



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Cinematic Rotterdam: the times and tides of a modern city

Paalman, F.J.J.W.

Publication date

2010

Document Version

Final published version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Paalman, F. J. J. W. (2010). *Cinematic Rotterdam: the times and tides of a modern city*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam]. Eigen Beheer.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

CINEMATIC ROTTERDAM

THE TIMES AND TIDES OF A MODERN CITY

Floris Paalman

CINEMATIC ROTTERDAM

THE TIMES AND TIDES OF A MODERN CITY

ACADEMISCH PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor
aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus
Prof. dr. D.C. van den Boom
ten overstaan van een door het college voor promoties
ingestelde commissie,
in het openbaar te verdedigen in de Agnietenkapel
op dinsdag 22 juni 2010, te 10:00 uur

door

Floris Jerome Jan Willem Paalman

geboren te Hengelo (O)

Promotiecommissie

Promotor: Prof. dr. T.P. Elsaesser

Overige Leden: Prof. dr. F. Bollerey
Prof. dr. V. Hediger
Prof. dr. A. Reijndorp
Dr. W.B.S. Strauven
Prof. dr. F.P.I.M. van Vree

Faculteit der Geesteswetenschappen

Cinematic Rotterdam; The Times and Tides of a Modern City
© 2010, Floris Paalman

ASCA / Universiteit van Amsterdam

Dit proefschrift kwam tot stand met een bijdrage van de EFL Stichting.

CONTENTS

on names and titles **010**

INTRODUCTION **013**

film studies / cinematic city – film and architecture / case-study: Rotterdam / research problems /
commissioned films / the urban environment – economy, culture, society /
a note on the practice of research / outline of the book

Part I – The Emergence of a Cinematic City, Rotterdam in the 1920s & 1930s

Part II – The Cinematic Reconstruction of a City, Rotterdam in the 1940s & 1950s

Part III – The Cinematic Proliferation of a City, Rotterdam in the 1960s & 1970s

**PART I. THE EMERGENCE OF A CINEMATIC CITY
ROTTERDAM IN THE 1920s & 1930s**

Prologue to Part I	031
the position of Rotterdam / the modernity of Rotterdam	
Chapter 1. The Emergence of Cinema in Rotterdam	038
§ 1. early cinema in Rotterdam	038
– city news / externalities	
§ 2. specialisation	043
§ 3. changing sounds	046
Chapter 2. Film, Architecture, City	049
§ 1. avant-garde	049
– The Bridge / Nul uur Nul	
§ 2. cross-disciplinary networks	060
§ 3. for modernity – construction film / industrial film / mobility	064
Chapter 3. Events	079
§ 1. between image and space	079
– urban playgrounds	
§ 2. amazing air-evolutions	085
– the arrival of the Zeppelin	
§ 3. Neniĵto	089
Chapter 4. Andor Von Barsy	093
§ 1. the man with the camera	093
§ 2. functional cinematography – Transfilma	097
– The City That Never Rests / afterlife	
§ 3. a new episode	108
§ 4. after Rotterdam	113
§ 5. reflections	114
Chapter 5. Shared Agenda	117
§ 1. improving conditions	117
– housing models / Schoolbioscoop	
§ 2. social engagement	126
– En Gij, Kameraad? / more union films	
§ 3. slums, crisis, renewal	133
§ 4. towards the end of an era	136
Recapitulation of Part I – The Emergence of a Cinematic City	138

**PART II. THE CINEMATIC RECONSTRUCTION OF A CITY
ROTTERDAM IN THE 1940s & 1950s**

Prologue to Part II	143
the disappearance and reappearance of a city	
Chapter 6. Gate to the World	146
§ 1. liquid city	146
– mediating subsistence	
§ 2. gate-keepers and viewfinders	149
§ 3. moving images: emigration	151
§ 4. stretching the liquid	153
– port affairs / ongoing news / further radiations	
Chapter 7. The Appearance of a New City	158
§ 1. the void, a matter of projection	158
§ 2. vision, strategy, network	165
– C.H. van der Leeuw	
§ 3. information and publicity	170
– and still... / alive and kicking	
§ 4. continuing projections	175
§ 5. manifesting positions	180
Chapter 8. A Model to Communicate the City	185
§ 1. cinematic models	185
§ 2. news reports and television	188
§ 3. steady spirit	191
§ 4. film production in and about the city	195
– the case of Jan Schaper	
Chapter 9. Extended City	200
§ 1. multiple extensions	200
§ 2. living innovations	200
§ 3. the Rijnmond region and the case of Vlaardingen	206
Chapter 10. To Animate the City	211
§ 1. city – event	211
§ 2. Ahoy'	212
§ 3. E55	215
§ 4. events in perspective	219
Recapitulation of Part II – The Cinematic Reconstruction of a City	222

**PART III. THE CINEMATIC PROLIFERATION OF A CITY
ROTTERDAM IN THE 1960s & 1970s**

Prologue to Part III	227
modernism moreover, final destination	
Chapter 11. Developing Compositions	233
§ 1. a view from afar	233
§ 2. Open Studio	235
– Schaper in Schiedam / Town Without A Heart	
§ 3. television news	243
– ongoing news	
§ 4. media and the municipality	248
– discussions	
§ 5. emerging film practices and experimentation	257
Chapter 12. The Structure of Motion	261
§ 1. film and mobility	261
§ 2. metro	263
§ 3. ‘De Ruit’	267
– Van Brienoordbrug and Beneluxtunnel / traffic junctions	
§ 4. Airport Zestienhoven	273
§ 5. Rotterdam, De Randstad and the Netherlands	275
§ 6. moving on	279
Chapter 13. Anchoring Film and Television	281
§ 1. city and port, film and television	281
§ 2. Europoort	283
– a tale of giants	
§ 3. corporate images	293
Chapter 14. Container Contained / Striking Development	301
§ 1. the composition of growth	301
§ 2. container contained I – the scenario of ‘process architecture’	303
– striking development I – the metal and harbour strike of 1970	
§ 3. container contained II – the choreography of modular spaces	308
– striking development II – the February strike of 1977	
§ 4. container contained III – the peace treaty	311
– striking development III – the harbour strike of 1979	
§ 5. implications	317
Chapter 15. The Urban Medium	319
§ 1. Floriade	319
§ 2. exhibitions, games, concerts	321
– city in motion / the new Ahoy’ / amplified sports / Holland Pop Festival	
§ 3. C’70	326
§ 4. Film International	329
Chapter 16. Re/Visions	333
§ 1. the human dimension	333
§ 2. urban renewal	336
§ 3. the promise of video, social-cultural explorations, and cinematic interferences	343
– Lijnbaancentrum / video rally / cable television / De Lantaren and socially engaged productions / Videocentrum / interferences	
§ 4. divergent visions	353
– television mediating new housing estates / turbulence / dystopian Rotterdam	
Recapitulation of Part III – The Cinematic Proliferation of a City	362

CONCLUSION	367
the appearance of a modern city – main film practices and forces / spiders in a multitude of webs / environment and information: stigmergy / media and culture, times and tides / hidden dimension / ontology – a prospect	
FILMOGRAPHY	
Filmography Rotterdam	379
Filmography Rotterdam 1890s, 1900s & 1910s – Selection	380
Filmography Rotterdam 1920s & 1930s – Selection	382
Filmography Rotterdam 1940s & 1950s – Selection	391
Filmography Rotterdam 1960s & 1970s – Selection	400
Filmography Rotterdam Since 1980 – Selection	424
Filmography – General	426
LITERATURE	431
REFERENCES – GENERAL	449
SUMMARY	451
NEDERLANDSE SAMENVATTING	457
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	463

ON NAMES AND TITLES

examples:

building

'Koningsbrug'

De Hef

"King's Bridge"

original name in Dutch

nickname in Dutch

translation

'Koningsbrug' (1924-1927, Pieter Joosting)

name (period of design/construction, architect)

film

HOOGSTRAAT

THE BRIDGE

"The Alley"

original title (Dutch, no English title)

original title (English)

translated title (not official)

THE BRIDGE (1928, Joris Ivens)

title (year of release, director)

organisation, company, institution

Filmliga

Bureau Voorlichting en Publiciteit

"Office for Information and Publicity"

official Dutch name (one word)

official Dutch name (more words)

translated name (not official)

particular expression

wijkgedachte

notion in Dutch/foreign language

people

Joris Ivens, J.J.P. Oud

names as they are commonly known

publication

'Film als Gemeenschapskunst'

Woonmogelijkheden in het Nieuwe Rotterdam

De 8 & Opbouw

article

book

magazine

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Within various academic fields since the 1990s, there has been a growing interest in the relationship between cinema and architecture, and more generally, between cinema and the city. At this intersection, some urgent questions appear in respect of the disciplines involved. I will examine this, first of all, through film studies, to which I will relate observations and ideas from the fields of architecture and the social sciences.

film studies

The history of cinema began to be written from within by engineers and filmmakers in the 1890s, when cinema was invented¹. Philosophers soon became interested as well². The link between film and reality was questioned – how film frames events, human concerns and ideas. Certain positions quickly established themselves, and from the 1920s onwards, theorists tended to move back and forth between highlighting the constructive features of film, with an emphasis on framing, montage, special effects and non-diegetic sound (e.g. Arnheim, 1932), and underscoring realistic features, due to the structural analogies of the photographic image to the object it shows (e.g. Bazin, 1958). Two major interpretative strands have developed concurrently, an aesthetic and a psychological one. Some of the most influential thinkers, notably Walter Benjamin and Siegfried Kracauer, paid attention to the political implications and social impact of the cinema as well. Their essays from the 1920s and 1930s have helped to establish the cinematic mode of perception as a model for modern aesthetics in general (leading to the so-called ‘modernity thesis’³).

As sound film established itself as the norm after 1929, spoken language increased in importance. Especially in Europe, the use of the vernacular strengthened the notion of national cinema, with films drawing on domestic traditions in the arts and entertainment forms. Avant-garde cinema lost out, and films became dedicated to telling stories. As a consequence, film scholars ever since, but especially after 1945, have been preoccupied with narration, fiction, and genre; they have conducted textual analysis, elaborated semiotic theories of film language, and applied literary psychoanalytical models to themes and ways of looking. A major literary concept that was adopted in the 1950s was that of the *auteur*. Although it has not only been applied to European films, it is antagonistic to the American studio system. The same can be said about the notion of art film; it goes back to the avant-garde, which rejected commercial cinema.

However, such paradigms are now under pressure. Due to globalisation, the notion of national cinema has become problematic. It no longer offers the appropriate tools for understanding the exchange between American and European cinema. After the long tradition of European *émigré* filmmakers who went to America, who in return affected European cinema, we now have more of a global system of exchange⁴. The scope, scale and frequency of international co-productions have brought the economic implications of film production into the picture, which require different concepts.

Another significant factor that has called for new approaches is the emergence of digital media. First of all, they have changed the photographic basis of cinema, and have therefore affected notions of realism. Digital media have also foregrounded spatial metaphors, rather than

¹ Among the first were William Kennedy-Laurie Dickson and Antonia Dickson: *The Life and Inventions of Thomas Alva Edison* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1894); *History of the Kinetograph, Kinetoscope, and Kinetophonograph* (New York: Albert Bunn, 1895). As a filmmaker who reported on the Boer War, W.K.L. also wrote *The Biograph in Battle: Its Story in the South African War* (Flicks Books, 1901) – www.victorian-cinema.net/dickson.htm (2008-01-29).

² According to Deleuze (1983), Henri Bergson’s *Matter and Memory* (1896) is a kind of proto-philosophy of film.

³ Bordwell (1997: 140-147) has called it as such, in order to give a critique on it; for a recent argument in favour of this thesis, see: Casetti, 2008. See also chapter 12.

⁴ E.g. Elsaesser, 2005a; Behlil, 2007.

literary ones⁵. Next to that they have ‘remediated’ cinema, to use a term introduced by Bolter and Grusin (2000). A convergence has taken place between different media, which has, as a consequence, caused a revision of the history of cinema⁶. Little known predecessors of current media practices are being rediscovered, which especially concerns films that have rarely been shown inside the cinema⁷. Historical potentials are therefore reassessed. Along with it the idea of linear ‘history’ of cause and effect and to some extent the nature of time as such are being challenged. One speaks of recurrent patterns, of accelerated or suspended developments, and of retroactive causalities.

Ideas of cinema and time have consequences for thinking about the way the medium itself constructs time. Cinematography used to be a matter of recording movements, and therefore time, while editing has enabled the impression of continuity out of discontinuity, with time compression, repetition, flash-backs, and flash-forwards as some of the most typical effects. Through new media, both as a way to produce and to distribute films, other conceptions have come to the fore: of non-linear temporality, simultaneity, flow and event. This has, in turn, made the study of cinematic time an issue of its own⁸, so that the movement intrinsic to film has itself become a matter of investigation along these lines – partly as an elaboration of ideas of Gilles Deleuze (1983, 1985), who himself drew inspiration from Henri Bergson.

After several decades of studying the language of film as a construction, and the ideology of film as based on creating the ‘illusion of reality’, there has been a shift towards phenomenology, which might be said to highlight the reverse: ‘the reality of illusion’⁹. More generally, film studies have opened up towards a proliferation of different approaches: besides cognitivist approaches, focusing on the nature of perception, there has been renewed attention given to ‘bodily affect’ and ‘embodiment’, thus emphasizing reception¹⁰. Such a diversity of issues highlight a philosophical divide between an epistemology of cinema – *the logic of knowing*, and an ontology of cinema – *the logic of being*. One way that ontological questions are being articulated is through the ‘spatial turn’, which has occurred across different disciplines within the humanities¹¹. This takes many forms, but in film studies it has led to the cinema being conceptualised as not only a narrative and temporal medium, but also as a cartographic medium: mapping feelings and ideas, human interactions and events, and eventually space itself¹². Moreover, there is a concern with the interaction between the location of production and the location of the action in a film¹³.

cinematic city – film and architecture

The spatial turn has also given new urgency to the relationship between cinema and the city. This interest, however, already has a long tradition. Since the 1920s it has been noted, first by scholars like Benjamin and Kracauer, that the modern aesthetics of metropolitan life hold parallels to the cinematic mode of perception. Cities have, moreover, played an important role in many films not just as locations, but as protagonists, while film production, movie-going and film culture have

⁵ This started with notions such as the ‘information highway’, the ‘digital city’ and ‘windows’, while programming has been called ‘architecture’.

⁶ E.g. Cubitt, 2004; Rodowick, 2007.

⁷ It includes various industrial, civil and scientific media practices, often with specific tools and methods. Shaw & Weibel, 2007; Harbord, 2007: 1, with references to Francesco Casetti [1996] and Victor Burgin [2004]. In this respect, Elsaesser (2007: 34-35) speaks of the ‘3 x S/M-practice’: surveillance/military, surgery/medicine, sensing/monitoring.

⁸ E.g. Doane, 2002; Mulvey, 2005.

⁹ E.g. Anderson, 1996 [on the reality of film perception], cf. Pisters, 2006: 13, e.a.

¹⁰ E.g. Marks, 2000; Sobchack, 2004.

¹¹ For an overview of different developments across various disciplines, see: Arias & Warf, 2008.

¹² E.g. Bruno, 2002; Conley, 2007, respectively.

¹³ Elsaesser has called this, respectively, *Standort* and *Tatort*, as addressed in a lecture for the Studium Generale of the Rietveld Academie at the Netherlands Media Art Institute Montevideo / Time Based Arts in Amsterdam, 2004-02-18.

also largely been an urban affair. Direct links can be established between film production, the urban environment and the perceptual body that moves in it.

A landmark in the revival of interest was the publication in 1997 of the book *The Cinematic City* edited, notably, by the British geographer David Clarke. It aimed 'to open up a space for the continued theorization of the cinematic city' (p10), beyond the dominant paradigm that is 'triangulated by semiotics, psychoanalysis and historical materialism' (p7). Clarke emphatically articulated the spatial quality of film, in terms of the 'cinematic experience' and specificities of the medium. Special attention was paid to 'the figuration of the city in cinema as either utopian or dystopian, and its relation to the extra-cinematic city' (p10). In utopian terms the metropolis has been framed as a whirlpool; of excitement, change, challenge, innovation and progress, exemplified by avant-garde 'city symphonies' such as *RIEN QUE LES HEURES* (1926, Alberto Cavalcanti), set in Paris, and *BERLIN, DIE SINFONIE EINER GROSSSTADT* (1927, Walter Ruttmann). The dystopian view on the city shows instead oppression, congestion, alienation, anonymity and loss of moral values, which has been exemplified by classics like *METROPOLIS* (1927, Fritz Lang) and *BLADE RUNNER* (1982, Ridley Scott). This is largely a discourse on fiction film, although Clarke's book also includes a study by Gold and Ward on informative films that supported urban planning in Britain. In the subsequent ten years many publications on the cinematic city have followed¹⁴. Among them are also cross-disciplinary studies such as *Imagining the Modern City* (1999) by James Donald. He argues that literature, cinema, architecture and the visual arts create a specifically urban consciousness; they provide images of cities that are primarily mental constructions rather than real places. It constitutes a particular dimension of urbanism, beyond planning and design practices¹⁵.

Parallel to the debate on the cinematic city, and to some extent part of it, has been a concern among film scholars and architecture historians with the relationship between cinema and architecture. They have studied set design, the way built space helps to structure a given film, or the way the sheer familiarity of cinema and its ways of seeing the world have promoted and hermeneutically affected modern architecture and urbanism¹⁶. But there is also a more fundamental side to it. While film scholars, as we saw, try to push the edges of existing paradigms and come up with new ones, architecture theorists too experience the limits of notions such as *tabula rasa*, the autonomous building based on universal principles, building as art, design as style, and the architect as genius, or, alternatively, architecture as a social condenser that generates new forms of life. The architectural counterpart of the spatial turn is, paradoxically perhaps, a new interest in time and movement, in narrative and processes, and how these intersect with or alter (static) space. It has been articulated since the early 1980s, and partly in cinematic terms, by Bernhard Tschumi and Rem Koolhaas, among others¹⁷. Such a turn has been strengthened by issues of redevelopment, which touch upon stories of buildings and their users¹⁸. Emphasizing use and programme, architects have reassessed the social implications of design and

¹⁴ Including more than fifty academic books (in English) and even more articles in (Anglo-Saxon) academic journals.

¹⁵ Cf. Bollerey, 2006.

¹⁶ Major studies on set design include those by Albrecht, 1986; Neumann, 1996; Bergfelder e.a., 2007. Important in respect of film and architectural hermeneutics is Colomina (1988 e.a.). Since the 1990s more than forty other major books on cinema and architecture have been published, a.o. Covert & Wick, 1993; Toy, 1994; Weihsmann, 1995; Penz & Thomas, 1997; Sorkin, 1999; Fear, 2000; Lamster, 2000; Shonfield, 2001; Pallasmaa, 2002; Bruno, 2002; Jacobs, 2007.

¹⁷ See e.g. Tschumi, 1999 (i.e. film school Le Fresnoy). Koolhaas, in his turn, began his career as a script writer, as mentioned by Gargiani (2008: 3), who links it to his architecture through 'the idea of the animated building' and 'actors on an urban stage'. In an interview for *Der Spiegel* (Kronsbein & Matussek, 2006), Koolhaas says himself: 'In a script, you have to link various episodes together, you have to generate suspense and you have to assemble things – through editing, for example. It's exactly the same in architecture. Architects also put together spatial episodes to make sequences.'

¹⁸ E.g. Crimson, 1995a. A recent case is the redevelopment of the 'Mercati Generali' in Rome (2004-2010, Rem Koolhaas).

their impact on daily life¹⁹. This harks back to discussions from the 1950s and the 1960s (e.g. Mumford, Jacobs, Team X, who themselves took up ideas from the 1920s). Regarding the use, significance and social role of space, cinema has been considered as a set of practices as well as discourses that can offer models.

Besides films dealing with space, the urban environment itself has become mediated, which has been conceptualised in terms of scripted space, locative media, augmented space, and convergence culture²⁰. By now, media have even become intertwined with the design process itself. Although this extends far beyond the cinema, the cinema is nevertheless still regarded as the genealogically most mature and aesthetically most legitimate realm of audiovisual culture, especially when hidden features of its history are discovered²¹. The cinema is even referred to as a paradigm for the experience economy²². This applies especially to what one might call the 'joint-venture' of cinema, architecture and urbanism, when it comes to matters of city branding and corporate identity. Like cinema, architecture, as a symbolic realm, has also become part of high culture as well as popular culture (with architects both treated as 'artists' and as 'pop stars').

Despite the many publications on the subject, the debate on the cinematic city, with authors from various disciplines, has remained rather loose. There have been some attempts to connect different disciplinary approaches. An example is the book *Cinema and the City, Film and Urban Societies in a Global Context* (2001). Its editors, the British film scholars Tony Fitzmaurice and Mark Shiel, explicitly advocated a sociological approach, in which global networks are framed through urban hubs, among them well-known cinematic cities such as New York, Los Angeles, London and Paris, but also cities such as Lagos, Manila and Montreal. It shifts the attention from national cinema and national institutions, to decentralised agencies and local developments that are embedded in a specific environment. While commendably ambitious in its reach, in terms of methodology, however, their sociological stance still needs further elaboration (of which more below).

But there is also a question of the relevant corpus when redefining the scope of such a study. If the notion of the cinematic city is to be taken seriously, it should apply to smaller cities too, especially those that are similarly modern, in their demographics, their concentration of specialised industries or services, and in their participation within global networks. Especially if we accept that such networks have gained in importance vis-à-vis the nation state, it might be instructive to leave the capitals, which largely represent the nation, and focus on regional centres or hubs. References, to be discussed later on in more detail, are case-studies concerning the avant-garde and industrial films dealing with Frankfurt (Elsaesser, 2005b), and municipal films dealing with Glasgow (Lebas, 2005 & 2007). While these studies focus on particular films (or periods), it might be possible to extend the scope, and to develop a more comprehensive view of the 'cinematic city' that concerns various kinds of (media) productions dealing with the city, the urban environment and its time-space dynamics.

case-study: Rotterdam

Rotterdam is a candidate for such a case-study. It is the second city of the Netherlands (a country that itself is little known for its national cinema). In international perspective, the size of Rotterdam is modest. It has had an average of about 600,000 inhabitants throughout the 20th century, and one million in the agglomeration. Yet, it is a modern city, which is part of global networks. Rotterdam is well-known for its port, as it used to be the largest in the world for several

¹⁹ E.g. Ghirardo, 1996; McLeod, 1996. A recent publication in respect of social engineering has been an edition of the architecture magazine *Volume* that is dedicated to this subject (see: Oosterman, ed., 2008).

²⁰ 'scripted space': Lunenfeld (1998) and Klein (1999); 'locative media' has been coined by Kalnins as a title of a workshop by the RIXC new media lab in Riga in 2002; 'augmented space': Manovich (2006); 'convergence culture': Jenkins (2006).

²¹ E.g. Rodowick, 2007: 189; Harbord, 2007.

²² E.g. Beller, 2006.

decades. While it is still highly important, the image of Rotterdam has diversified. Besides its port, it actively promotes itself nowadays as a city of architecture and as a city of media. It highlights its modern housing and industrial architecture, for which it made a name for itself since the 1920s, the achievements of post-war reconstruction, and various trendsetting projects from the last decades. In respect of media, the International Film Festival Rotterdam is of importance, next to the Rotterdam Media Fund and the development of an audiovisual sector, clustered in the 'Lloydkwartier'. Not coincidentally, Rotterdam is also featured in a diversity of films, which establishes a direct link to the 'city of architecture'. Such films range from art films, such as *A ZED AND TWO NOUGHTS* (1985, Peter Greenaway), to big budget productions, such as *WHO AM I?* (1998, Jackie Chan), to mention two obvious examples.

There are some titles to which I will refer throughout my project that may already be familiar. Among them are avant-garde classics, such as *THE BRIDGE* (1928, Joris Ivens), and popular feature films from the glory days of 'Dutch cinema', such as *BOEFJE* (1939, Detlef Sierck). There is the propaganda film *ANGRIFF AUF ROTTERDAM* (1940, UFA), with the well-known images of the bombardment of Rotterdam. There are classics from the period of reconstruction, such as *STEADY!* (1952, Herman van der Horst), which is considered a major example of the so-called 'Dutch School' of documentary cinema. There are also challenging hybrids, for example *ROTTERDAM – EUROPOORT* (1966, Joris Ivens), which combines the genre of the avant-garde city symphony with fiction, in particular the legend of the Flying Dutchman. Quite different to this are various dystopian feature films that have emerged since the 1970s, such as *SPETTERS* (1980, Paul Verhoeven). Although one may come across these titles when searching for films about Rotterdam in the database of the *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam*, which is the place to begin such an enterprise, they are not its main feature. The city archive's collection of films, from the 1910s to the present, includes about seven thousand titles. It grows every day, not only with recent productions, but also with historic films that eventually end up here, if they had not already found their way to the *Nederlands Filmmuseum* (Eye) in Amsterdam or the *Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid* in Hilversum (which is linked to television), which together add approximately fifteen thousand other titles or so, from newsreels to feature films.

Moving quickly through their databases, one thing is immediately clear. Although one may find a reasonable number of (sometimes unknown) avant-garde productions, as well as feature films, the vast majority of productions differ from the corpus that is usually studied by film scholars. Besides newsreels, which are mainly to be found in Hilversum, there are many commissioned films: industrial and business films, often related to the port, educational films, films to promote the city and municipal services, and films made for or even produced by various kinds of social institutions, next to amateur films. Much of the material found here has hardly ever, if at all, been studied by academics. While taking into account that there may be many more of such films elsewhere, and that a similar situation exists in other cities, it is still puzzling why all of these films were made, and who may have watched them.

It is obvious that these films were not made for reasons of entertainment, at least not in the first place. They may have their own aesthetic qualities, which I will take into account, but their purposes have been, first of all, social and economic. If it comes to advertising and sponsorship, on which large amounts of money are spent, economists have noticed that individual enterprises may profit from it, but that it is usually at the expense of competitors. There is scant evidence that advertising has an effect on macroeconomic quantities, and therefore there is little consensus about the significance of advertising for the economy at large²³. However, the films under consideration cover a range of issues. They are the product of various kinds of motivations and interests, which broadens the perspective.

One has to ask oneself what functions these films fulfil in society. It calls for an approach that may not only explain what these films transmit and how they are constructed, but especially

²³ Marlet, Van Woerkens, Mulder, Poort, 2006: III.

how they participate in social processes, or more specifically in the case of the city, how they contribute to urban development. This question does not just apply to commissioned films, but also to avant-garde films or feature films, and, by extension, to cinema in general. How is cinema embedded in social structures and what are the dynamics that operate between them? This question moves beyond the conception of cinema as the free play of the imagination opening up new perspectives, while it also challenges the conception that cinema influences behaviour through providing certain social role models. I consider the participatory and interventionist aspects of cinema as a major question that touches upon many other issues as well. It is particularly pressing in the light of the ubiquity of media within modern society, with various kinds of applications outside or beyond the cinema.

research problems

Some of the films under consideration have been reviewed by film scholars or critics before, especially in studies on avant-garde films and documentaries, where they have primarily been addressed as works of art. As a consequence, the films' commissioners, uses or purposes have not always been taken into consideration. This criticism, however, does not apply to the work of Bert Hogenkamp (1988, 2003), who has extensively written on Dutch documentary cinema. He has presented a vast horizon in this respect, especially since he has taken the term 'documentary' in its broadest possible sense. Notwithstanding this elaborate detective work, there is still a lot to be discovered.

A number of films that will come to the fore in various chapters here could be related to the national institutions and the artistic as well as economic developments that Hogenkamp has indicated, but there are also documentary productions that raise new questions and that require a different take²⁴. Among them are scripted and staged films, or films that strictly served local purposes rather than national ones. There are also many television productions dealing with Rotterdam, among them various foreign documentaries, made since the 1950s. They have not yet appeared in any study of Dutch cinema, nor in any study of another national cinema, since they simply do not match either the notion of 'national' or that of 'cinema'. Television, moreover, has often been considered by film scholars as something that belongs to another register, but film and television are related, if it were just for the fact that until the 1980s, most television reports and documentaries were still shot on film. By following the connections between film and television, one can reveal some of their dynamics, and compare their respective take on certain social issues that they have addressed.

Whereas the classification in terms of documentary or other specific media categories might sometimes be problematic, this also applies to their classifications in terms of avant-garde, art and *auteur*. The reasons for commissioned productions are usually social or economic, rather than personal or artistic²⁵. A film that is conventional in its style, however, may still be challenging otherwise. Even in the case of films that are idiosyncratic in their *mise-en-scene* or that show a clear sign of artistic expressivity, the paradigm of the *auteur* might still not explain how they have come about. The fact that such films, too, are embedded in an environment, and part of communication processes between different agents, requires different factors to be taken into account. This raises certain methodological problems. Textual analysis is no longer sufficient. Instead, a methodology has to be developed that links the aesthetic to the social-economic factors in a concrete and demonstrable way.

Rather than drawing up a corpus *a priori*, it appeared to me to be more relevant to examine various media productions and practices that had been left unnoticed before, to see to what extent they have played a role in the development of the city. Discovering networks, drawing links, and following the transmissions through them leads to unknown places, objects

²⁴ For a similar argument in the case of science films, vis-à-vis documentaries or 'non-fiction', see: Boon, 2008: 1.

²⁵ Cf. Boon, 2008: 4-5.

and people. It suggests the existence of an ‘exploded cinema’ or ‘postcinema’ before it was called that, as something that was not a marginal corollary of the cinema, but that actually belonged to its core right from the start. It includes film screenings at industry fairs, in factories, in museums and at schools²⁶. With such a broadening of the view, many more audiovisual formats come to the fore as well, from slideshows and the amateur 8mm film to the expensive format of widescreen 70mm, from live television broadcasting and telerecording to videocassettes and wired on-demand transmissions.

