

Syb Talma: A Dutch Christian Socialist*

Gerard van Krieken
Retired Teacher of History
Kennemer Lyceum, Overveen

Inspired by the London harbor strike of 1889, Syb Talma went from being a young, Dutch Reformed pastor of the ethical theological school to actively advocating for workers' rights in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in the Netherlands, particularly from within the labor organization Patrimonium. Talma remained loyal to the Dutch Reformed Church even after the split of 1886, when Abraham Kuyper led the formation of the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands, a more conservative denomination. Yet, inspired by Kuyper's speech at the First Christian Social Congress, Talma also joined the former's Antirevolutionary Party and remained loyal to it until his death, even holding public office in the early twentieth century. This article examines Talma's life and work, specifically focusing on his views of politics, labor unions, and workers' rights.

The London Harbor Strike

In September 1889, Syb Talma visited London. On August 14, the harbor workers there had stopped working because their employers had refused to consider their demand to raise their hourly wage from five to six pennies. The strike was a test of strength that ended after five weeks on September 22 with a victory for the workers and their unions. In the Netherlands, the harbor strike was being watched with mixed emotions. Some feared that there would soon be serious food shortages in London because the ships were unable to unload their cargo. At the same time, there was respect for the strikers who held "various orderly mass meetings" without any looting of stores. The largest was held in Hyde Park. "After a march with music and banners," 150,000 people gathered there.¹ Just as

Henry Dunant traveled as a tourist to Solferino in 1859 to watch the battle between the French and the Austrians, so, too, Talma traveled to London. He returned deeply impressed. He had listened to the elderly Roman Catholic archbishop of Westminster, Henry Edward Manning, who functioned as an arbitrator, and he had seen a march procession of 50,000 “strong men,” all of them dock workers.² They were not alone. Joining them were the well-dressed captains of lighter vessels, not laborers but ordinary citizens. They displayed their solidarity with the strikers by carrying a banner with the slogan: “Out on principle.” Talma was convinced that their solidarity had decisive significance for the ultimate victory of the strikers.³ For the rest of his life, Talma remembered those men who had not smashed any windows, had neither fought with the police nor cursed, but had demonstrated calmly and respectfully. They convinced him of the importance of a labor movement that defended the interests of the workers without preaching revolution. Only by uniting and self-consciously defending their rights, according to him, could they avoid becoming second-class citizens.

The Netherlands in 1900

In 1900, the Netherlands had about five million inhabitants. About half of them belonged to the Dutch Reformed Church (Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk).⁴ One-third was Roman Catholic, and ten percent, the Reformed (Gereformeerden),⁵ belonged to the strict Protestant church known as the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland [GKN]).⁶ The Dutch Reformed Church, where there was little doctrinal discipline, included different streams, varying from strict orthodoxy to liberalism. Many liberals who advocated public education under state control were members of this church. Others who advocated for Christian education usually voted for one of the three existing Christian Democratic Parties. Such parties could count on the vote of members of the Reformed churches and Roman Catholics who joined in opposition to public education.⁷

Since the revolution of 1848, the Netherlands has been a parliamentary democracy with a census franchise that benefits the liberal citizenry. In addition, a district model of government has been in place. If in the first round none of the candidates received an absolute majority of votes, a second round would be held where the two candidates with the highest vote count would run against each other.

In the Netherlands, there are no iron mines and only a few coal mines. For that reason, industrialization occurred later in the Netherlands than in surrounding countries such as Germany, Belgium, and Great Britain. However, after 1870, the economy modernized very quickly. Rotterdam became an important transit

harbor for the German industrial area, and, by means of steamship enterprises, the connection with the Dutch East Indies was maintained by way of the Suez Canal. The textile industry began to blossom, and in 1891 Philips began producing light bulbs.

For a long time, the modernization of the economy had no visible effect on social relationships. Everyone knew clearly who was entitled to wear a beret and who should wear a cap, who was to be called “ma’am” and who was to be called “miss.” Most workers had no difficulty living in a stratified society in which everyone knew their place. Only the socialists thought differently about such things. They were oriented not to England but to Germany, and, as convinced Marxists, they spoke of class struggle and declared religion to be the opiate of the people. That not only cost them the sympathy of the workers who went to church every Sunday but also, unlike in England, prevented the Dutch working class from functioning as a unity. Alongside the socialist labor movement arose a confessional labor movement that rejected the class struggle. In that connection, Talma played a significant role.

An Ethical Theologian

Syb Talma—according to the public register Aritius Sybrandus Talma—was born in 1864 in the Dutch Reformed parsonage in Angeren, a village in the province of Gelderland that had one hundred forty-five residents.

He spent a large part of his youth in Dordrecht, the oldest city of Holland, but he obtained his secondary school diploma in 1882 from the Erasmian Gymnasium in Rotterdam. For the two years he attended the Erasmian Gymnasium, he had traveled daily by train from Dordrecht to Rotterdam, a thirty-minute trip. After his final exams, Talma went to Utrecht to study theology. At that time, the ethical theologians were setting the tone. They were attempting to walk the middle path between modernism and orthodoxy. Their objection against the modern theologians was that under the influence of the Enlightenment they allowed only reason to speak and therefore called into question the resurrection of Jesus. At the same time, the ethical theologians did not feel at home with the orthodox, which rejected every form of critical biblical investigation. For the ethicals, it was not problematic if it could be scientifically proven that King David could not have been the poet who composed the psalms. The question whether the serpent in paradise had really spoken was for them also not a crucial issue. In their view, faith involved not dogmas but the “experience of the heart”: faith must be lived. Talma found his home in this theology. Throughout his entire life, he emphatically identified himself as an ethical theologian.

In Utrecht, Talma had more than enough time to pour himself into student life, and he did so with abandon. He served on the board of the student choral association and edited the national student magazine, *Vox Studiosorum*. He did not surrender to the temptation of alcohol, becoming a lifelong abstainer while still a student. He combined all his activities without injuring his studies, and he passed his exams in a timely manner. In 1887, five years after graduating from the Gymnasium, he was able to become a minister in the Dutch Reformed Church at twenty-three years of age.

The Church Split of 1886

The *Doleantie* split within the Dutch Reformed Church had occurred a year earlier in 1886 with the departure of Abraham Kuyper (1837–1920) and his orthodox contingent from that church. That resulted from a struggle over matters of faith and authority in the church that had gone on for years. In his parental home, Talma had heard very few favorable things said about Kuyper. His father was a minister of the old school, an upright believer who opposed every form of fanaticism. He, too, was a devoted minister in the Dutch Reformed Church, which until the French Revolution had been the privileged church. For him, that church remained the national church called to keep watch over the Christian character of the Netherlands. In his eyes, Kuyper, who with his neo-Calvinism had mobilized the orthodox within the Dutch Reformed Church, was a fanatic who acknowledged only his own perspective. Kuyper had such great difficulty that he left the Dutch Reformed Church to begin his own denomination, the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands. Nor did Talma's father appreciate the fact that Kuyper pleaded for the discontinuation of the government salary for ministers, the contribution from the national treasury to which leaders of recognized church denominations had a right. As a contender of free churches, Kuyper wanted the financial connection between state and church to be broken. For a minister in Dordrecht that would mean that he would lose three-quarters of his annual salary of two thousand guilders.

