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Abstract:
To overcome the lack of a representative dataset on the manufacturing sector in the Netherlands before the first census of companies in 1930, we constructed an alternative census of companies for 1896. Based on a large collection of local-preserved municipal reports, we estimated the number of establishments, employees, and steam engines, standardized for all Dutch municipalities and all manufacturing sectors. In contrast to other source material around this time period, this newly created dataset gives researchers for the first time a view on the structure and competitiveness of the Dutch manufacturing sector at the timing of its Industrial Revolution on such a geographical and sectoral detailed level. Following our illustration of the textiles manufacturing sector, we found that in 1896 modern factories and steam engines were limited to smaller centres in the eastern and southern part of the country, while the majority of the country still depended on smaller, non-mechanized handicraft establishments.

Introduction

During the first half of the nineteenth century, the economic gap between the Netherlands and its Western European neighbours was widening: while most countries followed the British industrial exam-

* The research leading to these results received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Programme / ERC-StG 637695 - HinDI, as part of the project ‘The historical dynamics of industrialization in Northwestern Europe and China ca. 1800–2010. A regional interpretation’. My thanks to the editorial board of TSEG, Mathijs Speecke, Jacques van Gerwen, Bas van Leeuwen, and Jan-Luiten van Zanden who read drafts of the paper and gave well-appreciated suggestions.
ple, the Netherlands faced an economic standstill. Thanks to political and economic reforms after the 1840s, the economic tide began to turn as a period of economic modernization and industrialization started after the 1860s, helped by the economic transfers with its overseas colonies. Why the Netherlands embarked so late in the nineteenth century on this path towards modern economic growth has been the topic of debate among both contemporaries and historians. One hindrance to answering this question has been the lack of available source material, to the point of the Netherlands being described as a ‘statistical late-comer’. With its first census of companies only published in 1930, the Netherlands falls behind in a long list of most European countries, in terms of the measurement of its manufacturing sector. In other words: even though all evidence indicates that the Dutch Industrial Revolution happened relatively late for a Western European country, between 1860 and 1910, due to a lack of data we know relatively little about the structure of the Dutch economy before or during this period.

Of course, sources do exist for the second half of the nineteenth century. Yet, it is often difficult to assess their reliability. For 1857 and 1871, the private organization Dutch Society for the Promotion of Industry compiled two editions of the *Condition of the Dutch Factories*, which assembled a large collection of municipal and provincial reports of the Chambers of Commerce and Factories. For 1888-1890, the inquiry of

---


2. Most publications put forward the 1860-1914 period as the start in which the Netherlands industrialized and caught up with economic growth, often pointing to a time-lag effect after the economic reforms of the 1840s (see: Van Zanden and Van Riel, *Nederland 1780–1914*). However, based on the continuing dominance of smaller industrial firms and a rather slow transition of the labour force from the agricultural sector to the manufacturing and services sectors during 1860-1890, other authors put forward 1890-1914 as the period in which the Netherlands started industrializing (see: J.A. De Jonge, *De industrialisatie in Nederland tussen 1850 en 1914* (Amsterdam 1968)).

3. The first census of industry in the Netherlands was published in 1930, relatively late compared to Sweden (1749), Norway (1769), Austria (1841), France (1845), Belgium (1846), United States (1850), or Germany (1875).

4. *Nederlandsche Maatschappij ter bevordering van Nijverheid, Staat van de Nederlandsche fabrieken volgens de verslagen der gemeenten, die aan het Ministerie van Binnenslandsche Zaken worden ge-
the engineers H.W.E. Struve and A.A. Bekaar reported the large manufacturing enterprises in the Netherlands, while in 1910 J.C.A. Everwijn edited the Description of the Commerce and Industry in the Netherlands. Yet, the representativeness of each of these sources is disputed. The Condition of the Dutch Factories of 1857 and 1871 more than often lack numbers on establishments or employees, as the municipal governments often did not fill in their reports completely, while the edition of 1857 only documented on 655 of a total of 1,209 municipalities. Furthermore, the inquiry of Struve and Bekaar reported an unspecified share of larger companies and, in addition, did not contain information on the city of Tilburg and the entire province of Limburg. Lastly, Everwijn did not capture the smaller manufacturing enterprises and reported exclusively ‘a certain number of areas of trade and industry’.