The variety of research material, however, causes methodological and practical problems, not least because of the sheer quantity. Whereas I initially had the intention to consider the history of films about Rotterdam from its beginning to the present, when I still had no idea about the actual numbers of films that had been made, it occurred to me later that some historical limitations were inevitable. I have decided to confine myself to the period from the 1920s to the 1970s, which still encompasses an estimated five to six thousand productions. I present this period in three chronological parts – while leaving space for ‘temporal differentiation’ or overlaps within the different chapters. This period roughly coincides with the heydays of modernity and modernism, as a social condition and as a set of movements and ideas, respectively. The chosen time frame has been motivated not least by the observation that in the 1920s cinema became increasingly important within culture and society, while it reinforced its connection with the city. It was also the period in which modern architecture and planning came to the fore and new ideas and technologies were explored. Since the 1920s, the city has changed rapidly. This was accelerated by WWII, and continued afterwards at an ever-increasing pace. In the 1970s, modernism became severely criticised; theoretically it came to a halt. New urban developments followed and, along with it, media as public or policy instruments took on new roles. Moreover, the media landscape itself changed too, which prepared the grounds for the media saturated society in which we live today.

In this way I try to investigate the emergence of the modern city, how it has been framed, and how it can be conceptualised, across the discourses of ‘modernity’ and ‘media’. Architecture historian Hilde Heynen (1999: 12) has made a distinction between transitory and programmatic concepts of modernity. Transitory concepts reside in the ‘new and now’, in ongoing change and the momentary, innovation and the revolt against tradition. Programmatic concepts are, alternatively, associated with progress, emancipation, liberation, and often conceived of as a *project*. Transitory modernity may inherently cause temporal complexity, but in the end this also counts for programmatic modernity, due to social and spatial programmes and plans that imply assumptions and expectations concerning the future. Especially after WWII, plans were made for the city of the future, which envisioned nothing less than a new society based on modern communities. As such the future was already part of the historical present, and vice versa. Temporal loops are integral part of the modernist project. With films participating in this project, the question emerges as to how they relate to such temporal complications. Should cinema likewise be understood in terms of recurrent patterns and suspended or accelerated developments? Should productions be approached in terms of ‘events’, as part of communication processes, and are particular films merely versions or series of some kind? How has this, in turn, affected the social-cultural processes and spatial developments at stake?

commissioned films

Since much of the corpus consists of commissioned films, we may consider a number of recent studies on this subject. Elizabeth Lebas (2000) has observed that many British municipal films, especially from before WWII, concern issues of health and body politics, which immediately relate to modernist ideas on social housing²⁷. Complex issues were visualised and made

²⁶ Cf. Lebas, 2000: 140.

²⁷ Cf. Boon, 2008: 145-150 (a.o.).

comprehensible through films in order to instruct people, in town halls, clinics, courtyards etc. They were part of a modernisation process, but, as she has argued, 'these were not films *about* modern living, but *for* modern living' (p141). Regarding municipal films from Glasgow, from the 1920s to the 1970s (2005, 2007), she has articulated, moreover, a correspondence between municipal films and a progressive political agenda of modernisation, which may be observed in Rotterdam too.

Besides municipal films, there are 'industrial films' to be considered, which have become the subject of an emerging debate among film scholars. An impetus to it was a study by Thomas Elsaesser (2005b) on historical films about construction and housing related to *Das Neue Frankfurt*: a housing programme of the city of Frankfurt, directed by Ernst May, which turned into a multidisciplinary avant-garde movement that gained notice through its magazine (1926-1931). Elsaesser argues that different strategies were followed in order to achieve modernisation, which were successful even though there was at first sight no direct convergence of approaches between the avant-gardes of architecture and cinema. The films in question often followed the argumentative and aesthetic schemes of industrial films, rather than those of avant-garde cinema. Films served particular purposes, and were shown to different audiences, on different occasions. Elsaesser has therefore suggested (2005b: 383) to explore three As: *Auftraggeber* (commissioner), *Anlass* (reason), *Anwendung* (use). Irrespective of the 'artistic quality', many examples of 'applied cinema' only make sense when taking into account to whom they were of interest, and why they were made. What purposes were served, how have they been used, on what occasions and in which settings, and what has been their role within the processes at stake? By linking the three As to one another, and those of similar productions, extensive crossdisciplinary networks emerge. They show 'the social life of images', in accordance to 'the social life of things' (Appadurai, 1986²⁸).

In the case of *Das Neue Frankfurt*, film promoted modernity along with various other media. Therefore Elsaesser has coined the concept of *Medienverbund* (2005b: 391). It is the way different media, including film, photography, printed matter, design and architecture, are strategically applied to reinforce each other, following a similar agenda. Various connections between the arts, industry and politics may hence come to the fore, which empowered different 'actors' and forged alliances for each occasion²⁹.

The concept of the three As has informed the book *Filmische Mittel, industrielle Zwecke* (2007), edited by the film scholars Vinzenz Hediger and Patrick Vonderau, including a number of studies that explicitly address the relationship between cinema and city³⁰. Elaborating on the three As they have argued that industrial films may subsequently be framed by considering three Rs: Record, Rhetorics, and Rationalization³¹. They too have emphasised that the *auteur* paradigm is not appropriate³². This does not degrade the work of the filmmaker. On the contrary, by framing the actual conditions, restrictions and requirements, we might actually get a better understanding of the solutions and achievements established by the makers. This also counts for cameramen or producers, for example, and all others involved. Industrial films developed their own conventions (Hediger and Vonderau, 2007: 11³³). They were of an exceptionally high level, like any other means of production, serving industrial objectives, even though they have not been canonised by

²⁸ This volume concerns a collection of essays; besides the work of Appadurai, one might especially consider the contribution by Kopytoff.

²⁹ Cf. Elsaesser, 2007: 39/51; Hagener, 2005.

³⁰ This concerns above all towns that have been identified with particular companies or industries such as Zlin (related to Bata'), Jena (Carl Zeiss), Mo I Rana (Norsk Jernverk) – see resp. Szczepanik, 2007; Hagener, 2007; Sørenssen.

³¹ Hediger and Vonderau (2007: 22) have pointed to the fact, that already in 1914, George L. Cox addressed that industrial films dealt with 5 Ms: Means, Materials, Machines, Markets and Men. This text is part of their volume (Cox, 2007 [1914]).

³² Hediger & Vonderau, 2007: 11.

³³ Cf. in the same volume: Hediger, 2007: 22.

film critics, theorists and historians. This is partly due to the ephemeral appearance of these films, since they were often made for a specific moment, event and audience. As Hediger and Vonderau state, there is much to be discovered in company archives, to understand the role of film in overall production processes; such films illuminate the rhetorical and functional qualities of cinema and its role in society at large. Moreover, they argue, this does not belong to the margins of cinema, if the budgets alone were to be considered. In fact, they have formed the backbone of national film production in many countries, such as the Netherlands³⁴.

Industrial films had their own circuits for distribution, including special industrial film festivals with their own awards and rewards. One of them was organised, for the first time in 1960, by the employers' federation *Conseil des Fédérations Industrielles d'Europe* (CIFE)³⁵. Each year this prestigious event was hosted by a different country and member of the federation. It created its own circuit and network, for filmmakers and businessmen to meet. One could learn here about other companies, and how they manifested (i.e. promoted and represented) themselves. The Netherlands have always been prominently present at such events, and various films dealing with Rotterdam have won prizes.

Already in 1960, the Dutch critic and (script) writer Jan Blokker remarked that the achievements of applied cinema were little known outside its own circles, despite its energy, working spirit and discipline of form, which were, as he said, only exceptionally still present in the big world of fiction film production. He predicted, moreover, that the film historian of the future would discover and recognise the private firms, municipal commissioners and governmental bodies as the great sponsors of cinema in the period after 1950³⁶. This seems applicable to Rotterdam, also in the case of artistic experiments and feature films. It should even be possible to extend Elsaesser's theoretical and methodological concept of the three As to cinema in general. Since any kind of film promotes a particular register of values, it may always be, in the end, a matter of 'applied cinema'.

the urban environment – economy, culture, society

The approaches discussed here touch upon concerns from the social sciences and social-economic history, especially where one observes a convergence between economy and culture. A particular reference is the book *On Hollywood* by economic geographer Allen J. Scott. He states that it is 'the broad question of the commodification of culture, and [a concern] with the ways in which basic physical conditions of production and the symbolic content of outputs are intertwined with one another in the modern economy' (2005: xi-xii). However, there remains an asymmetry in the approaches. For Scott, Hollywood is of interest as an industrial cluster, as *Standort*³⁷, whose productive fabric coincides more or less with the urban fabric. Rotterdam is a different case. Production arrangements are crucial here too, but only to illuminate the relationship of the films

³⁴ Hogenkamp, 2003: 179/282, cf. Zimmermann (2007: 55), for the example of Switzerland.

³⁵ For general information on this federation: www.eurofound.europa.eu > employer organisations (2008-05-15). The Dutch member is *Verbond Nederlandse Ondernemingen* (VNO). Besides its participation in the festival, it also organised special screenings of Dutch films. The Dutch contribution was selected by a jury that consisted of representatives from the *Nederlandse Bioscoopbond*, *Nederlandse Beroepsvereniging van Filmers*, companies with film services, and the minister of culture (CRM). In 1970 the CIFE established a permanent committee for the production and distribution of industrial films, with its secretary based in Rome. Ref.: 'Succes in Florence' (anon. magazine, Sept. 1970), personal archive Joop Burcksen.

³⁶ Original quote: 'Als propaganda- of louter als communicatiemiddel leidt de film een wonderlijk besloten leven: naar buiten vrijwel onbekend, binnen haar eigen bestaan daarentegen vervuld van een bedrijvigheid, een werkdrijf en een hoge mate van vormdiscipline, die in de grote wereld van de speelfilmindustrie alleen nog maar bij uitzondering voorkomen. Wie in later jaren de zoveelste geschiedenis van de film wil schrijven zal vermoedelijk op de veilige afstand die de tijd voor hem geschapen heeft, achter het filmbeoefenen van bijvoorbeeld de periode na 1950 veel scherper en duidelijker dan wij, niét de officiële producenten of filmproducerende firma's, maar de particuliere bedrijven, gemeentelijke opdrachtgevers en overheidslichamen als de grote "sponsors" van de filmkunst ontdekken en erkennen.' Blokker, 1960.

³⁷ *Standort – Tatort*, coined by Thomas Elasesser, lecture at the NIMK / Rietveld Academy, Amsterdam, 2004-02-18.

to *Tatort*, and to explain how they function within the city. Central here is the ontological question how media products and other creative achievements are enabled by the city in order, at the same time, to frame the city.

Notwithstanding the differences, some premises still hold. Scott depicts a place – in his case, a part of Los Angeles – and the way it generates values as a ‘system of socioeconomic interactions’, which constitute ‘an organized ecology of specialized but complementary production activities and labor tasks...’ (2005: xi-xii). He emphasises features of socio-economic agglomeration, such as mutual learning and synergy, which may be explicit in a cluster of similar firms, but which are also factors within urban development in general. Through so-called ‘Jacobs-externalities’, different sectors get interrelated and form an integral system. ‘The interpretation of the city as a layered system of structures is widely supported nowadays’, says sociologist Arnold Reijndorp in the ‘atlas of the cultural ecology of Rotterdam’ (2004)³⁸. This atlas has been presented as a methodology to frame developments in the city in terms of qualities and potentialities (p10). It both represents what the city is and what it can be, by a detailed mapping of differences, and by producing a comprehensive totality that is otherwise invisible (p11)³⁹. It does so by layering three sorts of maps that show the city’s morphology, the urban functions, and perspectives and dynamics.

This ecological approach goes back, though unacknowledged, to the *Theory of Culture Change* (1955) of the American anthropologist Julian Steward (1902-1972). Elaborating on Alfred Kroeber’s environmental possibilism, Steward coined the term ‘cultural ecology’ and called it ‘a method for recognizing the ways in which culture change is induced by adaptation to environment’ (1976 [1955]: 5). History and the environment set restrictions on possible directions for development, which tends to strengthen itself. In the case of Rotterdam, historian Paul van de Laar has reflected upon something like this in a television programme on historical promotion films (VERGETEN VERHALEN, 2005, Harm Korst, TV Rijnmond)⁴⁰. He notices that films from the 1950s promoted a city of labour, which caught on. In the 1970s, when the image of the city was changing, a tension appeared between content and message, or what the city was and how it was envisioned, as a city of culture and leisure. He concludes ‘that the image of the city of labour is so strong, that even when Rotterdam wants to get rid of it, it is hardly possible, and probably you need to make peace with it’⁴¹. It is a reconsideration of his thesis from the book *Stad van Formaart* (2000), which says that Rotterdam has developed from a *transitopolis* around 1900, to a city of labour, to a city of culture today.

The theory of cultural ecology has mainly been applied to rural communities⁴², and disappeared in recent years, but Steward himself has also indicated how it applies to urban development. While industrialisation brought national institutions and modern culture (including motion pictures, as Steward remarks), towns grew and their importance *vis-à-vis* the state

³⁸ Original quote: ‘De interpretatie van de stad als een gelaagd systeem van structuren wordt inmiddels wijd gedragen’ (Reijndorp, 2004: 14). Cf. Salingaros, 2005, and Marshall, 2009, which are both urban studies that understand cities as evolutionary, complex systems, akin to ecosystems.

³⁹ It attempts to do so by three series of maps of contemporary Rotterdam, drawn by NEXT architects. The first are ‘base’ maps, concerning the urban morphology, which pay attention to private and public spaces. The second are ‘inventory’ maps, concerning urban functions, indicating sites of different social-cultural and economic activities, such as shopping, knowledge exchange, and cultural production, including film and architecture. The third are ‘perspective’ maps, about the urban dynamics, which encompass flows of people, transformations, and parochial domains, among other factors. These three series of maps show different, increasingly complex layers of the urban cultural ecology.

⁴⁰ I.e. HOUEN ZO! (1952, Herman van der Horst), THAT MOST LIVING CITY (1954, Walter Smith), EEN WANDELING DOOR ROTTERDAM (1955, Joop Burcksen), ROTTERDAM (1962, Eimert Kruidhof), STERSPOT ROTTERDAM (1975, Toonder).

⁴¹ Original quote: ‘Naar mate het Rotterdamse imago aan het veranderen is, zo vanaf de jaren zeventig, dan zie je toch dat er meer spanning komt tussen de inhoud en de boodschap. Naar mijn idee heeft dat te maken met dat het imago van de werkstad zo sterk is, dat of Rotterdam er nou vanaf wil of niet, dat bijna niet mogelijk is, en misschien moet je daar vrede mee hebben.’

⁴² Cf. Moran, 1990; McNetting, 1990; Rappaport, 1990.

increased. Steward has distinguished five major categories of functions that cities fulfil in modern society at large; they became centres for: marketing, public facilities, commercial services, political and religious organisations, and the distribution of mass media (Steward, 1976 [1955]: 211). These functions also changed the internal composition of towns. New segments of classes and sociocultural groups appeared. How this manifested per city appears to be different, if we just compare Hollywood and Rotterdam. I will therefore consider the various social-cultural and economic institutions in Rotterdam that are mapped by Van de Laar (a.o.), and the networks that have enabled them⁴³.

Along with the appearance of new institutions and social groups, and an increasing complexity as a result of it, their overall integration takes place at a higher level, that of a city, a country or a commonwealth. The notion of 'integration' points to the degree of coherence between sociocultural institutions within the particular level of the ecology. At the highest level a common denominator can be found, but at lower levels differentiation is reinforced. This is a double movement⁴⁴. According to Steward, it is effected by three major factors (ibid, 49-50): education, participation in national institutions, and mass media. To some extent they transmit 'standardized and syndicated ideals of behavior', but there is also a subcultural repatterning of meaning.

For each audiovisual production, from blockbusters to 'media of microcultures' (Hannerz, 1992: 85), one may identify the relationships that enable it and the systemic level to which it relates. To whom is it of interest, and at what level does its vision or information apply or have consequences? In this perspective, subcultures may be taken into account, among them different professional organisations and interest groups. To identify them within a cultural ecology is a matter of drawing networks within networks. As the Swedish anthropologist Ulf Hannerz has it (1992: 99): 'we see subcultures as clusterings of perspectives; variously clearly bounded, sometimes nesting in one another, sometimes crosscutting; in some places rich in content and form, in other places poor in the same respects....'

Hannerz locates different subcultures within a common environment, for which he uses the term 'habitat': 'the habitats of different agents may overlap either more or less, within the landscape as a whole; and the habitat is emergent and transitory. It is not by definition linked to a particular territory' (Hannerz, 1996: 48). We should keep that in mind when thinking of a city like Rotterdam. Elaborating on it, Hannerz coins his concept of the 'global ecumene'. For this he refers to Alfred Kroeber, who used (in 1945) the term *oikoumene* of the ancient Greeks, being 'the entire inhabited world as the Greeks then understood it' (Hannerz, 1996: 7). Hannerz defines the global ecumene as 'an open fairly densely networked landscape', in which culture gets organised (1996: 50). It is, I would argue, directly related to the theory of cultural ecology, and also to Scott's economic geography. Since the Greek *oikos* means house, the 'ecumene' is the habitat, 'ecology' its organisation, and 'economy' its management.

Cultural ecology informs a methodology based on networks. Instead of an *agent – structure* divide, it invokes a sense of relationality⁴⁵. It corresponds to Hannerz's ideas of a networked landscape, with networks within networks. Levels of social organisation do not exist on top of each other; they exist within one another, through situational involvements (Hannerz, 1980: 172). Within complex society, one performs different roles within different situations. Through such individual involvements, links are made, alliances arise, positions may shift, and opposed forces may join.

⁴³ As indicated by, among others, De Klerk (1998), and Dicke e.a. (2003).

⁴⁴ See also: Jameson (1992), considering the overall mechanisms and the individual experience; Strauss & Quinn (1997: 4), following Bakhtin, concerning centripetal and centrifugal forces that enable cultural reproduction / thematicity next to cultural variation / inconsistency / change; Augé (1999: 5): planetarization / universalization being paralleled by individualization / particularization.

⁴⁵ Cf. Castells, 1996 [networks within networks]; Latour, 1997; Riles, 2000: 62-64, Urry, 2003: 122 [relationality]

The proposed methodology is a matter of tracing such involvements and alliances in respect of film productions. It is a matter of following the links between the content of films and the environment in which they are made and released, through the connections between artefacts and people. Beyond networks, however, are values that are transmitted, through collective cognitive operations, and the changes they bring about. I will therefore keep in mind what sociologist John Urry has called a theory of 'reflexive modernization' (2003: 139). Urry says that social processes are increasingly monitored through science and expert systems, as well as aesthetic-expressive systems. In this perspective, culture is a matter of collective learning, which is said to be crucial for society as a complex system (e.g. Conti, 2005; Fleener, 2005). A particular problem that emerges here, however, as addressed by sociologist Niklas Luhmann (1997), concerns the way a society registers and evaluates its own achievements, and how this enables further development. In the course of this thesis I will come back to Luhmann, and try to elaborate on these ideas through specific cases.

a note on the practice of research

For each period under consideration, I have made extensive inventories of titles of audiovisual productions that concerned Rotterdam and urban development. This has been carried out through filtering the catalogues of the principal film archives, and by adding titles of (missing) films that are known from other records. The choice of subject-headings and subjects that I will discuss, and hence the design of the chapters, is based on the main issues as they appeared from examining the available material.

One should notice, though, that over the course of my research, there has been a revolutionary development in the management and accessibility of databases. Illustrative is the case of the *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam*. When I first visited it, early 2003, the film 'database' was a paper catalogue with only titles and dates, which were not always correct, and which were ordered according to the way the films had entered the archive. There was one monitor with a VHS player in a corner of the general reading room. Tapes could be ordered by filling in forms, and it took about 20 minutes before they were brought. There is now an online database with various ways to search for titles. They can be watched at a special studio with various sets, and one can take the tapes or discs from the shelves oneself. The case of *Beeld & Geluid* in Hilversum is comparable. The *Nederlands Filmmuseum* (Eye) in its turn, has no online database yet. In the meantime other databases have appeared that offer access to films online (e.g. *Het Geheugen van Nederland*), but the number of titles relevant to my case is still rather limited. Due to the rapid changes, new data have come to the fore up until the end of writing my thesis, and new data will no doubt be found afterwards, which may offer new insights that hopefully can contribute to my overall argument, whether by strengthening it or providing further nuances.

For research, the databases are of crucial importance. Through some broad search keys, derived from preliminary impressions and the literature about the city, it is possible to observe major concerns and discern general patterns through the sheer quantities of data that are available. Such an approach is refined step-by-step. When selections of films are made, which are subsequently watched in the archive, the approach turns from quantitative to qualitative. Aesthetic features are taken into consideration, which, in turn, offer data to trace network connections. This leads to other databases, among them architectural ones – in particular that of *Stichting Bonas*, which is related to the *Nederlands Architectuur instituut*. It offers references to publications, actual places, and the people involved. People who are no longer alive may be represented through booklets and newspaper articles, and archive documents such as letters or notes. For more recent periods the people involved may, next to these sources, still speak for themselves. They can indicate reasons and motivations, reveal values and refer to the conditions that have enabled to create the objects at issue. This provides more links to be traced, and the cycle can be repeated again.

The sequence from database to films to places to people, and back again, is a basic model. In practice, many such sequences are followed simultaneously, which affect one another. It implies an ongoing movement between levels of analysis and abstraction, between quantitative and structural approaches through the databases, and qualitative and individualised approaches in the case of tracing connections and interactions. Although databases are once and again consulted, they themselves, like any other carrier of information, also affect directions of research. It may sometimes be relevant to know how the films or the data have entered the archive, and why things have been classified in the way they are. Through frequent use one develops an awareness of criteria and what may be possible to use as search keys.

However sophisticated databases may be, they are never complete. Moreover, files can have been modified for various reasons, or data may not be accurate. Databases give descriptions, which are useful for the first stage of research. But one should always keep in mind that for every title much more is hidden: the production histories, the potentials, and hence the options, choices and hesitations of those that have been involved. Hidden are also the effects that films might have had on spectators or users, the filmmakers themselves or on others. Such factors have somehow affected the thing itself. Once the situations are communicated and recreated, through the makers or their 'representatives', the objects come alive and potentials reappear. This has especially happened through the film series 'Rotterdam Classics' (since 2007), which I have compiled for the *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam* and theatre Lantaren/Venster. The public screenings have led to encounters with unknown spectators, filmmakers, representatives of institutions and others.

outline of the book

In order to visualise the architecture of my script I have imagined it as a kind of building in which the three periods constitute large domes, which are connected through recurrent themes that are corridors and elevators. However, it is probably more appropriate to imagine it as a city with three districts containing buildings from different periods. Each of the three districts is preceded by a prologue, a gateway, which is intended to provide some relevant data and to mark a point of departure. The districts lie around a common area, which is the port. The port is addressed in various chapters of Part I (ch. 2, 4, 5), and it is the subject of particular chapters of Part II and III (ch. 6, 14 and 15). People live all over this city, but there is a special 'residential quarter' that has grown over the years: this is the issue of social housing that is linked to social engagement (part of ch. 5, 9, 16). There is a common ground for events, which in themselves have addressed major concerns of their time (ch. 3, 10, 13). There are conceptual vehicles that connect the Parts, through issues of motion and mobility, avant-garde movements and industrial activities. There are other issues that appear occasionally, such as greenery, domestic life, education, sports, fine arts or literature. They do create spaces that provide shortcuts to move back and forth, but in terms of media and urban development they might possibly be extended beyond the scope of my thesis.

Part I – The Emergence of a Cinematic City, Rotterdam in the 1920s & 1930s

In Chapter 1 ('The Emergence of Cinema in Rotterdam'), I address the developments that preceded the period under investigation, as a background to the next chapters. In the early years, production was closely related to exhibition, which I frame through ideas of clustering and agglomeration. After 1920 specialisation occurred, which was then reinforced by sound film. In Chapter 2 ('Film, Architecture, City') I consider the avant-garde movements of both architecture and cinema. In Rotterdam these were related, which is exemplified by Ivens's *THE BRIDGE*. It has been studied by many for its innovative form and vision. In my turn I link it to the social-cultural networks through which it emerged, as well as other productions. Next to that I consider, among others, films on the Van Nelle factory. Through it I show connections between avant-garde productions and industrial films, which promoted modernity in their own way. In this perspective I also discuss construction films, as well as the issue of movement.

In Chapter 3 ('Events'), I relate different kinds of events to urban space and cinema, from sports games and aviation shows to the international industry exhibition Nenijs to that exemplifies the idea of *Medienverbund*. Various industrial films were shown there, including films by the Hungarian cinematographer Andor von Bary, to whom I dedicate the next chapter (4). Much of his work has remained unnoticed so far, since it did not correspond to the *auteur* paradigm. It has nevertheless played a role in the development of Rotterdam, especially the port. Whereas the social-economic significance of film is highlighted, there is still a personal side to it, which also touches upon the issue of contingency.

In Chapter 5, finally, I elaborate on the issue of a 'shared agenda', which is focused on social engagement. Special attention is given to housing projects, first of all those by J.J.P. Oud, and the way film helped to create the envisioned modern environment. Particularly important has been the municipal Schoolbioscoop, next to the avant-garde and companies that produced films for unions and other social organisations.

Part II – The Cinematic Reconstruction of a City, Rotterdam in the 1940s & 1950s

With WWII and the destruction of Rotterdam, a new phase of urban development started: the period of reconstruction. Much attention has been paid to its planning and architecture. I address the role of film in this process, which helped to communicate, to support and to develop the plans. However, in Chapter 6 ('Gate to the World') I will start with the port, which received priority. The early reconstruction films and newsreels did indeed concern the port, and for many years it remained the main subject of cinematic Rotterdam. The port connected the city to the world again, and film exemplified that, through reports on the navy, films that promoted shipping and industry, and films that showed the possibility of emigration. The port and its industry enabled film productions, while the two realms shared values of modernisation.

Ideas for the reconstruction of the city were already developed by the business elite during the war, which is discussed in Chapter 7 ('The Appearance of a New City'). Cinema played a role in its first stage, but it became soon a hidden affair. After the war publicity became important again, to generate support for the plans. The war accelerated modernisation, which paid off in the 1950s. Rotterdam became a model city, and film helped to create this image, as we will see in chapter 8 ('A Model to Communicate the City'). Important were Polygoon's newsreels, municipal promotion films, and Marshal films, including Van der Horst's *STEADY!* I address links between *Standort* and *Tatort*, through the 'porosity' of urban systems, while film production gradually recovered in Rotterdam.

Visions on social organisation were articulated by architects, planners, industrialists and filmmakers alike. This affected the city centre as well as the new suburbs, which are the focus of Chapter 9 ('Extended City'). One was concerned with building communities through a new spatial and economic order. In the perspective of the agglomeration of Rotterdam, things are exemplified through the case of Vlaardingen.

Various issues from the preceding chapters come together in Chapter 10 ('To animate the city'). It deals with large events, in particular Ahoy' and E55. They accompanied the reconstruction, for which various media were used, to animate the city.

Part III – The Cinematic Proliferation of a City, Rotterdam in the 1960s & 1970s

The process of modernisation that took place after WWII accelerated in the 1960s-1970s, not least in terms of audiovisual media. The image of the city diversified. This is articulated in Chapter 11, on 'Developing Compositions'. The new city became a living entity made out of a multitude of components, spatially and socially, which was reinforced by an influx of immigrants. This was paralleled by the bifurcation of media, which became an ever greater part of urbanism, through municipal informational films, artistic films, and municipal collaborations on fiction films and (foreign) television productions. Foreign productions may be little known in the city itself, but they helped to achieve its ambitions abroad. The role of television is further

elaborated through the case of the 'Open Studio', which anchored media practices in Rotterdam, next to news reports on national television.

The counterpart of the mosaic and its interactions was the straightforward design of transportation systems to regulate urban flows. In Chapter 12 ('The Structure of Motion'), it is exemplified by the media coverage of the developing metro, ring road, and airport, and, through a separate chapter, the port (ch. 13. 'Anchoring Film and Television'). Documentaries and newsreels heralded them as hallmarks of modernisation, but gradually resistance grew, which was reflected by film and television too. The arena of public opinion is highlighted in Chapter 14 ('Striking Development'), with promotional films about containerisation and television newsreels addressing the strikes in the port in the 1970s. The presence of television here is also an instance of 'developing compositions'.

Like the previous period, the economic conditions and the construction of the city's infrastructure were accompanied by large events to animate the city (ch. 15, 'The Urban Medium'). This too was subject to proliferation, from the Floriade and the C'70 to the new Ahoy' hall, the Holland Pop Festival, and finally the international film festival. Different forces came finally to the fore in the 1970s, which are discussed in the last chapter (Ch. 16. 'Re/Visions'). Revisions of functionalism made their way through the 1960s. More drastic changes were effected by the urban renewal movement, which criticised planning practices and propelled citizen participation. Media played a role in it, and video in particular. This, however, was anything but a clear development, since opposed visions emerged, which brought new challenges and opportunities to the urban system.