Differences of opinion within the Protestant Netherlands were not limited to matters of faith and ecclesiastical questions. People thought differently about many social problems as well, such as expanding suffrage and social legislation. However, on those issues, the dividing line was not between members of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands and members of the Dutch Reformed Church. Whereas one member of the Dutch Reformed Church, for example, could be somewhat indifferent about the issue of providing mandatory health insurance to workers, another member of the same church could be a rather

intense advocate of such a provision. Nevertheless, in general, it can be argued that members of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands were more favorable toward expanding suffrage and social legislation than were members of the Dutch Reformed Church.

The *Doleantie* split did not mean that members of the two denominations avoided each other like the plague. Rather, they continued cooperating in many areas in the life of Dutch society. Together they advocated for Christian schools. Their leaders also sensed that in the political arena they could not survive without each other. The district model compelled cooperation and conversation, for in order to win a seat, a candidate from the Dutch Reformed Church needed the votes of members of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands, and vice versa. Moreover, both sides joined together in their aversion toward the liberals and socialists who were the heirs of the French Revolution. It was not accidental that the party of orthodox Protestants be they members of either denomination, was the Antirevolutionary Party (ARP), which after 1879 was under the leadership of Kuyper. Although the name perhaps suggests otherwise, the Antirevolutionary Party was in favor of parliamentary democracy and was not inclined to give the king more power. The party also favored cooperation with the Roman Catholics. That group was always certain of victory in the southern part of the country where it constituted the overwhelming majority of the population. On its own, the Antirevolutionary Party was consigned to being the opposition party. Only by cooperating with the Roman Catholics could it become a governing party.

Encounter with Maurice

In January 1888, Talma preached his ordination sermon to his first congregation in the church in Heinenoord, a village of 1,800 residents in the barren polders south of Rotterdam. Approximately one week earlier, he had married Margoth van Schaardenburg, with whom he had been engaged for two years. Together they would receive six children, four girls and two boys, each of whom would reach adulthood. Talma had met Margoth in Dordrecht. Her father, Gerrit van Schaardenburg, was the owner of a steam rice-hulling mill that processed annually one and a half million bushels of rice imported from Asia. He was a Dutch Reformed Church member and was also a socially involved manufacturer. The local branch of the Christian workers association, Patrimonium, could always depend on his support.

In Heinenoord, Talma, who had come from a sheltered environment, became acquainted with the hard life of many of his parishioners. He was deeply affected by the story of a woman who baked her own bread. During a home visit she told

him that she gave her children four slices of bread each day. The lack of money compelled her to make her loaves smaller in the winter than in the summer, thus, the slices would be smaller.⁸ During the same period, he also met a young painter apprentice, an anarchist, who asked him how he could be a shepherd of the people if he was uninformed about the worries that occupied their minds on Sunday as they sat in church. He could answer merely by saying, “I don’t know. I am just a pastor. I don’t understand anything about that.” That encounter bothered him, and he later remarked, “I felt that that young man, who was a freethinker and an anarchist, was right about me.”⁹

He discovered the answer to the question of how the gospel could be meaningful for workers from the British Christian socialists Frederick Denison Maurice and Charles Kingsley; they were not unknown in the Netherlands. It was precisely during that period that the influential ethical theologian Johannes Gunning was publishing translations of their work. In 1889, a selection from Kingsley’s work appeared,¹⁰ and one year later in 1890 a translation of Maurice’s *Social Morality* appeared.¹¹

Talma recognized himself in Maurice, the theologian who connected heaven and earth. In Maurice, Talma was hearing someone who had not banned Christ to heaven but who summoned people to translate faith on this earth into deeds. Just like the Old Testament prophets, he envisioned a just society in which workers had a status that treated them justly. Rather than being invisible, this was already present on earth; it needed only to be made visible by people and that could happen without class struggle and social revolution. In order to realize this justice, Maurice wanted to help workers take their destiny into their own hands, which occurred with varied success. The Working Men’s College that he established in 1854 was successful, but the workers’ cooperative suffered its demise after a short time. That was a painful experience, but according to him, it was still beneficial “as a leaven . . . for spreading social sentiments.”¹² Maurice strengthened Talma’s conviction that a society suffered dislocation if it located “the basis . . . of morality and statecraft” in the economy. In actuality, however, it was just the opposite. A society that failed to acknowledge any moral values as foundational “was not worth anything” and absolutely incapable of solving “the social question.”¹³ This opinion led him to make the statement that “democracy will be safe only when it is governed by Christ.”¹⁴

Talma acknowledged his constant indebtedness to the English Christian socialists. Later he spoke with great respect about Maurice, who “had adopted the name of Christian socialist because when, in 1848, the socialists were opposed by everyone, he could not tolerate the possibility that the movement working on behalf of hungry people would be suppressed on account of a name.”¹⁵ Inspired

by Maurice and the other English Christian socialists, Talma wanted to devote himself to the cause of a just society. In so doing, he showed himself to be no slavish imitator. Whereas Maurice opposed strikes because they disrupted the social order, in 1891 Talma spoke out in favor of the right to strike. In his view, a strike was not an attempt to undermine the authority of the employer but a weapon for realizing “the expansion of the social freedom of the workers.”¹⁶

In addition to the English Christian socialists, he followed the example of Adolf Stöcker, the man from the Berlin city mission who sought with “Deed and Labor” to rescue the German workers for the faith.¹⁷ However, he had no sympathy whatsoever for the anti-Semitism of this former palace preacher of the German emperor Wilhelm II.

The Choice for Kuyper

His interest in the social question landed Talma in the Antirevolutionary Party. In November 1891, he attended the Social Congress together with his father-in-law Van Schaardenburg. There he and a thousand other people heard Kuyper’s address on “The Social Question and the Christian Religion.”¹⁸ In this speech, Kuyper issued a heartfelt plea for Christian social politics. According to him, the liberals, for whom everything turned on the issue of money, had no answer to the social problems of the day. Furthermore, they could expect no solution from the socialists who having abolished heaven were promising an earthly paradise. He believed that it was Christians who had the mandate to construct a society in which everyone, rich and poor, would experience flourishing. This obviously required that Jesus’ words about God’s kingdom and its righteousness would be taken seriously and would be the foundation of society. With the development of the building that had to rise upon that foundation, care had to be taken that space remained for society; it would be impermissible for the state to choke society and swallow it up. The state must know its own limits and grant society the freedom to develop unhindered. Only in this way could a society emerge that in terms of both good and evil took into account God’s eternal order.

