Security Agency, BVD), started following the Trotskyist movement more closely.<sup>47</sup> Already in April 1952, it informed the minister of justice of the Trotskyists' actions: 'With regard to activities within the labour party, the RCP has assigned its members not to make any political propaganda that could compromise them, and above all focus on establishing personal connections with "proletarian elements"'.<sup>48</sup> Still, in shadowing the Trotskyists, the BVD made occasional mistakes. In one case, an activist received several letters addressed to him and other Trotskyists, accidentally glued together, thus showing that their letters were being checked.<sup>49</sup> In another instance, an activist who had brought a fellow-activist home and spent some time talking to her at the door, was reproached by a man stating: 'OK, this has taken long enough already. Go home! I want to go to bed too!'<sup>50</sup> Activists were obviously being shadowed. The BVD also kept the labour party informed of the Trotskyists activities. When the previously mentioned activist had lunch with a labour party official, the latter exclaimed: 'You are a talent, but you are also an infiltrator ... we hear everything from the BVD. We need to keep the communists and Trotskyists off our backs'.<sup>51</sup>

These experiences only worked to reinforce the paranoia of the Trotskyists. One of them would later remember: 'After meetings, those in attendance would leave one at a time. In the 1960s! ... We demanded that each would leave one after another ... At that time, we were in the grip of a collective psychosis'.<sup>52</sup> Another activist remembers a similar incident, when the Trotskyists organised a First of May celebration in the early 1960s. The venue had been booked under the name of a fictional travel association, where a comrade from Latin America gave a speech. 'Just as he forcefully described the heroic resistance of the workers in the Bolivian tin mines, the waiter entered unannounced with coffee'. As agreed, the gathered group started to look at vacation photos 'in an artificially relaxed way'. The Latin

American comrade however had not been informed about this disguise, and 'continued talking in a loud voice': 'Obviously, he believed that we had lost interest for his report, so he stood up and raised his voice even more. It took some time before Sal [Santen] had explained to him the meaning of our intermezzo'. This strange conflict left the activist with mixed feelings: 'My impression was that the waiter took excessive time to serve everyone. Did I only imagine that he left the room with furrowed brows?'<sup>53</sup>

The clandestine way of working made it seemingly impossible to recruit new members for the Trotskyist movement. As the movement became smaller, it became an ever more tightly knit group. New members were mainly recruited in family networks or through circles of friends. Thus, Sal's daughter Ellen Santen became involved in the movement, as well as her partner Huib Riethof. Nienke Oeldrich, who also joined the movement, was the daughter of the resistance veteran Ab Oeldrich. New members such as Igor Cornelissen, who had come from Zwolle to Amsterdam to go to university, were initially approached indirectly. Without ever asking for it, he started to receive the Trotskyist newsletter. Only later, he was invited to join the movement.

Ellen Santen's autobiographical work illustrates how political values were transferred in a familial setting. With her father being a leading Trotskyist, she learned at home 'that being Jewish is subservient to your class and political stance'. During the war, her grandparents from her mother's side were persecuted for resistance work, while her grandparents from her father's side, as well as her uncle, were murdered in Auschwitz because they were Jews. At home, there lay a taboo on talking about the war. At the same time, for Santen her family's suffering was seen as an assignment: she had to make sure that 'it' would never happen again, through revolutionary work. At home, she learned not to sing the national anthem during the national commemoration at school. As a family, they went to an alternative memorial service. In 1956, her father explained to her why proclaiming solidarity with the Hungarian uprising would only serve to foster anticommunist sentiments: 'After the explanation, it felt self-evident not to join'. At home, the social and political merged and acquainted her with politics. She recounts sessions at home, where Jewish comrades would often come and visit, and where 'vicious and sometimes bitter arguments' were alternated with jokes and laughs.<sup>54</sup>

People who signed up but were unknown, were treated with caution and distrust. This for example happened with a typographer from The Hague. He had visited a conference, where he had 'zealously made notes', but had not participated in any of the discussions. This aroused the

suspicions of the group. During a follow-up meeting, the typographer was accused of being a secret agent. After a brief discussion, he was told that he was 'expelled and should leave'. The whole ordeal was disappointing: 'Finally, we had a worker in The Hague as a member and now we had to assume that he worked for the class enemy'.<sup>55</sup>

### **Reliving the German occupation: images of 'resistance' in the second generation**

During the 1950s, several youths were recruited by the Trotskyists. Most of these youths were either family or otherwise closely related to the first generation. As a result, politics and personal lives became closely connected. During the new year's holiday of 1959-1960, Huib Riethof and Ellen Santen made their first foreign trip. They drove to Paris in a small Renault, only to find out later that the trunk was 'filled to the brim' with false identity papers for FLN-fighters in France. At their arrival, they were pampered by their foreign comrades, 'because we were the kids of "Sal", a mythical figure for them, especially because he was the closest associate of "Pablo"'.<sup>56</sup>

By this time, the Trotskyist movement was thoroughly divided. In 1960, the section split over the politics of entryism, and a majority severed its ties to the Fourth International.<sup>57</sup> In their attempts to influence the social democratic movement, their ties to the Fourth International had proven to be a hindrance. The majority remained committed to articulating radical views within the social democratic movement. Still, they broke with the official Trotskyist movement. A small minority kept the official section alive, while trying – just as the majority – to influence the social democratic movement. Other activists from the first generation had taken refuge in the radical left Pacifistisch Socialistische Partij (Pacifist Socialist Party, PSP). When the left politician and historian Ger Harmsen met the official Trotskyists months later, they were still 'full of the split' and spoke bitterly of the dissenters.<sup>58</sup> Looking back, Sal Santen remarked ruefully: 'Rather than radicalization [of the social democratic movement], the move brought about the adaptation of many Trotskyists to the official socialist movement'.<sup>59</sup>