In order to fill this statistical gap, we reconstructed a new ‘census of companies’ for 1896, a benchmark year roughly located in the middle of what has been identified as the Dutch Industrial Revolution. For the construction of such a new census, we chose to collect an unprecedented large sample of yearly filled-in Dutch municipal reports, being the only source that documented industrial activities on the local level quantitatively. By augmenting this dataset with data of the population

zonden (Haarlem 1859) and Nederlandsche Maatschappij ter bevordering van Nijverheid, Statistiek van de fabrieks- en ambachtsnijverheid in Nederland: getrokken uit de verslagen, welke door burgemeester en wethouders, ingevolge art. 182 der gemeentewet, jaarlijks den gemeenteraad worden aangeboden (The Hague 1874).
5 To access and for more information, please consult: http://www.neha.nl/struve/.
7 After a first initiative of the House of Representatives in 1887 and as a first test, Struve and Bekaar first visited the factories in the cities of Tilburg and Maastricht, together with the entire province of Limburg. As their reports on these regions deviated strongly – both in structure and content – from the data provided in the later inquiry of Struve and Bekaar, data about these regions were not included by Struve and Bekaar in their later inquiry. The archival sources documenting the manufacturing sector in these regions can be found in National Archives of the Netherlands (The Hague), 2.02.22 Archief van de Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal 1815-1945; 3286-3300 Stukken van de commissie van enquête omtrent het tegengaan van overmatige arbeid en de toestand van fabrieken en werkplaatsen met het oog op de veiligheid, de gezondheid en het welzijn der werknijverigen 1886-1887, file 3300, attachments T, U, and V.
8 Van Gerwen, A statistical latecomer, 339-340. Everwijn was fully aware of the incompleteness of his survey as well, see: Everwijn. Beschrijving van handel en nijverheid in Nederland, 14.
9 One could argue that, next to the municipal reports, the reports of the locally-installed Chambers of Commerce would also be able to provide a basis for the construction of an alternative ‘census of companies’. However, we believe that the municipal reports are better suited for this exercise, based on the two following reasons. First, the Chambers of Commerce reports seem only available for the larger Dutch municipalities. Second, these reports prove to be very heterogeneous in both structure and content, often lacking information on the smaller handicraft companies and often lacking quantitative informa-
census of 1899, we achieved a complete coverage of the labour force in all Dutch municipalities. Thus, we can present for the first time a complete estimate of the Dutch manufacturing sector before 1930 on the sectoral and municipal level, which, in turn, can be linked to the editions of the Condition of the Dutch Factories of 1857 and 1871. In section 2, we review and discuss the 1896 municipal data in greater detail. In section 3, we put our dataset in perspective by comparing it with the data of the aforementioned inquiry of Struve and Bekaar (1890) and the population census. Furthermore, we illustrate the census with an empirical test for the Dutch textiles sector, a sector commonly regarded as having a catalytic effect for the industrialization process of other manufacturing sectors, followed by a brief illustration of the textiles manufacturing sector in section 4 and a conclusion in section 5. For the scholar with an interest in using this dataset, we refer to the appendices of the forthcoming publication of the PhD manuscript of the author.

The collection of municipal reports of 1896

In most cases, the municipal reports were preserved in the archives of the States-Provincial of the Netherlands (for the list of the respective municipalities for which we found a matching municipal report, see Appendix 1). However, for the provinces of Limburg, Zeeland, Noord-Holland, and Zuid-Holland this was not the case. For these four provinces,
we had to turn to local, municipal government archives (for a complete overview, see Appendix 1) which preserved these reports before sending them to the provincial government. Needless to say, we were not able to retrieve a representative municipal report for each Dutch municipality: in total, we found filled-in municipal reports for 852 of the 1,121 municipalities in the Netherlands (see Map 1). Especially for the provinces of Limburg, Zeeland, Noord-Holland and Zuid-Holland, the provinces where the municipal reports could not be retrieved in the provincial archive, we seem to lack a substantial amount of municipal reports. These gaps in our dataset can mainly be credited to the fact that the local archives, often organized by a small municipal government, were less capable of preserving these sources throughout the twentieth century.14 Furthermore, although these reports were filled in on a yearly basis, information about employment in the industry sector was only provided on a five-year basis. However, the pages which documented statistics on the manufacturing sector often remained empty, leaving us in doubt whether this was attributable to the implausible fact that no industrial activity within the town was present or negligence of the local administrative staff.15

14 A multitude of reasons could have been responsible for the loss of the local municipal reports: some municipal governments destroyed these reports due to shortage of storage, some reports were lost during the merge of municipal governments (and thus the merge of municipal archives), in some municipal archives it proved unable to find the reports for our selected benchmark year, etc.