It was an impressive address—one that established Kuyper’s reputation as a social thinker. Kuyper’s words fell on good soil in the person of Talma. With pleasure, he observed that, according to Kuyper, “universal Christian principles” were no hindrance to social reforms; instead they encouraged such reforms. In that way, Kuyper was walking in the footsteps of Maurice, who had declared that morality and statecraft must be the foundation of civil polity, and not the other way around.¹⁹ In Kuyper, he had found the Dutch translation of Maurice’s ideas! Talma’s choosing Kuyper involved the latter’s politics but not his theology. He

remained a preacher in the ethical movement and never considered leaving the Dutch Reformed Church.

With the elections of 1894, it became apparent that this choice was not without cost. In those days, the issue of expanding suffrage had both advocates and opponents. The advocates wanted three-fourths of men who were twenty-five years and older to be permitted to vote in the future; the opponents, of course, were not in favor of that. This issue divided all the political parties, including the Antirevolutionary Party (ARP). While Kuyper favored expansion, Alexander de Savornin Lohman (1837–1924), who represented the more conservative wing within the ARP, was opposed. During Kuyper’s address in Dordrecht, where he was running as a candidate, Talma aligned himself with the ARP and Kuyper. In his view, Kuyper deserved support because he stood for an ideal: the advancement of “Christian democracy”—a democracy that wanted to be governed by Christ and did not appeal to the principles of the French Revolution. By virtue of its emphasis on property, the current census voting right was a “mammon voting right” that contradicted “Christian democratic principles.”²⁰ He also thought that there was no reason to fear the populace and to fear that “the animal that is hiding in every man” would burst forth from the workers as soon as they received the right to vote.²¹ On the contrary, the ideal of a Christian democracy was attainable only if “the entire populace was declared free and full-grown.”²²

When the outcome of the election became known, it was evident that the opponents of expanding suffrage had won. Despite Talma’s support, Kuyper also received the smallest number of votes. The defeat, however, called not for adjustment but only delay. In 1896 a new election law was adopted whereby the number of voters rose from 300,000 to 570,000—approximately half of the men who were twenty-five years and older. During the subsequent decade, an additional 300,000 voters were added.

The disunity concerning the issue of suffrage led to a rupture in the Antirevolutionary Party. Alexander de Savornin Lohman withdrew and founded the Christian Historical Union (CHU). That party developed as a conservative alternative to the ARP as far as the issues of suffrage and social legislation were concerned. Many of its voters were members of the Dutch Reformed Church who had little sympathy for Kuyper, the leader in the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands. Nor were they happy with Talma’s choosing for Kuyper. He observed that reality in May 1894, at the annual meeting of the Association of Dutch Reformed Church ministers. There he received little support when he assured his colleagues that Kuyper was a democrat who wanted to treat the workers justly. They thought that Talma was mistaken, that Kuyper was primarily a demagogue who had it in for the Dutch Reformed Church. After the meeting ended, he was attacked so

fiercely that a former teacher, Professor Josué Valeton, thought it advisable to invite him to his home. Talma was grateful to him and, in a long letter, he thanked Valeton for his hospitality. In that letter, he also explained why he favored expanding suffrage—only in this way could a pathway be opened to “a genuine social politics.” In other countries, the leading classes had assumed their responsibility and put forth effort to treat workers justly. In the Netherlands, where “miserable, foolish indifference” often lived among the upper class, that was unfortunately not to be expected, in his view. Here in this country, the workers would have to seize what they deserved.²³

Patrimonium

By this time, Talma had already moved from Heinenoord to Vlissingen. The Zeeland port city had a shipping connection with England and it boasted significant industry as well. The naval dockyard De Schelde was far and away the largest employer, which made socialism popular among many of its workers.

Shortly after moving to Vlissingen, he became a member of Patrimonium, whose official title was the Dutch Workers Association Patrimonium. It was established in 1876 by Klaas Kater and several associates out of dissatisfaction with the course being followed by the older, liberal-oriented General Dutch Workers Association. That group had declared itself in favor of public schools because all students had to be able to feel accepted regardless of their faith; therefore, there was no room for religious instruction. Kater, however, did not want that. With heart and soul, he pleaded for Christian schools.

At that time, Patrimonium numbered thirteen thousand members. It was a workers association of which employers, ministers, and other nonemployees could become members with special standing. In Dordrecht, Talma’s father-in-law, Van Schaardenburg, was such a member, and Talma himself was a member of the Vlissingen branch. Most of the ordinary members were wage earners, but that was not a requirement. Self-employed people, such as butchers, could also become members. Larger branches of Patrimonium often had a health insurance fund that provided five guilders each week to those who had been sick for at least eighteen months. Many branches had a fund for widows and helped parents who themselves were unable to pay the tuition for Christian schooling. Each year a celebratory evening was held, enjoyed by members together with their wives and children, featuring an edifying word and singing a psalm and a hymn. In addition, they could hear a fanciful word and be entertained by *tableaux vivants*, which consisted of live scenes with actors posing as statues in a sort of living, human still-life with artistic lighting, which was popular in the late nineteenth

century. There were pastries and lemonade but no alcohol. Patrimonium was not a labor union with a strike fund, though in principle it was not opposed to striking. When in 1888 exploited textile workers implemented a work stoppage, an appeal appeared in *Patrimonium*, the weekly paper of the Workers Association, to support them and raised almost three hundred guilders.

When Talma joined as a member with special standing, the Vlissingen branch numbered 143 ordinary members and 19 members with special standing. Five years later, in 1896, the total number had risen to 230. Of these, 30 were members of the metal workers union, and 16 were members of the carpenters union. Talma had stood at their cradle when, after his visit to London, he became convinced that workers needed to organize into labor unions. However, he did not believe in a common union that united all the workers, certainly not in Vlissingen. There, the members of *Patrimonium*, who wanted not revolution but reformation, would have had to dance according to the tune called by the socialists. For that reason, he worked to advance the establishment of these two labor unions, which together with the 150 members of the Amsterdam branch of the carpenters union formed the first labor unions within *Patrimonium*.

From the beginning, Talma felt at home in *Patrimonium*. In March 1892, when the Vlissingen branch celebrated its ten-year anniversary, he gave the commemorative speech. In that address, he emphasized the right of the working man to unite with others, and he summoned his listeners to defend themselves on the basis of their own values and standards, and not to allow themselves to be carried along by the socialists. This was the first of innumerable addresses that he gave in subsequent years everywhere throughout the country on behalf of *Patrimonium*. They were heard with pleasure, for he spoke with a special “inspiring tone.”²⁴ Nor did they remain unnoticed. In 1894, he became a member of the advisory committee, and four years later, in 1898, he became a member of the editorial board of the weekly paper *Patrimonium*. As a member with special standing, he could not serve in any governing function. Those were reserved for ordinary members.

Is Patrimonium Protestant or Reformed?