In a similar way, the Trotskyist youths were spread out over a dozen organisations. The 'ex-Trotskyists' in the social democratic movement founded the Socialistische Jeugd (Socialist Youth, SJ), which was strongly influenced by Trotskyist ideas. The minority of 'official' Trotskyists encouraged their youth members to form an informal network of socialist

meeting groups (Socialistische Ontmoetingskernen, SOK) within the social democratic youth movement Ruimte (Space). They also stimulated student activists to try and take over the social democratic student organisation Politeia. Finally, a small group around Riethof organised independently, while officially supporting the politics of the Trotskyist section. In practice however, Trotskyist youths formed an informal network in which organisational affiliation mattered far less.

Youth activism in the late 1950s consisted of attending meetings, organising political education, some early political actions in the streets and a great deal of socialising. Some actions already echoed the spectacular anti-authoritarian and anti-imperialist actions of the late 1960s. This was the case when youths invited FLN officials to speak in Amsterdam. The event was banned by government decree, after which the Trotskyists organised an alternative event where they played a record with a previously conducted interview with the FLN officials.<sup>60</sup>

Transfer of values, opinions and experiences took place during formal and informal meetings with members of the first generation. In the process, feelings of paranoia and a perceived necessity to organise clandestinely were also transferred. In the first place, these feelings were linked to being a Trotskyist. Lisette Lewin was a radical youth in the 1950s and remembers how she felt after Igor Cornelissen had told her in secret about the Fourth International. In the format of an autobiographical novel, she wrote about 'Leon' (Cornelissen) and herself (Emma): 'Leon told about Trotsky ... In the Netherlands too, there existed a secret and small section of Trotsky's world party. The "Dutch section" worked from the underground ... He told her that she was to never, ever speak with anyone about the "Dutch section". Emma swore that he could trust her completely. Even when they were alone, she did not dare to ask Leon about the world party. There could be a denunciator nearby. The world party was more underground than ever. Emma could already see how she would find Leon, drenched in blood. Murdered because she had tattled'.<sup>61</sup>

Igor Cornelissen later remembered how he had tried to recruit Lewin for courier work for the movement. 'One time ... Lisette Lewin was to deliver a letter for me. Without doubt, it must have been an important document that could not fall into the wrong hands. I explained to her which tram to take, where to get off, which bus to change to and where to get out. All this with a very heavy voice, as if she was the fourteen year old daughter of a worker who had never seen a tram'. The seriousness of the matter became clear when Lewin showed that she was not as deeply into the movement as Cornelissen. After his travel directions, he continued:

‘If a balding man of about fifty years old opens the door ...’ “I take out my revolver and shoot him”, Lewin finished my sentence wittily. I was beyond angry’. Cornelissen accused Lewin of seeing the movement as on the same level as ‘a volleyball club’, and refused any further help, because: ‘Trotskyism was serious business. We were ... threatened and persecuted all over the world. If it was not the Gestapo, it was the GPU or the CIA’.<sup>62</sup>

The secretive way of working of the first generation was adopted by the young people. In similar ways, this regularly led to conflicts with other youths. At one point, Trotskyist young people were excluded from the editorial board of a youth magazine, because they had kept their affiliation to the Trotskyist movement a secret. In a report to the minister of justice, the BVD stated that ‘the other editors did not want to ... function as tools for the Trotskyist cause’.<sup>63</sup>

The clandestine way of working and the feeling of being part of a small but dedicated underground movement also fed into memories and popular imageries of resistance against the German occupation. Trotskyist youths had experienced the war, but only as small children. Still, stories and images of the anti-Nazi resistance soon formed the background against which the youths styled their own political work. This, too, echoed sentiments that would form an important factor in the 1960s youth revolts.

Two further recollections of Lewin illustrate how paranoia and resistance stories fed into the experiences of the youths. During a conversation in a café, Lewin was introduced to a conscientious objector, who explained her that he was a revolutionary and thus not a pacifist. On her question if he, then, wanted to kill people, the other replied: ‘Not if I don’t have to. Only if it is necessary’. And he continued, linking the present to the past: ‘In the resistance, during the war, you had to, and when you fight in the FLN in Algeria, you have no choice’. The conversation was then cut off by a comrade, who stated: ‘Be careful, the secret service is listening’.<sup>64</sup> Thus radical activism, anti-colonial war, and suspected surveillance by secret services were all linked to images and stories of the German occupation.

