"Strike and the World Strikes with You, Work and You Work Alone"
The Working-Class Urban Dutch and the Forces of their Faith

A Thesis

Submitted to Leiden University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Master's Degree

in North American Studies

By

Marleen Kramer

0709913

July 17, 2014

Supervisor: Dr. E. F. van de Bilt

Second reader: Prof. Dr. A. Fairclough

Table of Contents

1. Historiographical Backgrounds 4
2. The Dutch Presence in Progressive-Era Urban America 9
   2.1 The Dutch on the Streets 9
   2.2 The Dutch in the Workplaces 15
3. Congregating the Working-Class Dutch 23
   3.1 Fathers and Fraternities 23
   3.2 Uniting the Two 31
   3.3 The Dutch at Pullman, 1894 47
4. Conclusions 64

Works Cited and Consulted 68

The working-class Dutch immigrant holds a unique place in Progressive-Era labor history. Most blue-collar American immigrants defined themselves according to geographical and class distinctions. Those from the Netherlands, however, boasted a history of exclusive yet unmistakably successful ethnic communities established almost solely on the basis of religious conviction. Indeed, since their first Separatist settlements in 1847, churches were central in shaping Dutch-American subculture.[1] An unyielding reverence for the values and customs of their faith, however, placed many religious working-class urban Dutchmen in a distinct predicament during the tumultuous labor movement at the turn of the twentieth century.

The ideal of most migrating Netherlanders corresponded with a somewhat secluded agricultural life on the open plains and in the rural villages of the Great Lakes region, making those Dutch immigrants choosing, for whatever reason, to populate the ever-growing municipalities and metropolises of urban, north-eastern America an irrefutable minority. These few urban Dutch, however, remained so well-connected with their rural counterparts that Dutch historian David L. Zandstra referred to them as having been comfortably "in the city, but not *of* the city [emphasis added]."[2] With the coming of drastic social and economic revolutions following the surge of trans-European immigrant workers and the nationwide depression dubbed the Panic of 1893, the urban Dutch minority would begin to undergo a maturation different to that of its rural counterpart. The Dutch clergies and congregations of the city could no longer be sustained by their links with the more rural ethnic strongholds alone, and were forced to question the commensurability of their faith and their future in America.

With the passing of the Gilded Age, the working classes, both immigrant and native-born, recognized that the fruits of industrial capitalism were hardly bestowed on those who had actually labored for them. Increasing poverty and political unrest among the working-class led to the formation of trade and labor unions, but also instigated bitter strikes and some of the most violent uprisings the streets and factories of America had seen to date. Many religious Dutch, and certainly those with Reform tradition backgrounds had always maintained a "dignity and respect for manual labor and a strong sense of independence," which made it difficult for those earning a living in the urban sector to revolt against their daily employment or join any common labor movement,

[1] Hans Krabbendam, "Waarom christelijke vakbeweging onder de Nederlandse immigranten in Amerika niet aansloeg," *Cahier over de Geschiedenis van de Christelijk-Sociale Beweging* (2009): 146.
[2] David L. Zandstra, "In the City, But Not of the City: Dutch Truck Famers in the Calumet Region," in *The Dutch in Urban America,* ed. Robert P. Swierenga et al. (Holland, MI: Joint Archives, 2004).

especially if this meant fraternizing with associations and stakeholders the Dutch perceived as unnecessarily violent, clandestine and by all means un-Christian.[3] At the end of the day, however, if the bills could not be paid, some kind of concession with the movement would have to be made to keep the working-class Dutch both economically and socially stable.

Urban Dutch immigrants thus found themselves at a crux in choosing between upholding the often restrictive religious values and customs of their immigrant churches and communities or ameliorating their economic condition by opting to participate in the (radical) labor movements of the period rejected by their ethnic culture. Knowing that involvement could result in ruptures with their revered churches and possible condemnation from their well-established ethnic communities, to what extent were Dutch blue-collar immigrants willing to compromise their religious convictions in order to better their economic prosperity, and by extension, their social mobility in the increasingly cosmopolitan cities of turn-of-the-century America?

The extent to which any modification was necessary at all is a second and perhaps more interesting issue. Herbert Gutman was the first to challenge the labor historians' tendencies to "overlook religion or dismiss it as a negative influence," and ever since, a small but growing number of contemporary historians are indeed rethinking the not at all one-sided but intricate relationship between the religious sentiments and the working classes of Progressive-Era America.[4] It is through this broader approach that this thesis will analyze the role(s) that the Dutch migrant churches played in the lives of their working-class flock to determine whether the urban Dutch religious institutions were truly exclusively denouncing participation in any labor movements, or if there are valid claims suggesting certain Dutch churches and their clergies were beneficiary in their involvement and support towards workers' well-being. Furthermore, by tracing the activity of the Dutch during a case study of the direct labor confrontations at the Pullman factories in 1893–1894 Chicago, the influence that the Dutch as a minority had on the (immigrant) labor movement throughout the Progressive Era will be brought to light.

Substantial collections of personal correspondence from Progressive-Era urban Dutch have been preserved in historical and academic publications from both sides of the Atlantic, yet as these are often scattered over, among other things, time, location, faith and occupation, they can but

[3] Robert P. Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago: A History of the Hollanders in the Windy City* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 580.
[4] Evelyn Savidge Sterne, "Bringing Religion into Working-Class History: Parish, Public, and Politics in Providence, 1890–1930," *Social Science History* 24.1 (2000): 151.

provide snapshots of the subject matter in question. Thankfully, another form of contemporary literature is readily available, namely, the period's printed press. In 1927, Marcus L. Hansen promoted American immigration as a promising field of research, and claimed that the mass of literature connected with immigrants' religions was one of the two most important sources of history yet to be tapped into.[5] Almost a century later, historian Robert Schoone-Jongen writes that contemporary Dutch ethnic journalism has still remained unexplored.[6] With that in mind, I intend to be one of the first to probe those readily available ethnic language (religious) news bulletins to create an authentic sketch of the Progressive Era's Dutch working-class and their experiences at the crossroads of their faith and the nation's labor movement. The three newspapers forming the basis of analysis for this research are: Holland, Michigan's *De Grondwet (The Constitution)* (1871–1938); Orange City, Iowa's *De Volksvriend (The People's Friend)* (1874–1935); and De Pere, Wisconsin's *De Volksstem (The People's Voice)* (1890–1919).

---

[5] Marcus L. Hansen, "The History of American Immigration as a Field for Research," *The American Historical Review* 32.3 (1927): 518.
[6] Robert Schoone-Jongen, "Fighting at the Borders: Dutch-Americans and the Paterson Silk Strike of 1913," in *Across Borders: Dutch Migration to North America and Australia*, ed. Jacob E. Nyenhuis et al. (Holland, MI: Van Raalte Press, 2010): 205.

1. Historiographical Backgrounds

Immigration to America in many ways actually constitutes the nation's very coming into existence. Excluding the American continents' native inhabitants, the first Puritan settlers of colonial America were themselves immigrants from the Old World. In the centuries that followed, and up until today, the United States has beckoned peoples of all ethnicities to both its shores and the expanses inbetween. It is logical then, that migration is a field of study whose discourse is anything but fixed—the bulk of hard data available for research is ever expanding and more importantly, the scholarly frameworks for analysis are shifting likewise. David A. Gerber, Professor of History at the University at Buffalo (SUNY), traces the origins of American immigration historiography back to the turn of the last century, when the rising number of academic social historians presented their "intellectual reaction" to the nation's demoralizing immigration politics and the subsequent prejudices projected onto the foreign-born.[1] Among these scholars were second-generation Polish immigrants William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki who co-authored the five volumes of *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (1918–1920). The two shaped immigration historiography (and sociology in general) with the introduction of their "organizational paradigm", in which migration throughout the modern Western world was analyzed as a general process of (dis)organization towards upward social mobility. At the same time, many of Thomas and Znaniecki's successors focused more on "the lived experiences, attitudes and values" of the European migrants themselves.[2] Oscar Handlin's *The Uprooted* (1953) was the Pulitzer Prize winning child of both macro and micro approaches, and as one of the first general immigrant histories to combine the perspective of the individual migrant with more encompassing sociological patterns from the entire migrant community, it was and remains a classic in American immigration historiography.

According to Handlin, the European immigrants who relocated en masse to America were almost always desperately poor, lonely and with but "a single choice remain[ing] to be made—to emigrate or to die."[3] Handlin's early synonymy of new world immigrants and agrarian peasants makes his history one that was, even for 1953, one-sided and archaic. Rudolph Vecoli's 1964

---

[1] David A. Gerber, "Immigration Historiography at the Crossroads," *Reviews in American History* 39.1 (2011): 76.
[2] Gerber, "Immigration Historiography," 76.
[3] Oscar Handlin, *The Uprooted: From the Old World to the New* (London: Watts & Co., 1953), 37.

critique of *The Uprooted* opened the floodgates for critical analysis of the generic history Handlin sketched of the European immigrant.[4] Vecoli set the stage for increasing numbers of less conventional history scholars to incorporate issues such as gender, labor, and race theory in analyzing immigrant behavior. Clearly a reaction to Handlin's bleak sketches, the thesis of John Bodnar's *The Transplanted* (1985) argued that through multiple aspects of immigrant life, like religion and labor, sport, fraternal societies, folk-life and education, immigrants were able to comfortably settle their foreign roots in new soil.[5]

Although Bodnar is no labor or economic historian, it could be argued that *The Transplanted* was published in the trail of the 1960s "new" labor history. At that time, labor historians Herbert Gutman and David Montgomery had been stimulating labor historians to study the working classes themselves, and not base their research on records of labor organizations and their leaders.[6] As Bodnar saw it, "in short, ethnic clusters became economic interest groups" and in determining which paths their lives were to take, immigrants were "free to choose, but barely."[7] Although Bodnar's history is written with a focus on the everyday lives of the working class, he still did not write *their* history in that he concludes that migrants in America were merely differing puppets dancing to the same drum beating the rhythms of the all-encompassing capitalism.

Enter the "crossroads" Gerber feels the field of immigration historiography is stuck at. On the one hand, the field has become too "occupied with experiential reconstructions and with the formation of ethnic communities and ethnic identities to the extent that it has been reluctant to address those larger forces in the coming together of America itself." On the other, he fears that to combine these micro and macro strands of migration history "requires speculations about consciousness that in the absence of evidence, we are not in a sound position to make."[8] David R. Roediger's approach to labor in the form of whiteness studies makes a solid attempt at bridging Gerber's unbridgeable, but admits that, in the process, a certain "messiness" is indispensable.[9]

---

[4] Rudolph J. Vecoli, "Contadini in Chicago: A Critique of *The Uprooted*," *The Journal of American History* 51.3 (1964): 404–417.
[5] John Bodnar, *The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1985).
[6] Herbert Hill, "The Problem of Race in American Labor History," *Reviews in American History* 24.2 (1996): 189–190.
[7] Bodnar, *The Transplanted*, 137, 209.
[8] Gerber, "Immigration Historiography," 82–84.
[9] David R. Roediger, *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White* (New York: Basic Books, 2005), 32.

Roediger's *Working Toward Whiteness* (2005) analyzes the economic and political environments of twentieth-century American immigrants as these were complemented by the changing social contours of what we now recognize as ethnicity. His narrative of the "inbetweenness" of America's migrants is truly "agenda-setting," moving beyond the fault lines of traditional immigration historiography and at the same time distancing himself from the success-based labor history tradition to reveal the derogatory repercussions that skin color and culture had on the working classes of the American system.[10]

If the trend in labor studies has been to overlook the issue of race because of its tendency to complicate writing the narratives of working-class history, no doubt the same has been the case with religion. In Vecoli's 2001 revised bibliography on American immigration and ethnicity, referenced works concerning religion amount to a meager one of the thirty-five pages the document totals.[11] (For comparison, the rubric of government immigration policy counts over three pages, that concerning gender more than three and a half.) Of those religiously-affiliated references, most are country and conviction specific – the list includes no general history of the irrefutable effects that foreign faiths had on the American nation and its people.

In 1927, Marcus L. Hansen put forward American immigration as a promising field of research, and claimed that the mass of literature connected with immigrants' religions was one of the two most important sources of history that had yet to be tapped into; "How much lies buried in church archives can only be imagined. The great amount that found its way into print has hardly been touched."[12] Professor of church history Jay P. Dolan reveals that Hansen's incitement only became substance with the explosion of social history in the 1960s. Shortly thereafter, numerous denominational and parochial historical studies emerged, but because their outpouring was so extensive and was "ramifying in a hundred directions at once", the discipline of American religious history entered into a "state of flux".[13]

---

[10] Roediger, *Working Toward Whiteness,* 32; Desmond King, review of *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White*, by David R. Roediger. *American Historical Review* 3.5 (2006): 1528.
[11] Rudolph Vecoli, "A Selected Bibliography on American Immigration and Ethnicity," 2001, accessed May 12, 2013, http://www.ihrc.umn.edu/publications/pdf/BAIE.pdf.
[12] Marcus L. Hansen, "The History of American Immigration as a Field for Research," *The American Historical Review* 32.3 (1927): 518.
[13] Jay P. Dolan, "The Immigrants and Their Gods: A New Perspective in American Religious History," *Church History* 57 (1988): 61–62.

One principle of organization under which Dolan feels a certain coherence can be brought to the field of American religious history is immigration, as it is a phenomenon that cuts across denominational boundaries, and one that stimulates comparative study thanks to the vast amount of documented primary and secondary material. However, in their introduction to *Immigration and Religion in America*, scholars Richard Alba, Albert J. Raboteau and Josh deWind outline that when it comes to religion, scholars either "tend to deploy sociological categories and to emphasize the socioeconomic and political effects of religious activity" or focus on "beliefs, values, worship practices and devotional piety." Alba et al. argue that there have been few historians who have contemplated American history under the combined precedents of religion as an institution and religion as a set of beliefs.[14] Dolan puts it poetically when he labels such a historiographical tangent "moving from the pulpit to the pew," the same idea behind the trend that emerged in labor studies shifting the focal point from the management to the assembly lines.[15]

In a case study of 1890–1930 Providence, Rhode Island, Evelyn Savidge Sterne combines both approaches and presents the thesis that "the Catholic church was the most important public space in working-class Providence".[16] But where historians like Roediger propose innovative, new directions in American historiography, Sterne specifically rejects past trends, particularly those upheld by labor historians. According to Dutch historian Hans Krabbendam, in labor studies, religion has been ascertained to have either fragmented industrial workers on the basis of their faiths and/or propagated an obedience towards authority such that, if anything, it could only have repressed the labor movement.[17] Savidge Sterne herself can indeed cite but a "handful" of historians who did not "dismiss it [religion] as a deradicalizing influence or ignored it altogether."[18] Of these historians, most have focused on specific faiths or immigrant parishes, such as Robert Orsi on Italian Harlem and John J. Bukowczyk and Leslie Woodcock Tentler on the Catholic Polish immigrant, but the group also includes the more encompassing works of scholars

[14] Richard Alba, Albert J. Raboteau and Josh deWind, eds., introduction to *Immigration and Religion in America: Comparative and Historical Perspectives* (New York: New York University Press, 2009), 4.
[15] Dolan, "The Immigrants and Their Gods," 64.
[16] Evelyn Savidge Sterne, "Bringing Religion into Working-Class History: Parish, Public, and Politics in Providence, 1890–1930," *Social Science History* 24.1 (2000): 151.
[17] Hans Krabbendam, "Waarom christelijke vakbeweging onder de Nederlandse immigranten in Amerika niet aansloeg," *Cahier over de Geschiedenis van de Christelijk-Sociale Beweging* (2009): 149.
[18] Savidge Sterne, "Bringing Religion," 151.

like Ken Fones-Wolf, who has taken a closer look at the often marginalized 1910–1920s Labor Forward Movement of the American Federation of Labor in *Trade Union Gospel* (1989).

Since their earliest mass migrations, the Dutch have been documenting their overwhelmingly religious histories, making them an ideal group to study through the approach advocated by Savidge Sterne. The very first general chronicles of the Dutch in America were most often religiously oriented, either written by ministers or the earliest students and teachers of the Dutch-American colleges that were springing up in the Midwest. With the popularity of conducting quantitative historical research on the rise in the 1980s, Robert P. Swierenga entered the Dutch-American historical scene and set the stage for more statistical-based history writing. In spite of the move towards specialization and the establishment of transatlantic scholarly Dutch-American research institutes, conferences and even the *Origins* semiannual publication by the Calvin College in Grand Rapids, from the last decades of the twentieth century and onward, the religious factor remains the most prominent in Dutch-American historiography. And because the Dutch identity was best preserved among immigrants with strong religious affiliation, the rural communities of those Dutch-Americans, and especially the Secessionists, have received the most scholarly attention. With the exception of Hylke Speerstra's *Cruel Paradise*: *Life Stories of Dutch Emigrants* (2005), most studies of the Dutch in America were inspired by a certain nostalgia and presented an overtly positive and almost reverential undertone.

This study aims to be different. By taking a closer look at the marginalized urban Dutch through the combined wide-angle lenses of religion and labor, this research will contribute to the renunciation of the one-sided historiography of both the Dutch in America and the role of religion in labor studies.

