

8005061

International Encyclopedia of the SOCIAL SCIENCES

BIOGRAPHICAL SUPPLEMENT

DAVID L. SILLS EDITOR

VOLUME 18

THE FREE PRESS
A Division of Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
NEW YORK

Collier Macmillan Publishers
LONDON



COPYRIGHT © 1979 BY THE FREE PRESS
A DIVISION OF MACMILLAN PUBLISHING CO., INC.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. NO PART OF THIS BOOK MAY BE REPRODUCED OR
TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR
MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY
INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT PERMISSION
IN WRITING FROM THE PUBLISHER.

THE FREE PRESS
A DIVISION OF MACMILLAN PUBLISHING CO., INC.
866 THIRD AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10022

COLLIER MACMILLAN CANADA, LTD.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER: 68-10023

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PRINTING NUMBER
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

ISBN: 0-02-895510-2

deprivations could mean more stability seemed odd; yet it was profoundly true. One might argue that countervailing tendencies should have received more emphasis. As was repeatedly pointed out, the costs of the brutal and crude methods of Stalin's "initial socialist accumulation" were bound to become intolerably high as the reserve of the unutilized peasant manpower was approaching exhaustion, pressures for higher living standards coming from the increasingly urbanized population were gaining strength, and economic burdens of the "competition of two systems" in the nuclear age were mounting. The vested interest in tension and in ordering people around as much as possible still persisted. Yet neither considerations of static and dynamic efficiency, nor consumers' demands could be relegated to the back seat much longer without pushing stresses and strains beyond safety limits and without inhibiting the attempts to narrow the gap in technology. Gerschenkron did not deny that concessions to consumers had been made and that there was a modicum of over-all decompression. Yet he viewed it as a harbinger of growing instability—although in the introduction to his *Continuity in History* (1968) he noted that unsettling effects have not yet materialized.

A brief sketch cannot conceivably provide more than an inkling of the richness of Gerschenkron's work. Only a few salient points have been discussed. The finely chiseled details had to be left out, although, in this particular case, great spurts of innovative thought must certainly not be allowed to overshadow the extensions, refinements, and explorations in depth; suffice to mention the learned essay on philosophical foundations of the continuity concept, the fascinating debate with Rosario Romeo on problems of Italian industrial development, or the seminal paper on the agrarian policies of prerevolutionary Russia. Gerschenkron's scholarly interests ranged across the whole spectrum of social sciences and beyond: the beautiful essay on *Doctor Zhivago* and the devastatingly erudite review of Nabokov's translation of *Eugenii Onegin* have become classics. He will be remembered as one of the great poly-histors of our time.

ALEXANDER ERLICH

WORKS BY GERSCHENKRON

- (1943) 1966 *Bread and Democracy in Germany*. New York: Fertig.
 1945 *Economic Relations With the U.S.S.R.* New York: Committee on International Economic Policy.

- 1947 *The Soviet Indices of Industrial Production. Review of Economic Statistics* 29:217-226.
 1951 *A Dollar Index of Soviet Machinery Output, 1927-28 to 1937*. Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation.
 1962 *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press. → A paperback edition was published by Praeger in 1965.
 1968 *Continuity in History and Other Essays*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
 1970 *Europe in the Russian Mirror*. Cambridge Univ. Press.
 1977 *An Economic Spurt That Failed*. Princeton Univ. Press.

SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BARSBY, STEPHEN L. 1969 *Economic Backwardness and the Characteristics of Development. Journal of Economic History* 29:449-472.
 BERGSON, ABRAM 1961 *The Real National Income of Soviet Russia Since 1928*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
 FINDLAY, RONALD 1978 *Relative Backwardness, Direct Foreign Investment and the Transfer of Technology: A Simple Dynamic Model. Quarterly Journal of Economics* 92:1-16.
 GOMULKA, STANISLAW 1971 *Inventive Activity, Diffusion, and the Stages of Economic Growth*. Århus University, Institute of Economics, Monograph No. 21. Århus (Denmark): The University.
 HIRSCHMAN, ALBERT O. 1958 *The Strategy of Economic Development*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press. → A paperback edition was published in 1962.
 ROSOVSKY, HENRY 1961 *Capital Formation in Japan, 1868-1940*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
 ROSOVSKY, HENRY (editor) 1966 *Industrialization in Two Systems: Essays in Honor of Alexander Gerschenkron by a Group of His Students*. New York: Wiley.
 RUDOLPH, RICHARD L. 1973 *Austrian Industrialization: A Case Study in Leisurely Economic Growth*. Pages 249-262 in *Sozialismus, Geschichte und Wirtschaft: Festschrift für Eduard März*. Vienna: Europaverlag.

