

## Anti-Modern National Identity Formation: Dutch Depictions of America in Public Debates about Film Fandom, 1919-1939

Jesper Verhoef

Summary: *The Netherlands in the interwar years (1919-1939) was a unity in diversity, since several denominational and ideological segments of society lived-apart-together – barely feeling a shared national identity. This article researches how Dutch public media used film fandom to create such an identity. It shows how film fandom, depicted as an embodiment of the American “Other” and objectionable modernization, was used to discursively construct communal feelings of Dutch-ness across the various segments.*

In the wake of the First World War, American film companies managed to take control of large parts of the European film market, the Dutch one included.<sup>[1]</sup> During the interwar years (1919-1939), Dutch movie theaters mostly showed films of American origin. Interestingly, in public debates about film in general and about the successful dissemination of American films in particular, the distinctions between Hollywood and America frequently dissolved: Hollywood was seen as a *pars pro toto* for America; a “free floating signifier of American-ness.”<sup>[2]</sup> Consequently, debates about film contributed significantly to how Dutch people perceived America.

In these debates, film critics often depicted America as a dystopia: America was equated with phenomena that carried a strong negative connotation, such as mechanization, commercialization, and standardization.<sup>[3]</sup> These depictions fitted neatly within existing ideas about America and amplified them, leading to the result that anti-Americanism in the interwar years reigned supreme.<sup>[4]</sup> Dutch intellectuals such as the cultural historian Johan Huizinga added to this imagery, maintaining that Americans had yet to be cultivated – as if they were barbarians.<sup>[5]</sup> It has been argued that the negative way in which critics and commentators represented America assisted several Dutch interest groups in positioning themselves – not only in relation to America but vis-à-vis one another also.<sup>[6]</sup> This article, however, contends that American culture in the period between 1919 and 1939 at the same time helped to construct a *shared* Dutch national identity.

Before elucidating this proposition through a case study, it is necessary to briefly sketch three developments that enabled national community formation in the period leading up to and within the interwar period. First, from the second half of the nineteenth century onwards an increasing number of national newspapers and magazines was established. The ever-growing number of readers contributed to a new understanding of community, as stressed by Benedict Anderson.<sup>[7]</sup> Second, the construction of wider and better transportation networks during the same period reinforced feelings of connectedness.<sup>[8]</sup> Both processes countered feelings of isolation due to geographical distance.<sup>[9]</sup> Third, emerging new technologies such as film strengthened notions of mutual belonging; more than drawn by a specific film, audiences went to the cinema for the social experience.<sup>[10]</sup> In sum, these three developments might be called *catalysts* for national community formation.

However, even though all three were well under way after the First World War, they did not necessarily lead to the formation of a communal Dutch *identity*. On the contrary, in certain areas of the country strong regional identities remained dominant. More importantly, still, is that Dutch society was, to a great extent, organized along lines of denomination and ideology.<sup>[11]</sup> Especially from the second half of the nineteenth century onwards, several groups had begun to organize themselves along these lines.<sup>[12]</sup> Catholics, Protestants, socialists, and the more loosely grouped liberals all formed their own community or so-called “pillar.” Whereas Benedict Anderson in his *Imagined Communities* posited that a country “is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship,” the pillar metaphor implies the exact opposite: a vertical organization of Dutch society.<sup>[13]</sup> People lived their lives within rather closed communities, and only the leaders of the pillars met on a regular basis to organize public life. This segmentation characterized everyday life and led to the formation of separate organizations such as labor unions, youth clubs, and schools. Significantly, each group constructed its “own particular Dutch national identity.”<sup>[14]</sup> As a result, each had its own “brand of national feeling.”<sup>[15]</sup> A common, uniform Dutch identity was hard to discern, although the Dutch royal family occasionally functioned as a unifying symbol.<sup>[16]</sup>

Although over the last decades it has been argued that the paradigm of a pillarized society should not be seen as something absolute – as if, for instance, Catholics *never* talked with socialists – most scholars maintain that pillarization counts among “the most characteristic aspects of the Netherlands” in this period.<sup>[17]</sup> In short, therefore, the Netherlands seemed to embody a classic case of unity in diversity, or “living-apart-together.”<sup>[18]</sup> This introduction confirms that, in Benedict Anderson’s words, “nation-ness...is a cultural artefact of a particular kind,” not something that manifested itself naturally.<sup>[19]</sup>