15 This assertion is based on our own research on samples of the yearly municipal reports in the provinces of Limburg, Utrecht, and Groningen (available on request). Although these reports mostly document on a yearly basis, employment in industry was only reported on a five-year basis (on the years of 1846, 1851, 1856, 1861, ... and following). Since some municipal reports did not contain any information in its edition of 1896, we first tried to solve this issue by consulting the editions of 1891 or 1901. However, if this also did not contain any information, we considered such municipalities as a municipality with no useable municipal report (see: Appendix 1).
Each municipality documented four categories of information about the activity of the manufacturing sector within its municipal boundaries. First, they reported on an individual basis the number of factories (subdivided by factory/handicraft establishments), the number of employees (subdivided by gender and adult/child), the manufacturing activity, the number of steam engines and the amount of horse power they induced. In the municipal reports a factory was defined as each establishment with more than 20 people employed and/or if a steam en-
gine was present. Second, each report noted the number of establish-
ments and employees operating without steam engines and employing
less than 20 people. These were classified as *ambachten* or handicraft
establishments and categorized according to activity or profession, al-
though this was done arbitrarily, as no formal classification system of
these activities or occupations was provided by the central government.
Third, they reported information on potential peat or coal mining activ-
ities, often including information on the number of establishments and
employees. Fourth, they included information on shipbuilding facilities
and the number of ships produced in the local dockyard.

As we want to construct a census of companies directly comparable
to the later constructed censuses of companies in the Netherlands, we
decided to collect the following information on the municipal level: the
number of establishments, the number of employees (with a division
over gender and adult/child), and the number and induced horse pow-
er of the steam engines, per manufacturing sector and per municipality.
However, for the conversion of these municipal reports to a standard-
ized dataset on each of these indicators, we first turn to the next section.

**Corrections to the municipal reports data**

Although the municipal reports contain valuable information in itself,
two corrections had to be made before we could have a representative
account of establishments and employees. A first correction involved
those cases in which reports were filled in but did not contain all the
necessary information. So did most reports mention the handicraft es-

tablishments, or the factory establishments, but not always both. Of the
852 municipalities for which we found a report, 64 provided data for the
handicraft establishments but not for the factory establishments. We
corrected these cases by using the data of Struve and Bekaar to fill in the
missing factory establishment data. For the reports which provided data
on the factory establishments but not on the handicraft establishments,
which was the case for 114 municipalities, we applied a more elaborate
method (see infra). Furthermore, for 6.54 per cent of all records, the
number of establishments were listed but not the number of employees.
In these cases, we multiplied the former number by the average number
of employees per establishment in that particular branch of industry. In
the reverse scenario, if we did have numbers of employees but no data
on the number of establishments (this was the case for 4.42 per cent of
all records), we used the average number of employees in that particular industry branch to reconstruct the number of establishments.

Second, we had to standardize the heterogeneous professions and industrial activities listed in the municipal reports. As the guidelines for the municipal governments did not provide a centralized classification system for the documented occupations or manufacturing activities, 2,982 unique occupational titles or activities were listed in the municipal reports. We solved this issue by attributing each unique occupational title or manufacturing activity to the most suitable class of the International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities (ISIC), revision 4 classification system. As the ISIC classification is a well-defined classification system which leaves relatively little room for misinterpretations, it presents an ideal framework for classifying all the industrial activities listed in the municipal reports. Thus, we were able to categorize all 2,982 unique activities listed in the reports to 137 standardized four-digit classes of manufacturing activities.