2. The Dutch Presence in Progressive-Era Urban America

2.1 The Dutch on the Streets

The Dutch immigrants were never a dominant presence in urban, Progressive-Era America. In the entire century of 1820 – 1920, Dutch immigration to America totaled under 400 000 migrants – less than the number of Irish settling in the United States in each decade of that same century.[1] Indeed, as revealed by the 1911 reports of the United States Immigrant Commission, better known as the Dillingham Commission, from 1899 to 1909, the Dutch (grouped together with the Flemish) totaled only 74 646 of just over 9.5 million immigrants in the United States; almost half of these Dutch migrants went to the states of Michigan and Illinois.[2] Furthermore, it is a widely accepted and well-documented fact that most of the Dutch settling in America preferred the rural, agricultural setting above that of the urban, industrial one. Those Dutch-American migrants who did initially settle in the cities were most often farm laborers hoping to earn enough money during a short period in the city to eventually buy a plot of land on which to start their own farms and agricultural enterprises.[3] With the exception of the arrival of the first individually migrating Jewish merchants dating back to the period of the French occupation of the Netherlands, the city environments of America were hardly ever the final destination of choice for nineteenth-century Dutch emigrants.[4]

Family cohesion being a strong traditional Dutch attribute, most Dutch-American migrants travelled collectively with immediate and extended family.[5] Initially, many Dutch even migrated with entire congregations, most of these immigrants hailing from congregations under the collective umbrella of the Dutch Reformed faith, but leaving the Netherlands under the leadership of Secessionist ministers preaching a more orthodox faith.[6] The abundant and un-settled lands

---

[1] Herbert J. Brinks, *Dutch American Voices: Letters from the United States, 1850–1930* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 5.
[2] Abstracts of the Reports of the Immigrant Commission, S. Rep. at 107 (1911), accessed June 10, 2013, http://archive.org/stream/reportsofimmigra01unitrich#page/n9/mode/2up.
[3] Hans Krabbendam, *Freedom on the Horizon: Dutch Immigration to America, 1840–1940*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009), 80.
[4] Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 1.
[5] Robert P. Swierenga, *Faith and Family: Dutch Immigration and Settlement in the United States, 1820–1920* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 2000), 53.
[6] Henry S. Lucas, *Netherlanders in America: Dutch Immigration to the United States and Canada, 1789–1950* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1955), 519.

available in the Midwest were the perfect place for these religiously-motivated immigrants to establish communities free from the social ostracism sometimes experienced in their ever-liberalizing mother country. Brinks will even argue that the settlements of many Dutch Reformed communities "were designed to encourage ethnic isolation as a strategy for preserving family values and religious precepts".[7] This may seem somewhat suffocating, but it happened that immigrants who were not church members actually preferred to associate with those of the Dutch Reformed since the latter's ethnic network was extremely valuable in the strange, new environment.[8] There are even records of migrants who were not devout or at all religious who actually "swayed" on the boat or just after settling so as to be able to benefit better from this same network.[9] And because the Dutch were known for their religious solidarity, it was not uncommon that the Dutch were "indifferent to their Catholic, Jewish or secularist countrymen".[10] Upon arrival, rarely were the Dutch attracted to other religious groups, with the exception of the Presbyterian Church, as the doctrines of these historically Scottish Calvinists were very much akin to those of the Dutch Reformed tradition.[11]

However, Hans Krabbendam rightly notes that historians have, for too long, been under the "inflated impression" that the Secessionists and religiously inclined migrant movements have dominated Dutch-American historiography.[12] Robert P. Swierenga similarly argues that "Netherlanders were pulled away by the American 'magnet' more than they were pushed away by any Dutch 'devils.'"[13] In 1866, the renowned *Tijdschrijft voor Staathuishoudkunde en Statistiek* (*Magazine of Political Economy and Statistics*) describes this status quo on emigration to the United States in an article written by B.W.A.E. Sloet tot Oldhuis. Brinks summarized the article as listing "several structural, long term factors that propelled rural residents to depart" and revealing that the image the Dutch had of America was primarily one of "virgin land, high wages, low taxes

---

[7] Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 11.
[8] Annemieke Galema, *Frisians to America 1888–1914: With the Baggage of the Fatherland* (Groningen, the Netherlands: REGIO-Project Uitgevers, 1996), 176.
[9] Galema, *Frisians to America*, 176.
[10] Swierenga, *Faith and Family*, 154.
[11] Lucas, *Netherlanders in America,* 517.
[12] Krabbendam, *Freedom on the Horizon*, 6.
[13] Swierenga, *Faith and Family*, 59.

and individualism."[14] Eelco Ekker, a detached Mormon from Overijssel seeking prosperity in the Midwest writes to his father that, indeed, "You know it too, I didn't go to Utah for the Mormon faith, but, with God's blessing, to be the means by which you could live a more comfortable life."[15] According to one American in Grand Rapids, Michigan, the Dutch had indeed already been coming to the city by "numerous trainloads" in the 1880s and 1890s.[16] It was not until the beginning of the twentieth century, however, that the individualism praised in Sloet's article would convince more and more younger and independent Dutch urbanites to cross the ocean, or motivate those who initially preferred agriculture to remain in the cities "where high wages, together with the possibility of homeownership and the potential of capital accumulation, offered an attractive alternative to farming."[17]

Scholars agree that the Dutch migrant's urban focus "coincided with the belated but rapid industrialization of the Dutch economy after 1900."[18] Communal agriculture was abandoning its traditional patriarchal set-up, drastically cutting its workforce and creating a vast number of excess farm laborers. Joseph Noorthoek of Friesland writes in a 1910 account of his migration to America that "there was no future in the Netherlands for an ordinary workman nor even for the most skilled workman."[19] Industrialization and these excess laborers jeopardized the already deficient job opportunities for blue-collar workers of the Netherlands. Instead of undergoing "a drastic adjustment to factory life," many craftsmen and (farm) laborers preferred to try their luck in or on the outskirts of the growing urban centers of America, either continuing their trade or hoping to combine farming with other jobs.[20] Even though the bulk of blue- and white-collar Dutch were travelling to the colonial East Indies where their urban potential was greatest, there was a "modest" rise in individual emigrants to America and from 1900 onwards "the Netherlands had finally

---

[14] Ibid., 20–21.;The article in question can be found here: B. W. A. E. Sloet tot Oldhuis, "Over de oorzaken van de landverhuizing der Nederlanders naar de Vereenigde Staten," in *Tijdschrift voor Staathuishoudkunde en Statistiek 26* (1866): 79–102.
[15] Eelco Ekker, March 1877 cited in J. Spitse, *Altijd aan het Reizen: brieven van een mormoonse emigrant naar Noord-Amerika, 1877–1913* (Zutphen, the Netherlands: Walburg Pers, 2011), 121.
[16] Swierenga, *Faith and Family*, 53.
[17] Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 8.
[18] Robert P. Swierenga, "The Delayed Transition from Folk to Labor Migration: The Netherlands, 1880–1920," *International Migration Review* 27.2 (1993): 407.
[19] Dutch Immigrant Letter Collection. Calvin College Hekman Library. Accessed 16–17 March, 2014. http://www.calvin.edu/hh/letters/letters_main.html. (Joseph Noorthoek, "An Account of Some Noteworthy Events While Travelling From Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA, To St. Philipsland, The Netherlands And The Return Trip," Grand Rapids, MI: printed by Cart Nienhardt, 1910).
[20] Swierenga, *Faith and Family,* 270, 38.

'caught-up' with England, Ireland, Germany and the rest of northern Europe in the shift from family to industrial migrants."[21] 1917 marked the highest percentage (50%) of individual Dutch immigrants to the United States and by 1920, over half of the foreign-born Dutch in America lived in cities of 2500 or more.[22] The four main cities where the Dutch would settle from 1880 onward were located around southern Lake Michigan: Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo, Michigan; Chicago, Illinois; and Paterson, New Jersey. Only Roman Catholic and Jewish Dutch settled in New York City.[23]

In spite of the increase in individual and urban migration, urban Dutch-Americans were in no way far removed from their more remote rural counterparts. Like other immigrant groups, the Dutch were quick to establish ethnic language newspapers circulating the familial, commercial, political and religious affairs of their fellow migrants. Throughout the country, Dutch communities published regional weeklies such as Patterson and Passaic's (New Jersey) *Het Oosten (The East)* (1904–1940) and Chicago, Illinois, based *Onze Toekomst* (*Our Future*) (1896–1959). Some publications received national circulation, as was the case for *De Sheboygan Nieuwsbode* (1849–1861) of Sheboygan, Wisconsin, and *De Grondwet (The Constitution)* (1871–1938), which, although published in the smaller town of Holland, Michigan, counted eight thousand subscribers from across the entire nation at its publication peak in 1907 – the highest circulation any Dutch press in America has ever seen.[24] Near the turn of the century, at least fifty Dutch language weeklies and magazines came into being, and although most would not be read from coast to coast due to their specific regional or religious scope, about fifteen of these were published over a longer period of time and for a broad public.[25] Those forming the basis of the closer look at the Dutch language media covering the Pullman episodes of 1894 are the aforementioned *De Grondwet*, considered a national medium covering all corners of the business, political and religious views of Dutch-Americans; Orange City, Iowa's *De Volksvriend (The People's Friend)* (1874–1935), a predominately Protestant and Republican leaning paper; and De Pere, Wisconsin's *De Volksstem*

---

[21] Swierenga, "The Delayed Transition," 414, 423.
[22] Ibid., 407; Robert P. Swierenga, "The Dutch Urban Experience," in *The Dutch in Urban America*, ed. Swierenga et al. (Holland, MI: Joint Archives, 2004), 1.
[23] Krabbendam, *Freedom on the Horizon*, 82–89.
[24] Hans Krabbendam, "Nederlandse kranten in de Verenigde Staten 1849–1959," accessed July 29, 2013, http://kranten.kb.nl/about/VerenigdeStaten.
[25] Krabbendam, "Nederlandse kranten."

(The People's Voice) (1890–1919), the only Dutch language publication with a Catholic and Democrat emphasis.[26]

With respect to physical mobility within America itself, here too the Dutch showed a strong inter-connectedness. Having completed a monumental study of the Chicago Dutch, Swierenga reveals that there, entire communities would "pull up stakes in concert ... and relocate en masse."[27] In an essay tracing the development of Dutch truck-farming ventures in Chicago, David L. Zandstra recounts the "mutual interdependence" of Dutch farmers and urbanites working together to make a profit selling (extra) agrarian produce in the urban markets of Chicago.[28] Another profitable venture for the Dutch of Chicago was the so-called teamstering. What began as collecting private and market-based garbage, turned into maneuvering the city's general waste and would come to include hauling coal and ice, disposing of general waste and even transporting heavy industrial freight and debris. This teamstering was a particularly successful Dutch venture and brought those from the city in contact with those living in the agricultural districts and those who, for whatever reason, frequented the harbors and stations where the collected garbage was often hauled to for further disposal by the state.[29] In a letter written to his family in Holland dated April 30th, 1905, a rural immigrant from Groningen Klaas Niemeijer relates: "I haul loads [by horse] up to two hours away."[30]

Although the urban Dutch were most inclined to keep their small businesses within family and ethnic kin, according to Zandstra, the Dutch in the Chicago truck-farming business hired Slovaks, Poles, Italians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians and other Eastern-European immigrants to help with the labor in the fields and gardens.[31] These men could be picked up and dropped off en route to and from the urban neighborhoods where the Dutch sold their produce. This meant that the orthodox Dutch Reformed immigrant, for example, would have to work with devout Catholics, many of which had other ethnicities, but according to Zandstra, "life-long friendships were

---

[26] Ibid.
[27] Robert P. Swierenga, "The Dutch Urban Experience," in *The Dutch in Urban America*, ed. Robert P. Swierenga et al. (Holland, MI: Joint Archives, 2004), 4.
[28] David L. Zandstra, "In the City, But Not of the City: Dutch Truck Farmers in the Calumet Region," in *The Dutch in Urban America*, ed. Robert P. Swierenga et al. (Holland, MI: Joint Archives, 2004), 119.
[29] Robert P. Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago: A History of the Hollanders in the Windy City* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 577–579.
[30] Klaas Niemeijer, April 30, 1905 cited in Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 313.
[31] Zandstra, "In the City," 125.

established" and "these groups continued to support each other."[32] Swierenga's research notes a similar friendliness the Dutch exhibited with other ethnic and religious groups; among the Dutch, Jews and Blacks, for example, "were called by name and treated with respect."[33] In the urban environment of Progressive-Era America, ethnic and minority racism was wide-spread, and practiced not just by the American-born, but by many immigrant groups as well and "whether the racial categories being bridged were biological or cultural ones," almost every ethnic group would have been subject to ostracism in some way or another.[34] However, with their fair skin and Western-European cultural backgrounds, the 'Old immigrant' Dutch were not as strong a target of immigrant-related racism from American-born. Also, because those early immigrants who had made a name for the Dutch were mostly strict Calvinist farmers who valued their isolated enclaves and wanted little to do with the affairs of the cities, the Dutch appeared to be a group from which both the American-born and immigrant minorities had little to apprehend.

In his research on Dutch-American occupational change, Swierenga reveals that relocation to America indeed almost always yielded upward economic mobility, the promise of which had pulled so many to its soil in the first place.[35] Swierenga also notes that the potential for upward economic and by extension social mobility was generally higher in expanding industrial cities, like Chicago. In the first two decades of the twentieth century, most urban immigrants were of the "middling" class, a reasonably steady 70% originating in municipalities ranging in size from less than 5000 to 100 000+ inhabitants. Nearly six times as many "poor" were leaving the cities with populations of 50 000+ or less, cities from the interior provinces, Utrecht and Zwolle, for example, where industry was lagging behind places like Amsterdam and Rotterdam.[36] And although first-generation rural settlers initially "enjoyed greater stability and had a minimal loss of status … within a generation, the Dutch in the expanding cities surpassed their kin in the rural colonies."[37] According to Swierenga's research, the total percentage that, after migration, either stayed in the same occupational category (jobless, farm laborer, unskilled, skilled, farmer, low white collar, high

---

[32] Ibid., 126.
[33] Swierenga, "The Dutch Urban Experience," 3.
[34] David R. Roediger, *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White* (New York: Basic Books, 2005), 51.
[35] see Robert P. Swierenga, "Migration and Occupational Change," in *Faith and Family: Dutch Immigration and Settlement in the United States, 1820–1920*. (New York: Holmes & Meier, 2000), 257–273.
[36] Swierenga, "The Delayed Transition," 419.
[37] Swierenga, *Faith and Family*, 270.

white collar) or advanced forward at the beginning of the Progressive Era was 80 to 90%.[38] As such, there were few Dutch immigrants who found themselves in the cities as a desperate last option, something which has often been considered the common plight of the foreign born in America.

2.2 The Dutch in the Workplaces

American immigrants made up the bulk of the labor force in many industries.[39] Most turn-of-the-century Dutch migrants, however, were still not of the working class. As such, those who did labor in the industrial crafts and factories are a minority of interest. Due to lack of occupational research, it is difficult to determine just how many Dutch were employed in American industry, either directly upon arrival or after a certain number of years in the country. Thankfully, Swierenga's extensive statistical research is extremely valuable in providing some helpful numbers and percentiles. Swierenga reveals that in the 40 years from 1880 to 1920, nearly 80 000 of all Dutch emigrants had urban origins, and that 70% of all Dutch migrants relocated to America.[40] However, because more than half of the urban Dutch emigrants relocated to other cities in Europe or the promising Dutch colonies in Asia it can be assumed that there were surely fewer than 28 000 Dutch settling in American cities from 1880 to 1920 (70% of 40 000).[41] Naturally, there were always cases of urban Dutch migrants who preferred an agricultural future in the new world, and up until 1870, when American land was still quite cheap, numerous blue-collard Dutch were indeed settling on farms in rural America.[42] After this period, however, with labor devalued and upward economic mobility more difficult to attain, both the rural farm laborers and blue-collar skilled and semi-skilled city migrants would have generally remained longer in the cities.

Swierenga's research with a particular focus on occupational migration starts at the year 1900, just after the "take-off" of labor migration from the Netherlands.[43] Single male migration to America (those most likely to become industrial laborers) increased steadily through 1880 to 1920

---

[38] Ibid., 271.
[39] Thomas Göbel, "Becoming American: Ethnic Workers and the Rise of the CIO," *Labor History* 29.2 (1988): 174.
[40] Swierenga, "The Delayed Transition," 407, 409.
[41] Ibid., 410.
[42] Krabbendam, *Freedom on the Horizon*, 60.
[43] Swierenga, "The Delayed Transition," 406.

from 12 to 36%, with an outlying peak just after the war.[44] After 1900, the number of single male emigrants from the larger cities of the Netherlands was also ten percent higher than its rural counterpart.[45] From 1901 to 1920, Dutch emigrants employed in the secondary sector, which included manufacturing (textile, wood, metals, food, etc.), construction and general labor, counted for roughly 40% of the migrant population, which, in fact, overrepresented the workforce of its homeland counterpart by 20%.[46] Clearly, more and more Dutch (farm) laborers were keen to start and/or move shop to American soil. With numbers from the Dutch Central Bureau for Statistics, according to Swierenga approximately 60 000 migrants relocated to America between 1900 and 1920.[47] On the basis of Swierenga's occupational percentiles, it can be estimated that roughly 24 000 Dutch-Americans were of the working class in the first two decades of the twentieth century (40% of 60 000).

Once settled, the interconnectedness of the rural and urban Dutch network made it easy for the Dutch to learn of job opportunities throughout the United States, and the successful Dutch enclaves provided valuable social support ensuring that ethnic, religious and familial kin had little to worry about in the way of initial places to stay, credible council and intelligence, food and if necessary, even money. Within just two days of immigration to America, the father of later labor and peace advocate Abraham Muste had found a job in a factory in Grand Rapids.[48] This is no surprise, as the Dutch formed nearly half the workforce of the furniture industry in Grand Rapids.[49] Chicago was known as the "'Great Central Market' of the nation", so here, many of the excess agricultural workers from the Netherlands were quick to follow the example of those who had combined agricultural skills with the vicinity of cheap land in the suburbs of the city to make a profit growing and selling vegetable produce.[50] In Kalamazoo, similar produce gardeners and truck famers even had the luxury of being eligible for seasonal winter work in the lumber factories to increase the family's yearly income.[51] With produce inevitably comes waste, and the Dutch were just as canny in turning one man's trash into another's treasure; by 1913, Chicago had 202 licensed

---

[44] Ibid., 408.
[45] Ibid., 420.
[46] Ibid., 416, 417.
[47] Ibid., 411.
[48] Krabbendam, *Freedom on the Horizon*, 85.
[49] Ibid., 208–209.
[50] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 552.
[51] Krabbendam, *Freedom on the Horizon*, 86.

garbage wagons, almost all of which were in the hands of Dutch families and partnerships and continuing to grow in number.[52] Some Dutch were even so successful that they were soon running their own factories, as was the case for Jan ter Braak and the Steketee family, both of Grand Rapids, opening a factory making wooden shoes in 1873, and lumber warehouses employing many other Dutch city workers onwards from 1862, respectively.[53]

The Dutch with factory experience in the Netherlands were often too poor to immigrate, and so many of those taking on factory work were slightly better-off, experienced agricultural laborers, some with the hopes of earning enough money to eventually establish their own farmsteads and agricultural businesses.[54] Village craftsmen and laborers who were often healthier, more economically affluent, generally better educated and by extension more flexible were those most likely to be found taking on new and successful ventures in larger urban centers.[55] These urban immigrants, whether temporary or not, found work in various sectors and states. This included and was certainly not limited to: boat building in Holland, Michigan, working at saw mills and lumber harbors in Muskegon, Michigan, brick making, carpentry and automotive production in Detroit, Michigan, teamstering, truck gardening and cement contracting in Chicago, Illinois and work in iron foundries and coach building in De Pere, Wisconsin.[56] Furniture manufacturing provided one of the most prominent working-class occupations of the Dutch immigrants in the "major light industrial and commercial center" of Grand Rapids, as did the railroad and rail coach industries in Pullman and Hyde Park, Chicago.[57] Paterson, New Jersey, although not one of the larger urban centers, housed what was the largest county of Dutch-Americans in the East, most of which worked in the industrial textile and silk production or managed to become successful by creating a niche in regional construction.[58]

---

[52] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 580.
[53] Krabbendam, *Freedom on the Horizon*, 212, 216.
[54] Ibid., 198.
[55] Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 221.
[56] Geoffrey Reynolds, "Built Along the Shores of Macatawa: The History of Boat Building in Holland, Michigan," in *The Dutch in Urban America*, ed. Robert P. Swierenga et al. (Holland, MI: Joint Archives, 2004), 94–107; Krabbendam, *Freedom on the Horizon*, 214; James Evenhuis, "Detroit's Motor City Dutch," in *The Dutch in Urban America*, ed. Robert P. Swierenga et al. (Holland, MI: Joint Archives, 2004), 13–33; Robert P. Swierenga, Introduction to *The Dutch in Urban America*, ed. Robert P. Swierenga et al. (Holland, MI: Joint Archives, 2004), ix–xii; Krabbendam, *Freedom on the Horizon*, 221.
[57] Swierenga, *Faith and Family*, 268, 53; Krabbendam, *Freedom on the Horizon*, 211; Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 4.
[58] Gerald F. de Jong, "Dutch Immigrants in New Jersey Before World War 1," *New Jersey History* 94.2 (1976): 71; Krabbendam, *Freedom on the Horizon*, 88; Swierenga, Introduction, ix–x; Robert Schoone-

Working as a craftsman, or putting up with factory work must have been draining for the Dutch immigrants in the American cities, even if it was for just long enough to be able to earn enough to migrate to the coveted agricultural communities farther west. Factory labor was physically and, perhaps even more, mentally exhausting for Dutch farm laborers who were used to working with the land and animals outside in the fields as opposed to processing raw materials and operating heavy machinery in dusty and crowded factories indoors. As one Frisian family recalls, their 1924 move "to a lumber factory in the new world was a big change. In the evening, exhausted from factory work, father Age would sit and stare with moist eyes at nothing… 'My head feels so funny.' That was all he could say."[59] Louis van Koert, The Hague emigrant who found work as a stonecutter and painter writes home to his friends of the socialist movement of the Netherlands that in Chicago, thousands are still working ten to twelve hour days, not including the early morning and late evening hours they must devote to travelling to and from the workplace, "For them, the situation is more than unbearable."[60] Local painter P.J.J. van der Heijden from Orange City, Iowa reveals in a letter to a friend that his brother-in-law makes a good living with steady work and has little to complain, but that "he is a laborer which he does not like, which is something I can well understand, and now he is talking about either starting for himself or going back to Holland, but if he does that I think that the latter would be a worse mistake than the first."[61]

As van der Heijden's letter shows, although many urban immigrants spoke of the working life in the city as certainly very different, they almost always penned that things in America were far better off than in the motherland. In a 1908 letter to family and acquaintances, New Jersey painter Jan Willem Nijenhuis revealed that "You don't have to be afraid of the boss here. You learn that quickly in America."[62] Likewise, in a letter written in 1893, W.J. van den Bosch praises the foreman of a factory where he works in Indiana.