### **America as Imagined Construct and Noteworthy Other**

To shed light on the way in which a horizontal comradeship *could* take shape within this pillarized society, this article turns to an analysis of Dutch debates on modernization and America. In order to do so, it researches how Dutch newspapers and magazines constructed ‘America’ in debates on film fandom – a phenomenon that was linked to both modernization and the United States. The quotation marks indicate that America was not just a discernable entity, namely the United States, but also an imagined construct. Analyzing the images of this imagined America, in the words of historian Alex Körner, “provides a key to the way in which societies reflected upon their own past and future, how they experienced change, interpreted history, and fashioned ideas about selfhood and otherness.”<sup>[20]</sup> In other words, analyzing debates in which America played a role contributes to our understanding of Dutch identity formation.

As a case study, this article focuses on Dutch depictions of film fandom, a phenomenon that resulted from the invention of the so-called star system from 1907 onwards in the United States.<sup>[21]</sup> This system became a means by which Hollywood studios promoted specific actors and actresses, emphasizing their image rather than their acting skills. Through this system Hollywood studios effectively transformed actors into “stars,” and thereby made the latter public figures to which many filmgoers took a liking. This in turn contributed to filmgoers becoming fans of one or numerous actors. Film fandom originated in America around 1910 and rapidly became a “popular national pastime.”<sup>[22]</sup> Although the phenomenon diffused to the Netherlands after the First World War as well, Dutch public media consistently associated fans and fan behavior with America. Illustrating the putatively ubiquitous American interest in film stars, one newspaper article of the

time aptly stated that “ninety percent of the Americans showed more interest in the love life of film star Rudolph Valentino, than in the question whether a new war would break out in Europe.”<sup>[23]</sup>

Film fandom elicited multifarious reactions among Dutch critics. The vast majority of these was negative and regularly used fandom to make statements about both American national characteristics and modernization.<sup>[24]</sup> The use of representations and images of America functioned as a form of “othering.” Whether this imagery was accurate is not of our concern; it is not about *l’etranger* (“stranger” or “other”) but “about *l’etranger*-as-perceived.”<sup>[25]</sup> An identity – what people believe to be the core of a community – only exists through an Other used to position itself against. In other words: the Other offers the one perceiving a mirror to view herself.<sup>[26]</sup> By looking at how the Dutch represented America within debates about the emerging, modern practice of film fandom, we can learn how the Dutch constructed their *own* identity or, perhaps, identities. An important way through which othering is conveyed is discourse; in my case, the discourse within Dutch public media. The digitized repository of the National Library of the Netherlands – containing tens of thousands of magazine and newspaper articles that touched upon or engaged with film fandom – forms the main data set.<sup>[27]</sup> Newspaper titles connected to all four pillars are included in this data collection, which allowed me to see whether reactions to fandom varied along the lines of denominational or ideological background. Since almost all articles about film fandom denounced this modern phenomenon, the following questions will be central in this article: what did publications reject in particular, and how did they do this? Was there a difference along denominational lines, or did film fandom prompt a shared rejection that alludes to national identity formation? And how did the critique develop over the course of the period under scrutiny: did it, for instance, intensify?

### **Denunciation of Modern Hero-worship**

Three aspects of film fandom suggest ways in which Dutch newspapers rejected fandom as each was deemed explicitly American, and, consequently, non-Dutch. First, Dutch newspapers decried the excesses which occurred when film stars appeared in public. As actors visited foreign towns, newspapers wondered why fans would climb into streetlights just to catch a glimpse of an actress or actor. They were appalled by such behavior. Interestingly, irrespective of whether this perceived misconduct took place in America or elsewhere, or whether the fans were of American descent or not, to newspapers the nature of this behavior was evidently American. When American actor Tom Mix, for instance, visited Amsterdam in 1925, the mass outburst from the crowd was thought to indicate a “more or less American display.”<sup>[28]</sup> Less exuberant fan conduct was also perceived as American. Newspapers, for example, condemned how Americans collectively cheered when a famous film star entered a restaurant in Hollywood, and denounced how so-called “autograph hunters” posted outside such restaurants, waiting for the opportunity to request the star’s signature.<sup>[29]</sup>