GEYL, PIETER

The career of Pieter Catharinus Arie Geyl (1887-1966), one of the most outstanding Dutch historians of the twentieth century, embodied a deep paradox. When in 1940 he was interned as a hostage by the Germans, he had already transformed the understanding of the history of the Low Countries, yet he was virtually unknown outside the Netherlands except to a handful of specialists. Only his activity as a Dutch supporter of the Flemish movement in Belgium during the 1920s and 1930s had brought him local notoriety, especially when he was expelled by the Belgian government. After World War II, he quickly gained international recognition as a historical critic and essayist, while at home his innovative ideas, which a few decades before had been attacked by traditional

ns, became part of the generally acknowledged historical picture.

was of mixed German and Dutch origin. Her was a medical doctor in Dordrecht, and his early retirement, due to mental illness, was an emotional and financial hardship during Geyl's youth. The family moved to the Hague, where he attended a Gymnasium. In 1906 he entered the University of Leiden as a student of Dutch language and literature, but he was attracted to history by C. H. T. Bussemaker, and he turned to this field after a novel he wrote was critically faulted by the distinguished critic J. Verwey. He completed his doctorate in history under the guidance of P. J. Blok, a somewhat dreary scholar, but probably the best Dutch historian of his generation. His dissertation on Christofforo Suriano, the Venetian ambassador at the Hague from 1616 to 1623, was an additional work, a study in political history drawn directly from the sources, but it was already notable for the swiftness of its research and writing.

Geyl then gave up his embryonic career as a Gymnasium teacher and in 1914 moved to London as correspondent for the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, the preeminent daily newspaper of the Netherlands. This post gave him direct contact with outstanding political leaders in Britain and a reputation as a quick, lively writer. As a result, he was soon well known in intellectual and political circles in England. A year after the end of World War I, a chair in Dutch studies was created for him at the University of London, with the support of the Dutch government. His salary was not sufficient and he supplemented it with work as an unofficial press attaché for the Netherlands embassy. Insecurity, however, did not keep him from taking up the controversial Flemish question in Belgium, to the annoyance and sometimes dismay of the Dutch government.

The Flemish issue provided Geyl with the theme of his early writings. Viewing the Flemings as brothers of the Dutch, he soon challenged the interpretation of Low Countries history that had been most clearly expressed in the *Histoire de Belgique* (1900-1932) by that country's most eminent historian, Henri Pirenne. According to this view, Belgium since its earliest history had been essentially a separate country from Holland, and the implication followed that the Netherlands had no fundamental ties to Belgium and therefore to the Dutch-speaking Flemings in Belgium. In this interpretation, the

separation of the northern and southern Netherlands into distinct countries and peoples during the late sixteenth-century revolt of the Low Countries is seen as the culmination of their historical development over many centuries; by contrast, their unity under the Burgundian dukes in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries had been a historical accident. Pirenne's view, which most historians in Holland accepted and adapted to their own national history, was rejected by Geyl essentially in advance. He had publicly rejected it in lectures at University College London in 1920, and he published various articles and lectures expanding his argument in *De Groot-Nederlandsche Gedachte* ("The Great Netherlands Idea"; 1925). Geyl then began a monumental project based upon this idea that resulted in the publication of the three-volume *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Stam* ("History of the Dutch Nation"; 1930-1937).

The "Great Netherlands" of these works was a nation in a special sense of the term: a linguistic community possessing or seeking political form and expression in its own state. Geyl therefore excluded from the "Great Netherlands" the Walloon provinces that had been part of the Burgundian Low Countries and that had become the culturally and politically dominant part of independent Belgium in the nineteenth century. He dismissed or disregarded other theories of the nation, both the view of the nation as the creation by states of a historic community of shared institutions and sentiments, and the anthropological view, which saw it as a community sharing an entire range of customs and attitudes, not merely language. What he did see, vividly and clearly, was that the speakers of Flemish in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Belgium, where French was the language of culture and the chief language of government, suffered many deprivations and hardships. He failed to keep in mind, however, his own repeated warnings about anachronism—specifically, that before the modern age of mass politics and culture, those who spoke Dutch-Flemish in the southern Netherlands had suffered little or no disadvantage. His strong political commitment to at least the federal reorganization of the Belgian state—if not its actual breakup, with the Flemish provinces joining the Netherlands—is strongly reflected in his essays on Dutch-Belgian relations.