> In Holland someone like him would have been properly dressed, with chosen pride constantly commanding his laborers. This person though, walks around

---

Jongen, "There was Work in the Valley: Dutch Immigration to New Jersey, 1850–1920," *Tijdschrift voor Sociale en Economische Geschiedenis* 7.2 (2010): 77.

[59] Hylke Speerstra, *Cruel Paradise: Life Stories of Dutch Emigrants* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 38.

[60] Archief Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis. Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis. Algemeen, Correspondentie, 127, Koert, L.W. van. 1893–1894, August 10, 1893.

[61] Dutch Immigrant Letter Collection. (P.J.J van der Heijden, Orange City, Iowa, January 10, 1893).

[62] Jan Willem Nijenhuis, November 9, 1908 cited in Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 442.

> in an old shirt and trousers with a chew of tobacco in his mouth. He helps wherever his help is needed, working side by side with his laborers…[63]

Whether everything was actually as rose-colored as often depicted should be taken into question. In her studies of Frisian immigrant letter-writing, Annemieke Galema revealed that Dutch-American correspondence was generically hyperbolic and at times even withheld the more negative news. Galema's epistolary research emphasizes the amount of so-called 'spekbrieven' (bacon-letters) through which Dutch immigrants often exaggerated the opportunities, the harvests and of course the amount of meat being eaten each day.[64]

This overtly positive approach to epistolography was not limited to primitive comings-and-goings like food and weather, but also included, or rather, did not include, the deplorable conditions or socio-political backgrounds of industrial work. Klaas Niemeijer, a Chicago teamster almost entirely avoided the Chicago Teamster's Strike of 1905 in his correspondence, writing only that "At present there is a huge strike here and sometimes people use revolvers and knives. If you were to see it you would be shocked."[65] Niemeijer, a teamster himself, was undoubtedly caught in the middle of what would become one of the century's most violent and deadly strikes, and all he felt necessary to relate was that the violence was shocking. Niemeijer's acquaintances in the Netherlands were apparently worried that "cigar making is very bad work and that Pieterke's [Klaas's daughter of fifteen] life would be shortened by it." Father Niemeijer responded only that "We value our children highly enough, so if that were true we would not keep her there. Pieterke is very healthy and she enjoys the work."[66] The response blatantly ignored questioning why the assumptions had been made in the first place, and certainly lacked any valid arguments rebutting them. So too, does the Plaisier family correspondence tell nothing of the working conditions of wage earners Aart and Gerrit who worked in the furniture and gravel mine industries of Grand Rapids for years. In one of their letters, though, great lengths are made to describe certain farming operations, father Plaisier lamenting that letter writing was so expensive since "I could write six pages about the farm."[67] Even the blatantly honest anarchist Louis van Koert, who rarely had a good word concerning his American plights, admitted he did not want to pen his everyday trials

---

[63] Galema, *Frisians to America*, 107.
[64] Ibid., 106–107.
[65] Klaas Niemeijer, April 30, 1905 cited in Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 313.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Aart Plaisier, August 11, 1911 cited in Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 328.

"because this was less cheerful, and I wanted to conceal all the misery."[68] In a rare co-written collection of family letters from Paterson, New Jersey, the disappointments which father Willem Woudenberg chose to leave out in his correspondence to the Netherlands are recounted by his twenty-one year old son Johan. Revealing what work was really like in the dye-factories of Paterson, Johan relates,

> Dad must have thought many a time what a far cry it was from the white jacket and apron in his tidy and clean meat market in Holland to this small, rather dark dye shop, where the acid and steam rising from the dye troughs caused the eyes to tear constantly. … It was back-breaking work, unskilled, a job for men who couldn't speak the English language and thus were not in a position to reason with the boss regarding the working conditions.[69]

When it came to such issues as language on the work floor, however, few letters hesitated to sugarcoat or obscure the particulars. It is clear that the Dutch were quick to recognize that learning to speak English was a way to upgrade their station and quite often, increase their pay. Aart Plaisier, a skilled cabinet-maker from Rotterdam recalls that the men in the furniture factories of Grand Rapids generally worked the same hours as their peers in Holland,

> but the work here in factory is very different. You have to learn a great deal first. There are many Hollanders here in the factory, which makes it very easy for me, but it does not help in learning English. But I will not stay with this job for very long. As soon as I have acquired enough English usage, I will go to another factory where everyone is English, and I will learn much more.[70]

Peter Ypes Groustra's letters to family in Friesland similarly tell of the railcar manufacturing factories of Pullman, Chicago, where bilingualism could earn English-speaking workers a dollar a day more.[71] With regular loans at two dollars a day, incentive, in any case, was certainly not lacking.[72]

---

[68] Archief Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, October 10, 1893.
[69] Helen Westra, "Fear and Hope Jostled: Dutch Immigrant Life and Death in Paterson, New Jersey," *Origins* 8 (1990: Fall): 5–6.
[70] Aart Plaisier, May 1, 1910 cited in Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 323.
[71] Annemieke Galema, "Over de wereldzee naar de grote stad: Pieter Ypes Groustra met zijn gezin in Chicago rond de eeuwwisseling," in *De Nederlandsche Leeuw. Maandblad van het Koninklijk Nederlandsch Genootschap voor Geslacht- en Wapenkunde, 109de Jaargang*, (1992): 454.
[72] Annemieke Galema, *Zuster, kom toch over: belevenissen van een emigrantenfamilie uit Friesland: brieven uit Amerika in de periode 1894–1933* (Winsum, the Netherlands: Ulbe B. Bakker, 1999), 23.

According to the Abstracts of the Reports of the Immigrant Commission of 1911, foreign and American-born Dutch working in industry (manufacturing and mining) were earning on average $12.04 and $12.97 per week, respectively. As was to be expected, this was below the $14.37 average of native-born American whites, but also under the total average of $12.64 of all working-class laborers in America.[73] In fact, of all the 'old immigrants' who were generally better paid than their 'new' Southern and Eastern-European counterparts, the Dutch had the lowest average daily earnings.[74] These figures coincide with the wages reported in correspondence back to the Netherlands; in a 1906 letter, Klaas Niemeijer relates that his daughter earns just $7.50 a week at a cigar factory in Chicago, and Anko Hofman tells his brother in Groningen that the backbreaking work paving the streets of 1912 Grand Rapids paid just $12.90 a week.[75] Three months later, Anko exchanged the irregular employment of street paving for work in a furniture factory, and was happy to recall that "Yes, that [cement paving] was hard work, but now I have a better job, namely at a furniture factory, making cabinets and tables and beds, not wall beds. I earn $10.90 for a 9-hour day. … I do wish I had come here sooner."[76] Even though extremely happy with such employment, men like Anko were falling short of the rest. The same 1911 Immigrant Commission report reveals that the popular silk and furniture manufacturing factories of Patterson and Grand Rapids were averaging respectively $12.50 and $11.67 a week ($431 and $575 a year) – wages still under the country's working-class average of $12.64.[77] The Dutch, diligent as always, would not complain, but find a way to make ends meet. Orange City painter van der Heijden was lucky to have "received a nice job from that banker which will earn me at least 200 dollars; it has to be done by this winter, which is great because in wintertime there is little outside work here, but this is inside work".[78] (In comparison, in 1870, Chicago's unskilled were lucky to find year-round work averaging annual earnings of just $170–200.[79]) It was not strange then to find that the Dutch employed the entire family to help with the cost. Maartje (Lautenbach) Zondervan relates in a 1911 letter to her brother that in Paterson, "Charlie is now fifteen years old and works in a factory. I

---

[73] Abstracts of the Reports of the Immigrant Commission, S. Rep. at 307.
[74] Ibid., at 371.
[75] Klaas Niemeijer, Aril 30, 1905 cited in Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 313; Dutch Immigrant Letter Collection. (Anko Hofman, Grand Rapids, MI, June 9, 1912).
[76] Dutch Immigrant Letter Collection. (Anko Hofman, Grand Rapids, MI, September 17, 1912).
[77] Abstracts of the Reports of the Immigrant Commission, S. Rep. at 303, 307.
[78] Dutch Immigrant Letter Collection. (P.J.J. van der Heijden, Orange City, Iowa, January 10, 1893).
[79] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 4.

take in washing and also work as a midwife."[80] The Zondervan children, in fact, had already been helping with the cost for years. Since 1893, thirteen-year-old Antje and eleven-year-old Jeltje, like their father, worked in the silk factories of Patterson, all earning somewhere between just $4 and $5 in the week.[81]

In comparison, Swierenga's research reveals that the Dutch in Chicago were likely the most economically successful compared to all other Dutch-American migrants. Here, skilled craftsmen and artisans were usually slightly better off, carpenters earning roughly $15 a week. Most successful were those lucky enough to be part of the entrepreneurial Dutch scavenging teams. By 1911, the sector's hired hands alone were paid $15 a week and bosses were making profits as high as $120.[82] In and around what Swierenga calls the "prosperity decade" of the 1920s Chicago, "even wage earners and independent craftsmen enjoyed higher wages won by unions in the city."[83] Likewise, workers who were affiliated with furniture craft unions in Grand Rapids earned on a daily basis 55 cents more than those who were not.[84] The number of urban Dutch associated with such fraternal organizations, however, was strikingly low. For years, the immigrant Dutch had thrived with little help from outside their ethnic communities and it appeared they were still managing. A closer look at how the turn-of-the-century urban Dutch of America organized themselves socio-economically is necessary to understand the unique forces at work within this laboring class. On the axes of labor and religion, it becomes clear that the Dutch were a noteworthy minority. The following chapter will present the generally one-sided world of the Dutch working class, but also take a closer look at some of the individuals and organizations that stood out. A case study of the Dutch working class during the Pullman riots in Chicago will attempt to trace the Dutch as a labor minority in America to answer the question of whether or not the group influenced the (immigrant) labor movement that was essential to one of the major social achievements of Progressive-Era America.

---

[80] Maartje Zondervan, May 27, 1911 cited in Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 302.
[81] Tjerk Zondervan, November 13, 1893 cited in Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 294.
[82] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 5, 580.
[83] Swierenga, "The Dutch Urban Experience," 12.
[84] Hans Krabbendam, "Waarom christelijke vakbeweging onder de Nederlandse immigranten in Amerika niet aansloeg," *Cahier over de Geschiedenis van de Christelijk-Sociale Beweging* (2009): 138.

3. Congregating the Working-Class Dutch

3.1 Fathers and Fraternities

Extensive research has been done on the Dutch religious communities in America and scholars couldn't agree more that the cornerstones of the thriving Dutch settlements were their ethnic churches which "anchored urban neighborhoods, just as they did rural villages".[1] Most Dutch immigrants were members of the Dutch Reformed or Christian Reformed Churches. A slow but steady stream of Catholics from the sandy-soil regions of the north-east constituted a small share of the Dutch immigrants, but a religious motif for Catholic immigrants only played a role with the clergy, as most parish members felt comfortable ties to their regional counterparts in Germany and Belgium.[2] The Catholic Church in America generally discouraged ethnic parish formation, the Dutch immigrants of a Catholic tradition, already low in number, generally joined the larger denominations where other German and Flemish believers worshipped. It is therefore impractical to speak of a specific Dutch Catholic presence in America, as was the case with the stable Jewish Dutch community.[3] The latter predated both World Wars and was more or less Americanized before their fellow Dutchmen even began their North-American exoduses and, as such, the institutions and followers of the Dutch Jewish community have been excluded from this thesis.[4]

Alongside religious nourishment, the ethnic church as an institution provided both social and economic support systems, leaving almost no aspect of the immigrant's well-being unaccounted for. Successful schools, and homes for the elderly like Paterson's Holland Home were governed by the clergy and trustworthy church elders. In some cases, even insurance and death or unemployment benefit programs were initiated but this was done with extensive carefulness as there were devout Calvinists who felt such aid "reflected a lack of faith in God's protective care".[5] Jan Hospers, active elder of the Christian Reformed Church and its off-shoots in Pella, Iowa,

---

[1] Robert P. Swierenga, Introduction to *The Dutch in Urban America*, ed. Robert P. Swierenga et al. (Holland, MI: Joint Archives, 2004), ix.
[2] Krabbendam, *Freedom on the Horizon*, 24.
[3] P. R. D. Stokvis, "Socialistische immigranten in de Verenigde Staten: Vrijheid Versus Gelijkheid," *Groniek: Gronings Historisch Tijdschrift* 96 (1986): 107.
[4] Robert P. Swierenga, "Dutch Jewish Immigration and Religious Life in the Nineteenth Century," *American Jewish History* 80.1 (1990): 56–73.
[5] Robert P. Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago: A History of the Hollanders in the Windy City* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 499.

reveals his concern for taking matters of socio-economic welfare out of the hands of the community church:

> The poor fund that our church established is handed over to the municipality. I feel that those who favor this have good reasons apparently. But other times may come. It is usually dangerous to move ancient boundaries. The world is full of changes. They are seldom for the better.[6]

In her dissertation on the social action of the Reformed Church of America, Lynn Winkels Japinga reveals that the sphere sovereignty popular in the Netherlands under the leadership of Abraham Kuyper's government was also policy in the new world: "The realm of the church was the spiritual, and if the church meddled in the political or economic realm, it exceeded its appropriate boundaries."[7] Joining forces with American trade and labor unions then meant questioning the diligence of the Dutch heritage, the self-sufficiency of the strongholds that were thriving as a result, and in many cases, insinuated having to compromise religious doctrine. Unions themselves were just as wary of immigrant support and membership, particularly when it came to those religious immigrant minorities; from 1870–1920, roughly 40% of the working class were immigrants, and their managers were almost all disproportionately native-born, and Protestant.[8] Although both the church and the union seemed to represent each other's ideological opposite, no two institutions were as intertwined or played as large a role in shaping Dutch-American communities, thereby heavily determining their future.

In the Gilded Age, the religious pulpits and their press were presenting a cornucopia of "mixed signals" when it came to the role that religion should play in the lives of their working-class flock.[9] Concerning those tenets advocated by the Dutch ethnic churches, the term mixed signals is, at the very least, an understatement. Alongside the scores of Catholics, some Jews and even a handful of Mormon Dutch emigrants who brought their religious doctrines and customs with them, from the early mercantile colonies of 1626 New Amsterdam to the Doleantie of 1886

---

[6] Dutch Immigrant Letter Collection. Calvin College Hekman Library. Accessed 16–17 March, 2014. http://www.calvin.edu/hh/letters/letters_main.html. (Jan Hospers, Pella, Iowa, October 30, 1883).

[7] Lynn Winkels Japinga, "Responsible for Righteousness: Social Thought and Action in the Reformed Church in America, 1901–1941" (Dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1992), 31, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

[8] Robert H. Craig, "Nineteenth-Century Labor Radicalism," in *Religion and Radical Politics: An Alternative Christian Tradition in the United States* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992), 9.

[9] Craig, "Nineteenth-Century Labor Radicalism," 11.

in the Netherlands the Dutch Reformed church in America regularly branched out further left, right and center. Much of the friction sparking the divisions within this church actually predated the denomination's migration to America, and since some tensions coincidentally pertain to the issue of labor-oriented organizations, it is relevant to briefly recount this history.

The National Reformed Church of the Netherlands (Nederlands Hervormde Kerk, NHK) underwent a secession in 1834 based on controversial disputes between the church's traditional Calvinists and Enlightened Protestants. The groups that left the in their eyes ever-liberalizing NHK constituted members advocating a more orthodox Calvinist doctrine and evolved into what came to be known as the Christian Reformed Church in the Netherlands (Christelijke Gereformeerde Kerk, CRK). In 1886, politician and theologian Albert Kuyper led a second separatist movement within the NHK, namely the neo-Calvinist revival, also known as the Doleantie. These followers merged with the smaller parishes of the CRK in 1892 to form the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands (Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland, GKN). Most of the second and third wave of Dutch-American Reformed immigrants were followers of either of these newest, more orthodox Calvinist branches.[10] And although these Dutch separatists were theologically closer to their Calvinist predecessors (the pilgrims who had settled in New Amsterdam in the eighteenth century), these groups of fellow ex-Dutchmen would experience just as much animosity amongst themselves as had been the case for the Reformed mission in the mother country.

The national Dutch Reformed Church in America (RCA) was under the auspices of the Classis of Amsterdam from its foundation until its official break with Dutch governance in 1792. Remarkably, this break did not occur until more than 150 years after the founding of the American mission; issues concerning the acculturation of the Reformed mission to American customs (i.e. services in the English language, the singing of hymns, church polity, and relations with other denominations) instigated the split. There were members of the RCA who did not support such Americanization and certainly disagreed with the almost inevitable severance of ties with the Netherlands. As a result, in 1822 the 'True' Dutch Reformed Church (TDRC) was established, intent on upholding the Dutch language and traditional doctrines of the Reformed tradition of the motherland. With the waves of 1834 Separatist immigrants came a second trying period for the RCA. Although initially happy to help establish these migrating Separatists under a new 1847

---

[10] Hans Krabbendam, "Waarom christelijke vakbeweging onder de Nederlandse immigranten in Amerika niet aansloeg," *Cahier over de Geschiedenis van de Christelijk-Sociale Beweging* (2009): 137.

Classis of Holland (Michigan) as a part of the Reformed mission in the increasingly popular Midwest, it didn't take long before the RCA and their newest denominations were in constant discord. The 'old Dutch' and the 'new Dutch', or the eastern Reformed and Midwestern Reformed as they have often been clustered, had strikingly conflicting standpoints concerning the prominence and influence of the customs and traditions from back home and so yet another secession from the RCA followed. In 1857, a new mission came into being: the Hollandsche Gereformeerkde Kerk (Dutch Reformed Church, HGK). In 1890, the theologically similar TDRC merged with the HGK (the official name of which had changed three times since its foundation) to create the Christian Reformed Church of America (CRC).[11] Not surprisingly, the TDRC had been "fishing" for the souls of the Midwestern Classes since their arrival on America soil.[12] At the beginning of the twentieth century, it is safe to say that there were two large divisions of the Reformed faith in America, but both were incredibly unstable. Bickering among the branches and even within local congregations themselves occurred often.

For all the trivial disagreements the churches under the umbrella of the Dutch Reformed endured, there was one common nightmare that shook the Reformed faith to the core. Freemasonry had always been a concern among the religious, and for the stern Dutch Reformed, it was an issue that could make or break a church's survival in the Progressive Era. It is difficult to describe the Masonic lodges of the period because, within both Europe and America, each lodge could vary greatly in character. In general, though, lodges were known for their secretive and habitual frivolity, lavish dining and drinking and an Enlightenment-spurned rejection of several religious doctrines.[13] The diligent and god-fearing Dutch Reformed naturally shunned them with a vengeance. In his work on the freemasonry question among the RCA, Harry Boonstra points out that lodges in America had developed into societies with a far more ecumenical character. Here, universal faith was a major part of lodge membership, and because little emphasis was placed on the dogmatic differences of members' various churches, all were welcome.[14] Boonstra recounts that the earliest RCA churches had undergone years of Americanization and therefore had little

---

[11] "Memorable Events," accessed April 7, 2014. http://www.crcna.org/welcome/history/memorable-events.
[12] Harry Boonstra, *The Dutch Equation in the RCA Freemasonry Controversy, 1867–1885* (Holland, MI; Van Raalte Press, 2008), 36.
[13] Boonstra, *The Dutch Equation*, 6.
[14] Boonstra, *The Dutch Equation*, 13.

reason to abstain from interaction with Masonic societies: church clergy and elders even defended and praised personal involvement.[15] Indeed, Revered Dr. E. S. Porter openly defended Masonry at the 1880 General Synod as both a Royal Arch Mason and a minister. In an article outlining the Synod's afternoon discussion on freemasonry, the *New York Times* quotes Porter as having stated: "I wish to God the Christian Church knew enough to copy the methods of Masonic lodges, that it might do more good. You never find widows and orphans of Masons in the Poor-house."[16] For the newest Reformed immigrants from the Netherlands, however, freemasonry irrevocably undermined their church doctrines.