In order to assess the coverage of the dataset of municipal reports, we compare these results with two other sources which measured the Dutch labour force in manufacturing around this time. As mentioned in the first section, one source that does inform us about the manufacturing sector, is the inquiry of the engineers H.W.E. Struve and A.A. Bekaar of 1888-1890. This report lists 464 firms, yet it remained uncertain to what extent these firms captured the larger manufacturing firms in the Netherlands. Comparing the sample of factory-based employment recorded in the municipal reports with the results of Struve and Bekaar (see figure 1), it seems that Struve and Bekaar have missed only a small fraction of the larger Dutch manufacturing firms. One could argue that the deviation between both numbers can be credited to the difference in time of measurement between Struve and Bekaar (1888-1890) and the municipal reports dataset (1896). However, it is hard to imagine that the deviation between both datasets could solely be attributed to new businesses being established between 1888 and 1896. Furthermore, one could argue that Struve and Bekaar’s results should even be higher than the results of the municipal reports, as Struve and Bekaar put forward a more inclusive definition of factories than the latter. In particular the employment in the provinces of Noord-Holland and Noord-Brabant seems to have been underestimated by Struve and Bekaar, although the

---

16 While according to Struve and Bekaar’s definition a factory or a large manufacturing enterprise is an establishment which employed more than ten people, and/or made use of a steam engine, the municipal
lower number in the latter province could be explained by the exclusion of Tilburg in their inquiry.\textsuperscript{17}

For the larger factory establishments, we can say that, based on the recorded number of steam engines, the municipal reports present a representative image. So does our sample of municipal report 4,617 steam engines (of which 4,237 steam engines seem to match the definition of manufacturing as outlined in the ISIC classification), compared to the 2,918 active steam engines recorded in the inquiry of Struve and Bekaa and the 3,930 steam engines according to earlier estimations of the number of steam engines in the Netherlands in 1890.\textsuperscript{18} Yet, a compari-

\textsuperscript{17} Struve and Bekaa were appointed by the House of Representatives to report on all large manufacturing enterprises (here defined as establishments which employed more than ten people, or made use of a steam engine) in the Netherlands in 1888-1899 (Van Gerwen, \textit{A statistical latecomer,} 343). However, as they visited the cities of Tilburg and Maastricht and the entire province of Limburg on an earlier occasion, they did not include the numbers on these regions in their later inquiry.

\textsuperscript{18} So did H.W. Lintsen, \textit{Geschiedenis van de techniek in Nederland. De wording van een modern samen-leving, 1800-1890. Deel vi. Techniek en samenleving} (Zutphen 1993) 192. He estimated that 3,930 steam engines were active in the Netherlands in 1890.
son of the employment numbers in the population census of 1899 with the municipal reports suggests that our dataset faces an underreporting of employment numbers as well, though significantly lower than Struve and Bekaar (see figure 1).\textsuperscript{19} To a large extent, this underreporting can be explained by the incomplete geographical coverage of our assembled municipal reports. However, further investigation (available on request) revealed that there appears to have been a highly unequal reporting of handicraft industry in particular manufacturing sectors, with the largest deviations between our sample and the population census to be situated in the manufacturing of food, textiles, apparel, and leather products (respectively ISIC divisions 10, 13, 14, and 15). Since these activities often served as by-employment for subsistence farmers, the composers of the municipal reports might have underreported these activities. In addition, the underreporting of employment in particular provinces (available on request) – the provinces of Noord-Holland, Zuid-Holland, and Overijssel – might not come as a surprise either: these were the provinces with a widespread small-scale, domestic employment in manufacturing.

Therefore, to upgrade the collection of municipal reports to a complete census of companies, we implement a final correction. By adding the difference between employment per municipality and per manufacturing sector in the population census of 1899 and the employment numbers of the municipal reports to the latter, we acquire a complete coverage. By doing so, we tackle two main shortcomings related to the registered number of employees in the municipal reports dataset, namely the gaps in geographical coverage and the structural underreporting of certain sectors in the reports. Furthermore, by using the average number of establishments per employee and multiplying this by the added employment of the population census, we also acquire a representable number of establishments. Of course, this is done under the assumption that the non-reported and reported establishments have the same size, although it is more likely that the non-included establishments in the municipal reports were smaller in size than the registered establishments.