The ecclesiastical tensions did not pass by *Patrimonium*. Since its founding, Klaas Kater had been the leader. After spending time during his early years as a Bible salesman, he became a mason for a large brewery in Amsterdam. At the time of the *Doleantie*, he and his boss, Willem Hovy, went along with Kuyper. According to Kater, his departure from the Dutch Reformed Church need have no consequences for *Patrimonium*. In his view, *Patrimonium* was and remained a

labor association where all Protestant workers were welcome, whether they were members of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands or of the Dutch Reformed Church. In that connection, he pointed out that Patrimonium had no official ties with the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands. Indeed, the church split affected Patrimonium hardly at all in places like Dordrecht and Vlissingen. In Dordrecht, Talma's father-in-law, a member of the Dutch Reformed Church, continued as a member with special standing of the local branch, and in Vlissingen, Talma had felt at home since the beginning. However, that was not the case everywhere. In Rotterdam, the Dutch Reformed Church minister Johannes de Visser (1857–1932) left Patrimonium in order to found a uniquely and explicitly Dutch Reformed workers association. Like Talma, he was a theologian in the ethical school who had studied in Utrecht. In The Hague, Patrimonium lost no fewer than 150 of the 225 members when Dutch Reformed workers there decided to establish their own association. In 1894, those different groups joined together as the Christian National Workers Union, the CNWB. Only members of the Dutch Reformed Church could be members of that union. Therefore, the relationship between Patrimonium and the CNWB was not always smooth. When Patrimonium accused the CNWB of being an ecclesiastical organization, De Visser responded with the comment that it was remarkable that employers such as Van Schaardenburg and Hovy could hold membership in a workers union.

The founding of the CNWB occasionally put Talma in a tough position within his own church. That became apparent in 1895 at the Ecclesiastical Congress for members of the Dutch Reformed Church. In a discussion about the church and the interests of the workers, a confrontation broke out between him and De Visser that played out as an intramural contest. The latter praised his CNWB not just because its members had established pension funds and health funds but especially because it considered a good relationship between employers and workers more important than power. Thereby, he was distinguishing the workers union in his view from another organization concerned “especially about politics.” Everyone knew that he was referring to Patrimonium, and Talma did not hesitate to answer him.

Talma began by wondering why De Visser made such an emphatic distinction between employers and workers within an ecclesiastical organization—which was what the CNWB was, after all. In his view, that could not be squared with the conviction that in Christ all believers are one. At most, there was a distinction between fathers and children, where the fathers had the duty of encouraging and nurturing their children. Then he accused De Visser, saying that his CNWB opposed the weapon of the strike. Anyone with two eyes could see that workers

who out of principle refused to strike “were doomed to perpetual impotence.”²⁵ In his response, De Visser explained that the CNWB was not interested in power but in harmony, for then “by means of his service, the servant would compel respect from the master and thereby achieve power.”²⁶

It was the first of a long series of confrontations between two ministers who undoubtedly enjoyed hearing each other’s sermons, but beyond that, often differed in their opinions. The one had chosen for Patrimonium and the ARP, the other for the CNWB and the CHU. When both of them sat in the House of Representatives, it became evident that they disagreed about the manner in which workers could best be protected against sickness and deprivation. They stood side by side only when fighting against the socialists or during elections when the attempt to win a seat from the liberals was at stake.

The Direction of Patrimonium

Around the turn of the twentieth century there was a great deal of discussion within Patrimonium concerning which direction to follow. No fewer than three issues were in play. The first involved the relationship between Patrimonium and the Antirevolutionary Party, the second involved the question of whether Patrimonium had to become a real labor union, and the third involved the place of the worker in society. Talma had a clear opinion about each of these.

Patrimonium and Politics

To the outside world, the matter was clear: The Patrimonium of Kater and the Antirevolutionary Party of Kuyper were destined to exist together. The ARP did not want to lose the support of the Protestant workers, and Kater sensed that without Kuyper’s support, Patrimonium was powerless. The observation that each needed the other was correct but that was no guarantee of a smooth relationship. On the contrary, Kuyper was the man who permitted no one else, no matter who he was, to set the rules, and the impulsive Kater was occasionally far from diplomatic. Over against that flaw, however, stood Kater’s virtues of his undisputed uprightness and loyalty.

The two apparently never had a problem when Kuyper had helped the chairman of Patrimonium win a seat in the House of Representatives. In 1885, the liberals ran Bernardus Heldt, the chairman of the liberally oriented General Dutch Workers Association, as a candidate in a district where they were strong. He won, and thereafter was continually reelected. By contrast, Kater had to suffer the experience that the leadership of his party found him too much of a lightweight to become a member of the House of Representatives. He could be a member

of the Central Committee of the ARP, but in terms of elections he always had to be satisfied with a district where he did not stand a chance of winning. In 1890, he could no longer control his irritation. At the annual meeting of *Patrimonium*, he said with bitterness that Kuypers' *Patrimonium* was apparently nothing more than a trailer tagging on behind the ARP; it did not need to be taken seriously. He openly wondered whether the time had come for establishing a "Christian workers party."²⁷

Kuypers did not want to run that risk. He sensed that the members of *Patrimonium* would sooner or later obtain suffrage, that a Christian workers party would have robbed him of the support of the Christian workers, and that would injure and paralyze his ARP. He decided to meet Kater halfway by organizing the Social Congress mentioned earlier. Thereby, he made it clear that he took the social question seriously. He also cooperated with the Social Program that *Patrimonium* had adopted in 1894.²⁸ Part of that program was pleading for mandatory insurance for retirement, disability, and sickness. Workers and employers had to regulate that together, not the state, because Kater and his friends were allergic to everything that smacked of state interference.

The Social Congress and the Social Program did not mean, however, that everything between *Patrimonium* and the ARP was sweet and harmonious. The Workers Association still continued to lack a member in the House of Representatives. Piet van Vliet (1858–1941), who would succeed Kater as chairman of *Patrimonium*, was put up as the ARP candidate in the elections of 1891, but he did not succeed in winning a seat in the House of Representatives. He did no better in the elections of 1894 and 1897.

Talma, who at that point had no political ambitions himself, tried to put pressure on the Antirevolutionary Party with the elections of 1897. He proposed that *Patrimonium* recommend only those candidates who agreed with the Social Program of 1894. That sounded more threatening than it was. After all, he did oppose the suggestion to surprise candidates refusing to agree with the Social Program by nominating alternative candidates from the ranks of *Patrimonium*. Ultimately, his proposal resulted in nothing more than that *Patrimonium* published a list of the ARP candidates who had declared their agreement with the Social Program. They were recommended. From that list, it became apparent that the candidates of the Christian Historical Union, who also needed the votes of the members of *Patrimonium*, had refused agreement. The action had little effect. The liberals won the elections, and no one suggested that the voting behavior of members of *Patrimonium* influenced the outcome.