When Lewin and Cornelissen were arrested during a nightly round of street fly-posting, the subsequent events were explicitly experienced by Lewin in terms which resembled the wartime resistance. When the police officer asked her where they had started, she lied and answered ‘on the Waterlooplein’. She was escorted back from the interrogation room and walked past Cornelissen, only to whisper: ‘Started on the Waterlooplein’: ‘[Igor] acknowledged with a slight, hardly noticeable blink of an eye. Thus, [Lisette] saved [sic] the Kalverstraat and the Rembrandtplein. It was a moment of intense satisfaction and fellowship. She was part of the resistance’.<sup>65</sup>

In 1960, it became clear that the Trotskyists' clandestine ways of organising were not devoid of reason. On 10 June, Sal Santen and Pablo were arrested and accused of trying to forge French Francs on a mass scale so as to help the FLN in their struggle against France. To do so, they had set up a workshop in the West German city of Osnabrück. The BVD caught on and stopped the operation at the exact moment that all machines were installed. According to the historian Fritz Keller by that time the first suitcases had already been filled with forged banknotes.<sup>66</sup> Santen and Pablo were held in custody for fifteen months.<sup>67</sup>

The Trotskyists' response was to leave their homes and take on false names until the situation had cooled down. Riethof remembered: 'I remember an empty student's room, with the curtains fluttering out the open window. The inhabitant had fled. Others remained out camping until well into fall ... The camping sites grew emptier, but still they lived with the illusion that they did not stand out. By the end of October, we finally had gathered them all. They were suffering from severe "illegalitis"'.<sup>68</sup> Or, as Cornelissen remembers: 'A certain fear took hold. People imagined themselves back under the German Occupation'.<sup>69</sup>

Both in the first and the second generation of the Trotskyist movement, Jewish members played a prominent role. For example, Cornelissen and Lewin were Jewish, as was their comrade Geert van Tijn. For them, the arrests of Santen and Pablo revived memories and images of the Holocaust. In a recollection, Cornelissen described the psychological state that the arrests brought about, as he described a nightmare that he experienced after the arrest of Santen and Pablo, which showed that he, too, 'had been affected by slight paranoia': 'I was visited by two men in white coats, one with an injection needle pointed in my direction, who tried to friendly persuade me to accept their treatment. I resisted forcefully and woke up with a bleeding hand'. In his dream, Cornelissen had stepped out of bed and hit the door of the balcony, 'right at the spot where there was a nail': 'What had I all mixed up? The Moscow show trials? The conspiracy of the Murderers in White Coats, Stalin's last anti-Semitic campaign. Or simply the "medical tests" in German camps – I had not been there, but a part of my family had'.<sup>70</sup>

Of course, the attitudes of the Trotskyist youths were also, in part, characterised by boisterousness and humour. Cornelissen remembers of his time as leader of Politeia: 'No student association could organise an introductory meeting without us being there. As if it was 1907, we demanded debate, agitated and never missed the opportunity to mention Politeia a number of times'.<sup>71</sup> Lewin remembers Cornelissen's statement at that time:

‘Next time, when we have the meeting on the FLN, we should add again that Sartre has been invited as a speaker. That always attracts attention’.<sup>72</sup> Still, feelings of persecution and fear of repression were never far away.

Even so, it was clear that the Trotskyist youths faced different risks as a result of their activism than the first generation. They talked about clandestine actions and framed their experiences through memories and images of the German occupation. Still, their actions were not particularly dangerous. For the Trotskyist veterans of the 1930s, there was more at stake. This can be illustrated through their differing practices of internationalism. Santen and Pablo had, after all, been arrested for trying to forge French bank notes, and had previously been involved in forging identity cards for the FLN, while other members of the first generation had travelled to Morocco to work in a clandestine arms factory set up to aid the FLN.<sup>73</sup> The members of the second generation had organised photo exhibitions and public meetings to denounce the French involvement in the Algerian war. They had not been included in clandestine work by the members of the first generation, other than occasional courier work. Rather, the focus of their activities had been organising and radicalising socialist youths in the Netherlands.

The recollections of Santen, Lewin and Cornelissen illustrate how they interpreted their own activities within a framework of the German Occupation, resistance and betrayal. This was not so much done during actions themselves, but rather in the setting of private talks, cafés and at home. While public stories about the war played a role in this, so did the youths’ own experiences and images of the war and the stories they were told by veteran activists. As a result, mentally the two generations were close in sharing similar attitudes towards activism and its meaning – even when the nature and intensity of their activities differed.

### **New Possibilities in a new era: the emergence of the third generation**

In the mid-1960s, a new (third) generation of youths was drawn to the Trotskyist movement. Dutch Trotsky-inspired youths came from groups such as the Socialistische Jeugd, Politeia and the Pacifistisch Socialistische Partij. They were mainly inspired and influenced by the rise of new radical youth movements. In their turn to Trotskyism, the youths were above all inspired by Ernest Mandel, and it was contact with him that prompted them to join the official Trotskyist movement. Soon after, they forged ties with veterans of the first generation in the Netherlands. In The Hague

they invited Herman Drenth to organise political education. Drenth had been a member of the majority that had left the Trotskyist movement in 1960. The young activist Roel Wuite remembered him: 'He needed much space in the most literal sense of the word: he needed to spread out his left leg because he was plagued by a stiff knee. Using cyclostyled papers, he would explore the globe, focusing on a number of centres of power: the United States, the Soviet Union and communist China'.<sup>74</sup>

In Amsterdam, Rein van der Horst played an important role in the political education of the Trotskyist youths. He later remembered how he passed on knowledge that he himself had gained in the 1930s: '[In 1938,] Drenth gave me the pamphlet *Historical Materialism explained to Workers* by Herman Gorter. To me, it was a revelation, everything suddenly fell into its place ... One of the first things that I later did in Proletaries Links [Proletarian Left (PL), the direct precursor to the IKB], in 1972, was to insist that we publish the pamphlet again in a new edition'.<sup>75</sup> Another veteran who joined the youths was Theo Wiering. He had left the movement in the late 1940s, but now became active again. For the Amsterdam youths, he became sort of a mentor. One of them remembered: 'Theo was not only present everywhere and all the time, he also was a skilled teacher. He was always willing and able to give courses in Marxist economy'.<sup>76</sup> And Igor Cornelissen remembered how he had a special appeal towards the youths: 'Theo was imperturbable. Skimpy, a bit sunken and with hair down to his neck, he had an excellent rapport with the youths, who saw him as an aging Provo'.<sup>77</sup> Thus, several veterans got into contact with Trotskyist youths and transferred theoretical, political and practical knowledge, as well as political values and styles.