Through this script I hope to present Rotterdam as a template next to those of Frankfurt, Glasgow and Hollywood, in the way they have been presented by Elsaesser, Lebas and Scott, in order to understand the social role of cinema, and especially how it has contributed to urban development. Elaborating on this question, I try to answer why and how various productions dealing with Rotterdam have come into being. Through the relationship between film and the built environment I also make an attempt to frame architecture, planning and media production as part of broader social-cultural processes. I do so through a methodology based on network connections and transmissions that have left certain traces, which might hopefully offer a model to other studies too. Intertwined with these objectives is the aim to give an idea of the film history of Rotterdam, and hence of the city, with its particularities and qualities that have informed the different chapters as indicated. It may help to understand the current condition of Rotterdam as a city of media and of architecture, and in more general terms, to understand different kinds of little known factors within urban development. Dealing with a specific period of history, finally, I also attempt to contribute to a historiographical model that can grasp complex network dynamics and the way time is framed by them. It may open up ways to uncover recurrent patterns of potentialities, and to establish links between developments through time.

PART I.

THE EMERGENCE OF A CINEMATIC CITY ROTTERDAM IN THE 1920s & 1930s

PROLOGUE TO PART I

the position of Rotterdam

In the 1920s and 1930s, Rotterdam had about 550,000 inhabitants, while another 200,000 people or so lived in the rest of the agglomeration⁴⁶. It was the second city of the Netherlands, but the most modern, according to art historian Roman Koot (2001: 21). He has presented various cases to substantiate this claim: the port, the housing projects by J.J.P. Oud, the Van Nelle factory by Brinkman & Van der Vlugt (1925-1930), Joris Ivens's film *THE BRIDGE* (1928), the new typography of Paul Schuitema, Piet Zwart and others, and examples of *Nieuwe Zakelijkheid* in literature, such as Ben Stroman's novel *Stad* (1932). Rotterdam came across as a metropolitan whirlpool. Such an image was actively propagated, partly to make a difference with Amsterdam that relied upon its 17th century status. We should realise, however, that Rotterdam at that time was as a historic city too, not so refined as Amsterdam, but also with small alleys, canals, old warehouses and mansions – which were certainly not forgotten in promotional booklets. As such, the city was also shown, for example, in the Pathé film *ROTTERDAM, LA VENISE DU NORD* (1923)⁴⁷. Amsterdam, on the other hand, was host to the modern movement as well.

In order to get an appropriate idea of Rotterdam, its character, and how it looked like, I refer to three architects who wrote about Rotterdam in *De 8 & Opbouw* (1936/9). Willem van Tijen remarked that Rotterdam used to be reluctant to implement any kind of regulation. There were extreme contrasts, everything could exist next to each other, and everybody had a chance to express oneself. Vitality is enclosed in this clash of views, which brought Van Tijen to the conclusion that:

Rotterdam is actually too liberal to be really able to organise itself. Maybe it is therefore, that it suffers so fiercely from the crisis. However, it is also freer and more real in its ugliness and unconcernedness than other cities. // Who works here in the sense of order and functionality, will always painfully encounter the diametrically opposed character of the city. However, here as well he will always undergo a spur and an incentive of a vehemence that he will hardly experience anywhere else⁴⁸.

A similar image was drawn by W. van Gelderen, who started with a brief general introduction, in staccato style, like a radio reporter (p100):

Rotterdam, the city without tradition, the city where provincialism reigns supreme, but where sometimes one can descry something of metropolitan radiation. As a big city grown rapidly in a short time, living by the grace of "the harbour". There is continuously construction next to destruction. Architectural expressions, their time far ahead, next to hovels and ruins, which would be removed even in an expired city. // Rotterdam, where the ideas of *Het Nieuwe Bouwen* found attention: where 'Oud-Mathenesse' and 'De Kiefhoek' could be built at a time that in other Dutch cities one declared such expressions as the end of art and good taste⁴⁹.

⁴⁶ On 1920-01-01, Rotterdam counted 506,024 inhabitants; 1930-01-01: 586,285; 1940-01-01: 619,527 – ref. *Rotterdams Jaarboekje* (1921, 1931, 1941), W.L. & J. Brusse / Gemeentearchief Rotterdam. The second largest municipality in the agglomeration has been that of Schiedam: 1916-05-31: 37,050 inhabitants; 1942-12-31: 66,262 – ref. Historische Vereniging Schiedam <http://scyedam.delinea.nl/kaleida/pagina.php?id=2002853> (2008-10-22)

⁴⁷ Through 9.5mm copies (*Pathé Baby*, 1923), it was distributed for home screenings, in the Netherlands and abroad.

⁴⁸ Van Tijen, 1936: 99. Original quote: 'Rotterdam is wel te liberaal, om zich ooit werkelijk te kunnen ordenen. Misschien is het ook daarom, dat het zoo fel onder de crisis lijdt. Het is echter ook vrijer en waarachtiger in zijn leelijkheid en onbehouwenheid dan andere steden. // Wie hier werkt in de zin van orde en functionaliteit, zal het diametraal tegengestelde karakter van de stad altijd pijnlijk ondervinden. Hij zal hier echter ook altijd een prikkel en een aansporing ondergaan van een heftigheid, die hij vrijwel nergens anders zoo zal ervaren.'

⁴⁹ Van Gelderen, 1936: 100. Original quote: 'Rotterdam, de stad zonder traditie, de stad waar provincialisme hoogtij viert, doch waar af en toe iets van wereld-stad-allure te bespeuren valt. Als grote stad in korte tijd snel gegroeid, levend bij de gratie van "de haven". Voortdurend is er opbouw naast afbraak. Architectuur-uitingen, hun tijd ver vooruit, naast

Van Gelderen too emphasised that there is no clear direction, which allows for experimentation and innovation. Quite different is the article “The City Without Art”, by Han van Loghem, who was the most critical about public space design and the role of planners. Van Loghem called for another attitude, and to change the relationship between policy and design practice.

Within a circle of kilometres around the centre, Rotterdam has been completely beaten out of its joints. What the water still could connect in the old city centre, what the planting of trees near the harbours still could cover – the bad architecture that was too much present – all of that was not possible anymore in most of our new residential quarters, where water is almost not needed anymore as a functional architectonic motive, and hence stayed away very rightly. But this reflecting surface that has been lost is not compensated by other values. In many cases the street is not much more than a stone tunnel, of which the omission of the roof still makes visible a scarce strip of light⁵⁰.

Even if Rotterdam might offer space for progressive experiments, the general outcome is a different one, Van Loghem concluded:

For one part, Rotterdam is being ruined because of banality, and nobody in the country will grieve, because one will never grieve about the banal. Or would finally, because of the necessity, something be able to wake up, which carries out above the banal?'

These quotes present Rotterdam at best as an urban laboratory, and at worst as an unwarranted, swelling urban mass. It might have been the most modern city of the Netherlands at that time, but it is a particular vision of either modernity or urbanism. So the question is, considering the realms that are important to my research, in which ways Rotterdam appeared as a modern city⁵¹.

the modernity of Rotterdam: harbour...

At the beginning of the 20th century, Rotterdam used to be a ‘transitopolis’ (Van de Laar, 2000: 10). Rotterdam had made a position for itself by its harbour, which was already one of the biggest of the world by the 1920s. This was due to its location in the delta of the rivers Maas and Rhine, which connect it to the European hinterland, and the German Ruhrgebiet in particular. The river that flows through Rotterdam, the *Nieuwe Maas*, used to be part of the Maas (‘Meuse’) until the 20th century, but due to canalisations and dams it became fed by water from the Rhine⁵². As a sea port Rotterdam became a gateway for the Netherlands for the transportation of people and goods to and from the colonies, America, and the rest of the world. The port affected all other

krotten en puinhopen, die zelfs in een gestorven stad verwijderd zouden worden. // Rotterdam, waar de ideeën van het Nieuwe Bouwen aandacht vonden: waar Oud-Mathenesse en de Kiefhoek gebouwd konden worden in een tijd, dat men in andere Hollandse steden dergelijke uitingen als het einde van kunst en goede smaak doodverfde.’

⁵⁰ Van Loghem, 1936: 104-105.

‘Rotterdam is binnen een kring van kilometres om het centrum geheel uit zijn voegen geslagen. Wat het water nog kon binden in de oude binnenstad, wat de boombeplanting aan de havens nog kon bedekken, wat aan slechte architectuur te veel aanwezig was, dat alles is niet meer mogelijk in de meeste onzer nieuwe wijken, waar het water bijna niet meer als functioneel architectuurmotief nodig is, en dus zeer terecht weg bleef. Maar die verloren spiegelende vlakte is niet gecompenseerd door andere waarden. In veel gevallen is de straat niet veel meer dan een stenen tunnel, waarvan door de weglating van het dak nog een schaarse streep lucht zichtbaar is.’ (p104) Next quote (conclusion):

‘Rotterdam gaat mede door banaliteit ten gronde en niemand in het land zal treuren, want over het banale wordt nooit getreurd. Of zou eindelijk door den nood nog iets wakker kunnen worden, dat boven het banale uitvoert?’ (p105)

⁵¹ Whereas I consider film in connection to architecture and urban development, other realms will get less attention notwithstanding their possible role in the development of Rotterdam. This counts, for example, for painting, and the artist organisations *De Branding* (1917-1926) and R’33 (founded by Hermann Bieling), which also maintained connections with artists abroad (e.g. Kurt Schwitters, Paul Klee, Franz Marc, Alexander Archipenko, Constantin Brancusi) – see: Van de Laar, 2000: 375.

⁵² Cf. <http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rotterdam#Maasstad> > § ‘Maasstad’ (2008-11-17).

businesses in the city. It created an atmosphere of labour, travel and adventure. Moreover, the landscape of cranes, docks, bridges and processing industries appeared as a futuristic city in itself.

The port informs Rotterdam's 'culture core', which is, according to Julian Steward, an elementary configuration of subsistence arrangements within a particular environment. This is clear when we follow the first step in Steward's (1955: 40) theory of cultural ecology, by analyzing 'the interrelationship of exploitative or productive technology and environment'. 'In an industrial world,' Steward said, 'capital and credit arrangements, trade systems and the like are crucial. Socially-derived needs – special tastes in foods, more ample housing and clothing, and a great variety of appurtenances of living – become increasingly important in the productive arrangement as culture develops; and yet these originally were probably more often effects of basic adaptations than causes' (ibid, 40). Major capital and credit arrangements in Rotterdam are related to the developments in the port, which also secure the employment to many people in the city, directly and indirectly, while next to it these developments cause a continuous influx of foreign people and goods. As a whole, this system depends on the way energy is provided. On the one hand, it is an energy concern to keep industrial processes going on. Coal used to be important in this respect, to produce gas and electricity. On the other hand, citizens need to be fed. For dairy products the city depends largely on the surrounding countryside, but for products, like cereals, fruit and coffee, the harbour plays an important role, for the city as well as the hinterland.

Where 'the milk meets the coffee', new modes of production, trade and consumption emerge. The development of different forms of exploitation influence each other, since they join infrastructures and co-evolve within the emerging urban culture. This can be analysed, as Steward has suggested secondly, by regarding 'the behavior patterns involved in the exploitation of a particular area by means of a particular technology' (ibid, 40). The behaviour patterns are derived from values of international trade, industrial progress and modernity, labour movements (unions and political organisations), and social welfare, including ideas on housing and planning. This constellation is accompanied by the development of shipping technologies, engineering, construction and planning methods. It requires specialised knowledge, skills and materials, and the know-how to get them. Media technologies are part of this complex too, linking up to ideas and behaviour patterns of the workers, as well as to those of the managerial elite.

'The third procedure is to ascertain the extent to which the behavior patterns entailed in exploiting the environment affect other aspects of culture' (ibid). In Rotterdam this involves a general culture of modernity. It has been accompanied, on the one hand, by ideas of civic culture, community development, and citizen participation, and on the other by international exchanges. Since Rotterdam has always been part of international networks, through its port and trade connections, it has been exposed to foreign influences, including the influx of immigrants. In turn, the city has exported its products to the world as well. As Hannerz (1992: 197) has it: 'urban cultural process involves a degree of openness', which means 'the entanglement of an urban center with wider systems' (ibid, 198). It concerns interaction with both the nearby countryside and other cities, and hence flows of people, goods and meanings; this is a complicating factor, especially when studying media. With increasing complexity, it is more difficult to understand if changes are caused by the environment or by 'historical factors' (in the words of Steward).

However, the diffusion of ideas, through 'historical factors', also took place *because* of the environment, since the port facilitated international connections. In this way Rotterdam has been open to the ideas of the international modern movement, which became embedded in its own cultural ecology. In its turn, Rotterdam propelled the 'processed' ideas into the world again, as a 'switchboard of culture' (Hannerz, 1996: 149). In either way, the port has offered possibilities for the development of architecture and cinema. I will explore them, and their mutual connections, as ways to observe and to recognise the different steps of the cultural ecology.

...architecture and design...

The port has been determinant for the development of Rotterdam's industrial architecture and housing projects. Ideas about it have been elaborated by the architecture association *Opbouw* ("Construction"), which was established in Rotterdam in 1920. Through the contacts of its members (e.g. Han van Loghem, J.J.P. Oud, Mart Stam), Rotterdam became a node within the international networks of the modern movement, which was reinforced by the connections of people like Van Nelle director C.H. van der Leeuw⁵³. Ideas circulating in the international arena were 'processed' and sent into the world again. Rotterdam turned into a 'switchboard of culture'.

A famous example of industrial architecture is the 'Van Nelle factory'. The growing demand for its products – coffee, tea and tobacco – allowed Van der Leeuw to actualise a new building (1925-1930), designed by the young architects Jan Brinkman and Leen van der Vlugt, with Mart Stam as a collaborator. This building shows an intertwining of economic, social, spiritual, technical and aesthetic values⁵⁴. With its concrete frame and steel-and-glass façade, it became an icon of Dutch modernism, praised by Le Corbusier a.o.⁵⁵. Brinkman & Van der Vlugt designed also a grain silo, another major industrial food processing facility in the port area, and as such we may also mention the modernist HAKA factory (1931-1932, H. Mertens)⁵⁶.

Regarding housing, important were the privately developed garden village 'Vreewijk' (1913, Granpré Molière e.a.), the municipal housing projects 'Spangen' (1919-1922, M. Brinkman) and those by J.J.P. Oud ('Hoek van Holland', 'De Kiefhoek' a.o.). After housing was left to private developers again, high-rise experiments were carried out (e.g. 'Bergpolderflat', W. van Tijen e.a.), next to experiments with open planning that integrated building and greenery (e.g. 'De Eendracht', 1929-1935, J. van den Broek). The most productive in the 1930s, but little known today, was architect Wim ten Bosch, who pragmatically applied modernist ideas⁵⁷. He and others contributed to a significant volume that enabled the modern cultural ecology to emerge, within the outlines drawn by Rotterdam's city planner Willem Witteveen⁵⁸. Much of it is shown by the film *ROTTERDAM EN HOE HET BOUWDE* ("Rotterdam and how it built", 1940), which Ten Bosch made himself in the late 1930s. It starts with animations and statistics on the growth of the port, emphasizing the need for appropriate social housing. A tribute is paid to Oud, but also to the mayors, city planners, architects, civil servants, and representatives of housing associations and unions. The film accompanied a book, which was co-authored by professor J.G. Wattjes, with photographs by Jan Kamman⁵⁹. This project became an 'officially approved' reading of the recent history of architecture and planning in Rotterdam⁶⁰. It sheds a more diffuse light on the avant-

⁵³ For these contacts and the role of Oud, see: Taverne e.a., 2001: 359.

⁵⁴ Cf. Livesey, 1999; Lambla, 1999.

⁵⁵ Cf. Koot, 2001: 35.

⁵⁶ Due to the economic crisis of the 1910s, Rotterdam tried to reduce its dependence on shipping, by investing in its industry. Cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 323.

⁵⁷ In the 1920s and 1930s he designed no less than 7484 dwellings in Rotterdam, besides various other kinds of buildings, see www.bonas.nl > biografische gegevens > Ten Bosch (2007-09-08). Thanks to Frits Stuurman.

⁵⁸ E.g. 'Uitbreidingsplan Zuid' and 'Uitbreiding Blijdorp', to which Ten Bosch contributed too. Witteveen became director of the department for urban development in 1931, where he had worked already, as an architect and as a planner, since 1924 (De Jong, 2001: 233).

⁵⁹ The book was partly structured by thematic 'city walks'. Whereas the film was actually kind of a city walk, the book, with photographs by Jan Kamman, provided a kind of storyboard.

⁶⁰ Wattjes was an internationally distinguished professor of architecture at Delft University, whose broad interest encompassed modern architecture too. The official status of the project was confirmed by Mayor P.J. Oud, who wrote the foreword of the book, while many other officials were presented in both the book and the film. For additional diagrams and animated maps, which gave the film a reliable appeal as well, Ten Bosch collaborated with film company Profilti. The film had its premiere at Museum Boymans on the 3rd of March 1940, as a prelude to an exhibition on the redevelopment of the former zoo area (arch. Jan Wils, see: Ten Bosch & Wattjes, 1940: 125). The film was also shown at *Bouwkunst en Vriendschap* (Atlanta building, 1940-04-05), with an introduction by chairman and city architect A. van der Steur, who mentioned that it 'stimulated voyages of discovery in one's own city' (*Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1940-04-06, 3/p2). Another show of the film took place in Amsterdam, at the established architects association

garde that got highlighted in later years⁶¹. Remarkable modernist buildings were presented here too, but also other projects that fulfilled major functions, such as airport ‘Waalhaven’ (1919-1921, Gemeentewerken), and ‘bearers of Rotterdam’s welfare’, particularly docks, sheds and terminals⁶². Attention was also paid to the development of the former private ‘Land van Hoboken’, as the location of the new Boymans Museum, by city architect A. van der Steur, the Unilever headquarters, and an office tower for the municipal electricity works (GEB)⁶³.

The evolving urban fabric encompassed various accommodations that contributed to Rotterdam’s modernity. Among them are the railway projects by Sybold van Ravesteyn, the trade centre (‘Beurs’, 1925-1940, J. Staal), the office tower ‘Erasmushuis’ (1938-1939, W. Dudok), as well as many prominent public buildings, such as hospitals and schools, whose designs remained relatively unknown⁶⁴. Rotterdam established its modern image also through its leisure facilities, in spite of its reputation of being a city of labour. Famous is the Feijenoord stadium (1934-1936, Brinkman & Van der Vlugt), which can be considered next to other suburban accommodations, among them various parks, airport ‘Waalhaven’ (for aviation shows), the ‘Nenijto’ complex (1928), and ‘Blijdorp zoo’ (1937-1941, S. van Ravesteyn). Such sites were the counterpart of the cafés and dance halls in the city centre, especially at the Hofplein and at the Coolingsingel (e.g. Loos, Pschorr, De Unie, Atlanta)⁶⁵. Next to them were shops⁶⁶, like those at the Hoogstraat, and department store ‘De Bijenkorf’ (1928-1930, W. Dudok) – another icon of modern Rotterdam. Cinema, finally, was a highly popular form of entertainment. By the mid 1920s there were about twenty-five cinemas in Rotterdam. Although they propelled modernity, their architecture has only marginally been studied⁶⁷. Further investigation in this respect, however, lies beyond the scope of this thesis. They are mentioned here as constituents of a critical mass of modern buildings across different categories, through which the well-known landmarks could emerge.

Along with architecture, Rotterdam became a stage for design. Jacob Jongert, working for Van Nelle, helped to popularise modern graphics. Industrial designer Willem Gispen started his own production company, which became known for its steel-tube furniture, such as Mart Stam’s famous cantilever chair ‘with two legs’. Gispen’s furniture was for sale at ‘De Bijenkorf’, which also organised exhibitions on art and design and had a special show house⁶⁸. Gispen’s

Architectura et Amicitia, on the 9th of May 1940, one day before the German invasion in the Netherlands. General source: www.bonas.nl > biografische gegevens > Ten Bosch (2008-06-17). Thanks to Frits Stuurman.

⁶¹ Cf. Michiel Roding, in his essay on Ten Bosch; www.bonas.nl > biografische gegevens > Ten Bosch (2007-09-08).

⁶² Ten Bosch & Wattjes, 1940: 152-168; the dependency of Rotterdam on the port is elaborated by considering the role of companies like Willem Ruys & Zonen, Rotterdamsche Lloyd, Wilton-Feijenoord, SHV, RDM, HAL, a.o.

⁶³ Ten Bosch & Wattjes, 1940: 69-82. The ‘Land van Hoboken’ was developed after a plan by Witteveen, and included the new museum Boymans (1928-1935) by city architect A. van der Steur, the Unilever headquarters (1930-1931, H. Mertens), the office of the municipal electricity enterprise (GEB, 1927-1931, Witteveen, Poot, Van der Steur), and various other buildings, among them a number of functionalist white villa’s, by Brinkman & Van der Vlugt, and others. For the development schemes of the Land van Hoboken, see also: Van de Laar: 2000: 298-299 + 355.

⁶⁴ See: Ten Bosch & Wattjes, 1940: for railway projects by Van Ravesteyn, see: p116 ‘Station Beurs’ (1930-1934), p91 ‘Station Feyenoord’ (1937), p102 ‘Station Delftsche Poort’ (1930s); for examples of service buildings, see: p54 ‘Raad van Arbeid’ (1932, Lockhorst & Hooykaas), ‘St. Homobonus’ (1938, Gerard Holt), for examples of hospitals, see p39 ‘Sophia Kinderziekenhuis’ (1930-1937, Posthumus Meyjes & Van der Linden), p115 ‘Havenziekenhuis’ (1930s, B.J.K. Cramer), p71 ‘Diaconessenhuis’ (1939, Brinkman & Van der Vlugt / Van den Broek); for schools see e.g.: ‘H.B.S. St. Franciscus’ (1920, P.G. Buskens, H. Sutterland – ref.: Bonas), p40 ‘Christelijke Ambachtsschool’ (1933, Jos de Jonge).

⁶⁵ See: Van der Velden, 2001. Well-known are ‘Café Loos’ (1908, J.P. stok Wzn.), a semi-circular building at the Hofplein, and close to it ‘Café Pschorr’ (1921, Willem Kromhout), with an expressive art deco façade and behind it a large glass dome, and furthermore ‘De Unie’, according to the principles of De Stijl (1924-1925, J.J.P. Oud), and ‘Hotel-Restaurant Atlanta’ (1929-1931, F. van der Togt) – ref.: www.bonas.nl (2008-11-09).

⁶⁶ See: Ten Bosch & Wattjes, 1940. Ten Bosch himself built a number of complexes with both housing and shopping accommodations (e.g. ‘Meent’, 1937) which were among his major works, while he and his business partner, interior architect Henri Le Grand, modernised various existing shops as well. For examples of cinemas see: p37 ‘Victoria’ (1934-1935, Jacob van Gelderen), p106: ‘Lumière’ (1939, Krijgsman & Rosendahl).

⁶⁷ E.g. Blok, 1985.

⁶⁸ See: Merkelbach, 1932: 323; Van Eesteren, 1932: 241.

furniture was used, for example, in the Van Nelle factory, in the GEB building, and in private homes like 'Huis Sonneveld' (1929-1933, Brinkman & Van der Vlugt).

Important were also Paul Schuitema and Piet Zwart, who were respectively secretary and chairman of Opbouw⁶⁹. Both made innovative, constructivist graphic and industrial designs, as well as photographs⁷⁰. With a reference to architecture, Zwart applied the idea of functionalism to photography, in the way he used it for advertisements and, for example, the covers of the series *Monografieën over Filmkunst* (1931-1933, ed. Graadt van Roggen). Schuitema used photography similarly for the covers of *De 8 & Opbouw* and *Filmliga*. Once he had started to experiment with photography, moreover, film followed too. In this way both Zwart and Schuitema became switches within the relationship between architecture and film.

and film

Important for the history of cinema in Rotterdam were people like Jean Desmet and Abraham Tuschinski, who showed the latest foreign fiction films. Others have presented this history, its dynamics, and the perception by the audience⁷¹. It remains a question, however, how it has affected Rotterdam, which is different from my purpose, which concerns films on Rotterdam. It might nevertheless be noticed that cinema in general affected other artistic practices in the city. A case in point is Stroman's novel *Stad* (1932), which is a witness of cinema in several ways⁷². It was a literary 'city symphony', a counterpart to such avant-garde films, while the book refers also explicitly to film. When the protagonists go to the movies, they unexpectedly see a newsreel about the launching of a ship, which they had attended, and they are excited to discover themselves in the picture (Stroman, 1932: 84). It is a literary and a typographical illustration of cinema being an integral part of urban culture, with a direct link to journalism. Stroman wrote for the *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*⁷³, while many journalists of the NRC (*Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*) were involved with the *Filmliga*. Avant-garde films dealing with Rotterdam have therefore also received substantial attention from critics, among them *THE BRIDGE* (1928, Joris Ivens), *HOOGSTRAAT* (1929, Andor von Barys) and *MAASBRUGGEN* (1937, Schuitema).

Besides avant-garde shorts, Rotterdam was also shown by a number of feature films. Among them are unknown titles, but also classics of Dutch cinema such as *LENTELIED* (1936, Simon Koster) and *BOEFJE* (1939, Detlef Sierck). The former is a love story about two couples changing partners, which takes place in the countryside of Zeeland and in Rotterdam. The city is introduced by a fast montage-sequence (shot by Emiel van Moerkerken), showing images of the port and its industry and of all other icons of modern Rotterdam, like the Coolingsel Boulevard, 'De Bijenkorf', the 'Bergpolderflat', and the 'Van Nelle factory'. While Rotterdam was still an old city, characterised by small alleys, canals and old ware houses, the sequence has taken the icons from the different parts of the city and reassembled them in order to present a modern city⁷⁴. This was not so much a representation of the actual city, but a particular vision of it, a

⁶⁹ Schuitema was secretary in the period 1927-1934, see: Maan, 2006: 133. Zwart, was chairman in the period 1931-1937, see: Brentjens, 2008: 176n12.

⁷⁰ Other prominent names in this respect are: Gerrit Kiljan, Wim Brusse, Dick Elffers, Jan Kamman, a.o.

⁷¹ For Desmet, see: Blom, 2003; for Tuschinski, see (a.o.): Van Gelder, 1996. For cinema in Rotterdam in general see: Berg, 1996; Van der Velden, 2001; Romer, 2004. See also the extensive archive on cinemas in Rotterdam, i.e. GAR > Collectie Tj. de Vries betreffende Rotterdamse Bioscopen, toegangsnr.: 1289.

⁷² Gerrit Kiljan and Paul Schuitema also thought of the possibility to make it into a film, which did not happen in the end (De Boode & Van Oudheusden, 1985: 81).

⁷³ In the circle of people around Stroman, one also finds the names of novelists such as Herman Besselaar, Alfred Kossmann, and Wim Wagener a.o. See: Van de Laar, 2000: 379; for Wagener, see: Huygens, 2005.

⁷⁴ The sequence starts with an old building, which also appears in other films of that time, like Von Barys's *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS*. It is the *Witte Huis*, built in 1898 (arch. W. Molenbroek. Although its construction and style were conventional and even old fashioned at that time, it became a major landmark of the city, since it was, with its 45 meters, the highest office tower of Europe. In fact, it meant the onset of high-rise building in the Netherlands and as such it could not be omitted from a sequence of modern buildings in Rotterdam.

reference how to perceive the city, and how it could be like. Quite different is BOEFJE (“Little Rascal”), which was based on a popular story by Marie Joseph Brusse, and the successful theatre play⁷⁵. It is about a poor boy, played by the actress Annie van Ees, who wanders through the city, mainly the slums and the old alleys, around the corner of cinema Lumière where the film was to be seen, although the slums were reproduced through studio sets. As such it is the opposite of the previous film.

Films on Rotterdam were not only produced in Rotterdam itself, but also in The Hague, Amsterdam, and Haarlem, which were the main centres for film production in the Netherlands. Amsterdam was the most important for feature films, not only *Standort*, the production centre in the words of Elsaesser, but also frequently as *Tatort*, where the films were actually set⁷⁶. However, the shootings were not always done on location, but in studios or even in cities that served as a ‘stand-in’, like Rotterdam in some scenes of ORANJE HEIN (1936, Max Nosseck) – which we could call *Seinort*: where recordings are made. Between 1920 and 1940 about twenty major movies featured Amsterdam⁷⁷. Rotterdam appeared only in about eight fiction films during the same period⁷⁸. As *Standort* for feature film production, The Hague almost equalled Amsterdam, while for documentaries it was important due to the production company Haghe Film (Willy Mullens), which made also a large number of films on Rotterdam⁷⁹. As *Tatort*, The Hague has rarely been shown in fiction films, but still frequently in documentaries. Haarlem, at last, was also an important *Standort*, already since the 1910s when Hollandia produced its internationally famous features. It had also a documentary department, which developed into the company Polygoon in 1919⁸⁰. It became the leading Dutch company for documentaries and newsreels.

Polygoon produced many films that featured Rotterdam, including DE RIJN VAN LOBITH TOT AAN ZEE (1922, A.M. van der Wel), and GROEI (1930, Jo de Haas), which are classics of their genres: the educational and the industrial film. The first was made for the *Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop* in Rotterdam (“Municipal School Cinema”), whose director, Van der Wel, soon started to make films himself, often dealing with Rotterdam. The other film, GROEI (“Growth”), shows the construction of ‘De Bijenkorf’. Polygoon made similar productions for other enterprises (e.g. HAKA, Van Nelle). Many of such commissioned films, made for a specific public, have never reached the canons of Dutch film history. They have nevertheless communicated modern values and visions that contributed to the development of Rotterdam.

⁷⁵ Cf. Albers e.a., 2004: 42.

⁷⁶ Addressed in a lecture for the Rietveld Academy at the NIMK (Montevideo) in Amsterdam, 2004-02-18.