Four years later, in the elections of 1901, Kater finally got his way: Kuypers awarded two promising districts to men who belonged to *Patrimonium*. That

fortune was not to be his, for Kuyper had more confidence in the capacities of two representatives from a younger generation, Van Vliet and Talma. By now, Kater was sixty-eight years old, Van Vliet was forty-three, and Talma no older than thirty-seven. Talma received the Tietjerksteradeel district, a large and less prosperous rural district in Friesland, in the northern part of the country. It was a Protestant region. In the past, it had sent a liberal representative to The Hague. However, in 1897, after the first suffrage expansion, Pieter Jelles Troelstra, the leader of the socialists, was elected.

Therefore, Talma had a twofold mandate. Not only did he need to see to it that Patrimonium was finally represented in the House of Representatives, but he also needed to show that the Protestant workers were impervious to socialist propaganda. A defeat would have hit them hard, because then Kuyper would have to take stock of the fact that he had lost contact with the workers' world. That did not happen. Following an intensive election campaign, Talma won on the first ballot. He received 3,205 of the 5,600 votes cast. Troelstra received only 1,247. Because Van Vliet also won a seat in the House of Representatives, Kater could ascertain that Patrimonium was no longer a trailer tagging on behind the Antirevolutionary Party.

Toward a Christian Labor Union

The question of whether Patrimonium had to become a labor union was at that point not yet answered. For Talma, the importance of a strong union movement was not up for discussion. He would have liked to see the Dutch labor unions follow the example of the English. Those unions were strong, not afraid of a strike, and realistic. Moreover, they were not opposed to the faith. The series of articles that he wrote in 1898 about the English workers' world bore testimony to this admiration.²⁹ He drew the information for that series from the *History of Trade Unionism*, by Sidney and Beatrice Webb.³⁰

In those articles, he emphasized the right to strike. If employers refused to accede to the reasonable demands of their workers, his view was that the "sharp weapon" of a workers' strike was the only way for workers to obtain justice. Then the workers themselves had the duty to maintain solidarity, and there was no place for strikebreakers. The success of a strike was never assured ahead of time, and the possibility of defeat always had to be taken into account. Even a defeat could yield a victory over the longer term. A fine example of that was a double decision of the supreme justice in England. In one and the same sentence, he had decided that a strike called by a labor union was unlawful and that the same union had the right to demand that only its members were hired!

In the Netherlands, however, things had not progressed nearly that far, certainly not in Christian circles. At the Social Congress of 1891, the right to strike was emphatically acknowledged. However, that did not prevent many employers, often Christian ones, from complaining about workers who stopped working. Seldom did they ask themselves whether the strikers were right. In addition, many employers refused to sit across the table from a labor union. Illustrative of this attitude was the posture of cigar factories that absolutely refused to deal with outsiders regarding working conditions. For Talma, that was unacceptable. Without labor unions, workers stood defenseless and powerless, and for that reason, “the struggle for union organization was a struggle for justice.”³¹

To his regret, however, Talma had to recognize that the situation in the Netherlands was not comparable with that in England. In a large, general, Dutch labor union, the socialists would call the shots, and Christian workers would never feel at home there. For that reason he favored a separate Christian union movement, and he stood behind the formation of two specialty departments in Vlissingen. In 1898, holding firmly to his convictions, he pleaded for the formation of a Christian workers association in which not only the specialty departments of Patrimonium but also those of the CNWB could consolidate their strengths. Talma found it too sad for words that ecclesiastical problems hindered members of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands and of the Dutch Reformed Church from fighting side by side on behalf of improved working conditions.

His proposal was not received with open arms: De Visser wanted to maintain the Dutch Reformed Church identity and Kater was even less delighted. Before everything else, Kater wanted harmony, cooperation between workers and patrons. It was not for nothing that his Patrimonium was a workers’ association in which employers, ministers, and other sympathizers could be members. In his view, trade unions were adversarial organizations that disrupted such harmony. He clashed with Talma over this issue. It was a conflict between generations, between Kater who had worked in a company under patriarchal leadership and Talma who had become acquainted with a shipyard where the director never showed up in the workplace. Talma drew the longer straw. In August 1899, in the same meeting in which Kater was appointed honorary chairman, he declared that Patrimonium should not stand in the way of the workers movement.

A year later, in August 1900, the annual meeting of Patrimonium agreed with his proposal to establish the Christian Labor Secretariat, the CAS. All the labor unions of Patrimonium had to unite with this new organization. It would also be open to Protestant trade unions that had no connection with Patrimonium. A strike fund was begun, to which each member contributed one-half cent per week and together provided a paid employee.

The CAS was not successful. Many Protestant unions refused to surrender their independence and because official connections existed between the CAS and Patrimonium, in the eyes of De Visser's CNWB, it was an organization of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands with which they could not cooperate.

Nevertheless, some hope did shine through. In January 1905, a Christian Social Conference was held in Amsterdam, where Patrimonium and the CNWB were represented. The participation of the CNWB had the required support. De Visser had refused to participate, but other prominent members had come to Amsterdam, among them Jan Slotemaker de Bruïne, the editor of *The Precaution*, the magazine of the CNWB. Central to the agenda was the significance of the union movement. Talma spoke about the "universal task of the trade associations." He made an intense plea for a strong and healthy trade union that rejected class warfare but exerted itself in bringing about "healthy social relationships." That could be achieved if trade unions in each business sector reached labor agreements that secured the rights and obligations of patrons and workers. Only then could a worker be confident that he was earning enough so that after his sons graduated from primary school they would not have to go to work for someone but could continue studying at a technical school "that served the working man."³² Those attending the meeting agreed with this vision, including those who in the past had not been in favor of labor unions' negotiating with an employer on behalf of the workers.

One question remained unanswered at this Christian Social Conference: Was a Christian labor union in which Patrimonium and CNWB cooperated really within reach? The answer came from Patrimonium, when it met for several days after this conference. By severing the official connections, it freed the CAS from the objectionable associations arising from its close ties with the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands that had troubled De Visser. In so doing, an important obstacle to approaching the CNWB was removed. This made it possible for the various trade unions that belonged to Patrimonium or the CNWB to merge in 1909 to form the successor of the CAS, the Christian National Labor Union (CNV), which exists to this day. Talma was absent from the inaugural meeting of the CNV. After the Christian Social Conference in 1905, he remained active in Patrimonium, but the formation of the CNV occurred without him. Undoubtedly, he was satisfied at this point that a labor union now existed where the workers of Patrimonium and those of the CNWB could feel welcomed. He would have observed with a bit of surprise that the CNV was also open to Roman Catholic unions. He was not anti-Catholic, but he was Protestant enough to disapprove of the "Ave Maria" being sung during a concert in a Dutch Reformed Church.

All of Talma's activities in *Patrimonium* led to his nickname, "the Lion of *Patrimonium*." It was a well-deserved title of honor. Thanks to him, in 1901, the Protestant workers obtained two representatives in parliament and in 1909 their own labor union. The CNV was heavily indebted to him. To this day, the organization maintains his grave in the cemetery of Bennebroek.