Ten years before their Dutch counterpart declared freemasonry off-limits to church members, the newly founded CRC had little trouble making this semi-official statement at the Classis of Holland Assembly in 1867: "Also concerning the Free Masonry, it is decided that after all possible and fruitless efforts, those who are members of this [mevement] ar (sic) to be cast out of the church."[17] Boonstra argues that it was perhaps this incident which prompted the more orthodox congregations of the RCA to bring up the issue in their General Synod of that same year.[18] Generally speaking, those in the Midwest were only too keen on ridding the Reformed faith of what Abraham Kuyper called "this one black stain", while the eastern congregations upheld that it was not as harmful or as un-Christian as the anti-Masonic sentiment would have Americans, both native and foreign-born, believe.[19] The Midwest, stimulated and supported by the public involvement of CRC's Dutch and English language newspapers and periodicals, fervently insisted that the stance held by the RCA on the issue of freemasonry be reconsidered. Even after years of rejected resolutions, the General Synod maintained its neutral stance. Swierenga estimated that the neutral position on the issue of freemasonry would "cost the Immigrant RCA some 10,000 souls," and Boonstra relates that most of these joined the CRC, the rest opting for various English Presbyterian churches.[20] Jan Hospers of Pella makes reference to this exodus in a letter written to an old colleague in October of 1883: "There is a lot going on here in the churches because of

[15] Ibid., 17.
[16] "Masonry Misunderstood: Curious Arguments Against the Mystic Order," *New York Times*, June 8, 1880.
[17] Classical Assembly held at Holland on 20 February, 1867. Minutes, Article 15, 165.
[18] Boonstra, *The Dutch Equation*, 17.
[19] Abraham Kuyper, *Varia Americana* cited in George Harinck, *Mijn reis was geboden: Abraham Kuypers Amerikaanse tournee* (Hilversum, the Netherlands: Verloren, 2009), 126.
[20] Boonstra, *The Dutch Equation*, 27.

masonry which the Reformed people are <u>against</u>. A lot of people are migrating to the far west."[21] In all Hospers's letters, not once does he underline a word to make a point, its use here revealing the extent of his emotion quite nicely. Regretfully, Hospers reveals little more on the issue in his correspondence. An autobiography written by Dutch Reformed minister J. Noordewier relates 42 years in the ministry of numerous Midwestern CRC parishes from 1869 to 1912.[22] Even though Noordewier worked and travelled to many churches of both the eastern and western RCA, he hardly elaborates on the freemasonry issue either. Only once does Noordewier mention that Reeman CRC in Fremont, Michigan was born from those leaving the area's RCA because freemasons were accepted at the latter.[23] The second and final mention of Masonic-related issues arise when Noordewier described the ministry which had cost him the most effort and incidentally propelled him to end his career.

> I had entered upon the ministry in more than one church while it was in difficult circumstances, but had always surmounted the troubles. But in this church the outlook as very dark. It had been sorely neglected, and this became evident especially during the first summer, when the Modern Woodman held their annual picnic in Firth. It lasted two days, and was a regular vanity fair. Of course, we cannot expect anything different from the world. The town was flooded with people, but the worst thing was that we saw our own people attending these things. Fathers and mothers came with their children from miles away to enjoy those vain pleasures.[24]

The Modern Woodmen were a fraternal benefit society founded in 1883 which counted one million members by 1910, roughly the same time Noordewier was active at Fremont. Members were protected with life insurance should the breadwinner of the family pass away and through local picnics and barn-raisings the organization "soared in popularity." It was clear however, that the organization was not entirely welcome because in 1897, when the head-office and its records and archives were moved from Fulton to Rock Island, Illinois, the freights were blocked three times

---

[21] Dutch Immigrant Letter Collection. (Jan Hospers, Pella, Iowa, October 30, 1883).
[22] "An Octogenarian," Dutch Immigrant Letter Collection. (J. Noordewier, Lafayette, Indiana, 1919).
[23] Ibid., 16.
[24] Ibid., 20.

by unhappy Fulton residents.[25] It is thought-provoking, to say the least, that the issue of freemasonry and fraternal unions, most certainly on the lips of both clergy and congregation during Noordewier's ministry, were excluded from his life history, a 25 page memoir he insisted he wrote "as objectively as possible."[26]

Groups like the Modern Woodmen and other early unified fronts were often associated by many, including native-born Americans, with organizations like Masonic lodges. At the time of the foundation of the Knights of Labor in 1869, for example, union membership could cost one one's employment. Cunning capitalist tycoons like Cornelius Vanderbilt and John D. Rockefeller had been crushing any efforts to unite labor, and public opinion still frowned upon the idea of striking or boycotting work.[27] To ensure their survival then, it was necessary for groups like the Knights to meet in secret, and inspired by the Freemasons, they developed ornate rituals to protect their vulnerable fraternities. It was not until 1880, that these clandestine tactics were abandoned by the Knights, but their reputation among the Dutch Reformed had already anchored and the issue of union membership was not surprisingly a topic of profound debate almost identical to that of the Masonic question.

Widely considered brew houses of socialist philosophy, unions were, not surprisingly, certainly rejected for their anti-religious sentiment by the pious Dutch, and secrecy and the back-door politics of many trade and labor unions stood in stark contrast with the transparent and reverent systems of ministry in the Reformed parishes. A 1910 letter from Nicholas Hospers of Pella, Iowa, relates to an old colleague of his father:

> You must have read in the papers, no doubt, about the struggle between capital and work, the workers want to tell the capitalists what do to and especially the railroad workers; they are all organized into big unions each with their own leader, and then all those thousands and ten thousands of workers in turn submit to one big leader whom they obey instantly and to the letter; and when

[25] "Modern Woodman through the Years," accessed May 20, 2014. https://www.modern-woodmen.org/AboutUs2/History/Pages/Timeline.aspx.
[26] "An Octogenarian," Dutch Immigrant Letter Collection, Foreword.
[27] Almont Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike: the story of a unique experiment and of a great labor upheaval* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), 5–6.

> he gives the order they stop working immediately; all this causes a great deal of chaos in the big cities.[28]

This strong distaste of unions was not just preached but also taught and lectured on at the various schools and beneficial institutions upheld by the Dutch Reformed. Sidney Harkema, a successful freight-trucking operator, relates having sold his entire operation when the labor unions called for a strike. In an interview with biographer Hylke Speerstra, Harkema apparently shouted "'No labor union dictators in control! I learned at least that much in Boys Society.'"[29]

The fact that unions were prone to exceptional violence made them especially unworthy in the eyes of the pious Dutch Reformed. Socialist immigrant Louis van Koert writes of the unions that "the Irish have all the power, and these Catholic gangs are hostile to all progress."[30] Jans Jorrissen, the wife of white-collar Netherlands-Indian Railway Company engineer Wim van Schouwenburg, accompanied her husband on business ventures in America and her highly descriptive letters to acquaintances in the Hague reveal that during her year in New York, she was appalled by the brutality and apparent volatility of the "free-for-all fights" which began as union gatherings but often resulted in uncontrollable mobs, a mental contamination ("geestesbesmetting") having passed through the city.[31] Perhaps what spurned the anti-union stance of the Calvinists most, though, were the unions' controversial means to their ends; obstructing, boycotting and striking went against some of the very backbones of the Calvinist and Dutch heritage. Johan Woudenberg recalls: "As children, we soon converted [IWW] to stand for 'I Won't Work.'"[32]

It is undeniable that the general success of the Dutch communities is partially a result of the fact that for many Dutch, and especially those with a Calvinist background, practicing diligence, honoring a day's hard toil, and trusting in God's providence were the pillars of their ethnic and religious identity.[33] To be able to work hard, the Dutch ensured that they were at least

---

[28] Dutch Immigrant Letter Collection. (Nicolas Hospers, Pella, Iowa, March 27, 1910).

[29] Hylke Speerstra, *Cruel Paradise: Life Stories of Dutch Emigrants*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 87.

[30] Archief Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis. Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis. Algemeen, Correspondentie, 127, Koert, L.W. van. 1893–1894, June 1, 1894.

[31] Jans van Schouwenburg, *New York 1919: Brieven van Jans Jorissen* (Leiden, the Netherlands: van Schouwenburg, 2007), 107–108.

[32] Helen Westra, "Fear and Hope Jostled: Dutch Immigrant Life and Death in Paterson, New Jersey," *Origins* 8 (1990: Fall): 6.

[33] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 580.

always employed in some way or another. Winter and summer trades could vary as such, and instead of sticking to one craft farm laborers and village hired hands were, from experience back home, flexible when it came to generating an income. Most Dutch-American correspondence contained some kind of paraphrasing of the following part of a 1872 letter by Jan Wonnick, farmhand turned sawmill and factory worker in Rockwood and later Grand Rapids, Michigan: "America is a good country for a worker who is willing to make an honorable living by the industrious work of his hand. This, I know, had been written many times, but it is true."[34] In a comical account of how it was hard work and nothing less that brought prosperity to the inhabitants of the new world, Martje Smit Nieveen of Pella, Iowa writes in 1884 that

> not many would want to return [to the Netherlands] except those who have too high an expectation of America, as those who might expect that a flying bird is roasted and that pigs walk around with prepared pork in their mouths. No, no, that's not the way it's here; you have to work to maintain you daily upkeep, and you don't have to be ashamed of that.[35]

So, too, Klaas Niemeijer, a Chicago teamster, praises the commensurability of the Dutch work ethic and American opportunity in a letter from 1904: "For our part we believe that America is a land exactly suited for the working man. We, at least, find it far above our expectations."[36]

3.2 Uniting the Two

Like the freemasonry controversies, there was similar ambiguity among the Dutch Reformed concerning the trade union organizations. Even before the notoriety of the Knights of Labor, the CRC had banned union membership in 1866, but not all branches of the RCA were as forbidding.[37] Frederick Hugenholtz, for example, was a socially inclined Reformed pastor called in from Leiden, the Netherlands, to revive the Vrije Hollandsche Gemeente, a small, liberal movement of the Reformed Church supported by the Unitarian Church of America, one which had been making efforts to organize since 1875.[38] Upon his arrival in 1886, Hugenholtz led a

---

[34] Jan Wonnick, December 28, 1872 cited in Herbert J. Brinks, *Dutch American Voices: Letters from the United States, 1850–1930* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 249.
[35] Dutch Immigrant Letter Collection. (Maartje Smit Nieveen, Pella, Iowa, August 18, 1884).
[36] Klaas Niemeijer, November 20, 1904 cited in Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 312.
[37] Krabbendam, "Waarom christelijke," 139–140.
[38] Lucas, *Netherlanders in America*, 519.

denomination in Grand Rapids for almost twenty years.[39] Through The Hague anarchist Louis van Koert's 1893–1894 correspondence, it is clear that Hugenholtz's denomination indeed upheld an undogmatic and unorthodox Protestant character within the Dutch Reformed faith. Koert relates that many of the members of the socialist organization he was a part of were members of Hugenholtz's church and

> where their religion is concerned, their church is very radical, and their Reverend Hugenhols (sic) is the pioneer for socialism here, better yet, he is a socialist. … Hugenhols (sic) himself is a very good person I think, and is helpful towards everybody and anybody, and according to differing friends he must have sown the socialism present in the city.

Koert relates that this church opened its doors to the strikers numerous times, and that the socialist organization to which Koert belonged was free to hold their weekly meetings there as well.[40] Van Hinte relates that this "'modern' minister" took action in bringing change among the Dutch working class and announced in the church's periodical that it was "a gladdening sign" that Dutch had laborers initiated a branch of the Furniture Workers Protective Association in Grand Rapids in 1890.[41] The only religious organization the anarchist Koert is positive about, Hugenholtz's church unquestionably differed dramatically from those Koert had experienced elsewhere in Chicago. Hugenholtz's church remained a small movement, however, with only 316 member in Grand Rapids in 1889 and even fewer in the efforts at Kalamazoo, Michigan and Chicago.[42] Reverend Peter Moerdyke of Chicago's Trinity Reformed Church (RCA) revealed that by early 1894, "Without a tear or so much as a sigh, we chronicle the 'poor, dying rats' of that Holland Unitarian organization of our city, and, as far as we can learn its death. Defunct, at last, yes, so early, to all appearances. Died – of starvation, being without the bread of life."[43] By the close of the First World War, the church in Grand Rapids was similarly deserted.[44]

---

[39] J. J. Kalma, "Hugenholtz, Frederick Willem Nicolaas" in *Biografisch Woordenboek van het Socialisme en de Arbeidersbeweging in Nederland*. accessed May 13, 2014. http://hdl.handle.net/10622/C0DDC17D-4368-42B3-92C6-E6485D9A7084.
[40] Archief Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, December 17, 1894.
[41] Jacob van Hinte, *Nederlanders in Amerika II* (Groningen, the Netherlands: P. Noordhoff, 1928), 384.
[42] Jacob van Hinte, *Nederlanders in Amerika I* (Groningen, the Netherlands: P. Noordhoff, 1928), 486.
[43] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 30.
[44] Lucas, *Netherlanders in America*, 519.

In May 1899, the Reformed *Heraut* (Herald), the Netherlands's widest circulating newspaper among Dutch immigrants, published a thought-provoking letter written by an American immigrant addressed to the paper's editor, Doleantie leader Abraham Kuyper.[45] The letter's author requested that Kuyper shine a light on the enigmatic issue of trade unions.[46] Known as the hero of 'de kleine luyden' (the common people), Kuyper was a trusted and successful advocate for a more orthodox Calvinism, his sphere of influence certainly including the Dutch emigrants in America.[47] As a journalist, he contributed to many Dutch newspapers and publications from either side of the ocean, and his theological writings and teachings were passed from religious family to family as is revealed by the Winsum correspondence.[48] The author of the *Heraut* letter sounds his concerns over the clarity of the stance the Reformed faith held on the issue of unions: "we have a great need of this in America, especially considering the desperately necessary unification of the Reformed Church in this land."[49] Concerned with both the practicalities of membership of both unions and church, but also the disputes over the union as a social institution intent on bettering the lives of the working class, the author wonders whether the church and such organizations are truly that far removed from each other.[50] This piece was published less than half a year after Kuyper's 1898 speaking-tour through America, where he must have seen firsthand, as the author so eloquently states, that "It is suffering; and they (the Unions) are often born from suffering, be it a suffering caused by people under the coercion and malevolence of capital, still nonetheless a suffering that can teach us and strengthen our faith."[51]

Just two years later, Kuyper became the leader of the cabinet of the Netherlands (1901–1905), and his position on unions would become crystal clear. A nationwide railroad strike that took the Netherlands completely off guard fought to have, among other things, unions recognized as interlocutors.[52] The strike was successful, but Kuyper's government responded by banning public servants and certain groups of employees, like those working in the railroads, from forming

[45] Abraham Kuyper, *Varia Americana*, cited in Harinck, *Mijn reis was geboden*, 123.
[46] "Correspondentie," *De Heraut*, 28 May, 1899, 2.
[47] Harinck, *Mijn reis van geboden*, 13.
[48] Annemieke Galema, *Zuster, kom toch over: belevenissen van een emigrantenfamilie uit Friesland: brieven uit Amerika in de periode 1894–1933* (Winsum, the Netherlands: Ulbe B. Bakker, 1999).
[49] "Correspondentie," 2.
[50] Ibid., 2–3.
[51] Ibid., 2.
[52] A. J. Cord Rüter, "De Spoorwegstakingen van 1903: Een Spiegel der Arbeidersbeweging in Nederland" (PhD dissertation, Universiteit Leiden, 1935), 309–310.

trade and labor unions, making striking "a crime and therefore punishable."[53] Protests that resounded in the Hague on Kuyper's so-called strangling laws were held in low esteem by the Winsum family and likely many more Dutch Reformed: "We read in the newspapers that the work-people calmed down again in the Netherlands, which was very desirable for the rebellious people itself."[54] By 1903, and in part due to the Kuyper cabinet's extremely conservative reaction to the railroad strikes, it seemed the Confederation of Dutch Trade Unions (Nederlands Verbod van Vakverenigingen) had fallen entirely under the wing of socialists. In accordance with the pillarization advocated by Kuyper's (Reformed) Anti-Revolutionary Party, a new counterpart with a religious philosophical foundation was necessary.[55] Various regional and local Christian trade unions had indeed been materializing, but it was not until May of 1909, that these would become centralized to form the Christian National Trade Union (Christelijk Nationaal Vakverbond, CNV).[56] The only preserved issue of the *Standard-Bulletin*, a small but successful newspaper from Grand Rapids, and dated 1919 reprinted a piece penned by certain CNV members after a trip through America.[57] Initially published in *De Hope*, the unofficial periodical for the Midwestern RCA, the article written by author and secretary of the CNV G. Baas relates the opinion of the CNV on such initiatives in America. Baas touches on the pillarization of the Netherlands and that in America. Without initially proclaiming which situation is the better of the two, Baas dwells on the idea of religious unions in America and ends his article in earnest:

> Whether it is necessary can better be determined by the brothers here [in America], but the developments of the social welfare, the tense relationships we also discern here [in America], the necessity for us Christians to introduce our life-giving principles in all aspects of life, makes me suspect that one must seriously begin to ponder on these things.[58]

---

[53] Rüter, "De Spoorwegstakingen," 392.
[54] Galema, *Zuster, kom toch over*, 273.
[55] Herman Langeveld, "Kuyper, Abraham" in Biografisch Woordenboek van het Socialisme en de Arbeidersbeweging in Nederland. accessed April 6, 2014. http://hdl.handle.net/10622/4A546104-BE64-490A-8E52-95A00F17C6D7.
[56] "Geschiedenis van het CNV," accessed April 7, 2014. http://www.cnv.nl/over-cnv/organisatie/geschiedenis/.
[57] David Gordon Vanderstel, "The Dutch of Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1848–1900: Immigrant Neighbourhood and Community Development in a Nineteenth Century City" (PhD dissertation, Kent State University, 1983), 501.
[58] *Standard-Bulletin*, December 6, 1919.

In an article on Christian trade unions in the United States, Hans Krabbendam explores why such initiatives had few productive repercussions on the Dutch emigrants in America. He claims that is too facile to conclude that the Dutch rejected union membership on the basis of their conservative, religious convictions or that their limited number, particularly in the heavy industries, inhibited any such social assembly.[59] Krabbendam highlights the importance of studying the socio-economic mobility of the working class with the help of family survival strategies, an approach applied by Lex Heerma van Voss to the Dutch working class of the nineteenth century.[60] According to Heerma van Voss, the proletarian's strategies can be grouped under three catchwords: loyalty, voice and exit, i.e. working-class families could accept and customize their lives to the status quo, object to the norms and contribute to (radical) labor movements, or emigrate.[61] In the period from 1880–1920, those leaving the Netherlands outnumbered those who joined any union bodies and so Krabbendam argues that the Dutch arriving in America were from the start simply not the reforming type. With the option of a second emigration highly improbable, any still unsatisfied laborers could either choose loyalty or voice, either adapt to new American norms, or join the reform movement on American soil. Compared with Europe, the quality of life of the working-class American was generally far better, and with successful ethnic communities backing most Dutch immigrants, the loyalty scenario was therefore the most promising socio-economic strategy.