⁷⁷ These numbers are based on data by Dittrich (1987), Donaldson (1997), and the website www.geocities.com/Hollywood/Theater/2180/NF1926.htm (2005). Donaldson includes commissioned feature films made for promotional reasons, which I take into account as well.

⁷⁸ I.e. MODERNE LANDHAAIEN (1926, Alex Benno), NUL UUR NUL (1927-1928, Simon Koster), DE MAARSCHALKSTAF (1929, Luc Willink), EEN LIED VAN DEN ARBEID (1929, Walter Janssen), JENSEITS DER STRAË (1929), LENTELIED (1936, Simon Koster), BOEFJE (1939, Detlef Sierck), and ERGENS IN NEDERLAND (1940, Ludwig Berger).

⁷⁹ E.g. EEN GEZICHT OP DE GROOTE HAVENWERKEN TE ROTTERDAM EN SCHIEDAM, 1920; STEENKOLEN HANDELS VEREENIGING, 1921 and 1923; NV CORNS SWARTTOUW SUWADOORS.

⁸⁰ De Haan, 1995: 19.

CHAPTER 1. THE EMERGENCE OF CINEMA IN ROTTERDAM

§ 1. early cinema in Rotterdam

The beginning of cinema in Rotterdam was characterised by a clustering of small enterprises. Clustering reduces the costs of transactions, transportation, research and so on, while it enables standardisation, regulation, trust and knowledge spillover (Scott, 2000, 2005). Clustering relies, to an important degree, upon the socialisation of employees who share certain values; the industry is part of a local culture. Within economic geography this is called ‘Marshallian atmosphere’, after British economist Alfred Marshall (1842-1924)⁸¹. He gave his name also to the ‘Marshall externalities’. These are inter-firm linkages within the cluster, through which concentration and specialisation occur⁸². They are different from ‘Jacobs externalities’, called after Jane Jacobs (1969), who has pointed to connections with external economies that imply economic and urban diversification. Her thesis states that interaction with other branches leads to creativity and innovation and thus growth. However, these poles of externalities do not exclude each other: spillover can occur between firms within a sector, but also between sectors⁸³. Of a relatively small calibre, we can observe such processes in Rotterdam too.

On the 8th of August 1896, the French entrepreneurs Alexis Werner and his son Michel were the first to present film in Rotterdam⁸⁴. In the next year, films became a regular part of the Circus-Variété of the former German opera singer Carl Pfläging⁸⁵. The Casino Variété of Samuel Soesman followed, which was the first to show film images of Rotterdam: WATERPARTIJ OP DEN KRALINGSCHEN PLAS (1898)⁸⁶. More recordings followed, which were all made by the Austrian operator Stefan Hofbauer (1867-1914), who worked for Casino for about fifteen years, until his early death⁸⁷. He can be considered as the first important filmmaker in Rotterdam. His work includes street views and panoramas and entertaining images of fairs and parties, but he also set off to shoot, for example, an accident, a visit of a prominent guest, the launching of a ship, or a memorial that got unveiled⁸⁸. Such subjects became typical for newsreels later on, and these reports can thus be considered as their precursors.

It is notable that foreigners and Jews were among the first cinema entrepreneurs in Rotterdam, but this was not exclusively the case. In 1900, the Christian preacher A. Weltevreden organised evangelic film screenings⁸⁹. The young Dutch film pioneer Willy Mullens (•1880-†1953) came with a travelling film show, while he also made images of Rotterdam⁹⁰. Soon afterwards, in October 1903, the first permanent cinema in the Netherlands was opened by Frans

⁸¹ I.e. *Principles of Economics* (1890); *Industry and Trade* (1919). His ideas influenced many (Fan & Scott, 2003).

⁸² See: Fan, C. Cindy & Scott, Allen, J.; ‘Industrial agglomeration and development: A survey of spatial economic issues in East Asia and a statistical analysis of Chinese regions’, *Economic Geography*, Vol 79/3 (July 2003), pp. 295-319. www.sscnet.ucla.edu/geog/downloads/597/208.pdf

⁸³ Cf. Brouwer e.a., 2006.

⁸⁴ See: Berg (1996: 37). For further information on the Werner company, see: www.victorian-cinema.net/werner.htm (visited 2005). Herbert, Stephen, ‘Alexis, Michel and Eugène Werner’, in: *Who’s Who of Victorian Cinema*, BFI, 1996.

⁸⁵ The first programme was shown 1897-11-17, called the American Bioscope (Berg, 1996: 37). Pfläging also showed the first film images recorded in Rotterdam, which was a cinematic self-portrait: HET WELGELIJKENDE CONTERFEITSSEL VAN DEN DIRECTEUR – CARL PFLÄGING – DOOR DEN BIOSCOPE (1897-12-17). An example of another film recorded in Rotterdam and shown at the Circus-Variété is FEESTELIJK BEZOEK VAN H.M. DE KONINGIN WILHELMINA AAN ROTTERDAM (1899, Emile Lauste). See: Donaldson, 1980; for information on Pfläging: Berg, 1996: 38-39.

⁸⁶ First programme on the 14th of October 1898, called the Royal Bioscope (Berg, 1996: 173). Soesman was the stage name; Suisman was the actual family name (www.cinemacontext.nl 2007-08-29)

⁸⁷ Early recordings by Hofbauer include KIIKJE OP DE ROTTERDAMSCH BEURS OP VRIJDAG 19 MEI 1899, and LEVEND DRAAIEND PANORAMA VAN DE MAASBRUG EN DE MAASKADE (june 1899). See: Donaldson, 1980: 36-41. See also: www.nfdb.nl > Hofbauer, Stefan (2007-08-29)

⁸⁸ E.g. SPOORWEGONGELUK STATION DELFTSCHEPOORT, 1899; INTOCHT PAUL KRUGER TE ROTTERDAM, 1901; HET VAN STAPEL LOOPEN VAN HET VIERMAST BARKSCHIP ‘GEERTRUIDA GERARDA’ GEBOUWD OP DE WERF V/D. HEEREN J. & K. SMIT, KRIMPEN A/D. LEK, 1904, ONTHULLING CALAND-MONUMENT ROTTERDAM, 1907 – all by Stefan Hofbauer.

⁸⁹ Berg, 1996: 173.

⁹⁰ E.g. PAUL KRÜGER TE ROTTERDAM OP HET VREDENOORDPLEIN, and DE MAASBRUG TE ROTTERDAM (1901, Mullens)

Goeman in the *Tivoli-Wintertuin* at the Coolingsingel⁹¹. After 1908, cinema became a booming business. It was also the time that the first fiction film was made in Rotterdam: EEN ROTTERDAMSCH HEERTJE, VOOR 'T EERST OP DEN PLAS, produced by the Moderne Bioscope Theater Transvalia.

The rapidly developing business of cinema in Rotterdam and the first film productions that came along with it are manifestations of an agglomeration economy.

The propensity of firms in cultural-products sectors to converge together in distinctive spatial clusters within the city is above all a reflection of an organizational structure in which each individual unit of production is organically caught up in a wider system of socioeconomic interactions, on which it depends for survival. Above all, firms have a strong incentive to come together in communities or ecologies within the city because mutual proximity often greatly enhances the availability of agglomeration economies and increasing-returns effects (...). (Scott, 2005: 6)

Scott is interested how new economic models and structures develop in this process. This is not a description of events, but a sort of 'natural history', an evolutionary movement (Scott, 2005: 1).

During the next ten years, between 1908 and 1918, about twenty-five cinemas were established in the city, with J.F. Strengholt as one of the key players, who established the Apollo Bioscope (1909) and various others⁹². But he faced strong competition, especially from the Belgian Jean Desmet⁹³. When Desmet opened Cinéma Parisien, in 1909, he distributed 100,000 free tickets, hence free screenings for about three months⁹⁴. Since Desmet had noticed the enthusiasm for the fiction film EEN ROTTERDAMSCH HEERTJE, he produced another one himself (HET ORAKEL, 1910), which again attracted substantial attention. He quickly extended his business to Amsterdam⁹⁵, and reinforced his position in Rotterdam, by establishing *Cinéma Royal* (1913). Again he knew how to attract visitors, by producing another feature film shot in Rotterdam: DER GEHEIMNISVOLLE KLUB (1913), directed by the Austrian Joseph Delmont⁹⁶. In the mean time, other cinemas started to produce fiction films as well, like Casino-Variété, with the comedy ROTTERDAM OP HOL! ("Rotterdam runaway!", 1912, Leon Boedels)⁹⁷.

Within a year after its opening, Desmet sold Cinéma Royal to another cinema pioneer in the Netherlands: Abraham Tuschinski (•1886-†1942), a Jewish immigrant from Poland. He went to Rotterdam in 1904 with the intention to go to America, but he stayed and started to work as a tailor. Tuschinski saved money and established a small guesthouse for migrants like himself. He subsequently started a cinema, called Thalia (1911)⁹⁸. After less than a year he had to sell it to the municipality, since a new town hall was planned there (1912-1920, arch. Henri Evers). Tuschinski made a good deal⁹⁹ and with the money purchased not only the Cinéma Royal of Desmet, but also the Scala Theater from Emanuel Korozinsky, another Jewish immigrant from Poland. More take-overs would follow, while he extended his business to Amsterdam as well. This was the beginning of the prosperous Tuschinski enterprise.

⁹¹ It was called the Royal American Bioscope. The first programme was on the 10th of October 1903 (Berg, 1996: 174).

⁹² His firm was called Strengholt & Co., encompassing the Apollo Bioscope (1909), Hollandia Bioscope (1910), Bioscope Américain (1911), zie: Berg, 1996: 174.

⁹³ For more information on Desmet, see: Blom, 2003.

⁹⁴ Berg, 1996: 39. There was especially a strong competition between J. Desmet and F. Strengholt.

⁹⁵ By establishing Cinéma Parisien (1910); Blom, 2003.

⁹⁶ For more information about this film: Donaldson, 1997: 110. Previously, Desmet had also produced the film HET ORAKEL (1910), which was shown in Cinema Parisien. Next to that, he also showed registrations of events taking place in the city, e.g. ONAFHANKELIJKHEIDSFESTEN TE ROTTERDAM, OP MAANDAG 17 NOVEMBER 1913 – for more information on this film, see: Albers, 2004: 260.

⁹⁷ It was produced by Philip Soesman, who succeeded his brother Samuel as the director of Casino-Variété. He asked Leon Boedels to direct the film, who had already made fiction films for Filmfabriek F. A. Nöggerath in Amsterdam.

⁹⁸ See: André van der Velden (2004: 93-96) for a more detailed description and analysis of this history.

⁹⁹ Berg, 1996: 22.

Although Tuschinski was the most successful, his history is similar to those of other East-European Jews¹⁰⁰. It was part of a larger immigration trend, since Rotterdam used to be a ‘transitopolis’¹⁰¹. Especially after 1880, many people came to Rotterdam on their way to the booming cities of America. During WWI, people from various countries came to Rotterdam as refugees¹⁰². This explains the presence of Tuschinski and his colleagues, among them his brothers-in-law Hermann Gerschtanowitz and Hermann Ehrlich. Furthermore of interest is the case of Karl Weisbard (1877-1943), who came also from Poland and who also started to work as a tailor¹⁰³. He gradually extended his firm to have a fur workshop, which in turn brought him enough money to have some savings. In 1917, he established the Prinses Theater, together with Aron Chermoek, who had left Russia in 1907, and who had begun as a tailor too. This theatre became a success, and Weisbard sold his tailor’s firm. Differently from the others, he wanted to build an entirely new theatre, especially designed for cinema. To that end he established the real estate company *Het Westen NV*¹⁰⁴. Through the tightly-knit Jewish community, he became acquainted with the architect Jacob van Gelderen (•1888-†1944)¹⁰⁵, who designed the ‘Wester Bioscoop’ (W.B. Theatre)¹⁰⁶. Van Gelderen designed a modern cinema, with 1200 seats and a large, free suspended balcony. When it had been finished, in 1919, he immediately established his name as an architect within the cinema business in Rotterdam, and as a result he was asked to design the Ooster Theater (1919-1921)¹⁰⁷.

city news

Fiction films made up the main part of the cinema programmes¹⁰⁸. But there was also an interest in local issues, which was already demonstrated by Casino Variété. They became the subject of well-made documentary shorts and newsreels, which were shown as part of the regular programmes. Early examples include reports by Pathé Frères, from the early 1910s, on events like aviation shows and football matches¹⁰⁹. Following Soesman, some cinema entrepreneurs started

¹⁰⁰ André van der Velden, 2004.

¹⁰¹ For general information on the Jewish community in Rotterdam vis-à-vis Jewish immigrants: Van de Laar, 2000: 194.

¹⁰² See: Van de Laar, 2000: 189-196. He mentions, for example, that in the year before WWI (1913), 80,000 people left from Rotterdam to the USA, mainly coming from Russia and Austria-Hungary. Besides that, there existed in Rotterdam a significant German minority already for a long time. Among the people coming to Rotterdam during WWI were many Belgians, as well as Russians (especially in the years 1917-1919).

¹⁰³ www.cinemacontext.nl/id/P001809 > personen > Weisbard > bioscopen (2007-09-19). For information on Chermoek: Berg, 1996: 43. According to Van de Laar (p194), Tuschinski and his colleagues did not escape pogroms.

¹⁰⁴ See: www.cinemacontext.nl/id/P001809 > personen > Weisbard (visited: 2007-09-19), with a reference to the newspaper advertisement: ‘Wegens opheffing van mijn zaak – totale uitverkoop’, in: NRC, 1918-01-14. Weisbard sold his stock and supplies of his tailor’s firm and fur workshop.

¹⁰⁵ Jacob van Gelderen was born in Schiedam. He grew up in Schiedam and Vlaardingen within a Jewish milieu. His father was a butcher. He got married in London when he was twenty five years old, which might be an indication that he studied there as well. His work, at least, reflected international developments – based upon the data provided by: Muntjewerff, Henk A., *Descendants of Mozes Salomon van Emden*, Breda, Nov. 2003 www.home.zonnet.nl/h.muntjewerff/genealogy/mozesvanemden/mozes.htm.

Van Gelderen was one of the four partners of Weisbard, see: André van der Velden, 2004: 97.

¹⁰⁶ On its façade was written ‘W.B. Theatre’, but it has also been written as ‘WB-Theater’. It was located at Nieuwe Binnenweg 326. It was rebuilt in 1962, and is now an evangelic centre. Berg, 1996: 171.

¹⁰⁷ Berg, 1996: 25. The commissioner and owner of the cinema was Frans Berkhout. Its architecture received a positive critique in the NRC; see: Blok, 1985: 27. The theatre was located at the St.Janstraat 21; destroyed during WWII.

¹⁰⁸ All the cinemas mentioned here showed commercial feature films, both from the Netherlands and abroad. Since 1913 they got subjected to the municipal censor, which had been installed after a report by a committee that concluded that most of the films were morally inferior. In the meantime the municipality carried out a ‘civilisation offensive’. In 1913 a report was published by the municipal cinema committee, which concluded that most of the presented films were morally inferior. As a result it installed, as the first city in the Netherlands, a municipal censor (until 1928, when it became a national concern). See: De Wit, 1991.

¹⁰⁹ I.e. SENSATIONEELE VliegDemonstratie door den Franschen Luchtacrobaat PÉGOUD (1912) and DE FOOTBALLMATCH ROTTERDAM – ARNHEM (1913). For more examples, see filmography: Pathé Frères.

to produce such reports and documentary shorts themselves, particularly Tuschinski, from 1916¹¹⁰. He also showed football matches, as well as demonstrations by the army, aviation shows, and reports on accidents, such as the ravage after a ship had collided into the old 'Koningsbrug' (1918)¹¹¹. Such reports provided feedback to the city, as the latter illustrates. It amplified the problem of the bridge that was too low, which contributed to the decision to build a new bridge, which would become *De Hef* (1924-1927, Pieter Joosting)¹¹².

The reports began by being made irregularly; only exceptional events were reported. Around 1920, Tuschinski increased the numbers of reports, which were shown under the heading of *Stadsnieuws* ("City News")¹¹³. One of them is about 'the first marriage in the new town hall' (1920), as the title says. The report is not without wit, if one recalls the fact that the construction of the town hall had actually enabled Tuschinski to build his empire. While other reports covered issues like fire in the port (1920) or the visit of the queen mother to Rotterdam (1921), some of them also promoted the Tuschinski-concern, such as a report on the visit of the German movie star Lil Dagover to the Grand Théâtre¹¹⁴. Next to that, Tuschinski also premiered exceptional images of the city; in 1921, for example, shortly after Airport Waalhaven had been opened, he took the opportunity to have the city shot from the air, which was a real novelty at the time (with views of Rotterdam, Schiedam, Vlaardingingen and Maassluis). In addition, Tuschinski also produced other kinds of films, which were not necessarily related to Rotterdam, like travelogues and fiction shorts. Yet, film production remained merely an additional concern to him.

Like Tuschinski, Weisbard also started to produce shorts. An early example, made when the W.B. Theatre was ready, is a report on the zoo (DIERGAARDE, 1919, Karl Weisbard). At the beginning of the film we briefly see Weisbard himself, feeding birds. The film shows various animals and the different sections of the zoo. Special attention is paid to its architecture, including the 'grand rock' with a watch tower, glass-houses with exotic plants, the spacious and stylish club house (*sociëteitsgebouw*), the birdhouse, and the musical chapel. Besides such films, Weisbard began to produce newsreels for his so-called *W.B. revue*¹¹⁵. The first one (1920) also dealt with the new town hall; it reported on a race between just married couples from the town hall to *Café de Witte Ballons* about one kilometre away.

The reports were made by either Weisbard himself or the operators of the W.B. Theatre, among them Max Vis, who became responsible for it after 1925¹¹⁶. Once the recordings were made, they were immediately developed, and shown in the evening programmes of the W.B. Theatre as well as cinema Luxor¹¹⁷. Most of the reports concerned celebrations and sports events, like a motor tour, a *concours hippique*, and football matches (all 1921). A remarkable report is about, as the title says, 'the largest cinema of Rotterdam under construction' (1921). It was the Grand Théâtre Pompenburg (1922), which was also designed by Van Gelderen and

¹¹⁰ See filmography > Tuschinski.

¹¹¹ I.e. VOETBALWEDSTRIJD 'SPARTA' OP 16 SEPTEMBER (1917), DE LEGERDAG TE ROTTERDAM (1916), GROOTE VLIEGDEMONSTRATIE OP WOUDESTEN (1919), HET ONGELUK MET DEN SPOORBRUG OVER DE KONINGSHAVEN (1918).

¹¹² On the accident causing the awareness of the need to build a new bridge, see also: Van de Laar, 2000: 281.

¹¹³ Most likely, these reports were made by Tuschinski's chief operator John Meulkens, see filmography: Tuschinski (DE GEHEELEN TRIOMFTOCHT VAN CARPENTIER IN ROTTERDAM, 1921).

¹¹⁴ See: www.nfdb.nl > Tuschinski (2007-08-29)

¹¹⁵ The newsreels are lost. Information about them is found in *Kunst en Amusement* (1920-1921), see filmography > Weisbard. The *W.B. revue* existed for more than ten years (cf. Eric van der Velden, 1983 > this article includes the cover of a booklet: *Jubileumuitgave van de W.B. Revue 1919-1929*, published by Polygoon).

¹¹⁶ Max Vis in: De Vries, 1983. When the W.B. Theatre opened, Max Vis became assistant operator, at the age of thirteen, since his father worked as manager of the W.B. Theatre. Vis was trained by August Fick, chief operator at the W.B. Theatre (in: De Vries, 1983, cf. Berg, 1996: 49-50).

¹¹⁷ Max Vis in: De Vries (1983), and in a radio programme of Radio Rijnmond, 1991-10-23 (cf. Romer, 2004: 77). The screenings in the Luxor is mentioned, for example in the case of VEE- EN LANDBOUW TONTOONSTELLING TE ROTTERDAM, in *Kunst en Amusement* 1921/12, section 'De Films van de week'; 'Rotterdam'; 'W.B.-Theater' and 'Luxor'.

commissioned by Weisbard himself¹¹⁸. This film on architecture for film, could be considered as a self-reflexive instance within the urban cultural ecology. In the meantime, Polygoon from Haarlem had started its production and national distribution of newsreels, which were first shown in Rotterdam at the Ooster Theater and Transvalia¹¹⁹. It meant a competition to the local reports, but Tuschinski and Polygoon soon started to collaborate (see also Ch. 3.1).

externalities

Weisbard was as much a real estate developer as he was a cinema entrepreneur, which were in fact the two branches of his firm Het Westen¹²⁰. This practice is confirmed by the fact that in 1923, he sold the Grand Théâtre Pompenburg to Tuschinski. The competition between the two was at the same time a kind of collaboration, which is characteristic for ‘agglomeration economies’. However, when Tuschinski bought the Grand Théâtre he had the interior rebuilt, to make it ‘the nicest and most comfortable cinema of Europe’. It was carried out by the designers Pieter den Besten and Jaap Gidding, in a mixture of Jugendstil and art-deco¹²¹. As such they embodied the connection between cinema and design.

Pieter den Besten studied at the Academy of Visual Arts in Rotterdam. After his studies he worked for the decoration firm of his father¹²². He created various interior designs for Tuschinski, next to art works for many other buildings in the city¹²³. Gidding studied at the Academy of Visual Arts in Rotterdam as well. When he finished there, he worked for several years in Paris and Munich (with director Max Reinhardt a.o.¹²⁴). When he returned to Rotterdam he joined his father who ran a decoration firm too, while he became also part of the architects’ association Opbouw. The work of Den Besten and Gidding offers a clear example of Jacobs externalities, which has not only an economic significance within the development of the city, but also a sociocultural one, since their involvement drew cinema into the world of arts.

The Grand Théâtre was the most distinguished cinema of Rotterdam. Besides an exclusive café, it included a bowling-alley and the chic *cabaret-dansant* La Gaîté¹²⁵. Tuschinski’s idea of going to the movies was based on a formula that included different kinds of entertainment. People did not only see a film, they also went out for drinking and dancing afterwards. Tuschinski had already seen that at Café Pschorr, where he himself had organised shows in the summer of 1912.

As André van der Velden has pointed out in detail (2001: 106-108), Tuschinski also invited special guests and groups. While the low profile cinema Asta managed to contract the American cowboy superstar Tom Mix to pay a visit¹²⁶ (see: Polygoon, 1925-wk13), Tuschinski invited many: the pioneering modern dancer Loie Fuller, with her ballet of ‘light and shadow’, Sid Phillips and The Melodians, the Dutch jazz formation The Ramblers, Marlene Dietrich, Lil Dagover, Olympic Boxing champion Bep van Klaveren, and Josephine Baker, to mention some famous names¹²⁷. Josephine Baker especially, who came in August 1928, left a major impression

¹¹⁸ Original title: DE GROOTSTE ROTTERDAMSCH BIOSCOOP IN AANBOUW. It was located at the Pompenburgsingel 9; destroyed during WW II., see: Berg, 1996: 164. The report is mentioned in: *Cinema en Theater* 1921/ nr. 29, p9.

¹¹⁹ De Haan, 1995: 42 (according to information of Polygoon, September 1924).

¹²⁰ Cf. Berg, 1996: 42. The Wester Bioscoop was developed by Het Westen.

¹²¹ They also created the interior design of the Tuschinski Theater in Amsterdam (1918-1921, architect H.L. de Jong).

¹²² Berg, 1996: 52.

¹²³ E.g. the *Economische Hogeschool*, a bank at the Westersingel, the Blijdorp Zoo, and the *Beurs*, a.o. He and Gidding, also created murals for the Dutch Pavilion at the World Exhibition in Antwerp (1930). Halbertsma, 2001: 215-216.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Berg, 1996: 164. Its conferencier was Alex de Haas, Alexander: 1974: 154.

¹²⁶ See: Berg, 1996: 28; for the film report, see: ROTTERDAM, COUPURES (1926, anonymous).

¹²⁷ Van der Velden, 2001: 107-108), Berg, 1996: 28; Halbertsma & Van Ulzen, 2001: 178 (on Leo Ott). For Lil Dagover, see: HET BEZOEK VAN DE BEROEMDE DUITSCHE FILMARTISTE LIL DAGOVER AAN HET GRAND THEATER TE ROTTERDAM (1928, Tuschinski).

on her public, including artists from the avant-garde¹²⁸. Such performances were musically accompanied by Tuschinski's organ virtuoso Leo Ott, similar to the way he accompanied silent films (from 1924 until 1929)¹²⁹.

Since Tuschinski offered top entertainment, the Grand Théâtre was a respected cinema. However, it was not the only one; it competed, for example, with the large 'Theater Soesman', with 1200 seats, built in 1922 by architect Leen van der Vlugt. It became one of the most modern cinemas in the Netherlands at that time. Also for this theatre, although at a later stage, Pieter den Besten created the interior design¹³⁰.

All these theatres were located in the city centre, near each another. Moreover, they were part of the urban fabric that also encompassed bars and dance halls (cf. Van der Velden, 2001). It can be considered as a variant of the externalities that Scott has described for cultural industries. 'Industrial districts are made up not only of the units of production from which they draw their principal identity (...) but also of the myriad firms in adjunct sectors that provide critical physical inputs and services needed to keep the entire system operating' (2005: 9). Framing the situation in Rotterdam through the ideas of Scott, we might say that different economic sectors in and around the cinemas were connected 'through complex webs of spatial and functional relationships' (ibid). Cinema was linked to cultural disciplines like architecture, design, dance and music, among others. In the midst of these developments, film production grew too.

§ 2. specialisation

People like Tuschinski and Weisbard produced film recordings primarily for their own theatres. That also counts for their educational counterpart, the Schoolbioscoop, by A.M. van der Wel. Next to them, specialised production companies were established in Rotterdam. In 1925, Filmatelier F.H. van Dijk became the first commercial studio. François van Dijk had run a photography studio since 1910¹³¹. He started to make film recordings of family affairs¹³². This was followed by newsreels for local screenings, for example about the steamship 'Stuart-Star' that ran ashore at Hook of Holland (1923-10-04)¹³³. As a photographer, Van Dijk was known for his 'recordings of ships, factories, machines and the like'¹³⁴. As a filmmaker, he advertised his studio for 'films for all purposes'¹³⁵. The connection with photography remained to exist, also in terms of a professional network. It is especially manifest in a hilarious and experimental film he made about fellow photographers in Rotterdam, playing a theatrical game of billiards (BILLARD CLUB RFPV, 1930, Van Dijk). While Filmatelier F.H. van Dijk was a small studio, it is significant in that it paved the way for bigger companies.

In 1927, the company Transfilma was established in Rotterdam¹³⁶. It made itself a name for industrial films, due to the excellent work of its cinematographer Andor von Barsy, who was also responsible for the success of the feature length city symphony THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS (1928). Besides that, Transfilma began to produce fiction films like EEN LIED VAN DEN

¹²⁸ Already she had inspired the photographer Jan Kamman to make the well-known photomontage 'Charleston' that showed her in different poses (cf. Struyvenberg, 2001: 89 and 288). The Filmliga Rotterdam quoted her in its founding manifest by way of conclusion: "Later I will go to the cinema everyday" (Josephine Baker). 'You too?' (Filmliga magazine, 1927, first editions, last page). See also the Tuschinski newsreel: BEZOEK VAN JOSEPHINE BAKER AAN VOLENDAM (1928).

¹²⁹ Halbertsma & Van Ulzen, 2001: 178 (on Leo Ott); Berg, 1996: 48.

¹³⁰ The building was sold the next year (1923), to become cinema *Scala*.

¹³¹ See: Gemeente Archief Rotterdam (GAR), 1988: 6.

¹³² Among them are well made, partly staged films with his children, e.g. HERINNERINGEN AAN DE KINDERJAREN (1922).

¹³³ I.e. STRANDING VAN SS STUART-STAR TE HOEK V. HOLLAND (1923).

¹³⁴ Advertisement of *Fotoatelier F.H. van Dijk* in the Rotterdam telephone guide, edition 1920 and following years.

¹³⁵ Advertisement of *Filmatelier F.H. van Dijk* in the Rotterdam telephone guide, edition 1925 and following years.

¹³⁶ Other companies that established themselves in Rotterdam, often as distribution companies in the first place, were a.o. Internationale Filmindustrie and Filmbureau Daguerre, as mentioned in the Rotterdam telephone guide, editions 1925-1934, and the address books of the Municipality of Rotterdam, Gemeentearchief Rotterdam (GAR).

ARBEID (“A song of labour”, 1929, Walter Janssen). Like the former, it was distributed by Monopole, a company that had been established shortly before by Jacob Mühlrad, another immigrant from Polish origin who had previously run a number of cinemas¹³⁷. In a period that various distribution companies established themselves in Rotterdam, Mühlrad saw opportunities too¹³⁸. Moreover, distribution also allowed him to escape competition with Tuschinski, who dominated the business. Therefore he sold his Imperial Bioscope to the German UFA, and with the money he established Monopole. The practices of exhibition, distribution and production, became gradually specialised concerns, but they remained interdependent.

Cinema in Rotterdam got a stimulus with the appearance of the Dutch Filmliga, which was founded in Amsterdam in 1927, by the young literary critics Henrik Scholte and Menno Ter Braak. A critical mass was needed to cover the expenses of acquisition, and therefore branches were established in other cities, including Rotterdam. The aim of the Filmliga was to show films of artistic quality that found no distribution in regular cinemas, among them productions from Germany, France and the Soviet Union. Moreover, it caused several filmmakers to produce films to be shown at its programme, among them THE BRIDGE (1928, Joris Ivens), HOOGSTRAAT (1929, Andor von Barsy), THE BUILDINGS OF VAN NELLE (1930, Jan Teunissen) and DE STEEG (1932, Jan Koelinga).