Of course, by mixing both these sources, we introduce several problems in our estimation of the census of companies. First, since the population census aimed to categorize the entire population by occupa-

\textsuperscript{19} For this exercise, similar to the industrial activities listed in the municipal reports, we attributed each occupational title listed in the population census to the most fitting ISIC revision 4 class.
tion and the municipal reports aimed to report all current employment in industrial activities, it seems difficult to reconcile the employment numbers of both sources. However, by carefully attributing all occupations to the lowest sectoral breakdown of the population census in the systematized classification system of ISIC revision 4, as we did earlier for the activities listed in the municipal reports (see section 2), large distortions on this issue are unlikely. Second, the municipal reports recorded employees according to the location where the industrial activity took place. In contrast, the population census recorded the geographical location where the employees had their (main) place of residence. Hence, with our exercise, we risk attributing employees in the wrong municipality due to the practice of commuting. Nonetheless, given the high transportation costs and long travel times during this period, we believe our results were not significantly distorted. Third, we also introduce in our dataset several general shortcomings related to the population censuses: this was for instance the case when unemployed people listed their previous job as their current occupation, although one could argue this at the same time also corrects for seasonal employment.
Maps 2a-c  Number of establishments, employees, and steam engines in the textiles sector (ISIC division 13) in the Netherlands in 1896
Maps 3a-c Number of employees in the textiles sector (ISIC division 13) in the Netherlands in 1896 (respectively total number of employees, number of employees in factory-based employment, handicraft-based employment)
**Illustration: The textiles manufacturing sector**

Notwithstanding the aforementioned shortcomings, we consider the employment numbers of the population census a solid benchmark, given the fact that multiple studies used these numbers as the most reliable, if not the only, estimation of the Dutch labour force.\(^{20}\) Furthermore, we believe combining both sources allows us to gain further insight in the structure of the Dutch economy, as it enables us to differentiate between employment in factory establishments and handicraft establishments. An example of such an exercise could be found in Maps 2a, 2b and 2c, which show the total number of employees, establishments, and steam engines in the textiles manufacturing sector (ISIC division 13), a sector regarded in both international and Dutch historiography as one of the most exemplary for the Industrial Revolution. Furthermore, given the distinction between the factory and handicraft establishments in the municipal reports data, this also allows us to distinguish the data in Maps 3a-3c between both groups, for which the results are provided in Maps 3a-3c.

Both series of maps not only provide us of a first sight into the economic structure of the textiles sector in this time period, and to highlight the added value of this new census of companies, it also allows us to briefly revisit some theories on economic growth around this time in the Netherlands. Based on the increase in total factor productivity growth and GDP after the 1860s, most publications put forward the 1860-1914 period as the start in which the Netherlands industrialized and caught up with economic growth, often pointing to a time-lag effect after the economic reforms of the 1840s.\(^{21}\) In contrast, J. A. De Jonge put forward 1890-1914 as the period in which the Netherlands started industrializing, based on the continuing dominance of smaller industrial firms and a rather slow transition of the labour force from the agricultural sector to the manufacturing and services sectors during 1860-1890.\(^{22}\)

---

20 Given the widely use of the occupational records of the population census for the estimation of the Dutch labour force, we believe it is safe to assume that the population census of 1899 is able to provide a complete coverage of the Dutch labour force in this year. See, for example: C.A. Oomens, ‘De loop der bevolking van Nederland in de negentiende eeuw’, *Statistische onderzoeken* 35 (1989); C.A. Oomens and G.P. Den Bakker, ‘De beroepsbevolking 1849-1995’, *Supplement bij de sociaal-economische maandstatistiek* 2 (1994), and J.G.S.J. van Maarerveen (eds.), *Algemene tellingen in de twintigste eeuw. De methode van onderzoek bij personen en bedrijven* (Voorburg 2002).


22 De Jonge, *De industrialisatie in Nederland*. 
In maps 3, the presence of steam engines seem almost exclusively confined to centres as Tilburg, Enschede, Hengelo, Almelo, and Amsterdam. A similar picture arises if we take a look at the factory-based employment in Maps 3a-3c, which appear to be confined to the southern and eastern part of the country. In contrast, in many of the Dutch hinterland handicraft-based employment remained widespread. Thus, Maps 2a-c and 3a-3c seem to support the view of De Jonge and force the literature to take a more nuanced standpoint in the Dutch industrialization process by the year 1896.

Conclusion

In an attempt to fill a considerable gap in the Dutch historiography, we constructed a new census of companies for 1896, based on the rehabilitation of locally-preserved municipal reports. After two corrections – accounting for missing entries and classifying the manufacturing activities – an additional round of corrections was needed to overcome the underreporting of domestic and small-scale handicraft activities. Thus, we are able to present the earliest estimate of the structure of the Dutch industrial sector, both on the local geographical (municipal) and sectoral level. Notwithstanding the limitations of this method, we believe the gains outweigh the costs, as the construction of this census allows us to have a complete list of the number of establishments, employees, and steam engines for all Dutch municipalities and manufacturing sectors within a reasonable margin of error.