Involvement in the labor movement as such was limited and short-lived. Indeed, the numbers presented by the Dillingham report reveal that only two percent of Dutch immigrants working in manufacturing and mining, the rubric encapsulating almost all working-class occupations, were members of labor unions.[62] The report itself warns that this number is unreliable, because at the time, the number of unions in existence varied per trade, per state and per ethnic inclusion. Indeed, the aforementioned two percent is unreliable considering that the industrial Dutch were predominately employed in the silk and furniture factories, both of which lacked a strong union movement at the end of the nineteenth century.[63] Choosing to join a union was one

---

[59] Krabbendam, "Waarom christelijke," 137–138.
[60] Lex Heerma van Voss, "Why is there no socialism in the Netherlands? De Nederlandse arbeidersklasse in de twintigste eeuw" (lecture, Universiteit Utrecht, the Netherlands, March 9, 2002), 9.
[61] Heerma van Voss, "Why is there no socialism," 14.
[62] Abstracts of the Reports of the Immigrant Commission, S. Rep. at 419 (1911), accessed June 10, 2013, http://archive.org/stream/reportsofimmigra01unitrich#page/n9/mode/2up.
[63] Krabbedam, "Waarom christelijke," 138.

thing, but paying their dues was another. Louis van Koert, a bricklayer from The Hague, writes in his correspondence that he could simply not afford to join the union right away.

> I went to New York to look for work because I did not have the 17 dollars to take me to Chicago. In N[ew York], there was not a lot of work for the bricklayers, and you have to join the Union which costs 50 dollars, 10 directly and every 14 days another 10. This was of course not an option for me.[64]

Nonetheless, the labor movement was not entirely out of reach for the urban Dutch, as the following organizations and personal histories will reveal.

In the furniture capital of Grand Rapids, for example, and inspired by the motherland's Nederlandsche Werklieden-Verbond (Dutch Workers Guild) Patrimonium, an American branch of Patrimonium was founded in 1892 and even included a written mouthpiece *De Christen Werkman* (*The Christian Workman*). Patrimonium described itself as the first American immigrant initiative to organize trade workers on religious grounds.[65] Nonetheless, it was criticized by both Catholic and Reformed churches for its apparent socialist nature and fell apart shortly after its inception.[66] Another religiously-oriented union, the Christian Labor Association, was founded in Grand Rapids in 1910 but this effort was even less successful than Patrimonium, as the group was sooner a companionship and debate circle than an organization willing to undertake any significant action.[67] The above-mentioned 1919 *Standard-Bulletin* reprint of the CNV trip through America was printed in response to reports that a new Christian Labor Alliance had come into being in Grand Rapids in November. According to the editors, "Every true Christian wants to serve the Lord his God in every sphere of his life" but whether this group would take specific labor action is questionable, since "The great aim of this society is to fight Socialism, Bolshevism, in fact, all revolutionary ideas wherever they confront and attack us."[68] Nothing more could be found of this organization, but according to Krabbendam it was not until well into the 1930s and with the support of the federal government that yet another new Christian Labor Association would constructively advocate Dutch workers' rights.[69]

---

[64] Archief Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, May 3, 1893.
[65] *De Grondwet*, August 28, 1894.
[66] Krabbendam, "Waarom christelijke," 140.
[67] Ibid., 140.
[68] *Standard-Bulletin*, December 6, 1919.
[69] Krabbendam, "Waarom christelijke," 142.

Of the three papers consulted in this research, not surprisingly only the un-biased national *De Grondwet* reported on news of such nature. Its earliest reference of any such initiative dates December 9, 1884, when it reported about a meeting held by the International Workers of the World (IWW) in Roseland, where both Parsons and Spies spoke, mostly about the situation at Pullman.[70] It was not until ten years later, in May of 1893, that *De Grondwet* briefly reported that the Dutch were considering actively contributing to unions of such nature. Holland, Michigan, was holding an open meeting to contemplate beginning a division of the Dutch Workers Guild Patrimonium.[71] The next week, a more detailed report revealed that the initiative was likely to be a success; three men from an American division apparently already active in Grand Rapids answered any questions the curious audience posed and by the close of the meeting 18 men pledged to join and a committee of three men was instigated to spread the word. The goal of the American divisions of Patrimonium heralded: "A trade union with a positive Christian foundation, that also strives to better the community, particularly when it comes to the relations between laborer and boss and to do God's will according to his Word."[72] The first official meeting of the Holland, Michigan Patrimonium would reportedly be held on May 31 in the Director's room at the State Bank and in the weeks to come, *De Grondwet* continuously published a brief reference to the time, place and themes of successive meetings.[73] Distinctly reflecting the apprehensions of the time, themes like "Is Patrimonium contrary to or an order of the Word of God?" and "Wages as per necessity" would sometimes be carried over to the following week as the discussions were often far from finished come the end of a meeting.[74] In issues to follow, *De Grondwet* reported of American Patrimonium divisions arising in smaller communities like Roseland and Muskegon, Illinois, and that in Grand Rapids, where meetings would draw five to six hundred people, a sixth division was underway.[75]

Whether Patrimonium made any positive impact on the lives of its members or communities is highly questionable. It would seem that this group was little more than a debate club, and even that was questionable. According to Louis van Koert, the socialist from The Hague,

---

[70] *De Grondwet*, December 9, 1884.
[71] Ibid., May 16, 1893.
[72] Ibid., May 23, 1893.
[73] Ibid., May 30, 1893.
[74] Ibid., August 1, 1893, November 14, 1893.
[75] Ibid., June 12, April 30, January 23, April 10, 1894.

he asked to speak at more than one division but at one point he was involved in a heavy discussion with the Holland, Michigan, organization's president "and the way it ended was, that it was decided that we would not be allowed to discuss anymore, it turns out those guys all act identically."[76] Patrimonium was reportedly strikingly passive. For example, concerning the 12-hour work day in Grand Rapids, Patrimonium reported via *De Grondwet* that certain arguments had been presented before employers of influence and "if one considers that these hints were given with all modesty and warm interest by Patrimonium, then they will certainly be considered unbiased."[77] The second and only other course of action published revealed there was a proposal to send a proposal to certain employers concerning higher wages.[78] The available archives of Patrimonium in the Netherlands reveal little to no acknowledgment of its American branches. The official publication of the Netherlands, *Patrimonium*, reprints only *The Christian Workman*'s birthday wishes to Dutch Queen Wilhelmina and relates only trivial yet curious news from America.[79] The annual minutes and yearbooks do not once mention the organization in the new world. Alongside the snail's pace at which the organization was functioning, and the lack of support from the mother operation, the true force behind the organization's downfall, as previously suggested, was a religious one.

De Grondwet's reporting reveals that in Roseland, both CRC churches refused to allow meetings to take place in their churches, even though ministers were to speak at them, and when the latter did occur, an extra word of thanks in the following publications was necessary, a gratuity other speakers did not enjoy.[80] Patrimonium did its best to appease its religiously-inclined antagonists by submitting longer texts to be published in *De Grondwet*, such as a piece outlining the importance of keeping the Sabbath holy and a piece arguing that "the best constitution for all countries, for all times, is surely the Bible."[81] A small series printed over four issues of *De Grondwet* presented and defended the statutes of Patrimonium, because "now more than ever" people must understand the foundations of the society, even though the ends are the same as those of anti-Christian organizations.[82] In this same series, Patrimonium argued: "If there ever was a prime principle for the worker, a rejection of the false rest and ease, it can be found in Christianity"

---

[76] Archief Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, December 14, 1893.
[77] *De Grondwet*, August 28, 1894.
[78] Ibid., January 29, 1895.
[79] *Patrimonium: Orgaan van het Verbond*, September 26, 1896.
[80] *De Grondwet*, June 11, 1895.
[81] Ibid., September 12, 1893, August 28, 1894.
[82] Ibid., March 5, 1895.

and noted that "We can try to better our position in God's word, but it is he who ultimately chooses if it will work."[83] The efforts were in vain. On March 26, 1896, about two years after its founding, *De Grondwet* reported that with only ten loyal members at a meeting in Holland, the Patrimonium there would "part in sorrow." The author of the statement made clear that Patrimonium failed "because there was no sympathy, no cooperation from the Christian workers from Holland. It appears that according to the Christian laborer, no social problem exists."[84] The sporadic references to the organization still intact in Grand Rapids would eventually cease when it too fell apart only a few years after its founding.[85]

The American labor associations the Dutch could choose to cooperate with were not likely the notorious Knights of Labor, but those affiliated with the better organized and far less radical American Federation of Labor (AFL). The AFL was founded in 1866, the same year that the influence of the Knights dwindled almost out of existence.[86] However, Thomas Göbel relates that the AFL and associated American bonds had an explicit "reflex … to oppose outsiders" and correspondence from the time reveals that the Dutch were well aware of these anti-immigrant sentiments among American laborers.[87] In a rubric following the lives of American settlers from Friesland, local newspaper *Nieuw Advertentieblad* printed the following farmer's 1901 anecdote:

> I often go to *Oil City*, a lively town where three railway lines cross each other. It has almost 20,000 inhabitants, including many Poles - Polakken, as they are called here. These usually work in the pipe factories. They don't make the country any better, as the Americans say, because they work for almost nothing, just like the Italians.[88]

On account of the similarities between the Dutch heritage and America's earliest WASP settlers, the prosperity of the first Dutch merchant settlers in the east and the prevalence of the Dutch's detached, rural settlements, it is likely that the Dutch urban minority experienced less discrimination from native-born American wage earners. Louis van Koert even relates that the

---

[83] Ibid., February 19, April 9, 1895.
[84] *De Grondwet*, March 24, 1896.
[85] Krabbendam, "Waarom christelijke," 140.
[86] Ibid., 134.
[87] David R. Roediger, *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White* (New York: Basic Books, 2005), 79.
[88] A. Speerstra, "Noord-Amerika," *Nieuw Advertentieblad*, March 6, 1901.

Irish of Chicago tried to pass themselves off as Dutchmen.[89] However, the Dillingham Report reveals that of those migrants associated with labor unions, the Dutch held the lowest percentile of not only the 'Old Immigrants', but also the percentage second to last of the 'New Immigrants.'[90] Clearly, the Dutch repelled association with American trade and labor unions more than they were denied affiliation.

Besides the AFL, union options were scarce. German organizations would have likely been the next best option, but these were often quite removed from what the Dutch had in mind. Louis van Koert relates that only German was spoken at such organizations, that their ideologies were often of the purest anarchist nature, and that the meetings are always "above a saloon, due to the German habit of including beer drinking."[91] American pickings were just as slim. In the 1880s, "relative security" was enjoyed by only 15% of the American working class, and yet only 14.2% of native-born wage earners were associated with labor unions, just one percent higher than their foreign-born counterparts.[92] Socialism in America did not have the adherents it enjoyed in Europe as the new world in general had banked on its promises of endless job opportunities, higher wages, and fewer class differences. W. A. Francken's *Door Amerika* (*Through America*) praises the lack of class struggle across the ocean where a man's family and history are irrelevant and his "reputation is not tarnished when he has less fortune, knowledge or culture than another."[93] The fact that the socialist ideology had its roots in anti-religious and foreign soil was also hardly welcomed in the Promised Land. According to Leon Fink, the Knights of Labor was the first, and for some time the only, "mass organization of the American working class," and true to its democratic ideal it did not exclude immigrants, blacks or even women. What began as an 1869 secret organization of garment cutters in Philadelphia slowly evolved into a nationwide fraternity that included wage earners in the trades of manufacturing, agriculture and transportation. After the successes booked during the Great Railroad Strikes of 1877, the organization flourished and opted for a public approach to boycotting and strike waging.[94]

---

[89] Archief Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, June 1, 1894.
[90] Abstracts of the Reports of the Immigrant Commission, S. Rep. at 419.
[91] Archief Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, June 1, 1894.
[92] Craig, "Nineteenth-Century Labor Radicalism," 10; Abstracts of the Reports of the Immigrant Commission, S. Rep. at 419.
[93] C. J. Wijnaendts Francken, *Door Amerika: Reisschetsen, Indrukken en Studiën* (Haarlem, the Netherlands: H.D. Tjeenk Willink, 1892), 268.
[94] Craig, "Nineteenth-Century Labor Radicalism," 29–30.

Although the Knights were seen as a predominately socialist organization, the group was in fact founded on undeniably Christian ideologies. Comprised of both Protestants and Catholics, the Knights united on the basis of cofounder Uriah Stephens's creed that their task was "the annihilation of the great anti-Christ of civilization in the idolatry of wealth, and the consequent degradation and social ostracism of all else not possessing it." In their eyes, capitalism belittled what God had created and "heaven-ordained labor" had become inferior to the Mammon.[95] Nonetheless, the Catholic Church in Rome, for fear of secrecy and socialism, would go so far as to condemn the Knights of Labor in Canada in 1884 and the ministries under the umbrella of the Protestant faith were not at all negative towards capitalism. Many American churches preferred to view the capitalist system of the period through what has been termed the *gospel of wealth*. The latter's proponents Russell Conwell and Henry Ward Beecher preached it was a Christian's "duty to get rich," and that a laissez-faire economy resulted in a "community more refined, and the whole land more civilized."[96] This belief was not far removed from the 18th- and 19th-century European doctrines which preached that it would be against the will of God to interfere among entrepreneurs, and subsequently, that poverty was a result of personal sin.[97] At the same time, the *social gospel* movement was gaining in popularity among contemporary Protestant and Catholic clergies. This religious response to the inequalities of capitalism preached the need for compassion and charity for the suffering. And although Christianizing economic and social policy was the intended outcome of the movement, because it originated not from the ranks of laborers but among the middle and upper classes, like the gospel of wealth, it too was so out of touch with the realities of the working class that any progressive reformation failed to evolve.[98]

Heath W. Carter's aptly titled "Scab Ministers, Striking Saints" article researches the religious attitudes towards labor in 1894 Chicago and reveals that when it came to the plights of the laboring classes, the American clergies of the Progressive Era were not only ideologically disinclined to side with the working class, but were also materially invested in "a cozy relationship" with capital.[99] The Catholic and Protestant elites were likely those funding the

---

[95] Craig, "Nineteenth-Century Labor Radicalism," 36.
[96] Ibid., 12.
[97] Krabbendam, "Waarom christelijke," 147.
[98] Craig, "Nineteenth-Century Labor Radicalism," 12.
[99] Heath W. Carter, "Scab Ministers, Striking Saints: Christianity and Class Conflict in 1894 Chicago," *American Nineteenth Century History* 11.3 (2010): 322.

churches' major undertakings like new buildings and land plots, but also the more commonplace monetary necessities like communion and pew rental. It goes without saying that there were proverbial strings attached. In his correspondence with the Netherlands, Dutch Socialist Louis van Koert suggest that he would not be surprised if it turned out that the Catholic church was running all the unions in Chicago: "They know that a union in inevitable here, so they accept this fact, but do everything is being done to keep them away from socialism."[100] Koert also goes on to suggest that the clergy of the Dutch Reformed were just as guilty. Koert relates that while he was still free to speak at Patrimonium, he met many members who, like him, wanted nothing to do with the church. "The boys that have been born there [in America] are done with the church, and the pastors are scared to death because their fellow believers are the ones who must sustain them, their income is indeed gradually dwindling."[101] In his studies of 1894 Chicago, Carter writes that only a few individual Catholic priests were trusted by the working class and that those on the side of the working-class Protestants were usually unknown, often immigrant ministers of smaller suburban congregations.[102] In a 1922 essay entitled "Labor's View of the Function of the Church," one such immigrant clergyman Abraham J. Muste candidly outlined the period's generally antagonistic yet misunderstood relationship between labor and religion. What is especially noteworthy, is that Dutch-born Muste was speaking on behalf of the (radical) workers.

Muste would become one of the twentieth century's most broadminded theologians to address labor issues, memorial services at his death uniting speakers from the Church, the trade union movement, and even both Communist and Socialist Workers Parties. In 1891, at age six, Muste sailed to Grand Rapids from the province of Zeeland with his family and would later graduate class valedictorian at Hope College, and with theological degrees from both the Dutch Reformed New Brunswick Theological Seminary of New Jersey and the more theologically liberal Union Theological Seminary of New York. Muste was ordained there in 1909, and already somewhat uncomfortable with the doctrines of his native church, he became so influenced by the social gospel movement that he voted in the 1912 Presidential election for Eugene Debs's Socialist ticket and took on a minister's position at an independent, Congregational Church two years later. When the First World War broke out, Muste joined the religious pacifist Fellowship of

[100] Archief Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, June 1, 1894.
[101] Ibid., January 22, 1894.
[102] Carter, "Scab Ministers," 326, 332.

Reconciliation, something that would cost him his church. Ever less religious and ever more political, Muste eventually became a spokesperson for trade union activity and became "a respected and controversial figure in the trade union movement." Muste would eventually abandon his Christian pacifism to become a full-fledged Marxist, found the Trotskyist Workers Party of America, only to shift 180 degrees again and return to his Christian pacifist ways for the rest his life. Muste was a politically-oriented thinker, but an intellectual hardly known by the public, having left behind only a small collection of essays and articles.[103]

Muste's article, written during his labor activism period outlines "the grounds for the feeling of hostility to the Church among some of the more aggressive workers," the first being that "They [the Church] depend directly or indirectly upon the privileged classes for their financial support and social prestige," and the second that "the Church fixes the minds of the workers upon the next world and so distracts their attention from the pressing task of making the present world a decent place to live in. I have heard it said: 'The preacher points your eyes to heaven, and then the boss picks your pocket.'"[104] Nonetheless, Muste argues that labor's view of the church was "not that of definite, irrevocable hostility. The attitude of indifference is more common."[105] According to Muste, for every one man who was appalled by Muste's interests in both the church and labor, there were ten who simply "could not understand how one could make passage from one world to the other."[106] Apparently, it was indeed uncommon to attempt to join the two, making the efforts of the Dutch who followed Muste's example all the more noteworthy.

Two of such individuals in the labor movement were Samuel Gompers and Daniel de Leon. Gompers was the son of a Dutch cigar-maker, but was born and raised in London, England. De Leon, the son of an army doctor positioned on the Dutch colonial island of Curacao, briefly studied in Amsterdam. The former founded the AFL and the later was a prominent socialist theorist. According to P. R. D. Stokvis, however, both had absolutely no contact with Dutch immigrants.[107]

Individuals with direct or closer ties to Dutch-American communities make for more promising analyses. Frisian building contractor Johannes van Dyke, for example, spent six months

---

[103] Stephen Spender, "A.J. Muste Biographical Background," accessed May 14, 2014. http://www.ajmuste.org/ajmbio.html.
[104] Abraham J. Muste, "Labor's View of the Function of the Church," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 103.1 (1922): 112.
[105] Muste, "Labor's View," 113.
[106] Ibid.
[107] Stokvis, "Socialistische Immigranten," 106.

of 1881 working in Holland, Michigan, and Chicago, Illinois, intending to bypass the contemporary building slump in the Netherlands. His memoires relate the difficulty but necessity of finding a way into the union for his line of work.

> When we came to a construction job, our guide, who spoke both English and Dutch, would ask if we could be hired. But the boss asked if we belonged to the union. Since we had just arrived we were, of course, not members. It was the same everywhere we went. The bricklayers union in Chicago had made an agreement to work for no less than $4.00 per day and they also agreed to strike if their employers hired non-union brick-layers. We could not join without the recommendations of two union members and since we could not speak English we could not find two members to recommend us. Our guide did his best by going from one construction job to another and we stopped at various taverns to get news of additional job possibilities. We soon discovered that on these stops the beer was always at our expense. Finally, we made contact with Henry Nieterink, who was a bricklayer's foreman. He invited us to work for him and promised that he would have us recommended for union membership. We eagerly accepted his offer and were happy to be freed from our guide and his expensive beer-drinking friends.