In his political activity, Geyl favored the Flemish activists, but the flirtation of extremists, some of whom were his close friends, with

theories of violence and with German racism led him to emphasize democracy as well as nationalism. The rise of the Nazi movement in Germany moved him to a passionate advocacy of political freedom and thus to an estrangement from those Flemish separatists who did not share this commitment.

Geyl's Great Netherlands idea was extensively developed in his strictly historical works. He demonstrated, with a wealth of evidence and argument, that the formation of separate states in the northern and southern Netherlands during the sixteenth-century revolt was not the result of profound cultural, religious, or political differences. Rather, it stemmed directly from the outcome of military events. Neither Catholicism nor Calvinism had been characteristically indigenous to south or north; each section had been consolidated by political and military victory—by the Spanish Habsburgs in the former case, and by the forces of independence in the latter. Geyl recognized that the two regions had grown apart over the next two centuries, and he deeply regretted that the experiment in unity under King William I had failed.

In all these studies, Geyl neglected the question of the status of the French-speaking provinces in a polity committed to predominance of Dutch-Flemish speakers. Although his views on the Flemish question in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries won anything but universal acclaim, his reinterpretation of the sixteenth-century revolt was so persuasive that within two or three decades it replaced the older picture.

While Geyl was working on his Great Netherlands theme in London, he began studies that became fundamental for a new understanding of the place in Dutch history of the House of Orange. Where it had been taken for granted, except by the minority of Dutch Catholics, that the country was essentially Protestant in character and that the Orange stadholders under the Republic and the kings after 1813 were the pure embodiment of Dutch nationhood, Geyl called attention to the dynastic interests pursued by the stadholders, from Frederick Henry to William V, in their relations with England and, to a lesser degree, Prussia. The republican ("States") party, far from being narrowly provincial and unnational, had performed a necessary national task in opposing Orange dynasticism, which fostered dependence upon the stadholders' foreign relatives (see 1924; 1939). The impact of Geyl's works on this theme upon Dutch historical writing was not as dramatic as

that of the Great Netherlands idea, but narrow Orangism was displaced by more balanced understanding of all the parties in the history of the Republic.

In 1936 Geyl was appointed professor of history at the University of Utrecht, despite the difficulties that stemmed from his reputation as a stormy petrel lacking the sedate dignity characteristic of the Dutch academic world and from his connections with the Flemish movement in Belgium. He did not become the founder of a school of disciples, partly because he favored in his students (of whom the best known are J. C. Boogman, A. J. Veenendaal, J. W. Smit, and D. J. Roorda) the same kind of independence of spirit that he himself possessed. He continued his warnings of the Nazi menace right up to the German invasion on May 10, 1940, and did not keep silent even afterwards. On October 7, he and approximately one hundred other eminent Dutchmen were arrested and sent to Buchenwald, where they were held as hostages in retaliation for the internment of Germans in the Netherlands West Indies. Thirteen months later, along with most of his fellow hostages, he was sent back to the Netherlands for continued internment. After several months' hospitalization during 1943 and 1944, he was released and permitted to return home in February 1944. He provided hiding places for resistance fighters in his home, barely escaping detection and arrest. At the same time he worked at his writing, although he had been dismissed from his professorship by the German authorities in 1942. After the liberation of Holland in 1945, he was restored to his chair.

Geyl's writing now largely changed character. His energy for primary research flagged, but he turned his attention to historical criticism, the philosophy of history (although he insisted that he was no philosopher), and comment on public events. At the same time he broadened the area of his writing from his native Netherlands to all of Europe as well as America. He wrote frequently for the weekly newspaper *Vrij Nederland*, using new books for the themes of essays on a great variety of subjects. Always concerned with the influence of contemporary events upon a historian's choice of subject and his interpretations, he began to look into the past for greater understanding of the turbulent era through which he was living. At the same time he drew upon his own experiences for deeper insight into the past. During the last months of the occupation, he had written a book on the

changing picture of Napoleon—an obvious parallel to Hitler—in French historical writing (1946b). To show, as he did, that French historians' views of Napoleon had changed over the decades, depending on their political and ideological commitments, was hardly novel; but to draw the conclusion that the understanding of Napoleon had been enriched by these different interpretations was to take up the cudgel against historical relativism, veering over into outright skepticism, which had characterized historical thought in the 1930s. History, he proclaimed, was "an argument without end" and was the better for it. This book was followed a year later by a short study (1947), which rehabilitated the democratic movement in the final decades of the republic of the United Provinces against the contention of H. T. Colenbrander that the Patriots had been no more than puppets in the hands of the French. He also carefully distinguished the leaders of the Batavian Republic, who put the Patriot principles into practice with the support of a French army of occupation, from the NSB'ers, the Dutch Nazis, noting that the Batavian leaders had sought to rebuild their country upon democratic principles and sought its welfare under complex and trying conditions, none of which could be said of the NSB'ers, traitors to their country and its historical traditions.