A small sample of this dataset on the textiles manufacturing sector, hints at only one of the many possibilities of how this source could be used for further enquiries into the Dutch Industrial Revolution. Research possibilities also include the linkage of this source with later censuses of companies – 1930, 1950, 1963, and 1978 – or recent measurements of the Dutch manufacturing sector. An additional research possibility could be linking this census of companies with earlier estimations of the Dutch industry sector, by using a similar method as outlined in section 2 and 3 with the editions of the Condition of the Dutch Factories of 1857 and 1871, as both sources also used municipal reports. Such an exercise would be able to paint a standardized image of the Dutch manufacturing sector over the past 150 years. By doing so, we would not only acquire more insight on how and why the Dutch industrial sector went from retardation to its current strong position in the
international market, it would also enable us to uplift the Netherlands from its position as a 'statistical latecomer'.
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Appendix 1 Archives and respective municipalities for which a municipal report was used to construct the census of companies of 1896

Archief De Domijnen: Beek, Broeksittard, Grevenbicht, Limbricht, Munstergeleen, Obbicht en Papenhoven, Oirschot, Schinnen, Sittard, Spaubeek, Stein

Archief Delft: Delft, Hof van Delft, Maasland, Rijswijk, Vrijenban


Erfgoed Leiden en Omstreken: Leiden, Leiderdorp, Noordwijk, Rijnsburg, Sassenheim, Voorhout


Gemeentearchief Borsele: ’s-Heer-Abtskerke, Borsele, Ellewoutsdijk, Heinkenszand, Nisse

Gemeentearchief Capelle aan den IJssel: Capelle aan den IJssel

Gemeentearchief Gennep: Gennep

Gemeentearchief Goes: ’s-Gravenpolder, Goes

Gemeentearchief Hulst: Clinge, Graauw en Langendam, Hengstdal, Hontessen, Hulst, Ossenisse

Gemeentearchief Landgraaf: Ubach over Worms

Gemeentearchief Maasgouw: Maasbracht, Stevensweert, Thorn, Wessem

Gemeentearchief Meerssen: Bunde, Geulle, Meerssen, Ulestraten

Gemeentearchief Oegstgeest: Oegstgeest

Gemeentearchief Oud-Beijerland: Oud-Beijerland

Gemeentearchief Peel en Maas: Helden

Gemeentearchief Reimerswaal: Krabbendijke, Kruiningen, Rilland-Bath, Waarde, Yerseke

Gemeentearchief Schiedam: Schiedam

Gemeentearchief Schouwen-Duiveland: Bruinisse, Burgh, Dreischor, Duivendijke,
Elkerzee, Ellemeet, Haamstede, Koudekerke, Nieuwerkerk, Noordgouwe, Noordwelle, Oosterland, Serooskerke (Schouwen-Duiveland), Zierikzee, Zonnemaire

**Gemeentearchief Sluis**: Aardenburg, Eede, Groede, Hoofdplaat, IJzendijke, Oostburg, Sint Kruis, Sluis, Waterlandkerkje, Zuidzande

**Gemeentearchief Terneuzen**: Axel, Overslag, Sas van Gent, Schoondijke, Terneuzen, Westdorpe, Zaalmsg

**Gemeentearchief Tholen**: Oud-Vossemeer, Poortvliet, Scherpenisse, Sint Philipsland, Sint-Annaland, Sint-Maartensdijk, Tholen

**Gemeentearchief Venlo**: Maasbree

**Gemeentearchief Vlissingen**: Ritthem, Vlissingen

**Gemeentearchief Wassenaar**: Voorschoten, Wassenaar

**Gemeentearchief Zaanstad**: Koog aan de Zaan, Krommenie, Oostzaan, Westzaan, Wormer, Wormerveer, Zaandam, Zaandijk

**Gemeentearchief Zederik**: Ameide, Leerbroek, Lexmond, Meerkier, Nieuwland, Tienhoven, Zoeterwoude

**Gemeentearchief Zoetermeer**: Zegwaart, Zoetermeer


**Haags Gemeentearchief**: ’s-Gravenhage, Loosduinen, Voorburg

**Historisch Archief Westland**: ’s-Gravenzande, De Lier, Monster, Naaldwijk, Wateringen


**Noord-Hollands Archief**: Bennbroek, Beverwijk, Bloemendaal, Haarlem, Haarlemmerliede en Spaarnwoude, Heemskerk, Heemstede, Spaarndam, Uitgeest, Uithoorn, Velsen, Zandvoort