The two would later come to work building a grain elevator and when a large of part that crew of 65 went on strike, van Dyke, having stayed on the job, was surprised to receive a $2.75 raise, per day, in his wage envelope. "The boss said it was the result of our good work."[108]

Ten years later, what may likely have been this same bricklayers union caused a serious bout of trouble for the Dutch workers who were not just passing by, but were hoping to build a future in the Chicago suburb of Roseland, Illinois. Here, in an event striking enough to be noted by the English language press, the community's First CRC expelled a certain John W. Bloomendahl for refusing to withdraw his membership of the bricklayers union.[109] Such church standpoints could work both ways of course, as was the case with Gerrit Roorda, a Frisian emigrant

[108] Johannes van Dyke, "CHICAGO," Memoires published in *Origins* 1 (1983: Fall): 10–11.
[109] Carter, "Scab Ministers," 335.

to Orange City, Iowa, who chose to the leave the congregation after his Dutch minister blatantly condemned trade unions and the IWW in 1917.[110]

In his studies of the Dutch teamsters of Chicago, Swierenga reveals the story of Hendrick Evenhuis, who, unlike most of the other Dutch Reformed, joined the Teamsters union. Swierenga relates that Evenhuis had socialist sympathies since his days in the Netherlands, but also that he had always been a religious man, eventually converting to the Secessionist church of his wife. Evenhuis's union activity was in fact even supported by his pastor Dr. John Van Lonkhuyzen of the First Christian Reformed Church of Chicago, "believing it his Christian duty to be a leavening influence in the rough union world and to help workers."[111]

Jan Willem Nijenhuis gives a short glimpse into the 1908 laborer's life in Newark, New Jersey, but even though there are only two letters discovered from this man thought to have died at sea, they reveal that he was more than pro-union. In the very first paragraph of his very first letter home, he related that he was ill but that he thankfully did not have to pay the daily hospital fee of $1.00 thanks to his union insurance. The membership that had cost him 30 dollars and would pay the children 150 dollars in the event of his death had Nijenhuis convinced: "Tradesmen should join the union." In Nijenhuis's second discovered letter, he relates the wages of the union men, $3.28 for a painter, $4.00 for a carpenter, $4.50 for bricklayers and $5.00 for plumbers, and that "if you can work regularly [for the union] you can earn a good wage."[112]

Most of the Dutch immigrant correspondence revealing active participation in the American labor movement was penned by socialist and anarchist emigrants previously involved in similar organizations in the Netherlands. Most of these men were not religiously inclined and so their experiences have been excluded from this research. However, a valuable collection of letters written by the emigrated social-anarchist Louis van Koert is worthy of mention as they provide insight into the immigrant socialist/anarchist movement in America applicable to this research. Penned from May 1893 through December 1894, Koert's letters were addressed to his "friend and partisan," Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, leader of the SDB and the Netherlands's first socialist in parliament.[113] Koert had clearly been an active and informed party member, but he found it difficult to feel at home in the American scene where, according to him, the people

[110] Stokvis, "Socialistische Immigranten," 113.
[111] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 595.
[112] Jan Willem Nijenhuis, June 5, 1908 cited in Brinks, *Dutch American Voices*, 440–442.
[113] Archief Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, May 3, 1893.

were revolutionary enough, but there was a clear lack of organization standing in the way of success.[114] In Koert's opinion, the lackluster socialist movement in America could also be traced to a lack of decent propaganda.[115] His correspondence relates a serious effort to assist men in Grand Rapids with the publication of a socialist bulletin "because it was otherwise impossible to endure those damned lying religious papers." Similarly, an American branch of the Netherlands's first and revolutionary socialist party, the Social Democratische Bond (Social Democratic League), known from 1894 onwards as the Socialistenbond (Socialist League) emerged in Paterson, New Jersey but no mention of such a league was found in any of the bulletins studies in this research.[116] In the words of Koert, "much effort and work will be necessary to bring some life into the rusty heads of the Hollanders here, the church is so dirty, even meaner than the Catholics, and the Dutch publications that are printed here are just the same."[117]

Koert's depictions of the crossroads of religion and labor were unquestionably biased and, as such, do not merit any foundation on which to base an all-encompassing description of the Dutch blue-collar men and the extent of any compromise between their religious convictions and economic and social mobility. Likewise, the individual testimonies discussed are simply too scattered and lacking in depth to draw any valid mono-ethic conclusions on the state of the religious Dutch working class. The ethnic publications Koert makes reference to, however, provide a stable resource on which the affairs of the immigrant community as a whole can be analyzed over both time and place. The events of the Pullman strike and national boycott in 1893 and 1894, for example, were readily documented in Dutch language press and form the basis of the case study to follow. By investigating the content and nature of news bulletins applicable to the Dutch during the Pullman affair, a more comprehensive description can be made about the religious Dutch working class.

---

[114] Ibid., October 10, 1893.
[115] Ibid., January 22, 1894.
[116] John Frieswijk, "Een socialisties propagandist in revolutionaire jaren: Biografie van Tjeerd Stienstra (1859–1935)," *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis 2* (1976): 248.
[117] Archief Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, November 16, 1893; September 26, 1894.

3.3 The Dutch at Pullman, 1894

Roseland, Chicago, was the premier Dutch district of the greater Chicago area and it was primarily the Dutch Reformed from northern Friesland who initially populated it.[118] According to Galema, once settled in the greater Chicago area, 24% of these Frisians became truck farmers while an impressive 38% found work in industrial jobs.[119] The exclusive Dutch Reformed character these northern Hollanders had established in quiet Roseland would end with the 1883 opening of railroad tycoon George Pullman's factories, shops and even a Pullman town run by the magnate himself.[120] In 1892, 12% of Pullman's workers were of Dutch heritage.[121] By the 1920s, numerous factories taking root in the Calumet Region (which included Hyde Park, South Chicago, Pullman and Roseland) were employing thousands of other immigrant workers alongside the Dutch.[122] Galema presents that the Dutch Reformed members of Chicago's suburb community actually stuck together more than their other urban counterparts, because they felt more threatened in the suburbs of bustling and cosmopolitan Chicago.[123] The Catholics in the Calumet Region, on the other hand, initially affiliated with the predominantly Irish St. Patrick's Church and were in close contact with other immigrant groups.[124]

Swierenga claims that the 1880 opening of the Pullman works was a heavy pull factor to the Chicago region.[125] Pieter Ypes Groustra, a woodworker from Ee, Friesland, immigrated to Chicago in 1881 and was hired at the Pullman works. Groustra would remain employed by Pullman for more than thirty years, and three of his four children found steady work there as well. He proudly wrote home that not only his colleagues but even his boss were fellow Dutchman.[126] Johannes van Dyke travelled to Chicago in 1881 during a six-month journey to America in which he hoped to sit out the building slump costing him contracting business in Friesland. Van Dyke was greatly impressed by the Pullman experiment he witnessed first-hand while visiting friends in

---

[118] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 296; Galema, *Frisians to America*, 179.
[119] Galema, *Frisians to America*, 180.
[120] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 363.
[121] Krabbendam, "Waarom christelijke," 138.
[122] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 37.
[123] Galema, *Frisians to America*, 179.
[124] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 738.
[125] Ibid., 296.
[126] Annemieke Galema, "Over de wereldzee naar de grote stad: Pieter Ypes Groustra met zijn gezin in Chicago rond de eeuwwisseling," in *De Nederlandsche Leeuw: Maandblad van het Koninklijk Nederlandsch Genootschap voor Geslacht- en Wapenkunde, 109de Jaargang,* 1992, 454.

Roseland. He writes in his account of the journey that "it would be worth a special trip to America for an expert to see. I found that it was larger and more wonderful than anything of the sort that I had ever seen."[127] Van Dyke is lyrical about the beauty of the flowering gardens and large pond dressing the town and factory, and the latter's numerous small buildings of glass and iron; "It was all so shiny" he relates.[128] In an 1894 edition of the internationally-oriented Dutch monthly *Vragen van de Dag* (*Questions of the Day*), R. D. Nauta recounts a trip of his own to the town of Pullman and its factories and shops.[129] Praising Pullman "who we may call a wonder of a working man," Nauta's positive article about the institutions of the railroad magnate undoubtedly inspired many from the Netherlands to build a future at Pullman. According to Nauta, the factories ran like clockwork, the community championed the moral welfare of its inhabitants, and the common workers were easily mistaken for gentlemen, such was the success of this "model citizenry."[130] The diligent and god-fearing Dutch Reformed were undoubtedly attracted to Nauta's portrayal of Pullman as "not a charity foundation" but a place where hard work and pious behavior were championed.[131]

What is most striking about Nauta's article, is that it was written during the turbulent period of labor unrest in Chicago and throughout the United States; indeed its subtitle reads "Following the occurrence of young riots in America." However, it does not once describe how said incidents initiated or played out at Pullman. According to Nauta, "The exquisite organization of the factories has enabled him [Pullman] to give ample wages and the statistics also indicate that wages in Pullman are slightly higher than in other establishments of the same kind."[132] 1894, the very year of the article's publication, was the same year that rapidly diminishing wages at Pullman would put a halt to almost the entire railroad system of America, sparking one of the era's most costly and bloody national strikes. Minor incidents at Pullman predated those of 1894 but like Nauta's article, the Dutch were generally keen to distance themselves from these uprisings in both word and deed.

[127] Van Dyke, "CHICAGO," 13.
[128] Ibid., 14.
[129] R. D. Nauta, "Een Bezoek Bij Pullman," *Vragen van den Dag* (1894): 550–567.
[130] Nauta, "Een Bezoek Bij Pullman," 555.
[131] Ibid., 553.
[132] Ibid., 557.

In 1886, for example, "the year of the great uprisings," there were twice as many strikes throughout America in comparison with 1885. An unfavorable loss for an inter-state Knights of Labor railway protest caught the sympathies of the AFL and a nation-wide strike demanding an eight-hour work day was called for on May 1.[133] The strike was generally unsuccessful and at Pullman the lack of unity among workers resulted in absolutely no change to their situation. A *New York Times* article reveals that at Pullman some 1000 workers could not agree under which terms they would strike: for the eight-hour day with ten-hour pay, the eight-hour day with a 20% increase in pay, the eight-hour day with wages adjusted after some time, and the list went on.[134] Although more than 1400 Pullman Knights of Labor refused to work on May 1, every single Hollander, not one a Knight, crossed the pickets under police protection and helped to initiate the re-opening of the shops after just ten days.[135]

The Volksvriend, a Protestant, Republican leaning weekly from Orange City, Iowa, writes nothing of the Dutch workers or the incidents at Pullman, but it did feel the trials of one Chicagoan Daniel Bray were worth publication. After a strike at his company on May 8, Bray filed for indemnity against five members of the Knights of Labor who had instigated what was in his eyes much more than a strike, namely a "*conspiracy* to undermine his business [emphasis added]."[136] In a short clipping, Holland, Michigan's Democratic but religiously neutral and widespread *De Grondwet* reported that the strikes at Pullman were "calm," but made no reference to the Dutch laborers in particular.[137] In this same issue, however, *De Grondwet* does take time to provide a detailed report on the bloody Haymarket riot of May 4 and its aftermath. The editors described in great detail how here a handful of foreign anarchists, "the Russian nihilist, the German socialist and the French communist" had provoked the American working classes to instigate such violence, entirely against the peaceful intentions and ideals of the Knights of Labor and the trade unions.[138] Less than a month prior, the editors of *De Grondwet* had also claimed that "for all its misgivings, the Knights are important in the history of the workers movement and stand for the rights and just demands of these men."[139] As a reaction to an article in RCA weekly's *De Hoop* the week prior,

---

[133] Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike*, 8.
[134] *New York Times*, April 30, 1886.
[135] Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike*, 29; Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 641.
[136] *De Volksvriend*, May 20, 1886.
[137] *De Grondwet*, May 11, 1893.
[138] Ibid., May 11, 1886.
[139] Ibid., April 20, 1886.

De Grondwet regretted that the religious publication only showed the shady side of the Knights of Labor, and accused it of failing in its task "to promote the interests of Church, School *and Society*."[140] The incidents of 1886 as they involved the Dutch at Pullman in particular were seemingly averted in the Dutch press, but it is clear that *De Grondwet* was the only publication that intended to uphold a non-biased journalistic integrity.

In 1891, Roseland and the Dutch were again at the center of Chicago's attention when Roseland's First CRC expelled John W. Bloomendahl from the congregation for joining the local bricklayers union. The English language Republican *Chicago Daily Tribune* felt the incident was worth reporting and published Reverend Herny Vander Werp's decision: "The rules of our church are against any of its members belonging to secret societies. Bloomendahl was told to take his choice between the church and the union. He took the latter."[141] The Classis Illinois apparently tolerated union membership, excluding those holding elder and clergy positions, but should the unions in question act up, clergies were to enforce resignation of union memberships.[142] As was the case with the Hollanders breaking the 1886 strike, there was no mention of this incident in any of the Dutch language newspapers available for study either.

Thanks to the orders generated by the Columbian Exposition, the Panic of 1893 was hardly felt by Pullman and a walk-out by the steamfitters and blacksmiths on December 9 was the only trouble that year.[143] Such small-scale strikes were common to Pullman since its early beginnings but Pullman's "unyielding attitude towards all demands" ensured that most workers were quick to learn the futility of strikes and boycotts.[144] The only real time the factory's machines would grind to a halt after the episodes of 1886 occurred in the summer of 1894.

In short, the Pullman strike of 1894 lasted for three months and was unsuccessful for the Pullman laborers. It was the combination of reduced wages and President Pullman's refusal to lower rent in his model town that infuriated the workers living and working there. A massive walkout took place on May 11 and *De Volksstem* aptly reported that on that Friday, 3000 laborers went on strike demanding their initial wages.[145] Only 300 remained at work, mostly clerks and

---

[140] Ibid., April 20, 1886.
[141] Carter, "Scab Ministers," 335.
[142] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 644.
[143] Carter, "Scab Ministers," 327.
[144] Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike*, 28.
[145] *De Volksstem*, 18 May, 1894.

foremen.[146] President Eugene Debs of the newly founded American Railroad Union (ARU) initially opposed a strike at Pullman. In explaining the extent of the situation to its likely unknowing readers, *De Grondwet* revealed that of the approximately 350 000 rail workers in Chicago only 75 000 were members of a union, and so even if the latter did strike in solidarity with the Pullman employees, it would not be difficult to replace them.[147] But after learning of the maltreatment of the laborer at Pullman during a visit in early June, Debs was quick to put his full effort into helping the unified workers of Pullman.[148] The ARU, the country's first official labor union (as opposed to a craft or trade specific organization) recruited members by the thousands between its first and only successful action against the Great Northern Railroad in the early spring of 1893 and the affairs as they played out at Pullman.[149] With arbitration and negotiations paralyzed by Pullman's uncompromising strategy, Debs felt compelled enough to initiate a nation-wide boycott of all Pullman cars and materials onwards from June 26. This boycott lasted for weeks and left its mark on the entire nation.

An injunction (court order) filed by President Cleveland announced that mail freight must continue per rail without hindrance but was thwarted by so much striking and rioting that Federal troops were marched into Chicago on July 4 to enforce it. The Chicago state militia arrived on July 6 to tame the violence that was erupting amongst strikers, Marshalls and numerous civil officers who had been temporarily enlisted to help guard the freight and passenger trains that managed to run.[150] Indeed, *De Volksvriend* reported on July 5 that the boycott was felt all over the nation, and that particularly in Chicago, the strikers were becoming rebellious, mobs pushing stokers (those that tend to the coal fires) and engineers from their posts.[151]

Louis van Koert, a Dutch social-anarchist employed, for the most part, as a bricklayer in Chicago relates in correspondence with the Netherlands that "the first eight or ten days of the strike were the happiest of my time spent here [in America]." "Chicago stood on the verge of exploding," he continues, and "there was so much joy in my once sad mood when I saw the heaven-bound flames rising from the rail cars and buildings that were lit on fire by the workers."[152] Even though

[146] Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike*, 123.
[147] *De Grondwet*, July 17, 1894.
[148] Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike*, 124.
[149] Ibid., 113.
[150] Ibid., 166.
[151] *De Volksvriend*, July 5, 1894.
[152] Archief Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, September 26, 1894.

the strike covered two-thirds of the nation, counted tens of thousands of participants and left an estimated property damage of over 81 million dollars, most trade unions had actually withheld from joining forces with Deb's efforts.[153] The monumental AFL, the 'Big Four' major railroad organizations of Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Railroads and the Chicago General Manager's Association (GMA) representing the interests of 24 Chicago-based railroads were absolutely opposed to the operations of the ARU, the Knights and their small and local adherents.[154] Also opting out of an association with the Pullman strikers were, not surprisingly, Chicago's leading Catholic and Protestant leaders.[155]

Within the model town, there was no clergy more opposed to the doctrines and actions of the unions than that of Pullman Presbyterian Church (Green Stone Church) under Reverend Engelbert Christian Oggel. A Dutchman, it comes as no surprise that less than three weeks before the strike and in reference to the drastic wage cuts, he preached that "half a loaf is better than no bread."[156] This sermon, entitled "George M. Pullman, his services to his age, his country, and humanity," made it clear that Oggel's church rejected the incentives of the strikers and their leaders and stood behind George Pullman throughout the summer.[157] Twenty percent of Oggel's congregation left the church after his remarks (needless to say, most were from the working class), and those who stayed were mostly department heads or prominent, high-ranking employees. Of those who left, 95% re-enlisted elsewhere, with Carter rightly concluding that "their anger was not directed at *the* church but rather *this* church."[158]

In shrill contract to Oggel, Reverend William Carwardine of Pullman Methodist Church let it be known that he sided with the workers in the summer of 1894. Just after the beginning of the strike, Carwardine publicly supported the ARU and questioned the paternal and philanthropist claims of Pullman asking why the president never allowed "the calloused hand of labor occasionally to grasp the gentle hand of the man who professes to be so interested in our welfare?"[159] Placing himself within the same social rank as the laborers, Carwardine quickly became a working-class hero of national proportions. Daniel T. Averill, incidentally a former

[153] Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike*, 335–6; *De Volksstem*, August 8, 1894.
[154] Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike*, 135.
[155] Carter, "Scab Ministers," 329.
[156] Ibid., 321.
[157] Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike*, 102.
[158] Carter, "Scab Ministers," 322, 338note6.
[159] Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike*, 103.

member of Oggel's Pullman Presbyterian, summed up his reverence for Carwardine and frustration for the situation of the working class in a letter addressed to the minister: "I wish there were more ministers that would stand for God and the right and the common people."[160] There were other Protestant ministers like Carwardine whose pulpits were not those of the cathedrals of the middle and upper classes but of churches in smaller, scattered neighborhoods where immigrants were most likely to be members. According to Carter, "there were not more than three or four" of such American ministers supportive of the working class, but he sees these as having had enough sway to argue that there was broad support at a grassroots level for a change in religious attitudes towards labor.[161]

Dutch pastors like VanderWerp and Oggel dominate the trend of the Dutch's anti-union stance, in both their ethnic and more Americanized churches. The Dutch heritage, and particularly the Reformed doctrines of the Frisians of Roseland, taught them to oppose the strike, and even though their wages too had been slashed, many considered crossing the pickets at Pullman the way they had in 1886.[162] The extremity of the violence kept the Dutch from doing so a second time but the irrefutably negative effect of the Panic of 1893 and the aftermath of declining work and wage availability in Chicago's industrial sector were more likely to sway their attitudes towards united efforts this time around.

According to Carter's research, a meeting of 50 Pullman workers considering returning to work after the May 11 walkout was held on May 30 at the First RCA in Roseland under direction of Reverend Balster van Ess. It was almost instantaneously stormed by angry unionists although Van Ess claimed he was neutral on the issue of unionism and had held the meeting as a favor to colleagues of the First and Second CRCs of Roseland.[163] Carter's writes that "ARU officials scrambled to make sure their Dutch allies remained in solidarity."[164] However, reading *De Grondwet* of the time shows that the American press was not telling the whole story.

A June 12 article penned by the provisional secretary of Roseland's Patrimonium reports on about what can only have been the same incident, painting a strikingly different picture. The article opens with the following: "In order to properly explain what has happened, that which the

[160] Carter, "Scab Ministers," 333.
[161] Carter, "Scab Ministers," 332.
[162] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 641.
[163] Ibid., 641; Carter, "Scab Ministers," 335.
[164] Carter, "Scab Ministers," 335.