Johan Huijts, the foreign news editor of the NRC, was the chairman of the Filmliga Rotterdam for about six years. Various other journalists of the NRC became members of the Filmliga. In 1929, the NRC got its own film section, edited by Coen Graadt van Roggen¹³⁹. Because of negative reviews of popular films, and positive reviews of Filmliga films, the *Nederlandsche Bioscoopbond* (“Dutch Union of Cinema Theatres”) proclaimed an advertisement boycott against the NRC at the end of 1929¹⁴⁰. Abraham Tuschinski, as the ‘big man’ of Dutch cinema, intervened and negotiated with Huijts. He was well aware of the fact that in Amsterdam, at that moment, the Filmliga opened its own cinema De Uitkijk (1929-11-08)¹⁴¹. Tuschinski realised that the same would be possible in Rotterdam. Until then, the Filmliga showed its films at Corso¹⁴². In the conversation with Huijts, Tuschinski explained the plan to rebuild his *cabaret-dansant* La Gaîté, in order to establish the avant-garde cinema Studio 32¹⁴³. It would also include a gallery for avant-garde art, supervised by Pieter den Besten¹⁴⁴. The Filmliga agreed. Until the new cinema would be a fact, special Filmliga previews and other events were organised at the Grand Théâtre, next to its programme at Corso. Among these events were a late night show with the novelty of sound films, and presentations by special guests, like László Moholy-Nagy¹⁴⁵.

The collaboration with Tuschinski caused a conflict between the branches in Rotterdam and Amsterdam, since the latter was against commercial exploitation, while Rotterdam favoured the idea of bringing avant-garde films to the attention of the masses¹⁴⁶. In 1931, the branch in

¹³⁷ www.cinemacontext.nl/id/P001759Algemeen (2007-10-20)

¹³⁸ A.o. Monopole, General Vertretung, Daguerre, DLS, De Globe and Puvabi N.V. Source: Rotterdam telephone guide 1933 and 1934, and Berg, 1996: 30-34.

¹³⁹ For additional information on Graadt van Roggen, see e.g. Smit, 2005: 39.

¹⁴⁰ See the article: ‘De Nieuwe Rotterdammer, De Nederlandsche Bioscoopbond en de Filmliga’, pp1-4 in Filmliga 1929, vol 3/1 (November). See also: Huijts, 1975: 274.

¹⁴¹ Linssen, 1999: 100.

¹⁴² The directors of Corso and advisers to the Filmliga Rotterdam were S.F. van Lier, and Cees Roem, the goal-keeper of football club Sparta, who would later become director of film company Profilti (The Hague), and one of the directors of Polygon-Profilti and Cinecentrum after WWII. www.cinemacontext.nl/id/P001141#target3 (2008-04-01). See: *Filmliga*, 1927/1 (p11). Cf. Berg, 1996: 28.

¹⁴³ Huijts, 1975: 275.

¹⁴⁴ Struyvenberg, 2001: 89. The first exhibition that would take place in Studio 32 encompassed work of the etcher Antoon Derkzen van Angeren and of interior designer Pieter den Besten. Many others would follow, e.g. Hermann Bieling (cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 377), as well as Wally Elenbaas and Dick Elffers, October 1935 (cf. Halberstma & Van Ulzen, 2001: 82).

¹⁴⁵ Resp. 1930-11-20, see: Van der Velden, 2001: 118, and Moholy-Nagy in 1931, see e.g. Rietbergen, 2001: 50.

¹⁴⁶ By consequence, the *Filmliga* magazine, published in Amsterdam, was not issued between May 1930 – Sept. 1931.

Amsterdam was dissolved (but re-established later on), and Rotterdam became the seat for the general Dutch Filmliga for two more years, with Johan Huijts as the overall chairman¹⁴⁷.

Whatever the intentions of the avant-garde might have been, the Filmliga served above all a particular section of the urban population, a socio-cultural subgroup in terms of Julian Steward (1955). Rather than changing the system, the avant-garde became a subsystem, as a consequence of increasing complexity¹⁴⁸. Similar to Scott's take on the film industry, the Filmliga was an 'independent', made possible by a 'major' (i.e. Tuschinski)¹⁴⁹. In the same way we could mention another 'Filmliga' that was established in Rotterdam, in 1932: the *Rotterdamsche Smalfilmliga* (RSL), an association for amateur filmmakers. There was actually a direct link with the Filmliga, as Mannus Franken was one of the founders of the overarching *Nederlandsche Smalfilmliga* (while it also collaborated with Multifilm in Haarlem)¹⁵⁰. The RSL became very active, with a high output of film productions. Among them were the highly appreciated 'absolute films' DE STRAAT (1932, A. Carré & S.M. Scheffer), and WONDEREN VAN SCHADUW EN LIJN (1936, J.L. Clement), made in the spirit of the avant-garde¹⁵¹. In 1934, the RSL established its own film studio (i.e. Schoonderloo Studio), where all kinds of films were made, including fiction shorts¹⁵². Besides its activities in Rotterdam, the RSL became part of a well-organised national and international network of kindred associations¹⁵³.

Such a process of increasing complexity was characterised by increasing levels of integration of the system as a whole, which happened with the take-overs by Strengholt and Tuschinski¹⁵⁴. Next to them was the rapidly growing City concern of Bartel Wilton, from The Hague. In Rotterdam he bought the Imperial Bioscope, demolished it, and commissioned the architect Jacob van Gelderen to build the large and very modern 'City' (1927-1928)¹⁵⁵, designed in the spirit of *Het Nieuwe Bouwen*¹⁵⁶. At the same time, the formation of large concerns had

¹⁴⁷ Brederoo, 1986: 191.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Steward, 1976 [1955]: 211 a.o.

¹⁴⁹ Next to that, cinema Corso, where the Filmliga began to show its films, took the initiative to build another avant-garde cinema, which was never used as it was destroyed during the bombardment of 1940.

¹⁵⁰ Smits, 2002: 5. One of RSL's most active members, Albert Stam, was largely inspired by Jordaan's film course at the Volksuniversiteit (Smit, 2002: 82). One of Stam's films was a report on tug-boats in the port.

¹⁵¹ Both films won prizes at festivals for amateur films (Smits, 2002: 6). Prior to the establishment of the RSL, Carré had also made the film ARBEID (1932), which had been shown in De Uitkijk in Amsterdam (September 1932). Clement made also the absolute films ZEEPBELLEN and STUDIE 3-33 (1933), see: Smits: 2002: 7/10.

¹⁵² e.g. EPISODE (1933, R. van der Leeuw & J. Derksen), see: Smits, 2002: 11-12. The studio was established in the former Rienks Machine Fabriek; Rienks had also produced films, and he would continue to do so under the name 'Electra'.

¹⁵³ Already before the establishment of the RSL, amateur films were made in Rotterdam, such as ROTTERDAM, EEN FILM VAN DE STAD EN DE HAVENS (1926) by Jos A. Huygen, who was a construction draughtsman working for an architecture studio. He developed and edited his own films. His hobby, according to Aasman (2004: 139, 145 e.a.), was mostly a family affair; he regularly organised home screenings on Sunday afternoons. In this way he showed professional (Pathé 9.5mm) films next to his own, and in this case (Aasman, p146), he imitated the Pathé film ROTTERDAM, LA VENISE DU NORD (1923). Of interest are also the films by Ed Millecum, who joined the RSL after WWII, who made, for example, ROTTERDAM 1925-1938 and ROTTERDAM 1939. Besides amateurs film clubs and amateurs making films on their own, there were also people who made films related to particular organisations, e.g. J.A. van Pelt, who made films for sailing clubs (in particular WSV Schieland [?], see: filmography). A remarkable title concerns Van Pelt's own film facilities: ONZE FILMWERKKAMER EN NAAR DE ROTTEMEREN (1939). Besides sailing, Van Pelt made also a number of films on other subjects (e.g. ROTTERDAM, 1938). For a brief general note on amateur filmmaking in the Netherlands, see: Albers, 2004: 19.

¹⁵⁴ Tuschinski played also an important role in the union of cinema theatres (NBB); the position of Rotterdam within this union is illustrated by the Polygoon newsreel: JAARVERGADERING VAN DE NEDERLANDSE BIOSCOOP BOND (1938-05-05), in which members visit the port and gather for a meeting at the town hall.

¹⁵⁵ Since March 1923, Weisbard owned the Imperial Bioscope (www.cinemacontext.nl/id/P000125 > personen > Weisbard > bioscopen (visited: 2007-09-19)). So it seems likely that Weisbard either developed or mediated the development of the new cinema building for Wilton.

¹⁵⁶ The directors of the City theatre were Jac. & L. Mühlrad. It had a capacity of 1000 seats and it was located at Hoogstraat 136 (destroyed during WWII), see: Berg, 1996: 28 and 162. In 1934, the City-concern also established cinema *Lumière*, in the former *Casino-Variété* (Berg, 1996: 166).

already entered an international stage, which is exemplified by the German UFA taking over the Luxor, in 1926 – which in turn enabled its previous owner, Carel van Zwanenburg, to build a new cinema in the suburb Hillesluis (‘Colosseum’, 1927, arch. Ten Bosch & Le Grand). The old Luxor was broken down, to make place for the new Luxor Palast, bigger than any other cinema in town, with 1600 seats (1928, arch. J. van Wijngaarden). It was also built in a modern style, characterised by a light-tower that served as a landmark¹⁵⁷. It had the largest cinema organ of Europe, but it was already old-fashioned when it was put to use, as sound film would conquer the cinema.

§ 3. changing sounds

Before the introduction of sound film, live musical accompaniment made every show a unique event, with Karl Weisbard being one of the frontrunners. His W.B. Theatre had an orchestra pit for no less than forty musicians¹⁵⁸. Weisbard made all efforts to improve the cinema experience. In the summer of 1921, he approached A. Standaart, a well-known organ maker in Schiedam. Weisbard wanted an organ that would be able to perform the sounds of virtually all musical instruments that one could imagine, as well as other sounds, like those of birds, car horns, whistles of trains and ships, thunder, rain and so on. Standaart and his assistants worked for one-and-a-half year on it, and it was ready early 1923¹⁵⁹. It received much attention, and those who listened to it were truly amazed. The German *Zeitschrift für Instrumentenbau*, for example, wrote: ‘What a wonder of technical perfection and artistic refinement is this cinema organ (...) It is actually not an organ anymore, in the usual sense. It is a new musical instrument, which one should still give a name to’¹⁶⁰. According to the same review, this organ brought life, colour and suspense to the films that it accompanied, and would thus leave a profound impression on the audience.

Whereas Weisbard attracted substantial attention with the Standaart organ, six years later he was also the first in the Netherlands to show a sound feature film, again at his W.B. Theatre (May 1929)¹⁶¹. In order to get it work, Weisbard asked Philips engineer Frits Prinsen, who had developed his own sound system¹⁶². This collaboration resulted in an ambitious joint-venture.

Karl Weisbard decided to have a new theatre built for an optimal performance of sound film. Once more he approached architect Van Gelderen, to make the design for what would be called the ‘Roxy’ (1930)¹⁶³. With one thousand seats, it became a large and highly modern cinema. In the meantime Prinsen fine-tuned the so-called *Loetafoon*. It was enabled through a partnership with William Rienks, under the flag of the latter’s engineering company Electra,

¹⁵⁷ Berg, 1996: 166. Luxor is located at Kruiskade 30. It has been altered after WWII. It is now a (comedy) theatre.

¹⁵⁸ The W.B. Theatre opened on the 21st of November 1919 with the Austrian film *TIEFLAND* (1918, Hans Rhoden), which was based on the opera (1903) by Eugen d’Albert. The film was accompanied by an orchestra of forty people, directed by Anton Peers, with Tine Zadelhof as soprano and Frans Willemsse as baritone, next to a choir, see: www.cinemacontext.nl (2008-11-13); cf. Max Vis in: De Vries, 1983.

¹⁵⁹ ‘Een orgel voor het W.B. Theater’, *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 6, 1923.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, after a quote in this article. Original German quote: ‘Welch ein Wunderwerk technischer Vollkommenheiten und künstlerischer Feinheiten ist doch diese Kinoorgel. (...) Das ist eigentlich schon gar keine Orgel mehr im landläufigen Sinne. Es ist ein neues Musikinstrument, dem man noch einen Namen geben musz....’

¹⁶¹ Berg (1996: 29, 42) mentions the film *ELAINE* (cf. Max Vis, in: Eric van der Velden, 1983; and in: De Vries, 1983). It is presumably the American film *TIMES SQUARE* (1929, Joseph C. Boyle), which was released in the Netherlands as *ELAINE*. According to www.imdb.com (2008-10-22) this film was released in the USA in September 1929. At www.cinemacontext.nl (2008-10-22) it is said that it was shown at Weisbard’s Roxy theatre at 1930-08-01. It was distributed, however, by Loet Barnstijn, whose gramophone sound system, *Loetafoon*, was used indeed by Weisbard, (see Berg, Van der Velden, De Vries). According to www.cinemacontext.nl the first sound film at the W.B. Theatre was *LILAC TIME* (1928, USA, George Fitzmaurice), shown at 1929-09-06. Tuschinski would then screen *THE SINGING FOOL* (1928, USA, Lloyd Bacon) at his Grand Théâtre, at 1929-09-13.

¹⁶² See Berg, 1996: 29 and Dibbets, 1986: 263.

¹⁶³ Berg, 1996: 169. Roxy was located at West-Kruiskade 26. It was rebuilt in 1967 (now known as ‘Nighttown’). Although altered, it is the only building by Van Gelderen that remained a stage for popular culture, incl. film shows.

which traded in electrical machines. This company was a remarkable hybrid, since it was first of all aimed at the building industry, for which purpose a film had already been made before: HUIZEN BOUWEN DOOR ELECTRICITEIT (“Building Houses through Electricity”, 1928). The film itself has been lost, but the title suggests that it was a promotional film for new building methods. Rather than waiting for a response from the industry to apply these methods, Rienks and Prinsen converted the company into a building enterprise itself, in June 1930 (*Bouwmaatschappij Electra N.V.*¹⁶⁴). Moreover, they decided to register the firm as a film production company as well (*Filmmaatschappij Electra N.V.*), in February 1931¹⁶⁵. It produced non-fiction films, for which the camera work was done by the artist Wout van Heusden and the architect Joris Uyterlinde. As a spin-off, the two of them founded their own facilitating Studio 2000¹⁶⁶.

Electra, in its turn, became the first company in the Netherlands for sound film; it produced the talking newsreel NU EN DAN – HIER EN DAAR. It was enabled by Karl Weisbard, who presented it on the 23rd of May 1931, at his brand-new Roxy, and at the W.B. Theatre. Electra made great efforts to promote the new sound system, and the best way to do so, they thought, was by showing its quality through a feature film that would attract international attention. In this way they produced the first Dutch sound film, TERRA NOVA (1931, Gerard Rutten). Although it was completed, it was finally not released, due to an argument between the producer and the director. Their newsreels instead did fulfil their promotional function for Electra’s equipment.

Because of sound, the production companies Orion and Profilti from The Hague, saw opportunities to compete with Polygoon. In March 1931 they announced a collaboration and bought the system of Electra¹⁶⁷. During their first months, Electra collaborated on making the recordings¹⁶⁸. In the meantime, Electra received a commission for a documentary film on the recent history of the socialist radio broadcasting station VARA, even though it had already been promised to Polygoon¹⁶⁹. It resulted in the aesthetically and politically challenging film STUWING (1932, Co van der Wal¹⁷⁰). Polygoon, in its turn, started *Polygoontoon*. Although it had lost its

¹⁶⁴ Berg, 1996: 30.

¹⁶⁵ According to the data at www.cinemacontext.nl/id/R001532 (visited: 2007-09-19), it was preceded by another firm: *Electro Kino Technisch Bureau NV* (Schoonderloostraat 85, Rotterdam), since 1923, with Rienks and Prinsen as their directors (mentioned for the period 1928-1931). Electra was established 1931-02-24, and finally dissolved two-and-a-half years later (1933-09) www.cinemacontext.nl/id/R000685

¹⁶⁶ No film titles are known, and little information about this studio is available. Flora Stiemer (1992: 48-49) mentions it in her monograph on Wout van Heusden. She quotes Van Heusden in an interview by Ischa Meijer; he said that they received a commission from Electra, while he had never held a film camera in his hands before. Electra was thus the first enterprise for which he made recordings. Stiemer suggests that the Filmliga has been the link, through Jef Last and Joris Ivens, for their shared political engagement. This could be, but it is also likely to draw a link to the building industry, due to the business of Electra. While Van Heusden (1896-1982) has become known as a graphic artist, Uyterlinde has been left out of focus altogether. Joris Uyterlinde (1899-1952) was the son of the contractor and engineer Johannes Dirk Uyterlinde, who owned a construction firm in IJsselmonde, Rotterdam-South (genealogy Volker: <http://members.home.nl/ctvolker/Volker.htm> – 2007-10-20; cf.: <http://de-wit.net/bronnen/tel1915/pag/627.htm> > 341, Uyterlinde, J.D.). In 1927, Joris Uyterlinde married Steventina Volker, daughter of another contractor. Before he became president of the Volker Bouwmaatschappij, he and his brother built private housing at the Randweg and Hollandschestraat, Rotterdam South (see: Kramer, 1929). They subsequently made, as constructors, a modern house for elderly people, *Emmahuis* (1929-1930, arch. P. Hooykaas & M. Lockhorst). An important project that would follow became the pioneering modernist *Flatgebouw Parklaan* (1931-1933, Van Tijen, Van den Broek, Uyterlinde – see: Van Tijen, 1933: 140-146). It was during these years that Uyterlinde became involved with Studio 2000. So Van Tijen and Van der Broek, frequenting the Filmliga, might also have played a role here. Finally, both Van Heusden and Uyterlinde lived and worked in Rotterdam-South, and this might have enabled their collaboration too.

¹⁶⁷ Hogenkamp, 1988: 40.

¹⁶⁸ I.e. From Electra: Frits Prinsen (managing the equipment in the car) and Kees Tuyn (camera); from Orion-Profilti: W.P. Schefer and Ab van Wely. Dibbets, 1993: 247-249.

¹⁶⁹ Hogenkamp, 1988: 41.

¹⁷⁰ Who previously made the film GROOT ROTTERDAM (1929), for a magazine with that title.

near-monopoly, it nevertheless managed to secure a prime position. Moreover, in 1933 it would officially, but secretly, become the owner of Profilti¹⁷¹.

While the collaboration between Orion-Profilti and Electra was unsuccessful¹⁷², Electra also entered into a conflict with Weisbard, since the investments in the Roxy had simply been too high. In 1933 Electra was dissolved, and along with it Studio 2000; Van Heusden continued his work as an artist, while Uytterlinde was asked by his father-in-law to become a director of his construction company Volker. In the end Weisbard's enterprise could not survive either. His firm *Het Westen* went bankrupt and he had to sell the Wester Bioscoop, and finally the Roxy too (1934)¹⁷³.

After 1934, when the problems with sound film were definitively settled, Dutch cinema rapidly developed, in particular the production of fiction films¹⁷⁴. Also in Rotterdam new production companies appeared, among them Monopole-DLS, which was a collaboration between Jacob Mühlrad (Monopole) and Max A. Sprecher (DLS)¹⁷⁵. Its films did not deal with Rotterdam as such, but it helped to reinforce the city's development as *Standort*, next to *Tatort*¹⁷⁶.

¹⁷¹ De Haan, 1995:105-106.

¹⁷² Dibbets, 1993: 262-263.

¹⁷³ www.cinemacontext.nl/id/P001809 > personen > Weisbard (visited: 2007-09-19). The Westerbioscoop became 'Capitol', owned by Salomon de Hartog. He started his programming with a cinematographic retrospective of Rotterdam (1934), which was made for him by André de Jong / Polygoon.

¹⁷⁴ It was mainly due to the influx of professionals that had escaped Nazi-Germany, as explained by film historian Kathinka Dittrich (1987).

¹⁷⁵ Monopole produced fiction films like BLEEKE BET (1934, Richard Oswald). In 1934 Mühlrad suddenly died; Sprecher continued the enterprise, and more films were made, a.o. DE BIG VAN HET REGIMENT (1935, Max Nosseck), and ORANJE HEIN (1936, Max Nosseck).

¹⁷⁶ Cinema had become a serious concern in Rotterdam, after it had reached a degree of specialisation, which is also exemplified by a company such as Puvabi (Publiciteitsbureau NV), for the production and distribution of commercials (1929-1936); www.cinemacontext.nl/id/R000445 (visited: 2007-09-19).

CHAPTER 2. FILM, ARCHITECTURE, CITY

§ 1. avant-garde

The avant-garde has played a prominent role in establishing the modern image of Rotterdam. Its architecture especially has become well-known, in particular the housing projects of architect J.J.P. Oud and the 'Van Nelle factory' (1925-1930) by architect Jan Brinkman and Leen van der Vlugt. There is an immediate link between them and avant-garde cinema, since all of them, as well as the director of Van Nelle, C.H. van der Leeuw, and the associated industrial designer Willem Gispen, were among the initiators of the *Filmliga Rotterdam* in 1927¹⁷⁷. The interaction between these avant-gardes continued after the *Filmliga* dissolved in 1933¹⁷⁸.

This connection did not only exist in Rotterdam, which is clear when we look at other branches of the *Filmliga*. While most film historians have focused on the *Filmliga Amsterdam*, where it was founded, Hans Schoots (1999) has pointed to the fact that the branches in Rotterdam, Utrecht and The Hague were all established by architects¹⁷⁹. His observation can be elaborated and specified a little further. J.J.P. Oud was the founding chairman of the *Filmliga Rotterdam*. In that capacity he also signed its manifesto, together with the journalist and secretary Johan Huijts, and the architect Jan Brinkman, among others¹⁸⁰. Once the *Filmliga Rotterdam* was established, Oud became an ordinary member of the board¹⁸¹. Huijts became its chairman, while the role of secretary was then fulfilled by the young interior architect Ida Liefrinck (aka Liv Falkenberg-Liefrinck), who worked for Oud's studio¹⁸². For several years she ran the secretariat of the *Filmliga Rotterdam*, and afterwards that of the architecture association and magazine *De 8 & Opbouw*¹⁸³. In Utrecht the *Filmliga* was established by the architects Sybold van Ravesteyn and Gerrit Rietveld, chairman and secretary respectively. Van Ravesteyn was an especially active member. Further, in The Hague the architect Cornelis van Eesteren became the chairman and designer Vilmos Huszár became the secretary. Why were all of them committed to film?

One answer might be that they were interested in set design, like Henk Wegerif¹⁸⁴. After he had met *Filmliga* filmmaker Jan Teunissen, who made a film about his 'Flatgebouw Willemspark' in The Hague (1928-1930), he became the most important set designer in the Netherlands in the 1930s. In total, he designed the sets for nineteen feature films¹⁸⁵. However, Wegerif was an exception. Concerning Dutch cinema, the *Filmliga* was especially a platform for the 'absolute film', which was exactly the kind of film that hardly made use of spectacular sets.

¹⁷⁷ The first board of the *Filmliga Rotterdam* consisted of the following members: J.J.P. Oud (chairman), J.E. van der Pot (vice-chairman), J. Huijts (secretary), N. Rost (2nd secretary), J. Mees PRzn. (treasurer), S.J.R. de Monchy (member), J.A. Brinkman (member). These people also signed the manifesto that was printed in the first issues of the *Filmliga* magazine (1927) – inside back cover). Smit (2005: 32) adds the following names that originally signed the manifesto: L. Bolle, P. Meller, J.T.Schaddelee, W.H.Gispen, J. Gompertz, C.H. van der Leeuw, and L.C. van der Vlugt. For Van der Vlugt and Van der Leeuw, see: Koch, 2005: 189n92. See also: Huijts, 1975: 266.

¹⁷⁸ In 1934, for example, *Opbouw* organised an exhibition on *Het Nieuwe Bouwen* in the *Filmliga* related Studio 32 (see: Van Gelderen, 1934: 103-104).

¹⁷⁹ Schoots, 1999: 183-185.

¹⁸⁰ The *Manifest Filmliga Rotterdam* together with the *Manifest Filmliga Amsterdam* was published in the first two editions of the *Filmliga* magazine (1927).

¹⁸¹ At this time (autumn 1927), Oud got overstrained and ill, and various tasks were carried out by his collaborators, among them Pali Meller (cf. Taverne e.a., 2001: 132). In this case it was Ida Liefrinck to do the work, although Oud remained a member of the board for a period of two years (until October 1929).

¹⁸² For more information about her work: Kühnel, 2006.

¹⁸³ Liefrinck is mentioned as the secretary of the *Filmliga Rotterdam* from the second issue of *Filmliga*, 1927/2 (p13), until the issue 1930/5 February (p66). For her role in *De 8 & Opbouw*, see: Holsappel, 2000: 9; in the period 1934-1939 she ran the secretariat of its magazine.

¹⁸⁴ The architect A.H. Wegerif became known as a representative of the *Haagsche School* (The Hague). One of his famous designs is the Private House Solheim in Delft (1932, see: Groenendijk en Vollaard, 1998: 211).

¹⁸⁵ Dittrich, 1987.

Another reason why architects were involved with film might be that they were interested in designing cinema theatres, of which numbers had increased significantly during the 1920s. J.J.P. Oud had built one of the first cinema theatres in the Netherlands, the Schinkel Bioscoop in Purmerend (1912)¹⁸⁶. Leen van der Vlugt, who was also among the initiators of the Filmliga Rotterdam¹⁸⁷, had built the large ‘Theater Soesman’ in Rotterdam (1922). Some architects managed to link the interests indeed. In Amsterdam, Merkelbach & Karsten rebuilt the Filmliga theatre ‘De Uitkijk’ (1933), and Johannes Duiker created the famous ‘Cineac’ (1933-1934)¹⁸⁸, while De Stijl architect Jan Wils built ‘City’ (1935, part of the City-concern). In Utrecht, Gerrit Rietveld and Truus Schröder-Schräder designed the Filmliga theatre ‘Vreeburg’ (1936)¹⁸⁹. However, since their numbers were limited in comparison to the total amount of cinemas, this does not provide a satisfying answer.

Architects were probably interested in avant-garde films since many of them dealt with architecture and urban space. Well-known are THE BRIDGE (1928, Joris Ivens) and HOOGSTRAAT (1929, Andor von Bary), as well as MODERNE NEDERLANDSCHE ARCHITECTUUR (1930, Mannus Franken), and WE ARE BUILDING (1930, Joris Ivens), including the short NEW ARCHITECTURE. In the latter Ivens, like Mannus Franken, shows various landmarks of Dutch modern architecture. It gives special attention to the ‘Van Nelle factory’ that is highlighted in a constructivist way for its use of glass. These films reverse the question to: why were so many filmmakers interested in architecture? Film historian Bert Hogenkamp has addressed this issue too: ‘It is striking that the filmmakers of the Filmliga-generation were so fascinated by modern architecture. *Het Nieuwe Bouwen* [‘New Building’], lent itself apparently well for experiments in image composition’¹⁹⁰. Although architecture brought possibilities for formal experimentation, this interest was rooted in a broader concern. Film historian Tom Gunning even says that the interaction between architecture and the Filmliga movement has largely directed the Dutch conception of modernist cinema¹⁹¹.

In 1920, the artists Theo van Doesburg met Hans Richter and Viking Eggeling, who were working on abstract animations. Van Doesburg became very enthusiastic and wrote about them in the article ‘Abstracte Filmbeelding’ (1921) that he published in *De Stijl*. He linked these experiments to earlier ideas of Vilmos Huszár and addressed the possibility in the Netherlands to elaborate on them, to which end Van Doesburg would publish various other articles about film too¹⁹². At the same time he heralded modern architecture, such as the pre-barricaded housing experiment ‘Stulemeijer’ in Rotterdam, by architect Jan van Hardeveld (*De Stijl*, vol. 4/12, 1921). It carried the promise of low costs, acceleration of the construction process, and new opportunities for plasticity and flexibility. Walls could be arranged in various ways; concrete and steel frames even enabled architects to design sliding walls of glass, which linked up with cinema in terms of transparency, display, view, and perspective¹⁹³. Van Doesburg envisioned a kind of

¹⁸⁶ Taverne e.a., 2001: 86-89; cf. Van der Maden, 1986: 41.

¹⁸⁷ Schoots, 1999: 183.

¹⁸⁸ Next to that Duiker expressed a general interest in film (see: Duiker, 1933a, 1933b).

¹⁸⁹ See: Brusse, 1938: 3-5. At the same time Rietveld was also thinking of possibilities to create a stereoscopic theatre, which was a problem that he could not solve by architecture (cf. Limperg, 1939). Better suitable to do so was photographic technology that would be explored, for example, by Andor von Bary (which resulted in the book *Raumbild-Fotografie*, Halle (Saale): Verlag Wilhelm Knapp, 1943 – Bibliothek Carl Zeiss; www.stereoskopie.com > Literatur (2008-05-27).

¹⁹⁰ Hogenkamp, 1988: 49. Original quote: ‘Het is opvallend dat de filmmakers van de Filmliga-generatie zo door de moderne architectuur gefascineerd werden. *Het Nieuwe Bouwen* leende zich blijkbaar goed voor experimenten in beeldcompositie.’

¹⁹¹ Gunning, 1999: 256.

¹⁹² The first article (*De Stijl*, vol. 4/5, 1921) was followed by articles in the issues 2, 3 and 7 in 1922, 5 in 1923, and 55/56 in 1927.