In addition, Dutch media criticized the way fans – again supposedly mainly American fans – displayed their admiration through fan letters and, from the 1930s onwards, telephone calls. The most popular film stars often received thousands of letters per week. These letters were used as one of the means to determine a ranking: the star that received the most was considered the most popular. Dutch newspapers and magazines frequently copied these rankings to underline how grotesque the veneration of film stars had gotten. Clara Bow, for instance, broke the world record in 1927, when she received 16,000 letters in a single month. A year later she bettered that when fans

sent her 33,737 letters in May.<sup>[30]</sup> The parents of child star Shirley Temple went as far as hiring someone to answer the mail she received.<sup>[31]</sup>

Dutch newspapers ridiculed the phenomenon of fan letters, and tried to grasp why fans wanted to write their heroes in the first place. They found an explanation in layman's psychology: instincts and irrationality fueled fan behavior. One newspaper in 1938 reported on constant phone calls to Hollywood stars. Alluding to the expenditures, it sneered: "A normal person doesn't understand this, because for only one guilder one is able to see the admired film star four times in a movie theater. But a 'fan' after all is not a normal human being, he spends his money to hear the voice of his film hero."<sup>[32]</sup> Another newspaper agreed, stating that Americans – mostly women – "very frequently called their idolized heaven: Hollywood"; a heaven that was embodied by film stars.<sup>[33]</sup> This behavior, again, was deemed typical for Americans in general. It was non-normal or alien to Dutch publications; America and Americans were portrayed as the Other to which Dutch readers could oppose themselves.

Finally, fans went as far as to disturb actors in person. They blatantly violated the privacy of their heroes by going up to their houses and asking them for autographs and other favors. Children were affected by this yearning as well, as one newspaper remarked: "The American collects autographs like our children collect stamps."<sup>[34]</sup> As these examples highlight, Dutch newspapers regularly presented American fans as "full-fledged information junkies."<sup>[35]</sup>

Dutch newspapers not only linked film fandom to America but also associated it with modernization. To them, fandom and its excesses clearly epitomized this development. Fan behavior, to quote one newspaper, was seen as a "symptom of modern hero-worship."<sup>[36]</sup> Like the medium of film itself, fandom was considered superficial and regarded as a sign of moral decay – as were other modern, American phenomena such as mass consumption, and mass entertainment.<sup>[37]</sup>

All three aspects of film fandom received frequent coverage in Dutch newspapers and magazines – from 1919 onwards the number of articles covering them rose constantly with attention peaking in the second half of the 1930s – and all three were intrinsically linked to America and modernization. Only rarely did newspapers question or nuance this association with America. Even then, however, the link could surface. The very fact that a Dutch correspondent in 1939 felt obliged to write that "not all Americans are film fans," indicates, for instance, that many Dutch people *believed* in the idea of a "movie crazy America."<sup>[38]</sup> A salient feature of the discourse, moreover, is that the views on film fandom in the period under scrutiny barely changed. From 1919 until 1939 *all* newspapers were and remained critical of film fandom, overtly and persistently rejecting it: dissent hardly existed. Since newspapers connected film fandom with America, they also criticized America.

Regarding the existing sentiments towards America in the period between 1919 and 1939, as outlined in the introduction, it is not surprising that these criticisms displayed anti-Americanism. Neither is it surprising that fandom elicited a rejection of the modernization it supposedly embodied, since previous research has already shown how Dutch society in the interwar years was troubled by burgeoning modern phenomena; according to several scholars, the Netherlands in this period went through a process of "contested modernization."<sup>[39]</sup> Modernization ran counter to conservative values and in fact invigorated traditionalism – at least on a discursive level, as the newspapers underlined.<sup>[40]</sup> Lastly, it is also not surprising that the disapproval of film fandom by newspapers revealed different accents in their rejections, which were related to their denominational or ideological background.<sup>[41]</sup>