English papers in Chicago mentioned with much ado and as a result caused a misrepresentation of the situation, it is necessary that I start at the beginning. So what actually happened?" The author relates in detail how a group of men, including previous board members of the Christian labor guild Patrimonium of Amsterdam had gathered with the intention of beginning a division of said union in Roseland. How it would be done was naturally an issue of concern; the men had been in America no longer than a year and the area was not exactly aware of or experienced in the comings and goings of such unions. Nevertheless, "because we felt that in a Christian society a union such as ours would be welcome, anytime, anywhere" the effort was set forth. Because there were no local papers in which to advertise, the founding men requested the ministers of the area to make a short note of the organization's first meeting after their services on Sunday May 27. All were willing to do so. The number of people who were present for the meeting on May 30 was unbelievably large, but it quickly became clear that most were present intent on sabotaging the initiative, intending for it to fail. When the antagonists had taken over the podium, the organizers realized:

> One thing was for sure, certain things were attributed to us which were not at all our intention. Firstly, it was rumored that we would reject the strike, oppose the union and, hear this! that we would try to gather a block of 600 men or more to go to offer our services to the Pullman Company for any price. Concerning the first accusation, that is not in the direct planning now, because even if there was no union and no strike, we would have done the same [i.e. initiate a Patrimonium in Roseland], and concerning the second, that is likely less our intent than it is the union's.

The author follows with the announcement that the following meetings of Roseland's Patrimonium will not be such public events, "but by no means in secret," and that it would be greatly appreciated if other papers would publish this so as to rid the incident of its misrepresentation.[165]

May 11 marked the day of the first official strike at Pullman and the spark that eventually instigated the national boycott of Pullman. *De Grondwet*'s first bulletin printed under the auspices of Patrimonium following this date was a full-page spread of the annual meeting held in the Netherlands, but included nothing on the incidents in Roseland and Pullman. The reporting of the events of the infamous Roseland start-up assembly on May 30 was printed in the issues of early

---

[165] *De Grondwet*, June 12, 1894.

June, but there was no further reference to the Pullman strike. The regular meetings and each week's theme were announced, nothing more. On July 31, well into the strike and a good month after some of the most violent and costly incidents had taken place, Patrimonium only mentioned that it would naturally be celebrating Labor Day with the rest of the nation on September 1, but on its own terms and thankfully not with the "socialist and godless" labor union of Grand Rapids where the anarchist Debs would be speaking.[166]

August 28 reported the official recognition of the Patrimonium division in Roseland, and followed with what was the first and only statement that implied the group would take action on account of the situation at the Pullman factories. Concerning the laborers at Pullman who were not working, "It appears to us, it is the task of the division in Roseland to investigate and report on this matter quickly, with the request to so help our kinsmen, if help is needed. Patrimonium will take responsibility over such requests for help."[167] The issue of September 11 reveals the outcome of the investigation of Roseland's Patrimonium. After an extensive thank-you to *De Grondwet* for printing the undertakings of the organization, secretary H. Radius reports the following:

> The need [for aid] *now* is no higher than when the factories were not yet open. Many of those who complain there is a need now, did not want to work when the factories were opened once more. This was of course their undeniable right, but that for which they had absolutely *no* right, was that they repressed, with raw violence, those who were willing to work from doing so. Most of the latter suffered a *genuine* need: their conscience did not allow them to join the Union and they also upheld such a great dignity that kept them from reaching out to the Relief store. It is a shame that our Christian Labor Union was still *too* young then to act accordingly.

The piece follows with the announcement that the relief store is still up and running, predominately for the 2000 who according to Patrimonium "were *forced* to strike against their will" and with the regret that an agreement was made with those strikers who were willing to relocate to Kansas.

> May God open the eyes of many men so that they are no longer blind and will-less tools of men who support in *the very least* the interest of the workers, but who do sacrifice these workers for their own insatiable lust for power and

---

[166] Ibid., July 31, 1894.
[167] *De Grondwet*, August 28, 1894.

> glory, and may also those who have capital, that which has been divinely entrusted to them, use it not only for their own good or keep it from the industrious hands who have every right to it.

It is clear through their published statements that the ideology behind Patrimonium was on the side of the laborers at Pullman, but the extent to which the fraternity was willing to take action against either the unethical employers at Pullman or the immoral strikers inhibiting those willing to work was lackluster. Of the 1893 steamfitters' and blacksmiths' walk-out on December 9, Patrimonium had nothing to say, even though that same week the union revealed that a relief fund would be collected for those suffering as a result of the strikes in the mines of northern Michigan.[168] (It is unclear which strike is referred to here, making the attention given by Patrimonium all the more noteworthy.) The September 11 article ended with the following nota bene:

> Just as I completed [writing] the above, I received word that 50 to 60 men were 'laid off' at the factory, almost all of them fathers of families who, for fear of their own lives, returned to the factory when it was opened again for those wanting to work. Through their courage did the factory open again, and now they have been left in the cold. They are almost all Hollanders. … What will come of these people whose trust has been so shattered; they were told they had nothing to fear.[169]

The Dutch labor union had little to offer other than these condolences because with regards to the incidents at Pullman Patrimonium, as its propaganda in *De Grondwet* shows, apparently had nothing more to contribute.

De Grondwet reported of another such organization for the Dutch workers of Pullman. The issue of June 5 reveals that "The Hollanders have on the 31st of May organized their local fraction of the ARU in Van Wijngaarden Hall." A temporary chair, vice chair and secretary were chosen, and many present became members right away. "There is no need for an oath or other secrecy as many Dutch in these areas often believe, and those who have no money, are given some time to pay their dues." The meeting included a speech given by a representative from the American Union, who revealed that 90% of the Pullman workers were members and that their meetings were

---

[168] Ibid., December 12, 1893.
[169] *De Grondwet*, September 11, 1894.

so full of men, women and children that one had to arrive 45 minutes in advance to secure a chair. The president, vice-president and secretary chosen were different people than those of the preliminary and official Patrimonium of Roseland, so this is without question not a case of mistaken reporting of the infamous gathering of May 30 but a separate Dutch labor organization all together.[170]

The Second RCA of Roseland may have come off better in the American press, but their issues with the Pullman strike were perhaps even more earnest than those of Reverend Van Ess's First CRC congregation in Roseland. May 11 was not only the day of the very first walkout at Pullman, but also that of the installation of the church's first pastor Henrick Van Hoogen.[171] Considered a somewhat more "avant-garde" congregation than their "staid" parent First RCA, with most members working at Pullman, the church followed its pastor and opted for "pragmatism over principle," many members in fact joining the ARU.[172] Indeed, it was noted that in the aftermath of the Pullman affair, this infant church managed to hold its head above water, both financially and theologically; "by the grace of God our congregation was spared a severe spiritual decline."[173] What this actually entails is difficult to say, but according to Swierenga, no church in Roseland was more affected by the strike at Pullman that this one, so with many members choosing to join the union for the sake of the well-being of both their families and their new church, it seems the Dutch of the Second RCA had found middle ground. Real trouble was beginning to brew for the rest of the Dutch, however.[174]

With the intent to "enforce the injunctions with a vengeance," by the end of July, President Cleveland had almost all strike leaders with any influence arrested and the strikers' movement suffered greatly. New workers were quickly replacing those refusing to be rehired under unchanged conditions and the funds of both the strikers, the unions, and the mutual aid societies that supported both had dried up.[175] The Dutch were quick to return to work, one fourth of all of Pullman's first 800 recruits heralding from Roseland's Dutch community.[176] July 19 the *New York Times* reported that Pullman had revealed work would begin again "as soon as the number of

---

[170] Ibid., June 5, 1894.
[171] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 329.
[172] Carter, "Scab Ministers," 336.
[173] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 329.
[174] Ibid., 328–329.
[175] Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike*, 268–269.
[176] Swierenga, *Dutch Chicago*, 642.

operatives taken is sufficient to make a working force in all departments" but also that 300 Hollanders met in Roseland and "resolved to stand firm and refuse to go to work."[177] Clearly, the group as a minority was suspicious or untrustworthy enough to be featured in one of the nation's most widely-read newspapers. Whether these Hollanders meant what they said is to be questioned, because the following day the same paper reported that upon the re-opening of the shops, 100 of the 300 workers hired for preliminary tasks were Dutch men and women from Roseland. *New York Times* further reported that a fight ensued between union men and these Hollanders on their way to Pullman such that the Dutch were forced to retreat and head back home. Just before reaching Roseland, however, the Dutch apparently turned around and walked to work again.[178] Similar entries hailing from July 21 and 22 respectively report that 75 Hollanders working in Pullman's car shops were harassed on their way home by 200 strikers, and that patrol cars had to disperse mud-slinging and profanity-shouting mobs to ensure Dutch men and laundry women arrived home safely.[179]

Again, the Dutch language newspapers printed little to no objective news as it affected or pertained to fellow Dutchmen during the strike. On August 9, well after the initial walk out, and the national boycotts and strikes, the only Dutch-specific news *De Volksvriend* would report was that 150 men would return to work at Pullman when it opened the next week, every one of them a Hollander.[180] *De Volksstem* of September 26 announced that a benefit would be held at the Dutch-German St. Nicolaas Catholic Church in Roseland for those who had suffered financially due the incidents at Pullman, and that was all.[181]

Only *De Grondwet* made specific reference to the ordeals of the Dutch community throughout the Pullman affair of 1894, albeit briefly. For example, it referred to one Dutch family that would rather not have gone to live at Pullman because although work was guaranteed, rent was so high and "they keep the rent and don't ask if you have anything to eat."[182] This was not a piece written specifically about the situation of the Dutch, but was part of a longer description of the atmosphere at the Pullman town and workshops near the end of May. *De Grondwet* also

---

[177] *New York Times*, July 19, 1894.
[178] Ibid., July 20, 1894.
[179] *New York Times*, July 21, 1894; July 22, 1894.
[180] *De Volksvriend*, September 9, 1894.
[181] *De Volksstem*, September 26, 1894
[182] *De Grondwet*, May 22, 1894.

published two short clippings relating to the character of George Pullman himself in which a Dutch furniture maker and a lawyer, both from Grand Rapids, testified to the hypocritical nature of the businessman, both men claiming Pullman had outstanding debts in the city where he had worked himself up from poverty and that he had no intention to pay them off.[183] The first bulletin referring to the specific trials of the Dutch was identical to the *New York Times* piece printed a few days prior, although *De Grondwet* added the details that those Dutch who had resolved to return to work travelled in groups of 2 and 3 via detours on their way back to the factory after being chased away by strikers, and that a certain laundress Minnie Kaufman had been assaulted on her way home.[184] A second short, Dutch-specific clipping related that a large stone had been thrown through the shop windows of the Dekker brothers: "The suspect is naturally unknown, but the Dekker brothers were against the strikers, such that there is a hunch that the windows were vandalized by strikers. The strikers say that they saw a shaved dog with the letters ARU (American Railway Union) painted on it, jump through."[185] This same issue included a bulletin with the heading "The labor troubles," which made reference to the Hollanders in specific as the main group willing to return to the Pullman factories should they re-open entirely because it was "especially the Hollanders, who would rather work under lower wages, and so through their own work support the needs of themselves and their families, than live off of charity."[186]

All three newspapers studied here did print a few larger opinion-like pieces in which it becomes clear that the Dutch were not entirely on one line when it came to the Pullman affair. Surprisingly, it was not the objective and widely-circulated *De Grondwet* which published the most of these, but the Catholic *De Volksstem* from Wisconsin. The first of such pieces, entitled "The despondency of the strike," wrote of the regretful woes of strikers who had blindly followed, and therefore subjected themselves to the "inhuman tyranny" of, their "supreme leader Dictator" Debs. Anti-strike and extremely anti-Debs and associates, the author paints a tragic picture of the future of the workingman at Pullman, a tragedy the author argues is one entirely of the laborer's own accord.[187]

---

[183] Ibid., July 10, 31, 1894.
[184] Ibid., July 24, 1894.
[185] *De Grondwet*, July 31, 1894.
[186] Ibid., July 31, 1894.
[187] *De Volksstem*, July 11, 1894.

The pieces printed the next week were more favorable to the labor movement. A short piece relates that "this strike will also have good effects, alongside the negative ones: it will repress the growth of monopolies and make employers recognize the necessity of paying their workers reasonable wages."[188] A long and adequate biography of George M. Pullman followed, in which the Pullman model town was painted as little more than a system of "medieval feudal lordship" and the man himself portrayed as one "who deserves a rejection of the highest degree from all right-thinking citizens."[189] Another longer piece devoted to the Pullman strike was written as a play-by-play and revealed that the ARU was failing miserably in its efforts, notwithstanding well-intended but subordinate support from the Knights of Labor.[190]

Following this objective but discomforting sketch of the strike effort, a piece penned by correspondent A. Mess from Kensington, a suburb near to Pullman town, highlights the noble and just efforts of his Dutch Pullman colleagues striking there.[191] Mess regrets that

> the papers available portray the calm and determined laborers as rebels and mutineers, something that is repugnant to us good-willed Hollanders. I trust entirely that we are not meant here though. We receive no blame for burnings and the use of violence. I am positive that none of us have used firearms, not because we are not brave enough, but for the sake of peace.

Mess continues with an appraisal of the efforts of the activists at Pullman:

> It was not the soldiers, but the leaders of the union, who exhorted the people to calm down and to return to their homes after meetings. We are thankful that labor unions have appeared, otherwise the laborer would be stomped on until he was but a worm, by the men who may have once been what we are now.

The editors of *De Volksstem* agree, reminding their readers that the Dutch are indeed "friends of peace and order, in remembrance of the motto of the shield of the Netherlands: Je Maintiendrai, I will uphold."

The editors follow up on Mess's account with the observation that although most Dutch are indeed likely innocent of violent uprising, the same cannot be said for "the lower classes that are always found in the big cities in large numbers and who avail themselves to use such

188 Ibid., July 18, 1894.
189 Ibid.
190 Ibid.
191 *De Volksstem*, July 18, 1894.

opportunities let their innate passion for lawlessness have free reign." Indeed, the last of the larger opinion pieces published in *De Volksstem* makes a similar point. In the issue of July 25, the editors argue that the peaceful strikers undoubtedly regret the costly and violent outcomes of the Pullman strikes and riots likely just as much as those on whom they were inflicted. In theory, the unions could have achieved so much, but failed miserably due to a lack of structure and orderly commitment, which failed to earn them the sympathies of levelheaded citizens. Nonetheless, the likes of Pullman and Co. were just as guilty, having forgotten that employers' profits are "not just the fruits of their capital and their industriousness, but actually literally the fruits of the hard labor of their subordinates." True to the paper's nature, the article ended with the ambiguous advice that the business of the nation must build on a Christian fundament when it comes to capital and labor, and ends just as vaguely with the words of Cardinal Vaughan, the Archbishop of Westminster: "Amare et servire," i.e., love and serve.[192]

Because these *De Volksstem* articles covering the Pullman incidents were almost all limited to one issue, *De Grondwet* was still the most objective paper covering the issue, but it published fewer large-scale opinion pieces throughout the Pullman affair. In its shorter commentaries, however, it was clear that the paper was willing to publish both sides of the issue, but was loyal to only one. The first of such commentaries was published on May 22, after the walkout, but before the ARU national boycott and strike. A correspondent from Roseland relates that the laborers are fighting a just cause and that it is imperative that they win it. Pullman himself is portrayed as "one of the biggest liars of the world." [193] In the same paper, and beginning with the words "Because it is always good to see a matter from both sides," *De Grondwet* also published upon request from an anonymous reader from Roseland an article that appeared in the *Chicago Tribune* of June 8.[194] Said article, entitled "What a practical worker of the Pullman strike thinks," relates how the strike is the fault of skilled foremen who were known to brag about their higher wages to the unskilled laborers, and that honest and just Pullman was unfairly judged for his hard manners as a result. According to the *Chicago Tribune*, the differences among the workers could have been put aside were it not for the interference of the unions, "which gave them [the strikers] nothing but poverty and taught them to accept charity." Another of such smaller opinion pieces opening with

[192] Ibid., July 25, 1894.
[193] *De Grondwet*, June 12, 1894.
[194] Ibid.

"Honorable friends" uses the metaphor of broken machinery to describe the incidents at Pullman. "Proper care must be taken of the machine by its engineers, and this is why, when this does not happen, the machine will stop entirely, and perhaps even explode." More or less an appeal to the Dutch to accept labor unions, the article makes a case supporting peaceful united workers who do not let themselves be treated as beasts. It ends strongly: "Now, Dutch friends, I do not believe that you have the courage to stand in resistance to nine out of ten strikers and I do not believe that you have the conviction to do so. But stand tall, in unity there is strength, and enjoy the fruits of a free America." [195]

De Volksvriend was the least supportive of the efforts of the strikes and unions in Pullman, not surprisingly, considering its Protestant and Reformed-leaning character. Its first reference to the incidents at Pullman occurred in the July 12 issue, in a sermon-like open letter "To my friend in the still calm west."[196] Describing the paradox of the exponentially growing "wealth, prosperity, abundance and so much good in our country" alongside equally spreading "violence, disturbance, insecurity, danger and unrest, coupled with arson and fratricide," the author questions the efforts of the ARU "whose purpose *appears to be* to help the Pullman workers [emphasis added]."[197] The author clearly resents the paths taken as he seems to cry out: "But from where does one earn the right to hinder his neighbor from working. Some idea from men who so boast of their freedom!" In the same issue, another longer commentary describes the actions of the mobs and the anarchy by now in full swing; "Satan's children seem to have broken out of the place of the damned." Another long lecture-like piece printed on July 12 argues that "the word reform has become a word of power that exerts its magnetic force over almost everyone," perhaps even replacing the power of God, for all of which "Debs is guilty; guilty, for the strike directly, and indirectly for all the doom resulting."[198] The next week's publication quotes an article with a clear anti-union stance taken from the *Christian Intelligencer*, incidentally, the second religiously-oriented publication whose sources *De Grondwet* deemed necessary to question not ten days earlier.[199]

Perhaps the most questionable piece published in *De Volksvriend* concerning the Pullman affair was a so-called first-hand account provided by Peter De Joung, who lived and worked at

---

[195] Ibid.
[196] *De Volksvriend*, July 12, 1894.
[197] *De Volksvriend*, July 12, 1894.
[198] Ibid.
[199] *De Volksvriend*, July 18, 1894; *De Grondwet*, July 10, 1894.

Pullman for six years. Then a clerk, De Joung was likely well paid, and he claimed that many Hollanders like him had become rich after working for Pullman. It must be noted, though, that De Joung had left work at Pullman in 1887, and was therefore long gone before any of the wages had been dropped and the houses had been evicted. What is more, De Joung's so-called account of life at Pullman quickly accelerates into a one-sided assault of union men, or "communists and fools, indifferent godless blasphemers who let everything rot and would rather live off of gifts than work a time-dependent wage." De Joung is ashamed that there are Dutch who have chosen to unite with the men of the union, the latter merely "silly hot-heads" who waste away in theaters and saloons while their families starve. [200]

The last commentaries published in *De Volksvriend* with reference to Pullman were both contributed by an anonymous author "X," and are extremely interesting as they are philosophical pieces, quoting from the likes of anti-Catholic French novelist Eugene Sue but also Darwin. X's first piece alluding to Pullman was a commentary on the broken promises and inevitable failure of socialism in which he concludes that the Pullman experiment proves "the people are simply not good enough for it."[201] One reader, Jan Ton, responded two weeks later with the complaint that X must not color things darker than they truly are and that the inhabitants of Pullman, his neighbors, are not at all "trapped in a golden cage" and that Pullman, like everyone, "is certainly entitled to a fair judgment."[202] X presents *De Volksvriend*'s readers with another debate on socialism in early November and explicitly criticizes both Pullman and Debs as being guilty of repressing the forces that stimulate the people.[203]

De Volksstem was clearly most positive towards the strikers and efforts of the ARU and most against the Pullman magnate; while *De Grondwet* tried to be objective, *De Volksvriend* expressed a religious perspective. In the short news bulletin of June 6, the editors of *De Volksstem* reveal that Pullman claimed he had no choice but to lower workers' wages due to massive drops in profits, but the paper notes that Pullman's shareholders enjoyed an undisturbed dividend increase of 2%. The snide remark at the end of the report speaks volumes: "Commentary is clearly redundant."[204] But although the paper was in general more openly against "the dictator" Debs and

[200] *De Volksvriend*, September 9, 1894.
[201] *De Volksvriend*, September 27, 1894.
[202] Ibid., October 11, 1894.
[203] Ibid., November 8, 1894.
[204] *De Volksstem*, June 6, 1894.

was more than happy to report in July that "Deb's days are over," *De Volksvriend* did not entirely turn its back on the working-class suffering under Pullman.[205] *De Grondwet*, the most objective of the Dutch community's publications, kept its ear open for both the religious and political preferences of its readers and reported what likely expressed the attitude felt by most Dutch workers in the midst of the strike. *De Grondwet* expressed its regret that the worker "will pay the price of the feast of arrogance, despotism, self-interest, obstinacy and foolishness that unjust capitalists and mischievous labor leaders, each in themselves, but both equally detriment for the workman, will celebrate with devilish licentiousness…God have mercy this fourth of July on our poor country."[206]

The news delivery of these Dutch language newspapers, however, contrast sharply with the press coverage American media gave the affair. According to Pullman historian Almont Lindsey, the media coverage of the Pullman strike by American papers was generally negative towards the strikers and the ARU and strikingly anti-immigrant.[207] Matthew C. Lee's study of the Pullman coverage by the religious press of Chicago reveals a similarly anti-ARU stance, even though the Catholics were in general sympathetic to the strikers.[208] In this aspect, the Dutch Catholics were in line with the American trend, *De Volksstem* being the news bulletin most openly supportive of the labor movement. As objective in its coverage as the Dutch press was, it cannot be denied that it avoided reporting on unfavorable issues likely to upset ethnic readers. I would go so far as to suggest that Annemieke Galema's bacon-letter analogy mentioned in previous chapters could also be applied to many of the Dutch-language media of the period, particularly when it comes to the more religiously-tinted Reformed bulletins and press. The scope of the printed archives available for this research was limited and so to suggest that all American publications printed in Dutch followed this trend would be premature and unsubstantiated. However, considering that even the highly acclaimed *De Grondwet*, the minority's most objective paper, avoided printing the intimate predicaments of the Dutch workers during the Pullman incidents of 1894, the theory of a "bacon-press" holds a certain validity.