¹⁹³ In relationship to the work of Van Doesburg, see: Van Straaten, 1988: 142. The architects of the modern movement searched for new ways to elaborate and to apply ideas on movement and time, related to functions of space and modes of use, which changed according to different moments of the day and the year, as well as particular events. In this

'light-architecture', and thought of projected walls that created illusory spaces¹⁹⁴. Architecture, he prophesied, could be just light, fully transparent, even immaterial and constantly changing, which were radical extrapolations of the ideas that he and Van Eesteren had developed with their studies *Hôtel Particulier* and *Maison Particulière* (1923). While Van Doesburg moved abroad, other members of *De Stijl* became active members of the Filmliga, among them Huszár, Rietveld, Oud, and Van Eesteren¹⁹⁵.

The Bridge

The most famous example of a film that resulted from the converging interests between architecture and cinema is THE BRIDGE. It is a 'montage documentary' that has been compared to the 'city symphonies' of Cavalcanti, Ruttmann, Vigo and Vertov, among others. It deals with the 'Koningsbrug' ('King's Bridge', 1924-1927, Pieter Joosting), a big iron railway bridge that is also known as *De Hef* (≈ the lift). The film shows trains crossing the bridge, a train that has to wait when the middle part of the bridge is elevated, and ships passing by; the bridge goes down again and the train continues. These various movements provide abstract imagery, visual patterns, dynamic compositions and contrasting views. Through the film's expressive editing the different perspectives interchange and create a rhythm. A single movement, for example the closing of the bridge, is shown from different angles; the shots are edited one after the other, and in this way the movement is discomposed. The film coincides with the logic and the structure of the subject.

Comparing THE BRIDGE to the architecture theory of Siegfried Giedion, Tom Gunning argues that Ivens approached the architectural ideal of visual simultaneity.

On the basis of the railway bridge in Rotterdam, Ivens explores the reorganisation of space, but he also shows its functioning, its processes and rhythm by way of cinematic time. Until then, no other avant-garde film had researched the visual characteristics of one location so profoundly.¹⁹⁶

Both film and architecture were considered as modes of perception. In their own ways, both tried to see the world in a new perspective, to provide a new worldview, and to establish a new image of it. Gunning argues that architecture is in fact not the 'subject' of THE BRIDGE. Instead, Ivens elaborated the shared interest of the avant-garde cinema and modern architecture for new experiences, generated by technology and technological environments. THE BRIDGE, as Gunning puts it, explores a new vision, which is made possible by new technological constructions¹⁹⁷.

Film theorist Béla Balázs (1930) and Gilles Deleuze quoting him (1983), compared THE BRIDGE to Ivens's next film, RAIN (1929, Joris Ivens, Mannus Franken), which does not just show 'rain', as a general phenomenon, but a specific appearance of it.

perspective one might consider, for example, the application of sliding walls in the housing complex 'De Eendracht' (1929-1935, Jo van den Broek). A floor plan turned into a storyboard, indicating different sequences, for day and night.¹⁹⁴ This information is derived from the exhibition: 'Theo van Doesburg, architect, schilder, dichter', that was organised by the Centraal Museum in Utrecht, and the Kröller Müller Museum in Otterlo (2000-03-12 – 2000-06-18). Curators of the exhibition were Marja Bosma, Sjarel Ex, Toos van Kooten and Evert van Straaten, and it was accompanied by an oeuvre catalogue (Els Hoek, ed., 2000). The idea of light architecture would be elaborated by others later on, cf. Limperg, 1939.

¹⁹⁵ In this light one may also consider Van Eesteren's lecture and slide show on the functional city called *Eine Stunde Städtebau* (Berlin, January 1928), which has been called an 'urbanist film' (Van Rossem, 1997; cf. Vanstiphout, 2005: 267). In this presentation, with examples of urban planning in different countries, Van Eesteren made also use of aerial photographs, which, according to Van Rossem, was of special interest to Van Eesteren, next to maps, diagrams and graphs. As such, film could be added here too as an instrument to show the functioning and organisation of a city.

¹⁹⁶ Gunning, 1999: 257. Original quote: 'Ivens onderzoekt aan de hand van de Rotterdamse spoorbrug de reorganisatie van de ruimte, maar laat met behulp van filmische tijd ook zijn werking, zijn processen en ritme zien. Geen enkele andere avant-gardefilm had tot dan toe de visuele eigenschappen van één afzonderlijke locatie zo grondig onderzocht.'

¹⁹⁷ Gunning, 1999: 256.

‘And even when it’s a matter of a unique object, like the *Bridge* of Rotterdam, this metallic construction is dissolved in immaterial images, framed in a thousand different ways. The fact that this bridge can be seen in a multiplicity of ways renders it, as it were, unreal. It does not appear to us as the creation of engineers aiming at a determinate end, but like a curious series of optical effects. These are visual variations on which it would be difficult for a goods train to travel.’ [Balázs, quoted by Deleuze]

This is not a concept of bridge, but neither is it the individuated state of things defined by its form, its metallic matter, its uses and functions. It is a potentiality. (Deleuze, 1992 [1983]: 110-111)

Deleuze distinguishes between what something *is* at a particular moment, which is based on a specific character, role or object, for instance, and what something might *evoke*, a potential, which is based on things like brightness, a particular shape or, for example, a compassionate look. This potentiality is an ‘affect’ that opens up an ‘any-space-whatever’ (*espace quelconque*), which is a concept that Deleuze developed through *THE BRIDGE*. He writes that the large number of shots in the film ‘constitute the set of singularities which are combined in the any-space-whatever in which this bridge appeared as pure quality, this metal as pure power, Rotterdam itself as affect’ (Deleuze, 1992 [1983]: 111). It is not a fixed object anymore; ‘it no longer has co-ordinates, it is a pure potential’ (ibid, 120). The film opens up a space beyond the object. As such, the film establishes a new connection between film and architecture.

In order to understand the potentialities of *THE BRIDGE*, one might consider how this film came into being. First of all it seems important that Ivens (•1898-†1989), coming from Nijmegen, studied at the Economische Hogeschool Rotterdam from 1919 to 1922¹⁹⁸. This fact is often overlooked, since he is usually associated with Amsterdam, where he lived and worked later on. His years in Rotterdam were foundational in terms of interests and connections, regarding issues such as movement and construction, as well as labour and politics¹⁹⁹. Crucial is the fact that in Rotterdam he became friends with Arthur Lehning, who introduced him into the ideas of anarchism.

Ivens’s father, who owned the photography company CAPI, sent him to Germany to study photo-technology at the Technical Institute of Charlottenburg, near Berlin²⁰⁰. Lehning went to Berlin as well. At Lehning’s home in Berlin, Ivens met the anarchist and avant-garde photographer Germaine Krull, with whom he fell in love (and whom he married later)²⁰¹. Krull introduced him to the cultural and political scenes of Berlin and together they went to cinemas to see avant-garde films²⁰².

Krull had just been in the Soviet Union for a period of one year and, together with Kurt Hübschmann, she opened a photography studio (1922)²⁰³. It became successful, and as a result, she also took part in exhibitions together with André Kertész, László Moholy-Nagy and other prominent photographers. She established contacts with members of the Bauhaus and became involved with the constructivist movement. Concurrently to that, she frequented the same circuits as the photographer Ré Niemeyer, who was briefly married to Hans Richter, and collaborated on his films. This formed the basis for contacts between Ivens and Richter²⁰⁴.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. Schoots, 1993: 116.

¹⁹⁹ It was in Rotterdam too, in 1924, that Ivens made his first serious attempts at filmmaking – about a bar with sailors, see: Sichel, 1999: 71.

²⁰⁰ De Boode & Van Oudheusden, 1985: 62-63.

²⁰¹ Ibid. Krull and Ivens married at the 2nd of April 1927 (and they got divorced at the 27th of August 1943) – Sichel, 1999: 70; cf. www.kunstbus.nl/verklaringen/germaine+krull.html (2008-05-28).

²⁰² See: De Boode & Van Oudheusden, 1985: 63, cf. information by the Ivens Foundation Nijmegen: www.iven.nl.

²⁰³ Aka Kurt Hutton, see: Sichel, 1999: 37; cf. San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, www.sfmoma.org > exhibitions > Germaine Krull (2008-05-28).

²⁰⁴ Richter, in his turn, as a pioneer of Dada, was friends with Kurt Schwitters and Van Doesburg, who, together with Van Doesburg’s wife Nelly van Moorsel, gave their Dada performance in *De Doelen* in Rotterdam in 1923.

In the period that Krull and Ivens moved to the Netherlands, she made her photographic portfolio *Métal* (1925-1928)²⁰⁵. It includes her well-known photographs of the Eiffel Tower, next to photographs of industrial complexes in the harbours of Amsterdam and Rotterdam. At the same time, Ivens became involved with the Filmliga. As he was very enthusiastic about Ruttmann's *BERLIN, DIE SINFONIE EINER GROSSSTADT* (1927), he wanted to show it at the Filmliga, and to that end he visited Ruttmann in his studio in Berlin. It was during this occasion that Ivens got the idea to make films himself, and thought of a suitable subject. Sybold van Ravesteyn, who was a member of the board of the Filmliga and an architect for the Dutch Railways, suggested him to make a film about the new railway bridge *De Hef*, for all the movements it encompasses²⁰⁶. Ravesteyn contacted Pieter Joosting, who designed the bridge, and together they assisted Ivens during the three months of shooting the film. It is likely, however, that Krull has actually been the decisive factor, since she was working on her portfolio *Métal*. During, and probably already before the shooting of *THE BRIDGE*, in the first months of 1928, she took also several photographs of the bridge and of Ivens at work. When the film was shown at the Filmliga, Van Ravesteyn used them for a montage that was printed on the cover of the *Filmliga* magazine (1928/11 – cover design by Huszár). In addition, the photographs were also used for the cover of *De Gemeenschap* (1928, vol. 4/7, design: Paul Schuitema). In conjunction with the film, Krull's portfolio *Métal* was published in 1928 too²⁰⁷, which is a story that 'is best told as a collaborative tale of the photographer and filmmaker together' (Sichel, 1999: 74).

Whereas *THE BRIDGE* is Ivens's first important work, which set his reputation as an avant-garde filmmaker, his later work is rather different, no longer based on constructivism, but on social realism. In that sense the film is closer to Krull's work. It seems that gender issues are at stake, which could be further explored²⁰⁸. The directors have been accredited first of all, which at that time were almost exclusively men. Women, instead, often operated behind the scenes. This has been addressed before, but it has hardly been researched until now²⁰⁹.

If, alternatively, we consider the role of Van Ravesteyn, something similar comes to the fore. Van Ravesteyn, born and raised in Rotterdam, was trained as a civil engineer, and also worked as such. Because of his wife, Dora Hintzen, who was highly interested in modern art, and especially *De Stijl*, he decided to change functions at the NS and to work as an architect²¹⁰. Her connections also played a role here²¹¹. As such he got into contact with J.J.P. Oud, who introduced him to the avant-garde movement²¹². This also resulted in Van Ravesteyn's involvement with the Filmliga.

²⁰⁵ Sichel, 1999, Ch. 4.

²⁰⁶ De Boode & Van Oudheusden, 1985: 64.

²⁰⁷ For further details, see: Sichel, 1999: 77.

²⁰⁸ If one just realises that various film theorists have called editing the main feature of cinema, the cutter might be accredited accordingly. It is striking that Helene van Dongen and Lien d'Oliveyra were among the first in the Netherlands to edit sound-film. The former used to work with Ivens (e.g. *NIEUWE GRONDEN*, 1933), the latter with Rutten (e.g. *DEAD WATER*, 1934).

²⁰⁹ Cf. Hogenkamp, in: Westhoff, 1995: II (introduction). In this study on the biographies of thirty (male) filmmakers in the Netherlands (1920s-1930s), Hogenkamp has argued that more research should be done concerning the role of women in the Dutch film industry.

²¹⁰ Timmer, 2002. Besides the fact that Van Ravesteyn himself has pointed to the role of his wife in his career, it is also striking that they were married from 1915 to 1931, which runs parallel to the period that Van Ravesteyn came to the fore as an advocate of modernism, while after their divorce he turned towards a more traditional approach.

²¹¹ She was the daughter of George Herman Hintzen, who was a well-known economist and politician, with many connections. He had first been a member of the Dutch parliament before he became alderman of Rotterdam. Later he became partner at the banking firm of R. Mees & Co. (1902-1925). Whereas Van Ravesteyn became known for his work for the railways and, internationally, for his housing project at the *Weissenhofsiedlung* in Stuttgart (1927), G.H. Hintzen was concerned with the Dutch Railways, while he had also been the founder of the Society for Workers Housing (*Maatschappij voor Werkmanswoningen*, 1896). www.parlement.com/9291000/bio/00584 (2008-05-28).

²¹² Pronk, 2001: 190.

Although THE BRIDGE might still be understood in terms of ‘potential’ and *espace quelconque*, as proposed by Deleuze, it is first of all a crystallisation of interactions within a network. This is also the rationale that caused Allen J. Scott to frame the hypothesis that ‘innovation, all else being equal, is likely to be a geometric function of the size of the relevant reference group’ (2000: 12). Whether this hypothesis can be maintained in the long term remains to be seen, but as a provocation it is at least valuable. It suggests, in this case, that the film is the *sediment* of social exchanges, between people across different disciplines. As a *potential* the film has fuelled such exchanges, which is exemplified by the subsequent commission to make WE ARE BUILDING, and the fact that soon after its release it was shown in Berlin and acquired by Sovkino to be shown to filmmakers in Moscow²¹³. The film became the currency for an international exchange.

Nul uur Nul

Drawing the network, there appear to be more crystallisation points of innovation. A masterpiece never exists in isolation. Other works, however, have not necessarily received broad attention. For various reasons experiments might have been forgotten. They come only to the fore by reconsidering the network and the overall constellation of forces, and by tracing transmissions within it. In this way, I will present the case of NUL UUR NUL (1927-1928, ‘Zero Hour Zero’), which is little known, but which can be considered as one of the earliest and probably most radical examples of Dutch avant-garde cinema, as well as theatre: it was a film and theatre play in one. However, the film has not been preserved, except for fragments, but the available documentation allows for an attempt to reconstruct it on paper. The image that comes to the fore shows Rotterdam and The Hague, and deals most explicitly with *industry, mobility, media* and *leisure*. As such it might be taken as a counterpart of THE BRIDGE, also if we still follow Deleuze.

This successful project was initiated and written by the young Simon Koster (•1900-†1989), who was part of *Wij Nu!*, a collective from The Hague that promoted experimental theatre and film²¹⁴. This group of people would also help to establish the Filmliga as a national organisation. Koster himself, who had started to work in Berlin as a foreign correspondent of the NRC, became a representative of the Filmliga, for which he established and maintained contacts with filmmakers in Berlin, just like Mannus Franken did in Paris. Through his connections in The Hague, Koster approached theatre director Cor van der Lugt Melsert of the established *Vereenigd Rotterdamsch Hofstad-Tooneel*, and found him willing to collaborate on this experiment. Various interior shots were recorded in Berlin, in collaboration with the cinematographer Curt Oertel²¹⁵. Next to that he asked his friend Gerard Rutten, another member of *Wij Nu!*, to design the sets. Officially under the direction of Van der Lugt Melsert, the play was performed at the *Koninklijke Schouwburg* in The Hague, on the 1st of January 1928, and at the *Groote Schouwburg* in Rotterdam, on the 17th of January.

In a flyer for the show, Koster explained the reason of the project. The account starts with an experience Koster once had at midnight. After visiting friends at the countryside he was waiting for his train, which was delayed. The next train was about to depart at 0.00 hr. (*Nul uur Nul*). He remarked that these zeros were the result of the 24-hour-time, but there was something strange about it.²¹⁶

²¹³ In Berlin it was shown by the *Kino Technische Gesellschaft* – ref. *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 34, 1928.

²¹⁴ Cf. Rutten, 1976: 44.

²¹⁵ Mentioned on a flyer and a film production photo in the Archive Simon Koster, Theater Instituut Nederland, inventaris 48, nr. 215. The film is part of the collection of the B&G in Hilversum. It is eleven minutes in length, but the script (at the Theater Instituut Nederland) suggests that there must have been more material.

²¹⁶ Flyer written by Simon Koster (Archive Simon Koster, Theater Instituut Nederland, inventaris 48, nr. 215), original quote: ‘De verlatenheid, de nacht, de stilte, en daar héél, heel ver de brandende gloed van de stad, dat alles schijnt met deze eigenaardige drie nullen in eenig onbegrijpelijk verband te staan. Nul uur Nul...., is dat niet de stilte, de

The desolation, the night, the silence, and there, very far away, the burning glow of the city, that all seems to have some incomprehensible connection with these peculiar zeros. Zero hour Zero....., is that not the silence, the endless emptiness, a moment in time outside of all actual time? Which date is it? Is it still yesterday, or already tomorrow? A question to pursue a process. Maybe it is neither yesterday, nor tomorrow, but an instance of the absolute presence, between the old and the new day, an unreal point in space, with on the one side the blazing, glowing city, and on the other the nocturnal landscape.....

Based on these reflections, Koster wrote the script for the performance²¹⁷.

In a review for the *Filmliga* (1928/6), Johan Huijts wrote that the show starts with ‘a succinct and occasionally excellent *Rien que les Heures*’²¹⁸. The latter is a reference to Cavalcanti’s film about Paris (1926) that had just been presented at the Filmliga, while it had already been introduced before by Marcel L’Herbier and Mannus Franken at *Wij Nu!*²¹⁹. The film shows an image of the Earth: a globe that turns around very quickly. The world is literally sped up, which is subsequently articulated by a restless interchange of images, through a fast and suggestive montage, and through the technique of superimposition (double exposure), which emphasizes that everything is happening simultaneously. Besides that, various sequences of the film are coloured, by way of tinting. This visual whirlpool includes images of aeroplanes, ships at sea, enshippment in the Rotterdam harbour, and work being done in factories. Several of these images were shot by Andor von Barsy, as part of industrial films such as *ORANJEBOOM*, *HET BIERBROUWBEDRIJF*, including images of machines handling beer barrels, and *MACHINEFABRIEK EN SCHEEPSWERF VAN P. SMIT JR.*, including images of the production of bombs. A striking fact is that these Transfilma productions, which Von Barsy shot in 1927, were not even released by then. Those images are interchanged by recordings of a jazz performance by Johnny Possart at *Café Pschorr*, shots of people dancing, a merry-go-round, and people relaxing on a cruise ship, having lunch, watching horse races, swimming and playing tennis. There are telephone operators and office talks²²⁰. Altogether, this collage of quickly interchanging images exemplifies what Heynen (1999: 12) has called the transitory concept of modernity.

Whereas one of the main characters in *RIEN QUE LES HEURES* is a woman selling newspapers, *NUL UUR NUL* features a newspaper boy played by a woman: the actress Annie van Ees, who played a similar character in the very popular theatre play ‘Boefje’, since 1923, which was also directed by Van der Lugt Melsert²²¹. The vendor enters the theatre from behind the audience, comments upon all kinds of local affairs, moves to the stage and addresses the people on screen. The film shows a train arriving at a station, which is The Hague HS. These images were actually made by Otto van Neijenhoff for his never completed film about the Dutch railways²²². People get off the train, on stage, and walk away. The newspaper vendor starts speaking, with a broad local tongue, to people waiting for their train. An elderly couple approaches him and ask what time the train to Rotterdam departs. *NUL UUR NUL*, answers the boy, whose name is AKO (after a well-known chain of newspaper shops). He in turn asks them if

eindelooze leegte, een tijdstip buiten alle werkelijke tijd? Welke datum is het? Is het nog gisteren, of is het al morgen? Een vraagstuk om een proces over te voeren. Misschien is het noch het gisteren, noch het morgen, maar een oogenblik van het absolute heden, tusschen de oude en de nieuwe dag; een onwerkelijk punt in de ruimte, waarin aan de ééne kant de laaiendlichte stad, aan de andere kant het nachtelijke landschap ligt.....’.

²¹⁷ Simon Koster (1927), script *NUL UUR NUL*, Theater Instituut Nederland, code 45E 21.

²¹⁸ Original quote: ‘een beknopt en hier en daar voortreffelijk *Rien que les Heures*’.

²¹⁹ Fragments of Cavalcanti’s work had been shown at *Wij Nu!*, as part of presentations on French cinema by both Marcel L’Herbier and Mannus Franken – Brederoo: 1986: 186.

²²⁰ It is not exactly clear which of these images were already shown here, and which were part of later scenes.

²²¹ The play was based on the book by M.J. Brusse (publ. 1903); it was elaborated as such by Jaap van der Poll (1923), and performed by the *Vereenigd Rotterdamsch Hofstad-Tooneel*. The story was also made into a film (1939, Detlef Sierck), in which Annie van Ees also played the main character – see: Lammers, 2008.

²²² Information from the Instituut voor Beeld & Geluid, see the record *NUL UUR NUL* at B&G.

they are going to dance, because ‘all people from The Hague go dancing in Rotterdam’. They say they do not dance anymore. ‘Oh, are you then going to the aviation-school?’ But they don’t. They reply that they take it easy. The boy thinks a while and says: ‘Ohhh, then I know you. You are the committee for the Hofplein Issue [a major urban planning question since 1922]’. But the man does not understand him. He does not know Rotterdam at all, so the boy starts to explain the city. In a humorous way he tells them about the tramway company, roads being renovated and bridges that become ever bigger, so that the old man concludes that Rotterdam must be ‘the city of the future’. With this picture the setting has been drawn. All that comes next, being a reflection upon modernity, is at the same time a reflection upon Rotterdam.

While the elderly couple waits for the train of *Nul uur Nul*, the boy waits too, and falls asleep. On the screen there is a projection of film images showing newspapers, sold by the boy that we see as well, which report what is going on in the world. In front of the screen appears an old, anachronistic man. He starts to give an optimistic lecture, refuting the theory that the civilisation of Europe has come to an end. While reflecting upon issues of social development and technology, he argues that we are entering a new era. His observations are juxtaposed to all kinds of harsh film images projected behind him. Social catastrophes and images of the League of Nations are interchanged. Regarding these contrasts, Huijts remarked that ‘it is difficult not to write a satire’, but for ‘satire the prose was too weak.’ It was neither satire, nor prose, but an oscillation between such categories, of things that happen simultaneously, but Huijts found the interchanges too repetitive. Instead, he suggested that ‘our pioneers’ could try to establish the unity of theatre and film by using ‘the slow-motion and absolute film: rhythms, no representations’.

The old man disappears from stage and the motion pictures go on, which are subsequently presented under different headings, starting with traffic. There are images of traffic at the Willemsbrug, and a chaos of cars. The newspaper vendor sings about it, and at the end of the song a car approaches from a distance. It seems as if he rides over the boy, who falls on the floor. Under the next heading, ‘film news’, the boy pays a visit to Hollywood, which is shown on the screen. On stage the boy enters a palace, where he is the guest of Pola Negri and other famous stars. A film set is being built, and shootings begin. Different headings follow: ‘Family Announcements’, ‘City News’, ‘Radio’, ‘Commemoration’, ‘Feuilleton’, and ‘Latest News’.

All of the headings are about modern life and a world in turmoil, while confusion is *communicated* when people from the audience start to protest against the show. There are objections against ‘pornographic images’ of a lady scarcely dressed in a negligee (which seems another reference to Cavalcanti). Some people shout that the film has to be stopped. It is part of the script, and actors are among the audience. It allows the director to appear on stage and to give his motivation.

We live in a time of progress, of innovation in every area. On this evening we have broken with several traditions. And I believe that it is reasonable. Most of you made a telephone call for the first time about twenty, twenty-five years ago. That was a colossal invention. But you have forgotten the impression which that first telephone call had upon you. Only a few years ago you heard radio for the first time. What we do here tonight, is applying new means in the theatre. In a few years you will hardly remember that it had ever been different. This you should realise, when I ask you: shall we continue the film in this performance, yes or no?²²³

²²³ Simon Koster, script *NUL UUR NUL* (1927), p51, Theater Instituut Nederland, code 45E 21, original quote: ‘We leven in een tijd van vooruitgang, van vernieuwing op elk gebied. Op dezen avond hebben we gebroken met verschillende tradities. En ik geloof, dat dat te billijken is. De meesten van u hebben twintig, vijfentwintig jaar geleden voor het eerst getelefoneerd. Dat was een kolossale uitvinding. Maar de indruk, die dat eerste telefoongesprek op U maakte, bent U vergeten. Nog maar een paar jaar geleden hoorde U voor de eerste keer radio. Wat wij hier vanavond doen, is de toepassing van nieuwe hulpmiddelen op het toneel. Over enkele jaren zult u zich misschien nauwelijks herinneren dat het ooit anders is geweest. Dit moet u bedenken, als ik u nu vraag: zullen we de film in deze opvoering laten blijven, ja of nee?’

Of course, the performance is continued. In retrospect this is a key moment of the performance. This forecast became a matter of fact: the performance would be forgotten, while the use of media on stage (and beyond, in public space) became a common phenomenon. Most important here, regarding the performance's central issue of 'time', is the reflection upon past and future, or the ability to remember that it had been different, and to imagine that it can be different as well.

Under the next heading, 'Latest News', the director of the play, Van der Lugt Melsert, is to be seen in the film, playing himself, reading the newspapers with headlines about this 'scandalous film'. Between all the activities that the film shows, a clock is to be seen, once and again. It moves inevitably towards midnight (= NUL UUR NUL), with the director getting crazy. He finally puts a gun to his head, while the clock beats twelve. In the next shot are spectacular fireworks over the city: it is zero hour zero – one should notice here that the first performance took place on New Year's Day, 1928.

AKO wakes up. The train has arrived. All the people get on the train: the players on stage sit down on steps in front of the film screen. On the screen a train starts moving, which are constructivist images by Otto van Neijenhoff. The passengers begin to talk to each other²²⁴. The conversation is about the train that goes to Rotterdam. Rotterdam, however, is not an actual city anymore. It has become the future, or rather an abstract perception of time.

AKO: Watch! We move! If you didn't know any better, you would say that we move!

Chic Type: Where are we actually going?

Old man: It's not really a usual train.

Old woman: It isn't the ghost-train, is it?

AKO: No. It's the train of ZERO HOUR ZERO.

Old man: Do we have to stay in it for long?

AKO: Very long!!! Nobody knows how long. It can even be that you have to get off at full speed.

Chic Type: Mondieu! What an unpleasant train!

Editor: On which section are we actually riding?

AKO: Between two v-e-r-y big stations! Between 'Yesterday' and 'Tomorrow'.

Old man: Stop it!

²²⁴ Simon Koster, script NUL UUR NUL (1927), p54, Theater Instituut Nederland, code 45E 21. The following quote is from pages that are not numbered, but put in between the pages with numbers. It seems that this is a later version that replaced the previous one. The translation is without the broad tongue. Original quote: 'Ako: Kijk! We rije! As je nie beter wis, zou je zeggen dat we rije! // Chi. typ: Waar gan we eigenlijk heen? // Oude man: Het is ook geen gewone trein. // Oude vrouw: Het is toch niet de spooktrein? // Ako: Nee. Het is de trein van NUL UUR NUL. // Oude man: Motte we daar lang in blijven zitten? // Ako: Héél lang!!! Niemand weet, hoe lang. Het kan wel zijn, dat je in volle vaart mot uitstappe! // Ch.: Mondieu! Wat een onaangename trein! // redact.: Op welk traject rijden we eigenlijk? // Ako: Tusschen twee hééle groote stations! Tusschen "Gisteren" en "Morgen". // Oude man: Hou op! // Oude vrouw: Ik wil terug! // Ako: Dat kan niet. De weg naar "gisteren" is versperd! // El. dame: Is er geen noodrem? // Ch. Typ: Ik wil niet naar "Morgen". Al m'n bagage is in "gisteren" blijven staan. // Ako: Hier verkoope ze geen retourtjes! // Oude vr.: Stoppe!!!! // Oude man: Ik heb geen geld, om zoo ver te reizen! // El. dame: Hij gaat hoe langer hoe harder! // Redact. Hij vliegt als een bezetene. Dat is waanzin!!! // Oude vr. Ik word duizelig! // Ch. Typ: Wat een vaart!!! Wat een vaart!!! // Ako: We vliegen! Op weg naar de toekomst!!!!'

Old woman: I want to go back!

AKO: That's not possible. The road to 'Yesterday' is blocked.

Elegant lady: Isn't there an emergency break?

Chic Type: I don't want to go to 'Tomorrow'. All my luggage remained in 'Yesterday'.

AKO: They don't sell return tickets here.

Old woman: Stop!

Old man: I have no money to travel that far!

Elegant lady: It goes faster all the way!

Editor: It flies like a possessed one. That's madness!

Old woman: I get dizzy!

Chic Type: What a speed!!! What a speed!!!

AKO: We fly! On the way to the future!!!!

The conversation is accompanied by a loop of a moving train that is projected behind the actors. The train seems to move ahead, but its movement is actually indeterminate, due to the loop, while the actors on stage stay at the same place. Moreover, the image makes use of a split screen. The cameraman must have been hanging out of a window, and then filmed the train. The image is mirrored to the other side of the film frame. The result is that we see two sides of the train, without the train itself. There is nothing else than windows and a moving landscape. According to Huijts, this last image of the show was 'really a hollow built mysteriousness, an ectoplastic reality of etherealness'²²⁵. It might be another instance of Deleuze's 'any-space-whatever', as an affection-image that opens up a new realm, but it does more than that.