What is surprising, however, is that many reactions tapped into a *uniform* national sentiment, a shared feeling of “Dutch-ness.”<sup>[42]</sup> There is ample evidence to illustrate this. One typical remark held: “The American audience is gullible – more gullible than we are.”<sup>[43]</sup> American film fandom in many ways became the Other against which the Dutch projected a collective perception of themselves; a uniform self-image to which *all* Dutch people could somehow relate. Regardless of their background, all newspapers emphasized one characteristic in particular. They postulated that Dutch people did not turn into lunatic film fans because, in contrast to sensationalist Americans, they had self-composure. This quality was positioned within a broader “narrative template” about ‘the’ Dutch: newspapers presented Dutch people as acting rationally, and displaying stable, controlled demeanor.<sup>[44]</sup> Contrary to Americans, one newspaper claimed, “the Dutchman has a natural bent for being critical.”<sup>[45]</sup> The *communis opinio* was that the Dutch were able to steer clear of fan excesses – a few exceptions notwithstanding – because of this shared Dutch, sober nature.<sup>[46]</sup> One newspaper wrote that the Dutch looked at film stars “with eyes that say: ‘Yes, really nice, but still, it’s only a film star,’ whereas in America the star forms an important part of everyday life.”<sup>[47]</sup> “Confronted with the excess of fanatic veneration,” according to a final account, “Dutch people in their small country shrug their shoulders.”<sup>[48]</sup> The narrative of Dutch self-composure offered a national stereotype with which all pillars could identify. The following cartoon, published in a weekly magazine in 1926, fittingly illustrates this.<sup>[49]</sup>

Image 1. Cartoon depicting the Dutch response to American film stars



Source: Atlas Van Stolk; copyright by Koninklijke Bibliotheek / Geheugen van Nederland, <http://www.geheugenvannederland.nl> (accessed January 5, 2015).

A supposedly typical Dutch woman looks with anger and disgust at a number of ostensibly toxic vegetables (the caption above the cartoon states “Toxic crops” (*Giftige gewassen*)) from Hollywood. The intrinsic link between Hollywood and America is made clear by the label “made in the USA” at the left bottom of the box. The four crops in front of the lady embody, amongst others, Hollywood stars Gloria Swanson, Tom Mix, and Rudolph Valentino. The caption below the picture, “And this dares say something about my exquisite daffodils!” emphasizes the difference between Dutch and American products, which was supposed to lead the reader to conclude that although in the modern

age American film stars had grown huge, one was ill-advised to consume them – or, non-metaphorically, become their fan.<sup>[50]</sup> Americans, according to newspapers, seemed not to care about these considerations. One newspaper lamented: “The childlike public is captured completely by film producers – who take over the hearts and minds.”<sup>[51]</sup> This quote echoes the way in which modernization was seen as an American, mechanic monster, and in the worst visions conceived as threatening humanity.<sup>[52]</sup>

## Conclusion

Each Dutch subgroup or “pillar” might have had different views about how to control modernization in general, views that were, inter alia, aired by newspapers and magazines connected to these subgroups. These views often stood in clear opposition to one another. However, in their views concerning America within debates about film fandom newspapers and magazines *did* form a community, an anti-modern community that was thoroughly opposed to the American Other. This process of othering furthered the discursive construction of a national Dutch identity. This construction of a shared nation-ness was able to tap into a communal Dutch feeling, which could bridge internal differences amongst the pillars.

This does not mean the encounter with America inexorably led to communal feelings of “Dutch-ness,” nor that this shared, discursive national identity could only thrive because of an external Other. As stated before, internal processes such as better communication networks and infrastructure enabled and enhanced this process during the interwar years as well. However, this article works to show how alleged American and modern practices such as film fandom contributed to the larger process of identity formation. The arrival of the “uninvited guest” as America and its modern practice of devouring film stars awakened feelings of shared national belonging among the Dutch.<sup>[53]</sup> The result of this encounter with the Other was that, in the heyday of societal segmentation, the four Dutch pillars were able to discursively construct a shared national identity.