Geyl first began to receive wide attention in other countries, however, when he attacked the historical views of Arnold J. Toynbee as presented in *A Study of History* (1934–1961). He accused the English historian of twisting facts to fit his grandiose system, defended the legitimacy of nations and nationalism against Toynbee's universalism, and rejected the judgment that Christianity was the only true religion and the only salvation of mankind. Although accused of himself indulging in system making in his Great Netherlands historical writing, he asserted that he had been trying to take account of facts and to make his historical picture correspond to them, rather than twisting them to fit his preconceptions.

Geyl defined himself by argument with other historians, especially of the Netherlands. He had few strictly historical arguments with his greatest contemporary Johan Huizinga, who died in 1945, although his method of work and style of writing were very different from that of the subtle esthete Huizinga. Where Huizinga's view of the contemporary world was deeply pessimistic, Geyl defended against him what he

called in his own final lecture on the occasion of his retirement "the vitality of Western civilization." Although himself as much a man of high culture as Huizinga, he was far readier to accept the coarse vigor of the common man, and he felt that the problems of Western civilization did not arise from democracy in government or society. He saw totalitarian barbarity not as an exaggeration of faults within democracy itself, but as an attack upon the central spirit of democracy. He was even more critical, therefore, of Jan Romein, a highly influential and respected Marxist at the University of Amsterdam, because his historical vision rested not upon evidence and argument but upon his strongly felt subjective convictions. Geyl had no sympathy for Marxism, accusing it of combining utopian dreaming with Machiavellian practice of power politics in the present. He only joined the postwar Labor party (the former Social-Democratic party) after it abandoned its prior Marxist doctrines, feeling that it had become the best defender of liberal democracy. Although he has sometimes been described as a socialist because of this membership, there is no sign that he believed in socialism as a pattern for the future organization of society; indeed, he continued to proclaim himself a liberal, but not a defender of the capitalist status quo.

In the polemical and journalistic essays of the last two decades of his life, he reaffirmed his own vision of history and life. Even as death neared, he did not fall back on either traditional religion or the mysticism with which many intellectuals replaced it; he accepted the rational structure of the universe and the ability of man's rational mind to comprehend it, and he saw rationality as the basis for a healthy emotional life. His vision of the world was this-worldly. Quite unreligious himself, he defended the rights of Catholics and other non-Calvinists to full membership in the Dutch community. His belief in liberal democracy, separated from the tie established in classical liberalism between political democracy and free-enterprise capitalism, was only intensified by the attacks upon it from right and left. He was not as sensitive as many others to the social and economic problems faced by democracy, but he thought all totalitarian alternatives were false solutions. These ideas were never brought together into a full-scale exposition and therefore hardly present a neatly coherent picture. His significance lies not in the originality of his beliefs, which cannot be asserted, but in the extraordinary

vigor with which he defended them at a time when advocates of the middle way seemed to have lost their certitudes and their self-confidence.

His primary impact, however, remained his revisions in Dutch history and his historiographical and critical writings. As these became known in the Western world, he was invited to visiting professorships and lectureships in the United States, England, and other countries, and he became the best-known Dutch scholar in the postwar world. He died at his home in Utrecht on the last day of December 1966.