**Regionaal Archief Gorinchem:** Arkel, Asperen, Gorinchem, Heukelum, Kedichem, Leerdam

**Regionaal Historisch Centrum Limburg:** Amby, Borgharen, Cadier en Keer, Eijsden, Houthem, Itteren, Margraten, Mheer, Noorbeek, Oud-Vroenhoven, Schin op Geul, Sint Gertrud, Valkenburg

**Regionaal Historisch Centrum Rijnstreek en Lopikerwaard:** Barwoutswaarder, Bodegrave, Hekendorp, Lange Ruije Weide, Oudewater, Papekop, Reeuwijk, Rietveld, Waarder, Woerdén

**Regionaal Historisch Centrum Zuidoost-Utrecht:** Hagestein, Vianen

**Regionaal-Historisch Centrum Vecht en Venen:** Weesp

**Stadsarchief Amsterdam:** Amsterdam, Buiksloot, Nieuwewaard, Nieuwer-Amstel, Ouder-Amstel, Sloten, Watergraafsmeer

**Stadsarchief Rotterdam:** Barendrecht, Bergschenhoek, Berkel en Rodenrijs, Bleiswijk, Hillegersberg, IJsselmonde, Overschie, Pernis, Rhoon, Ridderkerk, Rotterdam, Schiebroek

**Stadsarchief Vlaardingen:** Maassluis, Vlaardingen, Vlaardinger-Ambacht

**Streekarchief Goeree-Overflakkee:** Dirksland, Goedereede, Melissant, Meddelharnis, Nieuwe Tonge, Ouddorp, Sommelsdijk, Stad aan ’t Haringvliet, Stellendam

**Streekarchief Gooi en de Vechtstreek:** Blaricum, Bussum, Hilversum, Huizen, Laren, Muiden, Naarden, Nederhorst den Berg

**Streekarchief Midden-Holland:** Bergambacht, Berkenwoude, Gouda, Gouderak, Haastrecht, Krimpen aan de Lek, Krimpen aan den IJssel, lekkerkerk, Moerkapelle, Moordrecht, Nieuwerkerk, Ouderkerk aan den IJssel, Schoonhoven, Stolwijk, Waddinxveen, Zevenhuizen

**Streekarchief Rijnlands Midden:** Aarlanderveen, Alkemade, Alphen, Benthuizen, Boskoop, Hazerswoude, Koudekerk, Nieuwkoop, Nieuwveen, Oudshoorn, Rijnsaterwoude, Ter Aar, Woubrugge, Zwanmerdam

**Streekarchief Voorne-Putten en Rozenburg:** Brielle, Geervliet, Heineoord,
Hekelingen, Hellevoetsluis, Oostvoorne, Oudenoord, Spijkenisse, Vierpolders, Zuidland, Zwartewaal


Waterlands Archief: Beemster, Beets, Broek in Waterland, Edam, Jisp, Midwolde, Monnickendam, Oosthuizen, Purmerend, Warde, Wijdeveermutterm

Westfries Archief: Abbekerk, Avenhorn, Barsingerhorn, Berkhout, Blokker, Boovenkarspel, Enkhuizen, Hensbroek, Hoogkarspel, Hoorn, Medemblik, Midwoud, Nibbixwoud, Opmeer, Oppedoes, Oudendijk, Schellinkhout, Sijbeekerspel, Spanbroek, Twisk, Ursem, Venhuizen, Wijdenes, Wognum, Zwaagdijk

Zeeuws Archief: Arnemuiden, Middelburg, Sint Laureins, Veere, Westkapelle, Zoutelande

• Guild Brotherhood, Guild Capital? [Saelens]
• Employer Support for Welfare State Development [Oude Nijhuis]
• De publieke rol van Nederlandse sociale diensten [Rodenburg]
• Construction of a Census of Companies [Philips]