---

## Footnotes

1. Kristin Thompson, *Exporting Entertainment: America in the World Film Market, 1907-1934* (BFI Publishing, 1985).
2. Quoted in Richard Maltby, “Introduction: ‘The Americanisation of the World,’” in *Hollywood Abroad: Audiences and Cultural Exchange*, ed. Richard Maltby and Melvyn Stokes (London: BFI, 2004), 16. William Uricchio, “Rethinking the American Century,” in *Media, Popular Culture, and the American Century*, ed. Kingsley Bolton and Jan Olsson (Stockholm: National Library of Sweden, 2010), 372. Richard Kuisel, “Commentary: Americanization for Historians,” *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 3 (2000): 512.
3. Rob Kroes, “Between Rejection and Reception: Hollywood in Holland,” in *Hollywood in Europe*, ed. D.W. Ellwood and Rob Kroes (VU University Press, 1994), 21–44. Ansje van Beusekom, *Kunst En Amusement: Reacties Op de Film Als Een Nieuw Medium in Nederland, 1895-1940* (Haarlem: Arcadia, 2001).
4. Cornelis A. van Minnen, “Dutch Perceptions of American Culture and Promotion of Dutch Culture in the United States,” in *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations 1609-2009*, ed. Hans Krabbendam, Cornelis A. van Minnen, and Giles Scott-Smith (Amsterdam: Boom, 2009), 431. Bob de Graaf, “Bogey or Saviour? The Image of the United States in the Netherlands during the Interwar Period,” in *Anti-Americanism in Europe*, ed. Rob Kroes, Maarten van Rossem, and Marcus Cunliffe (Amsterdam: Free University Press, 1986), 60.
5. Johan Huizinga, *America: A Dutch Historian’s Vision, from Afar and near*, trans. Herbert H. Rowen (New York: Harper & Row, 1972).

6. Kroes, "Between Rejection and Reception."
7. Frank van Vree, "De Macht van Het Gedrukte Woord. De Politisering van de Leescultuur 1870-1960," in *Bladeren in Andermans Hoofd. Over Lezers En Leescultuur.*, ed. Theo Bijvoet, Paul Koopman, and Lisa Kuitert (Nijmegen: SUN, 1996), 295. Cf. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).
8. H.W. Lintsen, ed., *Geschiedenis van de Techniek in Nederland: De Wording van Een Moderne Samenleving 1800-1890. Deel II. Gezondheid En Openbare Hygiëne. Waterstaat En Infrastructuur. Papier, Druk En Communicatie* ('s-Gravenhage: Stichting Historie der Techniek Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 1992); J. W. Schot, ed., *Techniek in Nederland in de Twintigste Eeuw. V, Transport En Communicatie*. (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 2002).
9. Hans Knippenberg and Ben de Pater, *De Eenwording van Nederland: Schaalvergroting En Integratie Sinds 1800* (Nijmegen: SUN, 1988), 76.
10. For instance Annette Kuhn, *An Everyday Magic: Cinema and Cultural Memory* (London etc.: I.B. Tauris, 2002). Richard Maltby and Melvyn Stokes, eds., *Hollywood Abroad: Audiences and Cultural Exchange* (London: BFI, 2004), 8.
11. Siep Stuurman, *Verzuiling, Kapitalisme En Patriarchaat: Aspecten van de Ontwikkeling van de Moderne Staat in Nederland* (Nijmegen: SUN, 1983), 335. Piet de Rooy, "Zes Studies over Verzuiling," *BMGN – Low Countries Historical Review* 110, no. 3 (1995): 382.
12. Michael Wintle, *An Economic and Social History of the Netherlands, 1800-1920: Demographic, Economic, and Social Transition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 340.
13. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 7.
14. Wintle, *An Economic and Social History of the Netherlands*, 287.
15. *Ibid.*, 298.
16. Frank J. Lechner, *The Netherlands: Globalization and National Identity* (Routledge, 2012), 69.
17. This quotation is derived from Wintle, *An Economic and Social History of the Netherlands*, 265. In another article, Wintle discusses how "the concept [pillarization, or, in Dutch, 'Verzuiling'] appears to be in crisis". Yet he upholds that although we "should certainly not permit verzuiling to block out other important factors and agents in modern Dutch society", there is "good reason to counsel against over-reaction." Michael Wintle, "Pillarisation, Consociation and Vertical Pluralism in the Netherlands Revisited: A European View," *West European Politics*, no. 3 (2000): 139, 150. For an overview of the discussion, see Rooy, "Zes Studies over Verzuiling." An outright rejection of the term can be found in Peter van Dam, *Staat van Verzuiling. Over Een Nederlandse Mythe* (Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek, 2011).
18. Wintle, *An Economic and Social History of the Netherlands*, 288. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 4.
19. Axel Körner, Nicola Miller, and Adam I. P. Smith, eds., *America Imagined: Explaining the United States in Nineteenth-Century Europe and Latin America* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 3.
20. Richard DeCordova, *Picture Personalities: The Emergence of the Star System in America* (Urbana, IL etc.: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 10.
21. Samantha Barbas, *Movie Crazy: Fans, Stars, and the Cult of Celebrity* (New York etc.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 187.
22. *Algemeen Handelsblad*, May 17, 1925
23. Cf. Osborne en Wintle, who pointed to the "compulsion of language to posit Otherness." John Osborne and Michael Wintle, "The Construction and Allocation of Identity through Images and Imagery: An Introduction," in *Image into Identity: Constructing and Assigning Identity in a Culture of Modernity*, ed. Michael Wintle (Amsterdam etc.: Rodopi, 2006), 18.
24. Joep Leerssen, "Echoes and Images. Reflections upon Foreign Space," in *Alterity, Identity, Image: Selves and Others in Society and Scholarship*, ed. R. Corbey and J. Th. Leerssen (Amsterdam etc.: Rodopi, 1991), 129.