At the same time, contacts with activists from the second generation were sparse. Most of them had left the Trotskyist movement by the early 1960s, or had resigned from politics altogether. Cornelissen drifted out of the Trotskyist movement and refocused his energies on his work for the left weekly *Vrij Nederland*. Lewin had never been an official member of the Dutch section and from the mid-1960s onwards started concentrating on her journalistic and literary work. Geert van Tijn, who had led Politeia together with Cornelissen, became a conductor and singing coach. Ellen Santen became active in the women's movement and, later, support for refugees. In the end, while some activists from the first generation remained in contact with the activists of the third generation, those of the second generation mainly left. How can this be explained?

The answer may lie in the different circumstances in which the members of the first two generations were politicised. While the first generation

was formed in an era of grave social conflict and revolutionary fervour, the second generation was politicised in the politically conservative 1950s. The Trotskyists of the first generation provided a model for political activism of the second generation that was developed in the 1930s and 1940s. This model focused on clandestine ways of organising, clinging to political beliefs and indirectly influencing other organisations and movements. As a result, mobilising new members and working ‘in the open’ was moved to the background of political practice. New members were not trusted. The New Left intellectual Perry Anderson reflected on this when he stated: ‘The combination of enforced isolation from the main detachments of the organised working class throughout the world ... inevitably left its effects on the Trotskyist tradition as a whole ... Reaffirmation of the validity and reality of socialist revolution and proletarian democracy, against so many events which denied them, involuntarily inclined this tradition towards conservatism’.<sup>78</sup> By the early 1960s, the Trotskyist movement was ploughing forward using old and trusted methods rather than considering new opportunities.

As the late 1960s opened up new opportunities for radical politics and contacts with newly politicised youths with a different cultural background, older activists such as Herman Drenth and Theo Wiering had less difficulty connecting, than the members of the second generation. For the Trotskyist youths of the 1950s, the movement had its appeal, first of all because of the way it offered a sense of belonging to a small but dedicated band of brothers (and some sisters) spanning the globe. The images of persecution and war-time resistance gave their political activism an exciting edge. However, as the dilemma between Trotskyist political and organisational dogma and the political reality of the early 1960s grew ever more obvious, they decided to leave the movement. When the third generation took over, they brought with them a new *élan*, which some members of the first generation felt inspiring. By that time, the second generation had lost its faith in the political potential of Trotskyism. The youths of the 1960s on the other hand looked to the Trotskyists in their search for something else. They saw joining the movement as a way to revive a tradition of dissident but revolutionary Marxism and as a way to connect youth movements to labour struggles.

### **Conclusion: intergenerational transfer in the Dutch Trotskyist movement**

Celia Hughes has written extensively on the personal lives of Trotskyist youths in the 1960s in England, aiming to reconstruct the ‘internal world of

the extra-parliamentary left', asking 'what did active socialist involvement feel like to these young working-class men?'<sup>79</sup> Drawing from interviews and letters, she aims to reconstruct their sense of self.<sup>80</sup> In Hughes' work, the focus lies above all on the way in which these youths connected to each other, rather than how they were included in organisations with their own histories, party cultures and veteran leaders. However, she does discuss the topic to some extent, when it comes to the early history of the International Socialists (the precursor to the Socialist Workers Party, SWP). Here, she emphasizes the non-patronizing attitudes that older, intellectual members assumed towards young working class activists, how the former emphasized the importance of education and how the IS leader Tony Cliff grew to become a father figure for many of the youths, a role similar to that played by Wiering in the Dutch group (albeit of a different tendency).<sup>81</sup>

Hughes describes the political culture of international Trotskyism well, when she writes of the 'otherness of the Trotskyist identity, defined by tendency, rooted in a commitment to the professional calling of revolutionary, and embedded in the bitter experience of political failure'.<sup>82</sup> At the same time, the British Trotskyist movement developed in a different social and political setting, growing and becoming the main extra-parliamentary movement in the country, a position that was never achieved by Dutch Trotskyists.

How, then, were the relations between the three generations of Dutch Trotskyists, and how were political styles, values and attitudes transferred from one generation to another? The first generation experienced great difficulties in mobilising new members, as the politics of deep entryism reinforced clandestine ways of doing politics and sometimes even paranoid attitudes. New members were therefore mainly recruited amongst family members and circles of friends. As a result, the connections were close, even when the youths of the 1950s organised separately. Although these youths from the second generation were never involved in the same kind of clandestine high-risk campaigns as the first generation, the latter's culture of 'illegalitis' sparked off images among the second generation's activists, in which radical activism merged with images of wartime resistance, repression and genocide – things that the members of the first generation had directly experienced or witnessed.

It has been claimed that for the first generation, the Second World War never ended, as fears of a new war and of ongoing repression reinforced a siege mentality. Although the second generation had only experienced the German Occupation as children, these sentiments were transferred in the context of familial, social and political ties. The recollections of members

of the second generation testifies not only of the way in which the recollections and experiences of the first generation were transformed and fused with other images as they were appropriated by the younger activists, but also of the generally similar attitudes of both groups. This common attitude was also forged by the long 1950s, which in the Netherlands translated into a stable and conservative political culture that severely limited the space and opportunities for radical politics. It thus further reinforced feelings of being in a small but righteous group in an otherwise hostile world.