NUL UUR NUL is a reflection upon the nature of time and addresses the problem of dividing it. Deleuze has addressed the same problem, arguing that time is a continuous flow, a movement, opposite to space that can be divided infinitely. Modern science, he says, has rendered time into 'equidistant instants'; each moment is equal to another, hence an 'any-instant-whatever'. Hence, we have immobile sections to which an abstract understanding of time is added. He says that the philosopher Henri Bergson, in 1907, mistakenly called it the 'cinematographic illusion'²²⁶. Although cinema is based on immobile sections, being still images that become movement, Deleuze says that this is not a matter of perceiving immobile sections to which abstract time is added by the mind. Rather, the movement is perceived immediately²²⁷. The result is what Deleuze calls the 'movement-image'. The final scene of NUL UUR NUL expresses exactly such a thought: the movement in between two instants, but at the same time it also shows the conceptual imprisonment of it. Film takes a peculiar position here, since it is combined with theatre, and for the fact that it is a loop in the end.

The loop suggests that one moves ahead, but it is a vicious circle in which the past becomes present, once and again. The loop exemplifies a fluctuation between past and future.

²²⁵ Original quote: '...werkelijk een holgebouwde geheimzinnigheid, een ectoplastische realiteit van onwerkelijkheid....'

²²⁶ Deleuze, 1992 [1983]: 1.

²²⁷ Ibid, 2.

Whereas it may exemplify the idea of the ‘movement-image’, it may also provide a counterargument to Deleuze’s ‘time-image’. Deleuze has explained that time is perceived by recalling a virtual image, from the past, through an actual image, from the present (he has called this together the ‘crystal-image’); the image that emerges from it is the ‘time-image’. It is a fluctuation between virtual and physical, and it is a creation of memory. In the case of a loop, however, there is a temporal shortcut. What does it mean, in this case, that the loop itself addresses the problem of time, by way of a train as a symbol of progress, which stands for the condition of the modern world in general?

At this point one can consider Niklas Luhmann’s thought about the way the modern world, as a social system, creates and maintains itself. He observed a major problem. At the scale of the whole world there is not ‘outside’, and the output of the system serves as input again. The result is a *sur place*, like the loop.

[A] re-entry leads to an unresolvable indeterminacy. The system cannot match its internal observations with its reality, nor can external observers compute the system. Such systems need a memory function (i.e. culture) that presents the present as an outcome of the past. But memory means forgetting and highly selective remembering, it means constructing identities for re-impregnating recurring events. In addition, such systems need an oscillator function to be able to cross the boundaries of all distinctions they use, such as, being/not-being, inside/outside, good/bad, male/female, true/false etc. (Luhmann, 1997)

To be able to remember, identities need to be made, which means images and forms, hence cultural expressions like cinema and architecture (a.o.). To create such forms the (collective) mind needs the oscillator function. It crosses boundaries and distinctions, like those mentioned by Luhmann, which can all be illustrated by examples from NUL UUR NUL. Such a boundary crossing is characteristic for the avant-garde in general, and the notion of ‘oscillation’ could therefore be used to address its role within cultural and society. At the same time the avant-garde provides a memory function, for the fact that a film (or a building) becomes a reference for things that have been done. In the case of NUL UUR NUL, the memory function is even explicitly addressed when the director appears on stage – memory and oscillation are two sides of the same coin.

In a literal way, the memory function is instantiated by the film making use of footage from other films. Recycled film images recall past issues and events, and as such the memory function is made explicit. In this case, however, there is a complication, since the original films by Von Barys and Van Neijenhoff had not been released yet. It causes a gradual shift from ‘remediation’ to ‘premediation’²²⁸. Alternatively, the film material was used within a stage performance. Whereas early cinema used to remediate the theatre, this is an instance of the theatre remediating cinema. Whereas mediation versus remediation is itself an instance of oscillation, the move between two different cultural forms – theatre and cinema – is yet another instance of oscillation.

The idea of oscillation is, furthermore, exemplified by moving back and forth between different media categories and genres, such as fiction and documentary, avant-garde and industrial film. This too is part of the ‘subject’ of NUL UUR NUL, since it reflects upon media practices, as well as urban development, as different sides of modernity. In this way it is both a *reflection upon* its conditions and a *crystallisation of* these conditions. It corresponds to John Urry’s theory (2003) of ‘reflexive modernization’. Elaborating on Urry’s emphasis on ‘relationality’, one can recognise a link here between the particular and the general: between metaphor, such as the looped train, as a vehicle of reflection, and the totality of the modern world.

²²⁸ Whereas the term ‘remediation’ was first used by Bolter and Grusin (2000), the latter has also spoken of ‘premediation’ – ref.: Richard Grusin: ‘Premediation: Media Logics in Times of War’, presentation at De Balie, Amsterdam, 2003-11-12. www.debalie.nl/artikel.jsp?articleid=4473&podiumid=media (visited, 2007-09-25).

This totality, however, can be precisely identified through the professional network of which Koster was part, which links Paris (Cavalcanti, through Franken, L'Herbier) to The Hague and Rotterdam, to Berlin (Oertel a.o.) and London (some additional shots), and elsewhere. This modern world is therefore not just a general reference (like the fictional visit to Hollywood), but largely a set of actual connections.

Since the central issue of NUL UUR NUL is time, a similar relationship between the particular and the general might be recognised concerning the particular moment of zero hour zero vis-à-vis the general nature of past and future. According to Luhmann, the system creates time by making a distinction between past and future, through memory and oscillation as functions of culture. This implies that the temporal horizon of the modern world, as addressed by Koster, exists because of cultural manifestations, including that of Koster. Each manifestation has its own temporal horizon, of past and future, which becomes abstract when it concerns explicitly a conception of time. From today's perspective, Koster's conception of time lies in the past, but it still offers possibilities for further thinking, which makes it eventually part of today's future. Next to that, NUL UUR NUL contains direct and indirect references to the future. An example is the casual remark of AKO, when referring to the procrastination in respect of the reorganisation of the 'Hofplein'. The discussion about the reorganisation of this square would continue for another fifteen years or so. Eventually it resulted in a major conflict between architect J.J.P. Oud and city planner Witteveen, during WWII, which affected both their careers, and the planning of post-war Rotterdam²²⁹.

Whereas I have already discussed the forecast that applied to the performance itself, being forgotten afterwards, we might instead consider its potential that revealed itself some years later. Koster would write the script for the successful feature film DEAD WATER (1934), which was directed by Gerard Rutten, who had been the set designer of NUL UUR NUL. Afterwards Koster himself directed LENTELIED (1936), while Andor von Barys collaborated on all of these films as a cameraman (see: Chapter 4). It shows a network that cuts across time, which already performs the functions of memory and oscillation. Returning where I started this section, I will elaborate on the role of networks in the next section.

§ 2. cross-disciplinary networks

Films like THE BRIDGE and NUL UUR NUL have been crystallisation points of social-cultural exchange within avant-garde networks. These networks were not only of an artistic nature. They were embedded within the concrete environments that the films reflect: 'Rotterdam itself as affect'. I will make an attempt to identify certain forces behind the scenes of both film and architecture, as a cross-disciplinary history, and how they have framed the city. Much of such social-cultural exchange happened in spheres where formal and informal activities took place simultaneously, which is especially at issue regarding the complexity social order of cities, according to Ulf Hannerz (1980: 172).

In such a differentiated structure, the individual has many kinds of situational involvements, that is to say, roles, and the opportunities for making varied combinations of roles in one's repertoire may be considerable. But to each role correspond one or more relationships to other people, and thus networks are assembled with a variability which roughly matches that of role constellations.

Role constellations are established through formal and informal contracts (cf. Hannerz, 1996: 69; De Certeau, 1997: 107-108; Conti, 2005: 30). Besides formal networks, based on administrative or professional relationships, De Certeau has addressed informal networks based on ethnicity, regional origin, kinship, as well as passion or convictions.

²²⁹ Wagenaar, 1992: 190-203.

Such ‘parameters’ can be recognised in Rotterdam too. In the case of ethnicity, one could consider the network of Jewish cinema entrepreneurs, the cross-disciplinary network of Hungarians (a.o. Von Barys, Von Ébneht, Meller), and the network of German film professionals²³⁰. The factor of the place of origin is exemplified by a number of prominent designers and architects in Rotterdam that came all from a particular area, north of Amsterdam – among them J.J.P. Oud, Mart Stam, Willem van Tijen, Jacob Jongert and Piet Zwart²³¹. Finally, according to Wouter Vanstiphout (2005: 268), the role of family ties has been particularly important within the world of architecture and construction in Rotterdam in that period of time²³². Love affairs have already been exemplified by the cases of Ivens and Krull, and Van Ravesteyn and Hintzen.

In addition, De Certeau has suggested a new model of a place based ‘ethnography of communication’. He has argued to ‘characterize the social group in its place through its way of dealing with its environment, through its fundamental strategies of communication, and through the systems that decode choices offered in matters of communication’ (De Certeau, 1997: 109). The manipulation of codes of communication implies inventions and changes in the social and spatial environment. In my case the ‘codes’ largely concern films and buildings, which I understand as intermediary objects providing temporary local attractors to direct the exchanges within the networks and the environment. This works on both a psychological and a cultural level²³³.

From the perspective of cognitive anthropology, this can be framed in terms of cultural connectionism (cf. Strauss & Quinn, 1997). This theory says that the mind organises thoughts through nodes of different weight. Important is the connection between the nodes, and the degree of activation. When a node is activated, it activates the adjacent nodes, and so on. The word ‘city’, for example, activates the word ‘citizen’, the word ‘Rotterdam’ activates ‘port’. Within a group of architects the name ‘Van Nelle’ brings to mind the design of its modern factory, rather than coffee, tea or tobacco. When Von Barys labelled his film HOOGSTRAAT (1929) as an ‘absolute film’, he gave it a code that corresponded to the collective cognitive network of the people involved with the Filmliga.

The Filmliga Rotterdam exemplifies the intertwining of formal and informal networks, and the actualisation of cross-disciplinary connections, something that Frank van Vree (2001) has outlined regarding the press. One of the agencies that contributed to the establishment of the Filmliga was the art society *Rotterdamsche Kring*. Initiated in 1913 by the banker Rudolf Mees and his wife Emilie Havelaar-Mees, it organised various kinds of events, including presentations

²³⁰ For the network of Jewish cinema entrepreneurs in Rotterdam, see: André van der Velden, 2004; for Hungarian artists working in the Netherlands in the 1920s, see: Ex, 2002: 18, as well as Ch. 4 §1.; for Germans, see: Dittrich, 1986.

²³¹ Designer Piet Zwart (•1885-†1977) was born in Zaandijk, which is not far from Purmerend where both the architects Oud (•1890-†1963) and Stam (•1899-†1986) were born, while their colleague Van Tijen (•1894-†1974) was born in Wormerveer that is also close to Purmerend. Graphic designer Jongert (•1883-†1943) was born in Wormer, and lived in Purmerend for several years. Oud and Jongert were teachers at the *Stadstekenschool* in Purmerend in 1909 (Taverne e.a., 2001: 82). Since 1915, Jongert made graphic designs for the Oud (family) trading company in alcoholic drinks and tobacco. In 1918, when Oud started to work for the municipality of Rotterdam (through Berlage), Jongert started to teach at the ‘Rotterdam Academy of Visual Arts’, and through him Piet Zwart one year later (see: Brentjens, 2008: 64). In 1919 Jongert got his first commission from the Van Nelle factory, whose trade included tobacco, which draws a link to the Oud trading company. In 1919 too, Jongert and Oud advised Mart Stam to come to Rotterdam to work for the studio of Granpré Molière, Verhagen & Kok, which he did (Halbertsma & Van Ulzen, 2001: 209).

²³² The fact that J.J.P. Oud’s brother P.J. Oud became the mayor of Rotterdam (1938), even though this followed other connections, seems more than a ‘coincidence’.

²³³ This can be seen in accordance with Urry’s ‘relationality’, and the ‘isomorphy of structure’ that has been outlined by Gell (1998: 221), see also: Riles (2000: 184), and the concept of stigmery, as explained by Bonabeau, Dorigo, Theraulaz, 1999: 16; cf. 7.§1.

on architecture and cinema²³⁴. The banker Jacob Mees P.Rzn, a co-founder of the *Rotterdamsche Kring*, became treasurer of the Filmliga Rotterdam, with his bank supporting it financially too. The secretary of the Rotterdamsche Kring, the librarian Johannes van der Pot, who was the director of the *Rotterdamsch Leeskabinet* (library), became vice-chairman²³⁵. Van Nelle director Kees van der Leeuw, another co-founder of the *Rotterdamsche Kring*, supported it too²³⁶. This happened when the new Van Nelle factory was built (1925-1930); its architects, Jan Brinkman and Leen van der Vlugt, became involved with the Filmliga as well, and along with them various others related to Opbouw, among them Willem Gispén, Leendert Bolle, J.J.P. Oud, Pali Meller, and Ida Lieftrinck.

Journalists frequented the *Rotterdamsche Kring* too, especially those of the NRC, which was located close to it²³⁷. The NRC's foreign news editor Johan Huijts became the secretary of the Filmliga Rotterdam, and soon its chairman. Foreign correspondent Simon Koster became the representative of the Filmliga in Germany, just like Mannus Franken in France, after he had been one of the first to write about film in the NRC. Many others can be mentioned here too, among them Jo Otten and Menno ter Braak, and also people that were not actively involved with the Filmliga, but still interested, among them literature editor Victor van Vriesland, architecture editor Han van Loghem and the columnist Charles Cocheret. The latter also wrote the article 'Stadsfilm' (NRC, 1929-06-29), which reads like a script for a city symphony, about the experience of Rotterdam from the perspective of a train passenger²³⁸. As a result of this interest in film, the NRC started a special film section, since 1929, and its editor became Coen Graadt van Roggen (1904-1933²³⁹)²⁴⁰. As I have already explained, his reviews caused the *Nederlandsche Bioscoopbond* to boycott the NRC, which Tuschinski finally resolved by establishing the avant-garde theatre Studio 32.

Graadt van Roggen also edited a series of ten books on film, *Monografieën over Filmkunst* (1931-1933). He himself wrote the first issue, and several of his NRC colleagues contributed to this series, which was published by W.L. & J. Brusse. The books attracted special attention for their covers, designed by Piet Zwart. At the same time, after the Filmliga had moved its main office from Amsterdam to Rotterdam, in 1931, the *Filmliga* magazine was published by Nijgh & Van Ditmar, which was related to the NRC²⁴¹. The covers of the *Filmliga* were, in turn, designed by Paul Schuitema. The latter had also started to make films himself, which finally resulted in the city-symphony MAASBRUGGEN (1937), about the bridges across the Nieuwe Maas, and the ongoing traffic that made use of them²⁴². Different from Ivens's film, people were prominently present in this film.

The cinephilia of the NRC journalists is articulated by an ironical fiction short about the stress at the office: REDACTEUREN ZIEN U AAN ("Editors watch you", 1931, anonymous). They all collaborated on this silent film, in which Victor van Vriesland played the main role. He goes crazy from his work: the pressure is too high, the money not enough, and the atmosphere at the

²³⁴ Van der Pot, 1962: 139; Schoots, 1999: 182; Huijts, 1975: 266; Koch, 2005: 59n5. The RK offered its members reduction to the Filmliga, and vice versa.

²³⁵ Smit, 2005: 18-19.

²³⁶ Van der Pot, 1962: 139.

²³⁷ Van Vree, 2001: 128. In the winter of 1930-1931, there were also lectures at the *Rotterdamsche Kring* by Menno ter Braak and Coen graadt van Roggen, see: Van der Pot, 1962: 150.

²³⁸ Cf. Van der Velden, 2001: 103.

²³⁹ In 1932, Graadt van Roggen left for the Dutch East Indies; he got ill and died in 1933, ref. Peter Bosma.

²⁴⁰ In *Filmliga* 1929/6 p76 it was mentioned that the NRC was the first Dutch newspaper with its own film section. A rectification in the next issue 1929/7 p92 mentioned that the newspaper *Het Vaderland* had actually preceded it, with a film section edited by Luc Willink, see for example the review on Von Bary's THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS: 'Filmkritiek, Rotterdam als Film-Epos,' *Het Vaderland*, 1928-08-16.

²⁴¹ Boele, 2003: 168.

²⁴² Schuitema started this production in 1932, together with the designer Gerrit Kiljan (who had already made SCHEVENINGEN, 1930) – see: De Boode & Van Oudheusden, 1985: 81.

office is too bad. He finally jumps out of a window, to commit suicide, but he lands on the canvas roof of a car. This enigmatic film is an outstanding example of avant-garde cinema, with unusual perspectives and framing, and a rapid montage. The reason for its production is unclear. Considering the title, one might wonder who is addressed by “you” (*U*) – at least not the general public. Also the anonymity of the author raises questions. Considering its style and professionalism, it must have been a filmmaker of the Filmliga – probably Andor von Barsy. The film exemplifies the position of the NRC within the avant-garde cinema in Rotterdam, as part of a cross-disciplinary history.

In 1935, when the Filmliga was already dissolved, the NRC opened its own cinema Cineac, like the *Algemeen Handelblad* had done in Amsterdam²⁴³. Here one could see on-going news shows, documentaries and animation films. Cineac was located at the Coolsingel, where the NRC had bought the former Cinema Royal from, indeed, Abraham Tuschinski (who lived above it)²⁴⁴. The investment of the NRC was not just a matter of cinephilia: cinema had changed the media landscape, which challenged the press. For that reason the *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, the largest in the city, had already covered the façade of its office building at Hofplein with big light screens and running texts to communicate the news in a cinematic way, which André van der Velden has called ‘a projector in the urban space’²⁴⁵. Once sound film had entered the stage, cinema became truly a competitor, and Cineac was an answer to that.

The *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad* also published frequently articles on film, and several of its journalists were affected by cinema²⁴⁶. Alongside it was the Catholic *De Maasbode*. In the case of the latter, it was especially the work of its editor Father Hyacinth Hermans, as he had been involved with film censorship, first in Rotterdam, and later nationally²⁴⁷. Someone else involved with this newspaper was the avant-garde filmmaker Jan Hin, after him and his firm Hinfilm moved to Rotterdam in 1933. In 1936 he completed the MAASBODEFILM, about the functioning of the newspaper, to be shown in Rome at an exhibition about the Catholic press²⁴⁸.

Important too were the local weekly magazines *Weekblad gewijd aan de belangen van Rotterdam* and its film critic Jan van Kasteel, and *Groot Rotterdam*²⁴⁹. The latter commissioned a feature length documentary, GROOT ROTTERDAM (1930, Co van der Wal), which deals with journalists reporting on things happening in the city. The commission itself reveals that the magazine understood the impact of film on journalism, but also the way that media in general were part of urban life. The film shows both the operations of the magazine as well as the city. Moreover, it makes clear that events become important when media are present.

Cross-disciplinary connections were reinforced by a number of other organisations, among them the business association Club Rotterdam (est. 1928), which played a major role behind the scenes through all kinds of interrelations, and openly through the Volksuniversiteit²⁵⁰. This “people’s university” was open to everybody, to follow all kinds of courses and lectures on various subjects. It was established in 1917, by the banker Willem Mees, and once again with the support of Van der Leeuw, among others. Under the leadership of its secretary Ida van Dugteren, the Volksuniversiteit became the biggest of its kind in the Netherlands, with more than 12,000 members²⁵¹, among them many women and people from the working-class. As such, it had an

²⁴³In Amsterdam the Cineac (1933-1934) was built by the architects Duiker and Elling. Duiker subsequently designed the rebuilt theatre in Rotterdam (1934-1935). For information on the latter: archive NAI/DUIK 227.

²⁴⁴Berg, 1996: page 34 and 162.

²⁴⁵Since 1930. Van der Velden, 2001: 115.

²⁴⁶among them Herman Besselaar, Alfred Kossmann, Wim Wagener and Ben Stroman, cf. Van Vree, 2001: 146.

²⁴⁷Nieuwenhuis, 1963: 166.

²⁴⁸Hogenkamp, 2004: 36/79.

²⁴⁹For Jan van Kasteel, see: Smit, 2005: 74-80. For the general role of *Groot Rotterdam*, see: Halbertsma & Van Ulzen, 2001: 23.

²⁵⁰Halbertsma & Van Ulzen, 2001: 76 and 164.

²⁵¹Van Ulzen, 2001: 167: 12.263 members in 1935-36.

important emancipatory function in Rotterdam. Moreover, transcending political divisions, it became an important node within the city's cultural ecology.

An active member of the Volksuniversiteit became designer Jacob Jongert, head of Van Nelle's publicity department. Architect J.J.P. Oud was also involved; in 1924 he drew sketches for a new accommodation, and one year later he presented a preliminary design²⁵². Because of problems to finance a new building, Van der Leeuw proposed to donate 10,000 guilders, but only if Brinkman & Van der Vlugt would be the architects. This was objected by city planner Witteveen²⁵³. For several years the process went on. The Volksuniversiteit kept in contact with Brinkman & Van der Vlugt, but no plan would be carried out. The Volksuniversiteit offered nevertheless a highly successful programme that included a range of lectures and courses, which often made use of industrial and informational films²⁵⁴. This concerned all kinds of topics, such as the industry, aviation, geography, architecture and planning, as well as cinema²⁵⁵.

Leo Jordaan, who was a member of the Filmliga and a film critic writing for *De Groene Amsterdammer* presented the cinema courses since 1929, which he continued for many years, even during WWII. Part of these courses were the screenings of art films from Germany, France, Russia and elsewhere, many of them being distributed by De Uitkijk²⁵⁶. Among these screenings was also a programme dedicated to Dutch Cinema (1929-11-12), including Ivens's THE BRIDGE and RAIN. The collaboration between the VU and the Filmliga resulted, in 1932, in an agreement that participants of Jordaan's film course got a reduction on the membership fee of the Filmliga. The agreement was written by Cornelis van Traa, who had become the secretary of the Filmliga Rotterdam²⁵⁷. Since he worked as a planner at the municipal department of urban development, this instantiates once again the cross-disciplinary networks that existed at that time.

§ 3. for modernity

Whereas the Filmliga Amsterdam considered cinema as a form of art in its own right, the Filmliga Rotterdam emphasised its potential within society at large (cf. Schoots, 1999: 187). This was articulated in a discussion between Menno ter Braak and Johan Huijts in *Filmliga*. Ter Braak started the discussion through his article 'Is de Film een Gemeenschapskunst?' ('Is Film a

²⁵² Ott, 1967: 61, 93; Taverne e.a., 2001: 336; cf. Halbertsma & Van Ulzen, 2001: 285.

²⁵³ Ott, 1967: 94.

²⁵⁴ For documentation of films shown at the VU, see: GAR, archive 'Volksuniversiteit', toegangsnr. 75, inv. nr. 275.

²⁵⁵ The courses, and the films, usually presented these subjects in general terms, but several of them dealt more specifically with Rotterdam, e.g. the course 'Rotterdamsche bedrijvigheid' (October-November, 1936). In the case of architecture and planning, presentations were given by people like Van der Vlugt, Stam, Berlage, Bos, and Van Tijen; in the case of cinema we might mention, besides Jordaan, the names of people like Ivens, Ter Braak, and Franken (ref. programme magazines of the VU, coll.: GAR, archive 'Volksuniversiteit', toegangsnr. 75, inv. nr. 314-318).

²⁵⁶ The VU continued to show such film long after the Filmliga was dissolved (1933), and as such it played an important role in the film culture of Rotterdam. The VU organised screenings at its own building and at cinema Corso, Samaritaan, Ons Huis, Nederlandsche Handels-Hoogeschool, Maasoord (Poortugaal) e.a., usually as part of its course, but occasionally also for groups of unemployed or disabled people. See: GAR, archive 'Volksuniversiteit', toegangsnr. 75, inv. nr. 275 e.a. This unique archive includes the intensive correspondence between Van Dugteren and various film distributors (a.o.), about all kinds of films that were shown by the Volksuniversiteit. Striking is the exchange of (many) letters between Van Dugteren and Ed Pelster of the *Centraal Bureau voor Ligafilms* (i.e. De Uitkijk). Consider for example the following fragment of a letter by Van Dugteren to Pelster (1929-10-12) about the organisation of the programme on Dutch cinema: 'I extremely regret that because of your so usual laxity this case is going haywire again. You do want to write bills for film rent and be introduced to other *Volksuniversiteiten*, but you don't spend any effort whatsoever for your clients.' Original quote: 'Het spyt my buitengewoon dat door de by U zoo gebrukelyke laksheid nu deze zaak weer in het honderd moet lopen. U wilt wel rekeningen voor filmhuur schryven en geholpen worden aan introducties by andere Volksuniversiteiten, maar U geeft U niet de minste moeite voor Uw klanten.' Also Jordaan got upset (in a letter to Pelster, early November 1929). Other organisational difficulties followed with the next screening, Ruttmann's BERLIN, DIE SINFONIE EINER GROSTADT (1927). It became an issue of 'fundamental importance', according to VU chairman W.C. Mees, and a special meeting of the board was dedicated to it (letter of Van Dugteren to Pelster, 1929-12-06). The collaboration with Pelster would nevertheless be continued.

²⁵⁷ Letter of Van Traa to Van Dugteren (1932-09-13) and a concept letter by Van Traa to the participants of the film course > coll. GAR, archive 'Volksuniversiteit', toegangsnr. 75, inv. nr. 275.

Community Art?’, in: *Filmliga*, 1927/3). In a rhetoric and elitist manner, Ter Braak argued that film could only be a matter of individual expression. Huijts reacted by writing the article ‘Film as Gemeenschapskunst’ (“Film as Community Art”, in: *Filmliga*, 1928/6). He warned that the avant-garde should not indulge in ‘sterile pleasure of beauty, lacking the inner coherence with life’; the avant-garde should not be about aesthetics based on individual experience and expression, neither the opposite: ‘community art is not about a generally confessed sentiment or thought, but about the problem; and the form is not the greatest common denominator and at best the smallest common multiple of the capacity of the mass, but the actualisation of its measure and symphony (*samenklank*)’²⁵⁸. Film should be about ‘the problem’, i.e. issues that really matter, which concern society, and the form of a film should be a logical expression of it. Huijts ended his article by saying that ‘it was the faith in film as community art, that I helped to set up the [Filmliga] branch in Rotterdam. Because for me the community goes above film’²⁵⁹. One should notice here that also Huijts had a preference for what was called the ‘absolute film’, which he had also suggested to the ‘pioneers’ that made NUL UUR NUL, instead of representational imagery. However, as his interest in this experiment has shown too, film had to address issues of the community, and he regarded film form as a subordinate to that. It implied that rather different kinds of film could be promoted too, as long as they would follow a progressive social agenda. It might be telling that Ter Braak, after he had moved from Amsterdam to Rotterdam, where he stayed for four years, eventually remarked that this city had been ‘a benevolent anti-aesthetic medicine’ to him²⁶⁰.

Since there were many architects among the members of the Filmliga, one can consider how such ideas corresponded to their views. A few experimental films showed their work, but many important projects, among them the housing estates by Oud, were hardly ever shown through film²⁶¹. This is comparable to an observation made by Thomas Elsaesser in the case of projects like the ‘Weissenhofsiedlung’ in Stuttgart (1927) and ‘Siemensstadt’ in Berlin (1930)²⁶². Thinking in terms of functionalism, there seemed to be little reason just to record such projects on film. For one part, photography was used for reasons of documentation and promotion. Film was used differently.

In the case of British municipal films, Elizabeth Lebas has remarked that these ‘[f]ilms could show both procedure and progress in ways that were practical, succinct and even entertaining. In turn, by showing the *actual sites and settings* of procedure and progress to inhabitants who were called upon to visit them and in the case of new housing estates, actually occupy them, they played a vital role in assigning and re-designating new spaces for another way of living’ (Lebas, 2000: 140; italics FP). Just because these films were produced locally, people could recognise their own situation, which turned out to be an effective way to educate and to instruct people, as a precondition for social, hence spatial change. Most important here has been the argument that ‘these were not films *about* modern living, but *for* modern living’ (p141).

A similar kind of argument has been made by Thomas Elsaesser in his article ‘Die Stadt von Morgen; Filme zum Bauen und Wohnen’ (2005). He starts by mentioning the screening of the German film DIE STADT VON MORGEN – EIN FILM VOM STÄDTEBAU (1930, Svend Noldan) by the Filmliga theatre De Uitkijk in Amsterdam, in 1932. He wonders why this avant-garde

²⁵⁸ *Filmliga* magazine 1928/6, p10, original quote: ‘het gaat in gemeenschapskunst niet om het algemeen beleden sentiment of de gedachte, maar om het probleem; en de vorm is niet de grootste gemene deeler en op zijn best het kleinste gemeene veelvoud van het vermogen der massa, maar de verwerkelijking van haar maat en samenklank.’

²⁵⁹ *Filmliga* magazine 1928/6, p11, original quote: ‘En het was in het geloof in de film als gemeenschapskunst, dat ik de Rotterdamsche afdeeling oprichten hielp. Want boven de film gaat voor mij de gemeenschap.’

²⁶⁰ Ter Braak in a reply to Stroman, quoted in: Petra Berrevoets, ‘Braak, Menno ter’, see: Halbertsma & Van Ulzen, 2001: 38.

²⁶¹ An exception is the film ROTTERDAM EN HOE HET BOUWDE by architect Wim ten Bosch, which, however, was not completed before 1940.

²⁶² Elsaesser, 2005b: 382.

cinema theatre showed this 'dry educational film from an unknown director'²⁶³. He then points to the fact that there was a close connection between the avant-garde movements of cinema and architecture, both in the Netherlands and in Germany and argues that architectural films were a way to show the possibilities for a new way of living. *DIE STADT VON MORGEN* was indeed enthusiastically received by progressive architects and planners in the Netherlands²⁶⁴. We might especially mention Alexander Bos. After he had become the director of the department of social housing in Rotterdam, he gave a course at the Volksuniversiteit on the development of Rotterdam in an international perspective. Part of it was the public screening of this film (the copy of *De Uitkijk*), which he introduced and explained by slides for a large audience²⁶⁵. As such, the film indicated the future of Rotterdam as Bos had it in mind (cf. Wagenaar, 1992: 60).