Liberating the Worker

Talma's most important contribution to the emancipation of the Protestant worker was his pamphlet, *The Freedom of the Working Class*.³³ In that brochure, he argued that those New Testament passages that spoke of authority and obedience between masters and servants did not have the modern worker in view. In his opinion, the modern worker was first and foremost a free man.

In Protestant Netherlands, where people liked to quote from the Bible, no one doubted that all Dutchmen were free men. However, that did not mean that they could do as they wished. There was a government given by God that had to be obeyed. In his letter to the Romans, the apostle Paul was clear about this: "Let everyone be subject to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except that which God has established" (Rom. 13:1). Many employers who read these words with agreement liked to quote from another of Paul's letters, the one written to the Colossians: "Slaves, obey your earthly masters in everything" (Col. 3:22).

Talma first touched on this theme in 1900. In a speech to Christian employers and in an article in *Patrimonium*, he made a plea for the labor movement. He observed that in everyday practice there was often very little difference between the freedom of modern workers and the bondage of slaves in classical antiquity. Sometimes circumstances were even worse than that. After all, the owner of a slave, who had purchased him for good money, had an interest in keeping his investment alive. Modern employers, by contrast, needed to invest nothing in a worker. For that reason, he could easily send the worker away and replace him with somebody else. Therefore, the freedom of the modern worker, who had no say concerning his working conditions, was in reality only a figment of the imagination. A worker should not feel he has to acquiesce to that. He had to fight for genuine freedom that made it possible for him to fulfill his "divine life calling as worker, as member of the family, [as member] of the church, [and] as citizen of the state." In order to achieve that, he and his compatriots had to unite in labor unions. Then they could successfully negotiate better working conditions with employers and, if necessary, lay down their tools. If no other way was possible—if that "was the only route for maintaining the right to proper living conditions"—then going on strike could even be an obligation. Employers should

not object that Paul summoned servants to obey their masters. If so, they would thereby be conveniently ignoring the fact that the apostle was speaking to slaves of his day, not to free workers in modern times.³⁴

Seeing the subsequent uproar that this claim caused, it is remarkable that employers received it for information. After the conclusion of Talma's address, they did wonder who actually could determine if a strike was legitimate. Moreover, the press paid no attention to this discussion.

That changed when, in March 1902, Van Vliet wrote an article entitled "Proper Relationships," in which he pleaded that an employer and his workers should negotiate working conditions on the basis of equality.³⁵ Because they were "citizens with equal rights," they had to respect each other fully and realize that they had equal rights and obligations. Then he repeated in his own words what Talma had said about the words of Paul that were being cited so often. According to him, a distinction had to be made between slaves and free workers. He added that employers misused the Bible when they appealed to an authority given them by God because the apostle had in view the worldly government, not the employers.³⁶

The response came from the most authoritative Reformed theologian of his time, Herman Bavinck. In an article entitled "Masters and Servants," Bavinck wrote that "among our workers the rumor is circulating that the admonitions for servants are no longer valid."³⁷ They were supposedly intended for the servants of that time, who were slaves, and not for the free servants of this modern era. Indeed, Bavinck had serious difficulty with this argument. In his view, this was the first step on a slippery slope. If you see this warning as time-bound, inevitably sooner or later the question will arise whether other warnings are also time-bound. Then the obedience of a wife to her husband and that of children to their parents will come under attack. Then employers in turn could tell their workers that Paul's summons to the Colossians was also time-bound, so that his words, "Masters, provide your slaves with what is right and fair" (Col. 4:1) were also time-bound. In other words, Van Vliet had opened Pandora's box.³⁸

A week after the esteemed Bavinck registered his judgment about Van Vliet, his article on "Masters and Servants" was placed in its entirety in *Patrimonium*.³⁹ Above it was printed an introduction from Kater with the pregnant title "Do Not Tear Scripture Apart." In that introduction, he wrote that he had great difficulty with Van Vliet's article because it opened the way to "an unsavory theological fight" and that he agreed wholeheartedly with Bavinck.

At that point, it was up to Talma to respond, though at the beginning of 1902 he had been sick for several months. In six articles that appeared in *Patrimonium* between July 4 and August 8, 1902, Talma argued that no one had the right to argue with Bible in hand that a worker must obey. In what might be called a

“miniature liberation theology,” he set forth that the worker was a free man with a uniquely personal responsibility. That freedom of the worker was, according to him, in tension with the admonition to “be obedient in everything” that Paul wrote about to the Colossians. For “being obedient in everything” would then mean that a boss had the right to forbid his worker from being a member of a labor union or from sending his child to a Christian school. They would then also be strikebreakers on command. In that case, the freedom spoken of in the gospel would be transformed into a bitter cross and would become a caricature, for the true gospel forged no chains; it broke them. Thus, wherever people listened to the Word, servitude and oppression made way for freedom and justice.

Next, Talma expended effort as a theologian with regard to the question of whether “being obedient in everything” could be consistent with the apostle’s declaration that a servant is “the Lord’s freed person” (1 Cor. 7:22). Although at first glance these appear to contradict each other, a deeper look would show that they in fact do not, for a slave was inwardly free. He knew how to behave by virtue of the certainty that one day “the outward slave uniform would also fall away.”⁴⁰ That hope made it possible for him to serve his master “according to the flesh.”⁴¹ Precisely because he was free in Christ could he bear his cross and obey his master voluntarily. The slave in New Testament times knew that God had placed him in that house and, therefore, he performed his duty “not as eye-service, not to please his master, but simply in the fear of God.”⁴² This conviction protected him from drowning in despair by “looking to Jesus, waiting on the Lord” and by moving forward with courage. As one who trusted in the coming of God’s kingdom, he could believe in “redemption from every tribulation.”⁴³

A person’s obedience to his master, however, was not without limits. As a “freedman of the Lord,” he was not owned one hundred percent by his master. Furthermore, if his master should order him to do something that conflicted with God’s will, his relationship with God was more important than that with his master.

To illustrate that this was not simply a bunch of nice words, Talma recalled Paul’s letter to Philemon. As a Christian, this man was the apostle’s friend. Their friendship was endangered when Onesimus, one of Philemon’s slaves who had been converted, ran away and sought refuge with the apostle. At that point, Paul faced a dilemma: whether he should respect the social order or not. In the first instance, he would need to send Onesimus back, but in the second, he could expect serious problems resulting from disturbing that order. He chose the first option. Onesimus had to return, but Paul did not send him back empty-handed. In a letter that he sent with Onesimus, he asked Philemon to treat him as a beloved brother in Christ. From that point forward, there was a double bond between them that compelled Philemon to love his slave more fervently than

a freed Christian. Thus, in Talma's opinion, that meant "the absolutely radical abolition of slavery."⁴⁴

Given these perspectives regarding the fate of Christian slaves, Talma wondered whether an employer was clothed with "authority." He recalled King David. David knew he ruled in service to the people, not the other way around. Not only did he protect his sheep against the claws and jaws of lions and bears, but he also rescued Israel from Goliath at great risk to his own life. For that reason, he had a right to obedience. In a family, the situation was the same. Because the parents did not use their authority in order to dominate, but to serve, it was obvious that children obeyed them.