The youths who joined the Trotskyist movement in the late 1960s had been politicised in a very different context, characterised by a seemingly unstoppable rise of radical youth movements. As they were politicised outside of the movement, in a different context, they were not raised politically within the movement, and heralded different styles and attitudes, with which the older activists had difficulties connecting. At the same time, the members of the third generation sought to connect to specific aspects of Trotskyist history. For them, its appeal lay in its revolutionary potential as a movement with a Marxist legacy, rather than its history of 'enforced isolation', as Anderson put it. As a result, connecting to movement veterans was deemed of great importance, up to the point where Wiering for some assumed a mentor's role. At the same time, the members of the second generation, who had been raised politically and been active in the 'long 1950s' and its wake, commanded less respect, and contacts between the second and third generations were more scarce and more strained.

The case of Dutch Trotskyism shows how styles and attitudes can be transferred from one generation to another within a social movement, and which social factors influence such processes. It furthermore shows how these processes can be cut off, without there being an overt generation conflict. Trotskyist youths who entered the movement at the end of the 1960s did not seek to break with the previous generations. Rather, they deemed the actions and political work of the older activists of great value. As they looked at their predecessor's history, they searched for things that they could use in their own politics. Thus, new continuities were sought out, and other aspects of Trotskyist history and politics were transferred, while the youths of the 1960s emphasized the political and organisational continuity with the radical politics of the pre-war era.

*The research for this paper is based on our volume Een banier waar geen smet op rust. De geschiedenis van het trotskisme in Nederland, 1938-heden, Soesterberg, 2015 and the article: B. van der Steen, 'De trotskistische*

*beweging in Nederland. Geschiedenis van de eerste generatie*' in *Kritiek. Jaarboek voor Socialistische Discussie en Analyse* 2008, Amsterdam, 2008, pp46-76. For a brief organisational history of the Dutch Trotskyist movement, see: R. Alexander, *International Trotskyism, 1929-1985*. A documented analysis of the movement, Durham NC, 1991. We would like to thank Hans Wilbrink, Meike de Goede, Joris Gijsenbergh and Onni Pekonen for their comments on earlier versions of this paper.

## Notes

1. For this approach, see among other: H. Righart, *De eindeloze jaren zestig. Geschiedenis van een generatieconflict*, Amsterdam 1995. See also W. Kraushaar, *1968 als Mythos, Chiffre und Zäsur*, Hamburg 2000.
2. See for this view, R. Inglehart, *The silent revolution in Europe. Intergenerational change in post-industrial societies*, Indianapolis 1971.
3. This was for example illustrated by the rise of dozens of new publishing houses and collectives, and their focus on reprints of dissident Marxists from the 1920s and 1930s. In the Netherlands, this task was taken up above all by the Socialistische Uitgeverij Nijmegen (SUN).
4. As Trotskyist ideas gained influence among unorganised radical youths, radical movements and socialist intellectuals, the prominent left intellectual Perry Anderson explained its appeal through its history of a repressed but intellectually rich movement: 'It filled no chairs in universities. Its members were hunted and outlawed ... The price paid for the attempt to maintain a Marxist unity of theory and practice ... was a high one. But the gain made, for the future of socialism, was in exchange an immense one. Today, this politico-theoretical heritage provides one of the central elements for any renaissance of revolutionary Marxism on an international scale'. On the future of Trotskyism he even commented: '[T]he growth of international class struggles since the late sixties has ... started to create an objective possibility of the reappearance of the political ideas associated with Trotsky in central areas of working-class debate and activity'. P. Anderson, *Considerations on Western Marxism*, London 1979, pp100-101.
5. See among others, Alexander, *International Trotskyism, 1929-1985* and J.W. Stutje, 'Trotskyism Emerges from Obscurity: New Chapters in Its Historiography' in *International Review of Social History* vol. 49 (2004), pp279-292. See also the contributions to E. Smith and M. Worley, *Against the Grain. The British far left from 1956*, Manchester 2014; J. Callaghan, 'Engaging with Trotsky: the influence of Trotskyism in Britain', pp25-44 and P. Burton-Cartledge, 'Marching separately, seldom together: the