HERBERT H. ROWEN

WORKS BY GEYL

- 1913 *Christofforo Suriano, resident van de Serenissime Republiek van Venetië in Den Haag, 1616–1623* (Christofforo Suriano, Resident of the Most Serene Republic of Venice in The Hague, 1616–1623). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- 1924 *Willem IV en Engeland tot 1748* (Vrede van Aken) (William IV and England Until 1748 [The Peace of Aachen]). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- 1925 *De Groot-Nederlandsche Gedachte* (The Great Netherlands Idea). Vol. 1. Haarlem (Netherlands): Tjeenk Willink.
- 1930 *De Groot-Nederlandsche Gedachte* (The Great Netherlands Idea). Vol. 2. Antwerp (Belgium): De Sikkel.
- (1930–1937) 1948–1958 *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Stam* (History of the Dutch Nation). 3 vols. Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek. → Revised and reprinted in six volumes in a paperback edition in 1961–1962. Volume 1 was translated as *The Revolt of the Netherlands, 1555–1609*, 2d ed., rev. & enl., published by Barnes & Noble, New York, 1966 (the first edition was published in 1932 in London by Williams & Norgate). The translation of the second volume was published as two volumes: *The Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century*, part one, 1609–1648, published by Benn in London, and Barnes & Noble in New York, 1966 (first published as *The Netherlands Divided, 1609–1648* in 1936 in London by Williams & Norgate), and *The Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century*, part two, 1648–1715, published by Benn in London, and Barnes & Noble in New York, 1964.
- 1936 *Revolutiedagen te Amsterdam, Augustus–September 1748* (Revolutionary Days in Amsterdam, August–September 1748). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- 1937 *Kernproblemen van onze geschiedenis* (Central Problems of Our History). Utrecht (Netherlands): Oosthoek.
- (1939) 1970 *Orange and Stuart, 1641–1672*. New York: Scribners. → First published in Dutch.
- 1946a *Eenheid en tweedheid in de Nederlanden* (Unity and Duality in the Netherlands). Lochem (Netherlands): De Tijdstroom.
- (1946b) 1963 *Napoleon, For and Against*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press. → First published as *Napoleon. Voor en tegen in de Franse geschiedschrijving*.
- 1946c *Patriotten en N.S.B.ers* (Patriots and N.S.B.ers). Amsterdam: J. van Campen.
- 1947 *De Patriottenbeweging, 1780–1787* (The Patriot Movement, 1780–1787). Amsterdam: P. N. van Kampen.
- 1948 GEYL, PIETER; and TOYNBEE, ARNOLD J. *Can We Know the Pattern of the Past? Discussion . . . concerning Toynbee's book "A Study of History."* Bussum (Netherlands): F. G. Kroonder.
- (1949) 1968 GEYL, PIETER; TOYNBEE, ARNOLD J.; and SOROKIN, PITIRIM *The Pattern of the Past: Can We Determine It?* New York: Greenwood.
- 1950 *Tochten en toernooien* (Campaigns and Tourneys). Utrecht (Netherlands): Oosthoek.
- 1952a *From Ranke to Toynbee: Five Lectures on Historians and Historiographical Problems*. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College, Department of History.
- 1952b *Reacties* (Reactions). Utrecht (Netherlands): Oosthoek.
- 1954 *Historicus in de tijd* (A Historian in His Own Time). Utrecht (Netherlands): W. de Haan.
- (1955a) 1964 *Debates with Historians*. Cleveland, Ohio: World Publishing.
- (1955b) 1970 *Use and Abuse of History*. Hamden, Conn.: Archon.
- 1958 *Studies en strijdschriften* (Studies and Polemical Writings). Groningen (Netherlands): J. B. Wolters.
- 1959 *Geschiedenis als medespeler* (History as a Fellow Player). Utrecht (Netherlands): Spectrum.
- (1961) 1963 *Encounters in History*. London: Collins.
- 1963 *Van Bilderdijk tot Huizinga: Historische toetsingen* (From Bilderdijk to Huizinga: Historical Evaluations). Utrecht (Netherlands): Spectrum.
- 1964 *History of the Low Countries: Episodes and Problems*. London: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's.
- 1971 *Pennestrijd over staat en historie. Opstellen over de vaderlandse geschiedenis aangevuld met Geyl's levensverhaal (tot 1945)* (A Pen-and-Ink War Over the State and History. Articles on National History Together With an Account of Geyl's Life [to 1945]). Groningen (Netherlands): Wolters-Noordhoff.

SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BARK, WILLIAM 1964–1965 Book Review of Geyl's *Encounters in History*. *History and Theory* 4:107–123.
- BOOGMAN, J. C. 1966–1967 Pieter Geyl, 1887–1966. *Bijdragen voor de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 21:269–277.
- MEHTA, VED (1962) 1963 *Fly and the Fly-Bottle: Encounters with British Intellectuals*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- PIRENNE, HENRI 1900–1932 *Histoire de Belgique*. 7 vols. Brussels: Lamertin.
- ROGIER, L. J. 1967 Herdenking van P. Geyl (In Commemoration of P. Geyl). *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde*, N. R. 30: Whole no. 12.
- ROWEN, HERBERT H. 1965 The Historical Work of Pieter Geyl. *Journal of Modern History* 37:35–49.
- TOYNBEE, ARNOLD J. 1934–1961 *A Study of History*. 12 vols. Oxford Univ. Press.

GHURYE, G. S.

Govind Sadashiv Ghurye was born into a Saraswat Brahmin family in Malvan, India, in 1893. He completed his high school and college education in Bombay, where he studied English and