- Cf. Joep Leerssen, "The Downward Pull of Cultural Essentialism," in *Image into Identity: Constructing and Assigning Identity in a Culture of Modernity*, ed. Michael Wintle (Amsterdam etc.: Rodopi, 2006), 42.
25. See also Michel de Certeau, *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis, Minn., etc.: University of Minnesota Press, 1997).
  26. The newspaper archive of the National Library of the Netherlands (*Koninklijke Bibliotheek*) is comprised of over eight million pages from more than 200 different newspapers and periodicals published between 1618 and 1995. See [www.delpher.nl](http://www.delpher.nl).
  27. *De Tijd*, April 26, 1925.
  28. *De Telegraaf*, February 13, 1929, and *Het Vaderland*, September 21, 1932.
  29. *Het Volk*, August 25, 1927, and *Algemeen Handelsblad*, July 19, 1928.
  30. *Nieuwe Tilburgsche Courant*, September 20, 1935.
  31. *Limburger Koerier*, March 31, 1938.
  32. *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, August 8, 1939, and *De Gooi- en Eemlander*, August 10, 1939.
  33. *Algemeen Handelsblad*, October 12, 1933.
  34. Barbas, *Movie Crazy*, 88.
  35. *De Gooi- en Eemlander*, April 23, 1925.
  36. Beusekom, *Kunst En Amusement*.
  37. *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, March 4, 1939.
  38. Johan Schot, Harry Lintsen, and Arie Rip, eds., *Technology and the Making of the Netherlands: The Age of Contested Modernization 1890-1970* (Zutphen: Walburg Pers : MIT Press, 2010).
  39. Piet de Rooy, *Republiek van Rivaliteiten: Nederland Sinds 1813* (Amsterdam: Mets & Schilt, 2002), 173–76.
  40. Cf. Kroes, "Between Rejection and Reception."
  41. Cf. J.C.H. Blom and J. Talsma, *De Verzuiling Voorbij: Godsdienst, Stand En Natie in de Lange Negentiende Eeuw*(Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 2000).
  42. *Algemeen Handelsblad*, May 17, 1933.
  43. The term "narrative template" is coined by James V. Wertsch, *Voices of Collective Remembering* (Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
  44. *Algemeen Handelsblad*, August 27 1924.
  45. One such excess was mentioned in an article that described how two students had stolen a photo of a film star out of a movie theater. *Algemeen Handelsblad*, May 24, 1932
  46. *De Telegraaf*, July 29, 1923.
  47. *Algemeen Handelsblad*, January 8, 1938.
  48. *De Groene Amsterdammer*, May 22, 1926.
  49. The caption below the cartoon in Dutch is 'En dat durft iets over mijn vorstelijke narcisjes te zeggen!'
  50. *De Tijd*, January 1, 1933.
  51. This sentiment is similar to critics associated with the Frankfurt School. See for instance David E. Nye, *Technology Matters: Questions to Live with* (Cambridge, MA etc.: The MIT Press, 2006), 69.
  52. David W. Ellwood, *The Shock of America: Europe and the Challenge of the Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 107.