- political history of two principal trends in British Trotskyism, 1945-2009', pp80-97.
6. On the 1960s in the Netherlands and the history of new social movements in the Netherlands see, Righart, *De eindeloze jaren zestig*; J. Kennedy, *Building new Babylon. Cultural change in the Netherlands during the 1960s*, PhD diss., University of Iowa 1995.
  7. M. van der Klein and S. Wieringa (eds), *Alles kon anders. Protestrepertoires in Nederland, 1965-2005*, Amsterdam 2006; J.W. Duyvendak et al. (eds), *Tussen verbeelding en macht. 25 jaar nieuwe sociale bewegingen in Nederland*, Amsterdam 1992; S. Poldervaart (eds), *Leven volgens je idealen. De andere politieken van huidige sociale bewegingen in Nederland*, Amsterdam 2002.
  8. For the history of Provo, N. Pas, *Imaazje! De verbeelding van Provo, 1965-1967*, Amsterdam 2003; R. Kempton, *Provo. Amsterdam's anarchist revolt*, Brooklyn 2007.
  9. E. Mandel, *Inleiding in de marxistische economie*, Nijmegen 1970; J.W. Stutje, *Ernest Mandel. A rebel's dream deferred*, London 2009.
  10. Righart, *De eindeloze jaren zestig*; Kennedy, *Building new Babylon*.
  11. In doing so, it competes with and complements other concepts, such as *histoire croisée*. For this, see among others Leon Fink (ed.), *Workers across the Americas. The Transnational Turn in Labour History*, Oxford 2011; M. Werner and B. Zimmermann, 'Beyond Comparison: *Histoire Croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity' in *History and Theory* vol. 45 (2006), pp30-50.
  12. For literature on generational transfer in migration history and criminology, see for example: S. Guyeli et al., *Intergenerational consequences of migration. Socio-economic, family and cultural patterns of stability and change in Turkey and Europe*, Basingstoke 2016; S. Besemer, *Intergenerational transmission of criminal and violent behaviour*, Leiden 2012.
  13. On collective memory, see the work of Aleida Assman, Pierre Nora and Maurice Halbwachs, A. Assmann, 'Canon and archive' in A. Erll and A. Nünning (eds), *A companion to cultural memory studies*, Berlin 2010, pp97-108; A. Assmann and J. Czaplicka, 'Collective memory and cultural identity' in *New German Critique* vol. 65 (1995), pp125-133; P. Nora, 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire' in *Representations* vol. 26 (1989), pp7-24; M. Halbwachs, *On collective memory*, Chicago 1992. Closer to labour history are for example: L. Passerini, *Fascism in popular memory. The cultural experience of the Turin working class*, Cambridge 1987; A. Portelli, *The death of Luigi Trastulli and other stories. Form and meaning in oral history*, Albany, NY 1991.
  14. For a concise overview, see: B. Wiesbrod, 'Generation und Generationalität

- in der Neueren Geschichte' in *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* no. 8 (2005), pp3-9.
15. D. Siegfried, 'Understanding 1968: Youth Rebellion, Generational Change and Postindustrial Society' in A. Schildt and D. Siegfried (eds), *Between Marx and Coca-Cola. Youth Cultures in Changing European Societies, 1960-1980*, New York 2005, pp59-81, here p75. In Siegfried's text, the term comment refers to the term '1968'.
  16. See among others, K. Mannheim, 'Das Problem der Generationen' in *Kölner Vierteljahreshefte für Soziologie*, vol 7 (1928), pp157-185, pp309-330. For a discussion of Mannheim's work and elaborations on his findings with regard to labour history, see various contributions in: A. Blok et al. (eds), *Generations in labour history. Papers presented to the sixth British-Dutch Conference on Labour History*, Amsterdam 1989 and B. Fietze, 'Die späte Ankunft des Karl Mannheim in der Generationssoziologie. Einblicke in die Werkstatt generationssoziologischer Theoriebildung' in *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* (2003), pp435-445.
  17. Siegfried, 'Understanding 1968', p70.
  18. See the special issue on transfer and social movements, edited by Henk te Velde and Charles Tilly; *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire* vol. 12 (2005) no. 2. See also R. Gildea et al., 'European radicals and the "third world". Imagined solidarities and radical networks, 1958-73' in *Cultural and Social History* vol 8 (2011), pp449-472.
  19. The main sources for this paper are memoirs, *romans á clef* by (former) activists and occasional interviews. The main sources for this paper are the memoirs of Igor Cornelissen, *Van Zwolle tot Brest-Litowsk. Onstuimige herinneringen*, Amsterdam 1983, and the *roman á clef* by Lisette Lewin, *Voor bijna alles bang geweest*, Amsterdam 1996. Cornelissen and Lewin were active in the same milieu of radical activists and bohemian artists, and their memoirs often 'mirror' each other, as they discuss the same events and developments. The archives of the Dutch section of the Fourth International can be found at the International Institute for Social History (IISH): Archief Socialistiese Arbeiderspartij.
  20. Popular Memory Group, 'Popular memory: theory, politics, method' in R. Perks and A. Thomson (eds), *The Oral History Reader*, New York 2003, pp75-86, here p78.
  21. Passerini, *Fascism in popular memory*, p60.
  22. S. Leydesdorf, *Het water en de herinnering. De Zeeuwse watersnoodramp 1953-1993*, Amsterdam 1993.
  23. Passerini, *Fascism in popular memory*, p60. See also Portelli, *The death of Luigi Trastulli*.