Having analyzed the content of the Dutch press, or lack thereof, with reference to the labor movement, I would further suggest that a similar double-standard was embodied by the working-

---

[205] *De Volksvriend*, July 19, 1894.
[206] *De Grondwet*, July 4, 1894.
[207] Lindsey, *The Pullman Strike*, 308.
[208] Carter, "Scab Ministers," 340.

class readers as well. To understand this identity, it is helpful to recall the family survival strategies first applied to Dutch working-class history by Lex Heerma Van Voss and the "inbetweenness" term coined by David R. Roediger. By applying these schemes to the working-class Dutch in America, I would suggest concluding that the Dutch occupied a distinct position between the accommodation and revolt strategies, implementing certain characteristics from both. There were certainly a few Dutch-American laborers who rejected the post-1893 industrial situation and joined the (radical) labor union efforts, and certainly those who chose to sit-out the riots hoping for a quick recovery to the norm. However, as this research and particularly the case study of Pullman show, there were also those Dutch, who remained loyal to the status quo, but not by waiting quietly on the sidelines. Strike-breaking and working in spite of certain social and physical burdens, the Dutch generally chose a course of action embodying components of both loyalty and voice strategies: their rejection of labor unions and their picket-crossing revealed a willingness to act discordantly—voicing their disagreement—in an effort to uphold their norms—remaining loyal to the situation as it had been. In her New York correspondence, Jan Jorissen related that on the rioting streets the words 'laugh' and 'weep' of Ella Wilcox' popular poem "The Way of the World" had been replaced with 'strike' and 'work,' the opening lines now heralding "Strike and the world strikes with you, work and you work alone."[209] These lines are particularly descriptive of the fickle position the Dutch found themselves in. Proud to choose the solitary path, but aware of the vulnerability in doing so, the religious Dutch as a minority were truly somewhere "inbetween."

---

[209] Jans van Schouwenburg, *New York 1919: Brieven van Jans Jorissen* (Leiden, the Netherlands: van Schouwenburg, 2007), 108.

4. Conclusions

If there existed a key to unlocking the histories of the Dutch-American immigrants, it would likely be inscribed with what was once the motto of the province of North Holland – *Ora et labora*.[1] Although often rejected by American historiographers, it is these combined cadres of religion and labor that best delineate the contours along which the histories of American migrants hailing from the Netherlands be written. In line with Herbert Gutman's watershed research on the influence of Protestantism on American labor history, writing the history of the Dutch working-class entails more than just

> analyzing what the leading clergymen said and what social philosophy religious journals professed. Unless one first studies the varieties of working-class community life, the social and economic structure that gave them shape, their voluntary associations (including churches, benevolent and fraternal societies, and trade-unions), their connection to the larger community, and their particular and shared values, one is likely to be confused about the relationship between the worker, institutional religion, and religious beliefs and sentiments.[2]

By bringing to light these histories ranging from common individuals to clergy officials to the Dutch labor community at Pullman, Illinois, this research has presented adequate accounts of Dutch association with the labor movement allowing it to conclude that the purportedly collective anti-union stance of the religious Dutch can no longer be advocated. As this research has shown, substantial cases of Dutch immigrants were prepared to advocate, albeit to various degrees, union philosophy and even union membership.

Even though their "bacon-press" was reluctant to chronicle their experiences in 1894, many Dutch involved in the Pullman affair appeared to be proud strike-breakers who felt little concern for the social ostracism and even physical violence they were consequently subjected to. Preferring to uphold the customs and values of their religious heritage, these Dutch would rather see their situation progress as it had under the initial status quo than better their economic and social

---

[1] James Wood, "Holland," *Friends' Review; a Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* (1847–1894) 35.3 (Aug 27, 1881): 35.

[2] Herbert G. Gutman, "Protestantism and the American Labor Movement: The Christian Spirit in the Gilded Age," *American Historical Review* 72.1 (October 1966): 77.

mobility through the means advocated by the (radical) labor movement. I would argue that by invoking both voice and loyalty strategies, the strike-breaking Dutch studied were unique to the American labor movement in that they occupied a certain space somewhere "inbetween" the common strategies of working-class immigrant laborers. More so, it was a religious and not economic incentive which sooner compelled the actions of the Dutch studied in this research, suggesting that the generic approach to labor history's ethnic components needs rethinking.

This research has provided a long overdue introduction to the urban Dutch of the Progressive Era, but for a lack of in-depth comparative primary sources, was limited to an analysis of but one all-encompassing case-study. Of course, the ethnic publications studied in this research are far from the only bulletins available for comprehensive analysis, and naturally, the Pullman affair of 1894 was not the only environment in which the Dutch working class were subjected to America's (radical) labor movement. The Dutch immigrant capital and by extension religious city of Grand Rapids, Michigan, for example, boasted the nation's largest furniture industry and by extension its own nineteenth-century labor upsets, yet remains to be academically investigated. Robert Schoone-Jongen, on the other hand, recently published an article highlighting the diversity of the Dutch involvement in a 1911 silk strike in Paterson, New Jersey, with emigrants found on the side of the strikers, the strike-breakers, the employers, the labor unions and even the law enforcement officials and judges presiding over the aftermath.[3] I would invite Dutch-American historians to revive the forgotten histories of the urban Dutch such that the latter will find their way into the field of comparative immigration studies and that the neglected role of religion, the Dutch, and the two when entwined receive fitting acknowledgment in the historiography of the American nation and her people.

---

[3] Robert Schoone-Jongen, "There was Work in the Valley: Dutch Immigration to New Jersey, 1850–1920," *Tijdschrift voor Sociale en Economische Geschiedenis* 7.2 (2010): 77–79.

Works Cited and Consulted

Secondary and Tertiary Sources

Alba, Richard, Albert J. Raboteau and Josh deWind, eds. Introduction to *Immigration and Religion in America: Comparative and Historical Perspectives*. New York: New York University Press, 2009.

Appleby, Joyce, Lynn Hunt and Margaret Jacob. *Telling the Truth about History.* New York: Norton, 1994.

Bodnar, John. *The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Boonstra, Harry. *The Dutch Equation in the RCA Freemasonry Controversy, 1867–1885*. Lecture Series of the Van Raalte Institute Visiting Research Fellows Program No. 6. Holland, MI; Van Raalte Press, 2008.

Bratt, James D. *Dutch Calvinism in Modern America: A History of a Conservative Subculture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984.

Carter, Heath W. "Scab Ministers, Striking Saints: Christianity and Class Conflict in 1894 Chicago." *American Nineteenth Century History* 11.3 (2010): 321–349.

Craig, Robert H. "Nineteenth-Century Labor Radicalism." In *Religion and Radical Politics: An Alternative Christian Tradition in the United States*, 6–45. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992.

De Jong, Gerald F. "Dutch Immigrants in New Jersey Before World War 1." *New Jersey History* 94.2 (1976): 69–88.

Dolan, Ray P. "The Immigrants and Their Gods: A New Perspective in American Religious History." *Church History* 57 (1988): 61–72.

Evenhuis, James. "Detroit's Motor City Dutch." In *The Dutch in Urban America*, edited by Robert P. Swierenga, Donald Sinnema and Hans Krabbendam, 13–33. Holland, MI: Joint Archives, 2004.

Frieswijk, John. "Een socialisties propagandist in revolutionaire jaren: Biografie van Tjeerd Stienstra (1859–1935)," *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis* 2 (oktober 1976): 219–256.

Galema, Annemieke. *Frisians to America 1888–1914: With the Baggage of the Fatherland*. Groningen, the Netherlands: REGIO-Project Uitgevers, 1996.

Galema, Annemieke. "Over de wereldzee naar de grote stad: Pieter Ypes Groustra met zijn gezin in Chicago rond de eeuwwisseling." *De Nederlandsche Leeuw: Maandblad van het Koninklijk Nederlandsch Genootschap voor Geslacht- en Wapenkunde* 109 (1992): 450–458.

Gerber, David A. "Immigration Historiography at the Crossroads." *Reviews in American History* 39.1 (2011): 74–76.

Göbel, Thomas. "Becoming American: Ethnic Workers and the Rise of the CIO." *Labor History* 29.2 (1988): 173–198.

Gutman, Herbert G. "Protestantism and the American Labor Movement: The Christian Spirit in the Gilded Age." *American Historical Review* 72.1 (October 1966): 74–101.

Handlin, Oscar. *The Uprooted: From the Old World to the New*. London: Watts & Co., 1953.

Hansen, Marcus L. "The History of American Immigration as a Field for Research." *The American Historical Review* 32.3 (1927): 500–518.

Heerma van Voss, Lex. "Why is there no socialism in the Netherlands: De Nederlandse arbeidersklasse in de twintigste eeuw." Lecture given at the Universiteit Utrecht, Utrecht, the Netherlands, March 8, 2002.

Hill, Herbert. "The Problem of Race in American Labor History." *Reviews in American History* 24.2 (1996): 189–208.

Kalma, J. J. "Hugenholtz, Frederick Willem Nicolaas." In *Biografisch Woordenboek van het Socialisme en de Arbeidersbeweging in Nederland*. Accessed May 13, 2014. http://hdl.handle.net/10622/C0DDC17D-4368-42B3-92C6-E6485D9A7084.

King, Desmond. Review of *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White*, by David R. Roediger. *American Historical Review* 3.5 (2006): 1528–1529.

Krabbendam, Hans. *Freedom on the Horizon: Dutch Immigration to America, 1840–1940*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009.

Krabbendam, Hans. "Nederlandse kranten in de Verenigde Staten 1849–1959." Website of the Royal Dutch National Library. Accessed July 29, 2013. http://kranten.kb.nl/about/VerenigdeStaten.

Krabbendam, Hans. "Waarom christelijke vakbeweging onder de Nederlandse immigranten in Amerika niet aansloeg." *Cahier over de Geschiedenis van de Christelijk-Sociale Beweging* (2009): 132–150.

Langeveld, Herman. "Kuyper, Abraham." In *Biografisch Woordenboek van het Socialisme en de Arbeidersbeweging in Nederland.* Accessed April 6, 2014. http://hdl.handle.net/10622/4A546104-BE64-490A-8E52-95A00F17C6D7.

Lindsey, Almont. *The Pullman Strike: the story of a unique experiment and of a great labor upheaval*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Lucas, Henry S. *Netherlanders in America: Dutch Immigration to the United States and Canada, 1789–1950*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1955.

Reynolds, Geoffrey. "Built Along the Shores of Macatawa: The History of Boat Building in Holland, Michigan." In *The Dutch in Urban America,* edited by Robert P. Swierenga, Donald Sinnema and Hans Krabbendam, 94–107. Holland, MI: Joint Archives, 2004.

Roediger, David R. *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White*. New York: Basic, 2005.

Rüter, A. J. C. "De Spoorwegstakingen van 1903: Een Spiegel der Arbeidersbeweging in Nederland." PhD diss., Universiteit Leiden, 1935.

Savidge Sterne, Evelyn. "Bringing Religion into Working-Class History: Parish, Public, and Politics in Providence, 1890–1930." *Social Science History* 24.1 (2000): 149–182.

Schoone-Jongen, Robert. "Fighting at the Borders: Dutch-Americans and the Paterson Silk Strike of 1913." In *Across Borders: Dutch Migration to North America and Australia*, edited by Jacob E. Nyenhuis, Suzanne M. Sinke and Robert P. Swierenga, 199–209. Holland, MI: Van Raalte Press, 2010.

Schoone-Jongen, Robert. "There was Work in the Valley: Dutch Immigration to New Jersey, 1850–1920." *Tijdschrift voor Sociale en Economische Geschiedenis* 7.2 (2010): 56–81.

Speerstra, Hylke. *Cruel Paradise: Life Stories of Dutch Emigrants*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

Spender, Stephen. "A.J. Muste Biographical Background." Website of A.J. Muste Memorial Foundation. Accessed May 14, 2014. http://www.ajmuste.org/ajmbio.html.

Stokvis, P. R. D. "Socialistische immigranten in de Verenigde Staten: Vrijheid Versus Gelijkheid." *Groniek: Gronings Historisch Tijdschrift* 96 (1986): 103–116.

Swierenga, Robert P. "The Delayed Transition from Folk to Labor Migration: The Netherlands, 1880–1920." *International Migration Review* 27.2 (1993): 406–424.
Swierenga, Robert P. *Dutch Chicago: A History of the Hollanders in the Windy City*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.
Swierenga, Robert P. "Dutch Jewish Immigration and Religious Life in the Nineteenth Century." *American Jewish History* 80.1 (Autumn: 1990): 56–73.
Swierenga, Robert P. "The Dutch Urban Experience." In *The Dutch in Urban America,* edited by Robert P. Swierenga, Donald Sinnema and Hans Krabbendam, 1–12. Holland, MI: Joint Archives, 2004.
Swierenga, Robert P. *Faith and Family: Dutch Immigration and Settlement in the United States, 1820–1920*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 2000.
Swierenga, Robert P. Introduction to *The Dutch in Urban America*, edited by Robert P. Swierenga, Donald Sinnema and Hans Krabbendam, ix–xii. Holland, MI: Joint Archives, 2004.
Vanderstel, David Gordon. "The Dutch of Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1848–1900: Immigrant Neighbourhood and Community Development in a Nineteenth Century City." PhD diss., Kent State University, 1983.
Van Hinte, Jacob. *Nederlanders in Amerika I.* Groningen, the Netherlands: P. Noordhoff, 1928.
Van Hinte, Jacob. *Nederlanders in Amerika II.* Groningen, the Netherlands: P. Noordhoff, 1928.
Vecoli, Rudolph J. "A Selected Bibliography on American Immigration and Ethnicity." September 2001 edition. Accessed May 12, 2013. http://www.ihrc.umn.edu/publications/pdf/BAIE.pdf.
Vecoli, Rudolph J. "Contadini in Chicago: A Critique of *The Uprooted*." *The Journal of American History* 51.3 (1964): 404–417.
Winkels Japinga, Lynn. "Responsible for Righteousness: Social Thought and Action in the Reformed Church in America, 1901–1941." PhD diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1992. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
Zandstra, David L. "In the City, But Not of the City: Dutch Truck Famers in the Calumet Region." In *The Dutch in Urban America,* edited by Robert P. Swierenga, Donald Sinnema and Hans Krabbendam, 118–127. Holland, MI: Joint Archives, 2004.

Primary Sources

Correspondence and Memoires:

Archief Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis. Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis. Algemeen, Correspondentie, 127, Koert, L.W. van. 1893–1894.
Brinks, Herbert J. *Dutch American Voices: Letters from the United States, 1850–1930*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1995.
Dutch Immigrant Letter Collection. Calvin College Hekman Library. Accessed March 16–17, 2014. http://www.calvin.edu/hh/letters/letters_main.html.
Galema, Annemieke. *Zuster, kom toch over: belevenissen van een emigrantenfamilie uit Friesland: brieven uit Amerika in de periode 1894–1933*. Winsum, the Netherlands: Ulbe B. Bakker, 1999.

Harinck, George. *Mijn reis was geboden: Abraham Kuypers Amerikaanse tournee*. Hilversum, the Netherlands: Verloren, 2009.

Spitse, J. *Altijd aan het Reizen: brieven van een mormoonse emigrant naar Noord-Amerika, 1877–1913*. Zutphen, the Netherlands: Walburg Pers, 2011.

Van Dyke, Johannes. "CHICAGO." Memoires published in *Origins* 1 (Fall: 1983): 10–15.

Van Schouwenburg, Jans. *New York 1919: Brieven van Jans Jorissen*. Leiden, the Netherlands: van Schouwenburg, 2007.

Westra, Helen. "'Fear and Hope Jostled:' Dutch immigrant Life and Death in Paterson, New Jersey." *Origins* 8 (Fall: 1990): 3–15.

Contemporary Books and Articles:

Muste, Abraham J. "Labor's View of the Function of the Church." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 103.1 (1922): 112–116.

Nauta, R. D. "Een Bezoek Bij Pullman." *Vragen van den Dag* (1894): 550–567.

Patrimonium: orgaan van het verbond

Sloet tot Oldhuis, B. W. A. E. "Over de oorzaken van de landverhuizing der Nederlanders naar de Vereenigde Staten." *Tijdschrift voor Staathuishoudkunde en Statistiek* 26 (1866): 79–102.

Wijnaendts Francken, C. J. *Door Amerika: Reisschetsen, Indrukken en Studiën*. Haarlem, the Netherlands: H. D. Tjeenk Willink, 1892.

Wood, James. "Holland." *Friends' Review; a Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 35.3 (1881): 35.

Newspapers: (country of publication)

De Heraut van de gereformeerde kerken in Nederland (NL)
De Grondwet (USA)
De Standaard (USA)
De Volksstem (USA)
De Volksvriend (USA)
New York Times (USA)
Nieuw Advertentieblad (NL)

Church Archives:

Minutes of the Highest Assembly of the Christian Reformed Church 1857–1880. Archives of the Christian Reformed Church in North America, Hekman Library, Calvin College. Accessed April 5, 2014. http://library.calvin.edu/guide/collections/hekman_databases/synod/.

"Memorable Events." Website Christian Reformed Church. Accessed April 7, 2014. http://www.crcna.org/welcome/history/memorable-events.

Company Archives:

"Geschiedenis van het CNV." Website Christelijk Nationaal Vakverbond. Accessed April 7, 2014. http://www.cnv.nl/over-cnv/organisatie/geschiedenis/.

"Modern Woodman through the Years." Website Modern Woodmen of America. Accessed May 20, 2014. https://www.modern-woodmen.org/AboutUs2/History/Pages/Timeline.aspx.

Government Archives:

Abstracts of the Reports of the Immigrant Commission, S. Rep. (1911). Accessed June 10, 2013. http://archive.org/stream/reportsofimmigra01unitrich#page/n9/mode/2up.

Statistical Review of Immigration, 1820–1910. S. Rep. (1911). Accessed June 10, 2013. http://pds.lib.harvard.edu/pds/view/3067941?n=6&imagesize=1200&jp2Res=.25&printThumbnails=no.