In a factory, however, there was no such authority. A factory was not a philanthropic institution where the happiness and well-being of the workers was central. Rather, the important thing was to keep the business going. To prevent it from degenerating into chaos, workers accepted the leadership of their foremen and followed their instructions. That was something different from authority, for in the factory, they were and remained free people. Nobody had compelled them to work there. By their own free will, they had signed an employment contract and, therefore, they could not be put in the same category as children who were obligated to obey their fathers. At best, they could be compared with bakers. Bakers would agree with their customers to provide their supply of daily bread. They did that voluntarily and none of their customers had the illusion of possessing authority over them.

Talma seriously questioned the freedom of the modern worker: How could one call a worker a free man if, out of fear of being fired, he dared not tell his boss that he would rather not work on Sunday? For that reason, he applauded workers who, in fighting for their "freedom and independence,"⁴⁵ demanded higher wages and a shorter workweek. Only then could they support their families in a decent fashion and as husband and father be at home for wife and children. Unfortunately, they could not do that with all other workers. The workers who bowed before God's Word refused to accept the class struggle of the socialists. They did not believe in a classless society. They accepted the place in society that God had given them. They wanted to maintain "their rights over against the aristocrats." That was not revolutionary, but simply their "duty."⁴⁶ Consequently, it deserved applause that they had found each other in the Christian workers movement.

In Protestant circles, *The Freedom of the Working Class* was received with mixed feelings. In addition to praise, there was criticism, especially from those who continued to insist that employers exercised authority and had to be obeyed. To illustrate the correctness of their view, they pointed to the captain of a ship. Sailors accepted the captain's authority because that was the best guarantee of a

safe and secure journey. There was no talk of compulsion in that context. They obeyed voluntarily because they had their own interest in mind. Talma disagreed. He continued to insist that here, as well, it was not a matter of authority but of leadership.

Talma's argument attracted attention even beyond Protestant circles. At a Roman Catholic gathering in Eindhoven, one of the speakers declared that, after reading Talma's "little piece," he had come to think differently about the relationship between worker and employer.⁴⁷ Less-friendly words came from socialist circles. Member of parliament, Jan Schaper, declared that, after the takeover by socialists, he would appoint Talma the official government exegete, because he could find good use for a theologian who knew how to interpret the phrase "obedient in everything" to mean "ultimately obedient in nothing." After digging around in the Bible a little bit, such a fellow might discover that the "common ownership of land and factories" is one of God's commandments.⁴⁸

For Patrimonium, Talma's so-called liberation theology was very significant. It was the theological foundation of the Christian labor movement. It placed the Protestant worker with both feet in the twentieth century where there was no more room for patriarchal relationships. In the modern era, with its huge factories, he had to fight for better working conditions.

Minister

After serving as a member of parliament for seven years, in 1908 Talma became minister of Agriculture, Industry, and Trade in the confessional cabinet under Prime Minister Heemskerk. In the House of Representatives at that time, the three confessional parties held sixty of the one hundred seats, but the Cabinet was filled with only Antirevolutionary and Roman Catholic ministers. The Christian Historical Union had not provided any Cabinet ministers. That party, for which De Visser was a representative to parliament, preferred to stay on the sidelines.

Talma presented an ambitious program. Shortly after his inauguration, he declared his intention to legislate obligatory work insurance that gave the worker the right to deferred compensation. Then he would no longer need to be anxious about "the days when he would actually have to live from his labor, [but] would not be able to find the compensation he needed for that."⁴⁹

When he resigned in 1913 after five years, a health law as well as laws for disability and retirement appeared in the law gazette. Those laws stipulated that a sick worker had the right to seventy percent of his compensation for six months. Thereafter, he would receive a disability payment. Workers who were seventy years and older, who had been wage earners between their sixtieth and

seventieth birthdays for at least one hundred fifty-six weeks, received a retirement payment: two guilders per week for unmarried and three guilders for married people. Widows were excluded from this.

It had cost Talma a great deal of trouble to get these two worker insurance laws through parliament. Not only did the opposing parties of the liberals and socialists naturally point out shortcomings but also within the confessional camp there had been much criticism. Talma received much grief, especially from De Visser who was member of parliament and honorary chairman of the Christian National Workers Union. Talma had to take account of his views because without his support there was no parliamentary majority for his legislative proposal. De Visser would have preferred to see Talma forego mandatory insurance. However, when he promised him that his proposal would leave untouched the more than 1,700 health funds, encompassing more than 400,000 members altogether, De Visser reluctantly accepted the proposal for mandated insurance. Talma had great difficulty with De Visser's position. More than fifty years later, his oldest son Dirk still recalled that his father commented bitterly on arriving home that his "own church people" were opposing him. Dirk's younger brother Jan wanted to smash De Visser's windows (he lived just around the corner), but Dirk eventually brought him to his senses.⁵⁰

On other points, Talma did not agree with parliament. The health law that he proposed stipulated payment of money for those who fell sick but not for healthcare. Parliament preferred to view the matter differently, but Talma stuck to his guns. In his view, the government was not in a position to see to it that a doctor would visit the sickbed of an insured person. Nor did he favor following England's example, where since 1908 a government pension had been in place. Many liberal members of parliament favored that but not Talma. For him, a government pension was equivalent to government poverty relief—support for people who could not take care of themselves. In his view, his proposed retirement pension was not a government pension. It was indeed a payment from the treasury to retirees who had not saved for it, but younger people were going to be substantially paying for their own retirement pension.

These two worker insurance laws died a peaceful death when the opposition won the elections in 1913. Before the elections, the liberals had said that after their victory they would see to it that a physician would pay a visit. They also promised a government pension for everyone. One part, however, escaped their wish for total change, namely, the retirement pension. In connection with the debate on the disability and retirement law, Talma had adopted an amendment proposed by the socialists. That amendment stipulated that the workers affected could pick up their first retirement pension payment at the post office six months after the

announcement of this law. This promise was kept. After Monday, December 9, 1913, eighty-one thousand retirees received their pension.

During that time, Talma was a pastor in Bennebroek, a village in the region of Haarlem. Due to the election defeat, he abandoned politics in disappointment. After the outbreak of World War I, during which the Netherlands remained neutral, Talma enlisted as a military chaplain. In 1916, it became evident that his service as Cabinet minister had exhausted him to the point that he died in a hospital in Haarlem. He was only fifty-two years old. Members of the local branch of the CNWB served as pallbearers.