24. G. Voerman, 'Partijcultuur in Nederland. Naar nieuwe invalshoeken in de studie van de politieke partij' in G. Voerman and D.J. Wolffram (eds), *Benaderingen van de geschiedenis van politiek*, Groningen 2006, pp43-49. See also: G. Voerman, 'De stand van de geschiedschrijving van de Nederlandse politieke partijen' in *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* vol. 120 (2005) nr. 2, pp226-269; H. te Velde, 'Het wij-gevoel van een morele gemeenschap: een politiek-culturele benadering van partijgeschiedenis' in *Jaarboek Documentatiecentrum Nederlandse Politieke Partijen 2004*, Groningen 2005, pp106-123; H. te Velde, 'The Opening Up of Political History' in W. Steinmetz, I. Gilcher-Holtey and H.G. Haupt (eds) *Writing Political History Today*, Frankfurt 2013, pp383-395.
25. Voerman did this explicitly, for example in his history of the Christen-Historische Unie (CHU): "Een unie, niet een partij". Over de partijcultuur van de Christelijk-Historische Unie' in *Jaarboek van het Documentatiecentrum Nederlandse Politieke Partijen* Groningen 2005, pp206-218. For cultural approaches to the Dutch labour movement, see A. Van Veldhuizen, *De partij. Over het politieke leven in de vroege S.D.A.P.*, Amsterdam 2015 and D. Bos, *Waarachtige volksvrienden. De vroege socialistische beweging in Amsterdam, 1848-1894*, Amsterdam 2001.
26. P.J. Mol, *De trotskistische beweging in Nederland, 1938-1945*; W. Bot, *Tegen fascisme, kapitalisme en oorlog. Het Marx-Lenin-Luxemburg Front, juli 1940-april 1942*, Amsterdam 1983; W. Bot, *Generaals zonder troepen. Het Comité van Revolutionaire Marxisten, zomer 1942 – mei 1945*, Amsterdam 1986, (English translation in *Revolutionary History* vol. 1 no.4 (1988-89)); R. Lubbersen, *Revolutionair-socialisme in Nederland tussen oorlog en intrede. De Revolutionair Communistische Partij (RCP), Nederlandse afdeling van de 4<sup>e</sup> Internationale, van 1945 tot 1952* (MS. 1983); M. Jacklin, *De Vierde Internationale in de Nederlandse sociaal-democratie. De Revolutionair Communistische Partij (RCP), Nederlandse afdeling van de Vierde Internationale, 1952-1957* (MS 1984).
27. For this approach, see amongst others, M. Bevir, *The making of British socialism*, Princeton NJ 2011.
28. Celia Hughes has taken up a similar task, focusing on the sense of self of Trotskyist activists in Britain. However, while she focuses on the individual 'psyche' of activists, our approach rather focuses on the more collective party culture. See also, C. Hughes, 'Young Socialist Men in 1960s Britain: Subjectivity and Sociability' in *History Workshop Journal*, vol. 73 (2012), pp170-92; C. Hughes, 'Left Activism, Succour and Selfhood: The epistolary friendship of two revolutionary mothers in 1970s Britain' in *Women's*

- History Review* vol. 23 (2014), pp874-902, and C. Hughes, 'Narratives of radical lives. The roots of 1960s activism and the making of the British left' in Smith and Worley, *Against the Grain* 62-79.
29. On the post-war history of the Netherlands: A. van Liempt, *Na de bevrijding. De loodzware jaren 1945-1950*, Amsterdam 2014.
  30. P. Coomans et al., *De Eenheidsvakcentrale, 1943-1948*, Groningen 1976.
  31. G. Verrrips, *Dwars, duivels en dromend. De geschiedenis van de CPN, 1938-1991*, Amsterdam 1995; A.A. de Jonge, *Het communisme in Nederland. Geschiedenis van een politieke partij*, Den Haag 1972; W. Gortzak, *Kluiven op een buitenbeen. Kanttekeningen bij enige naoorlogse ontwikkelingen van het Nederlandse communisme*, Amsterdam 1967.
  32. J.C.H Blom and J. Talsma (eds), *De verzuiling voorbij. Godsdienst, stand en natie in de lange negentiende eeuw*, Amsterdam 2000; S. Stuurman, *Verzuiling, kapitalisme en patriarchaat. Aspecten van de ontwikkeling van de moderne staat in Nederland*, Nijmegen 1983.
  33. F. Wielenga, *Geschiedenis van Nederland. Van de Opstand tot heden*, Amsterdam 2009, p291.
  34. P. Luykx and P. Slot (eds), *Een stille revolutie? Cultuur en mentaliteit in de lange jaren vijftig*, Hilversum 1997. For the historiographical debate on the 1950s, see: H. de Liagre Böhl, 'De rode beer in de polder. Een herinterpretatie van de "lange jaren vijftig"' in C. Kristel (ed.), *Met alle geweld. Botsingen en tegenstellingen in burgerlijk Nederland*, Amsterdam 2003, pp214-229
  35. S. Stuurman, 'Het zwarte gat van de jaren vijftig' in *Kleio* vol. 25 (1984) no. 8, pp6-13.
  36. For the history of the RSP, R. Blom and B. van der Steen, *Wij gingen onze eigen weg. Herinneringen van revolutionaire socialisten in Nederland*, Delft 2011; Herman Pieterse, 'Tussen NAS en Komintern. Ontwikkeling en aanhang van SP, RSP, OSP, RSAP 1918-1940' in M. Eekman and H. Pieterse, *Linkssocialisme tussen de wereldoorlogen*, Amsterdam 1987, pp109-205; M. Perthuis [P. van 't Hart] (ed.), *Voor vrijheid en socialisme. Gedenkboek van het Sneevliet Herdenkingscomité*, Rotterdam 1953.
  37. A. Dolleman, in *Bulletin Nederlandse Arbeidersbeweging* No. 27 (1992), pp17-43, here pp25-26.
  38. The newspapers were initially produced on a typewriter, and later on a cyclostyle. As a result, the print run grew from a dozen to two thousand copies at the end of the war. Bot, *Generaals zonder troepen*, pp23-30.
  39. Piet van 't Hart's partner Cor would cycle through the harsh winter weather from The Hague to Amsterdam and the north of Noord-Holland on a bike with garden hoses for tires. 'I did not have much time to read