Conclusion

After his death, Talma was praised on the right and on the left as an upright contender for the interests of the workers. Only a few elderly, inveterate Dutch Reformed Church members could not resist commenting that it was too bad he had come under Kuyper's influence with Patrimonium and had become a "full-blooded Antirevolutionary Party member."⁵¹ No one took the trouble to respond to that criticism, for times had changed. Without necessarily becoming friends, members of the Dutch Reformed Church and the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands had learned to live together. They had decided to cooperate in the Christian National Labor Association. The CNWB and Patrimonium continued to exist as social organizations. The latter would subsequently be concerned with social housing. In a large number of places, a "Patrimonium neighborhood" was developed. In the political arena, the ARP and the CHU acknowledged each other's right to exist. For that reason, nobody was struck by the fact that Talma's casket was not carried to the cemetery by members of Patrimonium. No deeper meaning lay behind that fact. Because there was no branch of Patrimonium in Bennebroek, everybody thought it was natural that this honor fell to workers of the CNWB, people who sat with him in church on Sunday.

Talma was never embarrassed to have been a student of Maurice. He owed him, together with many others, the insight that "the social calling is emblazoned in the Christian consciousness."⁵² As a follower of Maurice, he believed that Christianity was and is a partner of workers. In word and deed, he sought to give expression to that conviction in Patrimonium by writing *The Freedom of the Working Class* and by establishing the Christian Labor Secretariat, which was the predecessor of the Christian National Labor Association. In this way, he hoped to guide the obedient worker into becoming a self-aware and independent worker. That did not change when he entered politics. With his workers' insurance legislation, he sought to provide the worker with the freedom he deserved.

Notes

- * Translated from Dutch by Nelson D. Kloosterman.
1. *Leeuwarder Courant* (August 28, 1889).
 2. *Handelingen der Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal 1910–1911* (March 17, 1911), 1803.
 3. *Boaz, maandblad van de Vereeniging van Nederlandsche patroons “Boaz”* (January 12, 1900).
 4. Translator’s note: The Dutch phrase is *Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk*, usually identified as the privileged or public church. In this translation, the phrase “Dutch Reformed” identifies some kind of association with this church.
 5. Translator’s note: The Dutch word is *Gereformeerden*.
 6. Translator’s note: The Dutch phrase is *Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland*. In this translation, the phrase “Reformed Churches” identifies some kind of association with this denomination.
 7. In this article, the phrase “Dutch Reformed” refers to that group within the Dutch Reformed Church who favored Christian education. In the Netherlands, the term “Christian” is synonymous with Protestant, so the phrase “Christian school” refers to a Protestant school, whereas a Roman Catholic school was identified with the phrase “Roman Catholic,” and so on.
 8. *Proces-verbaal der christelijk sociale conferentie gehouden te Amsterdam, gebouw Nieuwe Heeregracht (Patrimonium) op maandag 9 en dinsdag 10 januari 1905* (Utrecht: Wentzel, 1905), 93.
 9. A. S. Talma, *De arbeidersbeweging* (Ruys, 1914), 6.
 10. Charles Kingsley, *Uit de diepte, woorden voor hen die troost behoeven* (Nijmegen: Ten Hoet, 1889).
 11. F. D. Maurice, *De zedelijke grondslag der maatschappij: eenentwintig lezingen gehouden aan de universiteit van Cambridge* (Nijmegen: Ten Hoet, 1890).
 12. Talma, *De arbeidersbewegingen*, 44.
 13. A. S. Talma, “Het Sociaal Congress gehouden te Amsterdam van 9–12 November 1891,” in *Bouwsteenen, tijdschrift voor inwendige zending*, 9 (1892): 1–17, especially 4–5.
 14. A. S. Talma, *Mammonkiesrecht of mannenkiesrecht?: Rede gehouden te Dordrecht op 23 april 1894* (Vlissingen: P.G. de Vey Mestdagh, 1894), 14.

15. *Patrimonium: orgaan van het verbond* (September 6, 1901).
16. HDC / Historisch documentatiecentrum voor het Nederlands Protestantisme (1800-heden) (HDC). Archief A. S. Talma, inv. nr. 29 (undated). See the website for the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam at www.hdc.vu.nl. This site is in Dutch.
17. Talma, "Het Sociaal Congress gehouden te Amsterdam van 9–12 November 1891," 17.
18. Abraham Kuyper, *Het sociale Vraagstuk en de Christelijke Religie* (Amsterdam: Wormser, 1891).
19. Talma, "Het Sociaal Congress gehouden te Amsterdam van 9–12 November 1891," 7.
20. Talma, *Mammonkiesrecht*, 7.
21. Talma, *Mammonkiesrecht*, 14.
22. Talma, *Mammonkiesrecht*, 14.
23. HDC, Archief A. S. Talma, inv. nr. 48: Talma, letter to J. J. P. Valetton (June 1894).
24. F. Noordhof, *Met God, vóór Oranje en ons recht!: een bladzijde uit de geschiedenis der christelijke werkliedenbeweging* (Wageningen: Nederbragt, 1905), 43.
25. G. J. Vos, ed., *Verslag van het Kerkelijk congres voor hervormden gehouden te Amsterdam op 1 november 1895 in Maison Stroucken* (Utrecht: C. H. E. Breijer, 1896), 352–53.
26. Vos, *Verslag van het Kerkelijk congres*, 353.
27. *Patrimonium* (September 20, 1890).
28. *Patrimonium, het sociaal program van ... en de conclusiën van het Sociaal Congres* (Amsterdam: Nederlandsch Werkliedenverbond Patrimonium, 1894).
29. These articles appear in the September 2–9, 16–19, 23–29, and 30 issues of *Patrimonium* in 1898.
30. Sidney Webb and Beatrice Potter Webb, *The History of Trade Unionism* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891).
31. *Patrimonium* (February 2, 1900).
32. *Proces verbaal*, 14.
33. *De vrijheid van den arbeidenden stand* (Utrecht: Ruys, 1902).
34. *Patrimonium* (September 14, 1900) and *Het nieuws van de dag* (October 12, 1900).
35. *Patrimonium* (March 28, 1902).

36. Ibid.
37. *De bazuin* (May 9, 1902)
38. Ibid.
39. *Patrimonium* (May 16, 1902).
40. Talma, *De vrijheid*, 19.
41. Talma, *De vrijheid*, 16.
42. Talma, *De vrijheid*, 16.
43. Talma, *De vrijheid*, 23.
44. Talma, *De vrijheid*, 18.
45. Talma, *De vrijheid*, 38.
46. Talma, *De vrijheid*, 43.
47. Kapelaan A. Mutsaert, cited in the *Tilburgsche Courant* (April 10, 1903).
48. *Handelingen Tweede Kamer 1902–1903* (April 12, 1902): 324.
49. *Handelingen Tweede Kamer 1908–1909* (November 20, 1908), 618.
50. HDC, Archief A. S. Talma, inv. Nr. 57: Dick Talma, letter to his sister Lize (August 27, 1967).
51. A. W. Bronsveld, *Stemmen voor waarheid en vrede*, 53 (1916): 801.
52. Talma, *De arbeidersbeweging*, 61.