- the newspaper. Sometimes I was away for ten days, only to return for a moment and be on the road again'. Bot, *Generaals zonder troepen*, p30.
40. Dolleman, 'Het huis'; Santen, *Sneevliet, Rebel*, Amsterdam 1971; H. Smeets and D. de Winter (eds), *Wij moesten door...*, Ridderkerk 2002.
  41. T. van Tijn, 'Piet van 't Hart – Marx Perthus (1910-1975)' in, Max Perthus, *Henk Sneevliet. Revolutionair-socialist in Europa en Azië*, Nijmegen 1975, pp11-17. The illegal RSAP was officially called Marx-Lenin-Luxemburg-Front. See, Bot, *Tegen fascisme, kapitalisme en oorlog*.
  42. M. Ferares, *Violist in het verzet*, Amsterdam 1991; Hans Boot, 'Max Plekker, 3 oktober 1924 - 11 oktober 2007': [http://www.solidariteit.nl/ingezonden/2007/max\\_plekker\\_is\\_dood2.html](http://www.solidariteit.nl/ingezonden/2007/max_plekker_is_dood2.html).
  43. S. Santen, *Dapper zijn omdat het goed is*, Amsterdam 1993, p12.
  44. Santen, *Adiós compañeros!*, p51. The conference report can be found on: <http://www.marxists.org/history/etol/document/fi/1950-1953/fi-3rdcongress>. See also the text by Pablo from 1951: <http://www.marxists.org/archive/pablo/1951/11/congress.htm>.
  45. E. Santen, *Aan twee minuten heb ik niet genoeg. Op zoek naar mijn joodse oorsprong*, Amsterdam 1983, p60.
  46. J. van Lingen and N. Slooff, *Van verzetsstrijder tot staatsgevaarlijk burger. Hoe progressieve illegale werkers na de oorlog de voet is dwarsgezet*, Baarn 1987, pp203-204.
  47. A great number of BVD documents have been digitized by Stichting Argus. These files can be found: <http://www.stichtingargus.nl/bvd/index.htm>.
  48. BVD, *Maandoverzicht*, April 1952, p15.
  49. Van Lingen en Slooff, *Van verzetsstrijder tot staatsgevaarlijk burger*, pp203-204.
  50. G. Mak, *In Europa. Reizen door de twintigste eeuw*, Amsterdam 2004, p872.
  51. Ibid., p874.
  52. Van Lingen and Slooff, *Van verzetsstrijder tot staatsgevaarlijk burger*, pp203-204.
  53. Cornelissen, *Van Zwolle tot Brest-Litowsk*, pp227-228.
  54. Santen, *Aan twee minuten heb ik niet genoeg*, pp60-61.
  55. Cornelissen, *Van Zwolle tot Brest-Litowsk*, pp303-304.
  56. Mak, *In Europa*, p871.
  57. *Internal Bulletin of the International Secretariat of the Fourth International*, 'Dutch Question', No. 1 and 2, IISH, archive M. Ferares, inv.nr. 11-12.
  58. G. Harmsen, *Herfsttijloos (Colchicum autumnale). Een levensverhaal*, Nijmegen 1993, p406.
  59. Santen, *Dapper zijn omdat het goed is*, p12.

60. Lewin, *Voor bijna alles bang geweest*, p327.
61. *Ibid.*, p261.
62. Cornelissen, *Van Zwolle tot Brest-Litowsk*, p266.
63. BVD, *Maandoverzicht* (February 1964), p25; *ibid*, *Ambtsbericht Vierde Internationale* (juli 1963).
64. Lewin, *Voor bijna alles bang geweest*, p244.
65. *Ibid.*, p266.
66. F. Keller, *Gelebter Internationalismus Österreichs Linke und der algerische Widerstand (1958-1963)*, Vienna 2010, p163.
67. Igor Cornelissen: 'Voorwoord' in Sal Santen, *Schimmenspel. Filmdagboek*, Amsterdam 1982, p5-11.
68. Mak, *In Europa*, p873
69. Cornelissen: 'Voorwoord', p6.
70. *Ibid.*
71. Cornelissen, *Van Zwolle tot Brest-Litowsk*, p172
72. Lewin, *Voor bijna alles bang geweest*, pp318-319.
73. For this, see the interview with Max Plekker in Chris den Hond's (dir.) documentary *Ernest Mandel. Een leven voor de revolutie* (2010).
74. R. Wuite, 'Een lang actief politiek leven in Den Haag. Herinneringen aan Herman Drenth', *Solidariteit* No. 97 (2000).
75. J. Zonneveld, 'Eén van de oprichters van Solidariteit - Rein van der Horst. "Ik geloof niet in sociaal-demokratiese illusies"' in *Solidariteit* No. 75 (1996)
76. J. Kircz, 'De vijand van mijn vijand is nog niet mijn vriend', pp150-163, in M. Arian et al., *Alles moest anders. Het onvervulde verlangen van een linkse generatie*, Amsterdam 1991, p155.
77. Cornelissen, *Van Zwolle tot Brest-Litowsk*, p281.
78. Anderson, *Considerations on Western Marxism*, pp100-101.
79. Hughes, 'Young Socialist Men', p173.
80. See also: Hughes, 'Left Activism, Succour and Selfhood' and Hughes, 'Narratives of radical lives'.
81. Thus, she describes: '[T]he Cliffs' Stoke Newington home – created a reassuring familiarity that helped to shape a sense of belonging amongst the young men. Before long [the young activists] Cox and Light found themselves baby-sitting for Cliff and his South African wife, Chanie', Hughes, 'Young Socialist Men', p180.
82. *Ibid.*, p176.