Besides *DIE STADT VON MORGEN*, many other films should be taken into account²⁶⁶. It is a cinema that started with *Das Neue Frankfurt*, under the direction of city planner Ernst May, which has been the focus of Elsaesser's study. Such films were, indeed, not about modern living, but for modern living. We may recognise a parallel to the distinction between transitory and programmatic concepts of modernity, as suggested by architecture historian Hilde Heynen (1999: 12). If it comes to film, it is clearly the programmatic side that needs more attention.

Film scholars have predominantly focussed on a limited notion of the avant-garde, and therefore, Elsaesser argues, too much material has never been studied in its full content, if at all. For one part, this is due to the fact that many of these films were not meant for regular cinema distribution, but for occasions like big (industrial) exhibitions and fairs²⁶⁷. Elsaesser has therefore argued to relate three 'A-factors' to each other: the *Auftraggeber* (commissioner), the *Anlass* (reason) and the *Anwendung* (use) of a film²⁶⁸. In this way it is possible to discover the motivations behind these productions, the agendas they served, and the settings of which they were part. Elaborating on this view, Elsaesser has addressed *Das Neue Frankfurt* as a specific case of 'Media-Publicity' (*Medien-Öffentlichkeit*), which is an instance of what he has called *Medienverbund*. It was a complex of architecture, design, graphic design, press, photography, film, and meetings (e.g. the CIAM congress in 1929), which all served to propagate the ideas of the modern movement, those of social-democracy, progress and industrialisation. Besides analyzing films and buildings as objects, we need to frame them as part of broader programmes and networks. This might be illuminated, first of all, by considering 'construction films'.

construction film

Architecture in itself is a difficult subject to be filmed, since it usually does not move itself. In that respect still photography has been a more suitable medium²⁶⁹. However, one can move the camera along or through a building, in order to show its plasticity and spatial-temporal order, which has indeed been explored, or one can record the movement of vehicles or people in relation to a building. The construction process is yet another way to show the architecture, where camera movement, movement of people and movement of machines can be combined, while it follows a clear narrative: the building process. Moreover, both people and machines are engaged with the architecture that is to arise, which makes the architecture both human and dynamic. The resulting film is informative, of documentary value, and a record of human creation.

²⁶³ Elsaesser, 2005b: 381. Original quote: 'Ein eher trockener Lehrfilm, von einem unbekanntem Regisseur...'. The film was produced by Svend Noldan, but directed by the city planners Maximilian von Goldbeck and Erich Kotzer.

²⁶⁴ cf. Duiker, 1932; Groenewegen, 1932.

²⁶⁵ See: 'De Stad der Toekomst' [review], p1 in: *Co-Bouw* (vol. 80, nr. 96), 1936-12-01; see also: *Geïllustreerd Programma VU, Cursus 1936-1937*, Volksuniversiteit te Rotterdam; and *Vertooning van de film "De Stad der Toekomst"*, VU, November-nummer 1936 (vol. 16, nr. 4) > archive 'A. Bos' at NAI: BOSA (1-6).

²⁶⁶ Ciacci (2001), cited by Taverne, 2007: 6.

²⁶⁷ Elsaesser, 2005b: 400.

²⁶⁸ Elsaesser, 2005b: 383. Original quote: 'Hier gilt es, drei Ebenen mit einander ins Verhältnis zu setzen: der Auftraggeber, der Anlass und die Anwendung des Films.'

²⁶⁹ Cf. Elsaesser, 2005b; Taverne, 2007: 6.

One of the first filmmakers to record construction works in Rotterdam was the Dutch film pioneer Willy Mullens, from The Hague. In the years 1919-1920 he documented the construction of garden village 'Vreewijk' (1913-, arch. Granpré Molière). The film is a kind of excursion through this new residential area, giving impressions of the construction activities that take place. Different approaches developed during the next years²⁷⁰. Construction processes were documented step by step; almost as a cinematographic 'blueprint' for similar projects to take place elsewhere. An early illustration of this are the recordings by Mullens, made between 1926-1930, of the construction of the 'Van Nelle factory'. It was done so in close collaboration with the architects Brinkman and Van der Vlugt²⁷¹.

In July 1926, when Mullens received the commission, the construction time was estimated to be ten months, but it would be four years in the end. After Mullens and his employees had visited the construction site for about twenty-five times, in a period of a year and a half, most of the shots of the central building, the tobacco factory, got lost because of a fire²⁷². They decided, however, to continue the film project, and to make new recordings of the construction of the coffee and tea factories, the garage and the heating station²⁷³. This film, BOUW VAN DE VAN NELLE FABRIEK, was ready in April 1930, but it probably never had a public screening²⁷⁴. It was made for documentary purposes. History has confirmed it, as Anna Abrahams made the film BOUWEN VOOR HET LICHT (1991) with this material. Whereas the building itself defined space, since it became a reference mark in the environment, film marked a moment in time, for next generations of workers and the general public. Next to that, the commissioner and the architects needed a record to evaluate the decisions they made. In fact, the construction method and the design of the factory were altered during the construction process.

Mullens's film is not exceptional. The memory function is also at issue regarding port activities or the production of milk, for example²⁷⁵. In the 1920s, production methods rapidly changed. Documenting a stage of this development offered the possibility to match results, which is the reason that such films still enjoy the interest of specialist groups today. There is, however, a difference between the industrial film in general and the particular genre of the construction film, since the latter does not show mass-production. Since each building is unique, with its own development history and its own programme, it is possible to distinguish different purposes.

A major case is the construction of department store 'De Bijenkorf' and the film GROEI (1928-1930), produced by Polygoon and directed by Jo de Haas. In the late 1920s De Bijenkorf commissioned architect Willem Dudok to build a modern department store with a steel-and-glass façade. The building was located at the Coolingsingel, the main boulevard of the city, different from the 'Van Nelle factory' that was located in the outskirts. As it was visually very present, 'De

²⁷⁰ One might also consider here the reports on the construction of the *Koninginnebrug*, by Orion (1928, 1929) and Krieger (1929). The bridge was built by A.H. van Rood & W.G. Witteveen, 1924-1929, see: Groenendijk & Vollaard, 2007: 123. Next to such reports and documentaries, one may also mention newsreels on construction, as different as e.g. NIEUW GEBOUW NATIONALE LEVENSVZERKERINGENBANK (1924-02-07, Polygoon); NIEUWE BRUG (1926-10-05, Polygoon); DE NENIJTO IN AANBOUW (1928-04, Polygoon); FEYENOORD STADION GEREED (1937-02-27, Polygoon).

Outside Rotterdam we find other 'construction films', including well-known examples such as BETON EN WONINGBOUWFILM (1923, Cor Aafjes), about 'Betondorp' in Amsterdam, commissioned by the municipality, and the film BOUW FLATGEBOUW WILLEMSPARK (1930, Jan Teunissen), about the construction of a building in The Hague by the architect Henk Wegerif, which was commissioned by the 'collective of residents'.

²⁷¹ Correspondence between Van Nelle and Haghe Film (Mullens), 1926-1930 – GAR, 'Archief Van Nelle', toegangscode 944, inv. Nr. 2020, 'Stukken betreffende de producties van de eerste Van Nelle reclamefilms, 1919-1936.

²⁷² Ibid; a part of the lost material was made by A.P.A. Adriaansz, chief operator of Haghe Film. Once the material was burnt, Mullens proposed (1928-02-02) to make animations of the construction, but that idea was rejected.

²⁷³ Ibid; letter by Van Nelle to Brinkman & Van der Vlugt, 1928-02-02.

²⁷⁴ Ibid; In a letter by Mullens to Van Nelle, 1930-01-03, Mullens mentioned that a positive rush print was sent to Van Nelle, in order to discuss the editing of the film. On the 22nd of April, Mullens wrote a letter to say that the film was ready. There are no further references to a public screening whatsoever.

²⁷⁵ See e.g. NV HYGIËNISCHE MELKSTAL 'DE VAAN' (1928, Transfilma) and HET MODERNSTE MELKINRICHTINGBEDRIJF VAN NEDERLAND (1929, Polygoon), for: Rotterdamsche Melkinrichting.

Bijenkorf' meant the onset of a prosperous era for Rotterdam, as the title of the film indicates as well: 'Growth'. Rotterdam had made its definite step into modernity. In the following years, this new spirit of the city was above all experienced at the Bijenkorf roof-terrace [ref.]. Prophetic are therefore the images of it in the film, with the camera placed low, so that we see men working high above the city. This image, just like several others, creates a contrast between height and depth, so that the city becomes a huge spatial volume, a vast, modern metropolis.

GROEI makes use of modern film aesthetics, through mobile framing, superimposition, rhythmic editing, and special compositions. There is, for example, a shot from the roof, showing a construction elevator coming up, while down in the street a tram comes into the frame from top to bottom. The tram is like an elevator, and vice versa. This 'three dimensional graphic' distorts the viewer's perception by using depth and opposed movements, which results in 'cinematic plasticity.' It establishes an analogy between tram and elevator, and between urbanism and architecture. There is another remarkable sequence with an elevator, which is filmed from the inside, while moving upward. The elevator cab is bounded by a steel fence, through which the camera registers the different storeys of the building. The pattern of the fence interferes with the same pattern at the floors it passes, which causes a rhythmic doubling of lines. Whereas people are absent in these shots, there is also an 'absolute' image of workers that climb down a series of steep stairs. This ongoing human movement forms a contrast and yet a synthesis with the mechanical movements.

Other images show ram machines and cement transporters, followed by informal shots of workers having lunch and then workhorses eating and drinking in a similar way – a witty example of associative filmmaking. At the end the completed building is shown. Its composition, with a tower and a large rectangular building, is transferred into a cinematic composition. The camera frames the tower diagonally, moves to the right along the building so that the top corner is shown diagonally. As the façade of the building consists of steel-and-glass in a regular grid, the sequence shows an abstract pattern of lines. The building has changed into moving graphics, an architecture that seems to float. The camera scans the building. Moving across its façade, there are suddenly people standing behind it. They do the finishing touch, the glass and frameworks are cleaned and polished for the great event: the opening.

Finally the film shows the opening with 70,000 people attending it²⁷⁶. They had been waiting for this moment for two years, regularly informed by the Polygoon newsreels that were made from the footage. In this way De Bijenkorf bought itself into the news, similar to what commercials for De Bijenkorf would later do, like those by Henk Alsem and Andor von Barys²⁷⁷. Thus, GROEI expressed the identity of the store. The construction, as a seemingly functional concern, was above all a way to show modernity, progress, hence 'growth'. Functionalism dictated style and fashion, and style and fashion were the trade of De Bijenkorf. Trade, architecture, and film reinforced each other.

'De Bijenkorf' became a symbol for modern Rotterdam. Various other films contributed to that too²⁷⁸. While it is an outstanding example of the 'construction genre', it could equally be called an avant-garde film²⁷⁹. Polygoon was largely influenced by the Soviet cinema; it had already been so for several years²⁸⁰. According to Polygoon director B. D. Ochse, it also conceived documentary filmmaking in terms of art, which had to be shown in the (regular)

²⁷⁶ This number is mentioned by Talle, 2001: 245.

²⁷⁷ I.e. DROOMEN (1931, Alsem); HERFSTMODE (1932), TAFELTJE DEKJE (1933), Von Barys (the latter two are missing).

²⁷⁸ It was subsequently shown, together with the 'Van Nelle factory' and other buildings, in the film MODERNE NEDERLANDSCHE ARCHITECTUUR (1930, Mannus Franken), in ROTTERDAM (1935, Max de Haas), and e.g. in the montage-sequence of modern architecture in the film LENTELIED (1936, Koster).

²⁷⁹ Simultaneously to GROEI, De Haas also made STALEN KNUISTEN (1930), for the 'General Dutch Union of Metal Workers' (ANMB, *Algemene Nederlandsche Metaalbewerkerbond*), which was actually shown at the Filmliga; for detailed information on this film see Hogenkamp, 1988: 36, cf. Schoots, 1999: 207.

²⁸⁰ See: Hogenkamp, 1988.

cinema. It combined artistic and financial aims, which happened indeed with GROEI²⁸¹. One should also consider the film as a particular instance of *Medienverbund*. Within this programmatic union, the film links up with De Bijenkorf commercials and other media. Von Barys, for example, made photographs for De Bijenkorf as well²⁸². Next to that, De Bijenkorf organised exhibitions of important international avant-garde artists. In addition, it displayed modern design, like the furniture by Willem Gispen, as part of its collection. Finally, its architecture brought it all together.

Whereas GROEI was based on modernity as an ‘identity’ to attract customers, similar films had other goals, like Ivens’s WIJ BOUWEN (1930), on building in the Netherlands, and the related film BETONARBEID (“Concrete Labour”, 1930),²⁸³ on the construction of embankment walls in Rotterdam. Since they were commissioned by the “General Dutch Union of Construction Workers” (ANBB), they promoted the building industry and its workers in order to recruit new members. BETONARBEID shows in detail the construction process and methods, and the skills of the workers, often through close-ups of hands, interchanged with overviews of the collective achievement and its organisation. Although WIJ BOUWEN received highly enthusiastic reviews²⁸⁴, in its approach it is not very different from GROEI. We might also compare it to another film by Polygoon, with the suggestive title “The Cooperative Production Grows; a cinematographic excursion through our new HAKA-factories” (1932)²⁸⁵. It shows the construction and eventual operation of the co-operative HAKA factory (1931-1932), which was designed by Herman Mertens, another member of the Filmliga²⁸⁶. This film presents, in a straightforward manner, manual labour and mechanical production as extensions of each other, and the individual engagement and collective efforts of the workers.

A construction film that served above all a memory function, not unlike the building that it portrayed, is BOUW MUSEUM BOYMANS (1932-1935), made by G.L. Theijssen of Gemeentewerken, in order to present it to the museum in the end. This detailed film, of almost an hour, shows the building process step by step. It starts with images of the ‘Schielandshuis’, the former location of the museum, followed by shots of the architects of Gemeentewerken on their way to the office, where they are portrayed at the drawing tables. Overviews and close ups of the construction work interchange, while the film pays also attention to the workers, including shots of them receiving their salary.

Another extensive construction film, with a different purpose, is BOUW MAASTUNNEL (1937-1941, Polygoon), commissioned by the N.V. Maastunnel, a joint venture of construction companies²⁸⁷. It shows technical drawings and animations of the tunnel, interchanged with shots of the construction activities. It takes the viewer along the design and engineering process, to explain it to both professionals and citizens. Different versions were made for different audiences, between 15 minutes and one hour, while the progress of the construction was also shown by

²⁸¹ According to Hogenkamp (1988: 36), the film was shown in the programmes of Cinema Royal and Tuschinski in Amsterdam, but it seems more than likely that at least Tuschinski also showed them in Rotterdam.

²⁸² In Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, ref. Joop de Jong / *Nederlands Fotomuseum*, 2008.

²⁸³ It is also called CAISSONBOUW.

²⁸⁴ E.g. De Graaff, 1930.

²⁸⁵ Original title: DE COOPERATIEVE PRODUCTIE GROEIT, EEN CINEMATOGRAFISCHE RONDWANDELING DOOR ONZE NIEUWE HAKA-FABRIEKEN.

²⁸⁶ Mertens was, besides Van Ravesteyn and Rietveld a.o., a member of the board of the Filmliga Utrecht, see: *Filmliga* 1927/3, p13.

²⁸⁷ N.V. Maastunnel collaborated with the *Dienst Gemeentewerken*. Next to the Polygoon production, an employee of *Gemeentewerken*, E. Jeanmaire, made a series of twelve shorts about the construction. Both the Polygoon and the series of shorts were handed over to the photographic archive of *Gemeentewerken*. Information by J.P. van Bruggen in a letter (1960-11-21) to the GAR, Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, archive ‘Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam’ (archief van het archief), dossier ‘correspondentie filmcollectie’, toegangsnr. 297.01, inv. nr. 461 (1958-1962).

²⁸⁷ It seems that these film recordings were made at the same time as the photographs made by Van der Leeuw, June 1945, which are reprinted in: Roelofsz, 1989: 140.

Polygoon's newsreels, over a period of four years²⁸⁸. It created an interest among the cinema spectators to learn about the advancements. This continued when the city around it was destroyed, in 1940, of which we do not see a glimpse. It is an instance of the system's capacity for selective memory.

When going to Rotterdam to record the advances of the Maastunnel, Polygoon occasionally shot other construction works too. Examples are those of the World Trade Centre ('Beurs') and the new zoo ('Diergaarde Blijdorp')²⁸⁹. It shows that the mediation of one project caused the monitoring of others as well²⁹⁰.

Construction films were more than records of new construction techniques or registrations of actual events. They celebrated progress and urban development, characterised by optimism: the future can be built. Notwithstanding this common goal, and their common iconography, these films were made for different reasons. It opens up perspectives to other kinds of productions. Linking the concerns of Elsaesser with those of Lebas allows us to move beyond the subject of building, in order to consider a broad range of films that served modernity, and the development of the modern city.

industrial film

The 'construction film' could be seen as a particular 'genre' of the industrial film²⁹¹. After the crisis of the 1910s, industrial production in Rotterdam increased, since one tried to reduce the city's dependence on shipping²⁹². This growth was accompanied by the production of industrial films, which grew exponentially in a few years time. To all of these films apply the three Rs of Hediger and Vonderau (2007: 22), which stand for: Record, Rhetorics, and Rationalization²⁹³. Such films served as recruitment, of clients and investors, and reinforcement, by providing positive feedback that is instrumental to the emergence of the modern city as a self-organizing system²⁹⁴.

In total, an estimated number of at least three hundred industrial films were made in Rotterdam in the 1920s and 1930s, varying in length from about ten to ninety minutes. It is hard to give exact numbers, since such films had their own exhibition channels and were often not reported, and if so, the records as well as the films might have been lost during WWII or for any other reason later on. From the available data, it is known that one of the first industrial film concerning Rotterdam, and one of the first commissioned films in the Netherlands, was ONZE SCHEEPVAART (1913), which was directed by Maurits Binger and produced by the *Maatschappij*

²⁸⁸ It started by showing the location where the tunnel would be built, and the first digging works: TUNNELBOUW OFFICIEEL BEGONNEN (1937-06-15). For the implementation it was also necessary to remove a wooden Norwegian sailormen's church, which was lifted and rolled aside: HET VERROLDE NOORSE KERKJE WORDT OPNIEUW IN GEBRUIK GENOMEN (1937-11-14). The last report of that year briefly showed the construction activities: TUNNELBOUW (1937-12-29). A few months later a more extensive report showed the works, with traffic at the Coolsingel and at the Maas bridges, followed by schematic drawings of the tunnel, and images of the construction: TUNNELBOUW (1938-03-08). More reports followed, sometimes combined with other construction works, like that of De Beurs: ROTTERDAM BOUWT (1939-01-23). See furthermore: BOUW VAN DE MAASTUNNEL (1939-09-28), DE MAASTUNNELWERKEN (1940-03-15), BOUW VAN DE MAASTUNNEL VORDERT (1940-10-07), EEN BELANGRIJKE FASE IN DE TUNNELBOUW (1941-05), a.o.

²⁸⁹ WTC (J.F. Staal, 1925-1940): NIEUWE BEURS IN ROTTERDAM GROEIT (1938-01-18), ROTTERDAM BOUWT (1939-01-23), BEURSGEBOUW NADERT HAAR VOLTOOIING (1940-04-09); Zoo (S. van Ravesteyn (1937-1941): ROTTERDAMSE DIERGAARDE GAAT VERHUIZEN (1939-11-17), DIERGAARDE BLIJDORP GEREED (1940-12-09).

²⁹⁰ See, alternatively, also the *demolition* of a building: OPRUIMEN VAN EEN OUD GEBOUW (1938-11-25). It shows an explosion, which is subsequently repeated, but the other way round, as a marvellous act of construction.

²⁹¹ Rather than reflecting upon industrial films in terms of genre, I have tried to frame broader tendencies, and to relate titles because of features and agendas. For industrial film genres, see Kessler & Masson, 2007.

²⁹² Cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 323/354, as proposed by the Vereeniging Stadsverbetering Nieuw Rotterdam, in 1919.

²⁹³ It is an elaboration of the three A's of Elsaesser (2005b). At the same time Hediger and Vonderau point to the fact, that already in 1914, George L. Cox addressed that industrial films dealt with 5 M's: financial Means, Materials, Machines, Markets and Men. This text is included in their volume (see: Cox, 2007 [1914]).

²⁹⁴ Cf. Bonabeau, Dorigo, Theraulaz, 1999: 9.

voor *Wetenschappelijke Cinematografie* from Haarlem (later Hollandia, and subsequently Polygoon)²⁹⁵. The film was made for the municipality and various enterprises, in order to promote the port, and as such it was the onset of a long history of harbour films, and the connection between Polygoon and Rotterdam²⁹⁶. Among the early films that Polygoon made for companies in the port are those for the warehousing firm *Blaauwhoedenveem* (1920, Alex Benno²⁹⁷), the dockyards of Gusto (1920, Polygoon), and the dockyards of Fijenoord, on the occasion of its centenary (1923, Polygoon²⁹⁸). Another prominent name regarding such films became Willy Mullens and his company Haghe Film²⁹⁹. Around 1920, Mullens made his series of ‘city films’, for municipalities across the country. One of these films is *EEN GEZICHT OP DE GROOTE HAVENWERKEN TE ROTTERDAM EN SCHIEDAM* (1920). As a result of it, Mullens was also asked to make films for the coal trading association *Steenkolen Handels Vereeniging* (1921, 1923, Willy Mullens).

There is an immediate connection between these films and the emergence of newsreel production. Images from the Fijenoord film, for example, were used for a newsreel too³⁰⁰. In this way Polygoon attracted companies to commission films, while at the same time it reduced the production costs of the newsreels. It became the beginning of a practice that Polygoon would continue for decades. Something similar applies to the newsreels and documentaries by Mullens³⁰¹. It also enabled Otto van Neijenhoff, who began his career as a cameraman for Mullens, to produce films himself, for companies such as Watson (1925) and Wilton (1926). The Wilton shipyards, moreover, gave rise to the production of newsreels in another way as well. Bartel Wilton, one of the directors of the company and the oldest son of its founder, left it in 1920, at the age of fifty-seven, after a fight with his brother. Bartel became the director of the City cinema concern and established the Orion film production company, in The Hague³⁰². Orion got known as a non-fiction and newsreel producer, which also made reports on Rotterdam. We might, furthermore, mention Henk Alsem, who had worked for Fox-News in the USA before he made a film on the Dutch East Indies for the Rotterdamsche Lloyd, and before he began to work as a filmmaker for the Royal Dutch Navy³⁰³.

The port guaranteed a continuous flow of news. Besides economic interest, this included human interest too, such as a report on the funeral of eight sailors of a rescue-team after their lifeboat had foundered, or, alternatively, the celebration of the crew of the cargo steamship *Alhena* that rescued 536 passengers from a sinking ship near Uruguay³⁰⁴. Especially popular

²⁹⁵ At about the same time, Hollandia made the film *DE HAVENWERKEN TE ROTTERDAM EN AMSTERDAM* (1913); this production seems to be related. One can also consider here an earlier production by the British company ‘Urban Trading’: *AMSTERDAM AND ROTTERDAM* (1911).

²⁹⁶ Albers, 2004: 266; the film had its premiere, for invited guests, on 1913-11-10 at De Doelen. At about the same time Hollandia also made a film for the Van den Bergh margarine factory, and another one to promote the port of Rotterdam and Amsterdam. For more information on the way Polygoon dealt with industrial films and other films for commercial purposes, see: De Haan, 1995: 23.

²⁹⁷ Afterwards, Alex Benno would make various other films for firms in the port too with his company Actueel Film, e.g. *THOMSENS HAVENBEDRIJF* (1924).

²⁹⁸ For such commissions, Polygoon worked with local agencies; in Rotterdam it was the photography shop of J.J. Swart (De Haan, 1995: 25). Of interest here are also family films that Polygoon made for Swart, and, among others, for the Ruys shipping dynasty that was linked to the Rotterdamsche Lloyd (1921, 1922, Polygoon). For this company Polygoon subsequently made the film *DE STOOMVAARTMAATSCHAPPIJ ‘ROTTERDAMSCHER LLOYD’* (1925). For Van Nelle director Sonneveld, Polygoon also made family films (1925).

²⁹⁹ E.g. *ROTTERDAM* (1922); *VERVOER DROOGDOK 8000 TON – DOK TANDJONG PRIOK* (1923) a.o.

³⁰⁰ i.e. *WERF FIJENOORD* (1923); newsreel: *HET 100-JARIG BESTAAN VAN DE WERF FEIENOORD* [1923-02-01].

³⁰¹ In the case of Mullens, see for example the newsreels on the mayors Zimmerman and Wijtema (1923), which were made due to Mullens’s connections with the municipality.

³⁰² www.cinemacontext.nl > personen > Bartel Wilton Sr. (website visited 2008-07-07)

³⁰³ www.nfdb.nl > Alsem, Henk > info (2007-10-27)

³⁰⁴ *BEGRAFFENIS VAN DE BEMANNING VAN DE REDDINGSBOOT ‘PRINS DER NEDERLANDEN’ TE HOEK VAN HOLLAND* (1929, Orion); *HULDIGING VAN DE BEMANNING VAN DE ALHENA* (1928, Polygoon). The ‘SS *Alhena*’, of shipping company

became reports on the launching of a ship or its maiden trip³⁰⁵. This is, furthermore, also reflected by amateur recordings, as a way to appropriate modern times. Of special interest is a series of forty-one short films (1929-1937), made by A Vertregt, who was a captain for the Rotterdamsche Lloyd. He recorded all kinds of aspects of his travels and the life aboard of his ship³⁰⁶.

The growing demand for industrial films by firms in Rotterdam resulted in the establishment of the film production company Transfilma. One of its major films was ORANJEBOOM, HET BIERBROUWBEDRIJF (1927, Transfilma). In almost one and a half hours, it shows each step of the production of beer. It raises some questions. Who was interested in such a detailed and long record of industrial production? Considering the subject of beer, one can hardly think of educational purposes, at least not to instruct school children. To whom was the film shown, where, and why? It makes a difference if it was presented to a general audience, as a promotion for beer, or, for example, to engineers interested in industrial production. As I will show in the chapter on events, it was meant for a general audience, as part of the international industry exhibition 'Nenijto' (1928). It not only promoted the brand, but above all industrialisation and rationalisation, turning the ancient craft of beer production into a product of the new life, that of modernity. This is well expressed by way of an etching by Jan Luyken that the film shows³⁰⁷. It makes clear that in the seventeenth century, the barrels were filled manually, while it now all happened mechanically³⁰⁸. Besides the fact that it rhetorically addresses the modernisation of the production process, the reference also relates that artwork to film as a contemporary medium with a similar purpose. The modernity of industrial production is reinforced by the medium itself.

Similar arguments can be made for other industrial films. In addition to those on beer, are those on tea and coffee, by Van Nelle. Already quite early, it made use of film for promotion and information. In 1919, Dick van der Leeuw, the youngest brother of Van Nelle director Kees, made the film DE THEE, VAN DE PLANTAGE NAAR HET PAKJE³⁰⁹. It starts with the work on the tea plantations in Java, it then shows the transshipment of the tea to the port of Rotterdam, and finally the way it was processed in the (old) Van Nelle factory³¹⁰. The film was shown across the Netherlands, as Van Nelle started to travel around the country with a special film car, to organise screenings at clubs, schools, stores and especially at the main squares of villages and towns, where hundreds and sometimes even thousands of people gathered³¹¹. Besides the tea film, a short film was made about coffee from Brasil³¹², and more films would follow. Until the late 1930s Van Nelle's film car drove around the country. In this way Van Nelle reached the general public, and as such the films had an important share in Van Nelle's increasing sales figures³¹³.

Nievelt, Goudriaan & Co., assisted (1927-10-25) the wrecked 'Principessa Mafalda', with Italian emigrants on their way to Argentina.

³⁰⁵ e.g. TEWATERLATING VAN HET S.S. SLIEDRECHT (1924-05-31, Willy Mullens); VERTREK 'STATENDAM' (1929, Orion); HET NIEUWE MS WELTEVREDEN VAN DE ROTTERDAMSE LLOYD VERLAAT DE WERF VAN P. SMIT JR (1937, Filmfabriek Holland); NIEUWE ONDERZEEER VOOR DE POOLSE MARINE TEWATERGELATEN (1938-42, Polygoon), a.o.

³⁰⁶ Besides that, the Rotterdamsche Lloyd had also various films been made by (a.o.) J.C. Mol, e.g. JAVA, SUMATRA EN BALI (1939). See also the films by Willem van der Poll (1934, 1936).

³⁰⁷ The etching is from the book *Het Menselyk Bedryf* ("The Human Trade"), published in 1694. It contains engravings from Dutch artist Jan Luyken about trades from the late 17th century. www.janluyken.com/ (visited: 2007-10-03)

³⁰⁸ cf. 'Bedrijfsfilm D'Oranjeboom', in: *De Maasbode*, 1928-01-14.

³⁰⁹ Dicke, 2007: 43, referred to as THEEFILM. It is most likely that Dick van der Leeuw, who continued to make films until his death in 1936, made other recordings related to Van Nelle as well, e.g. FAMILIE VAN DER LEEUW (1925).

³¹⁰ The film includes scenes of the Van Nelle garage at Wilhelminakade and of its factory at Schiedamsedijk.

³¹¹ The tea film also meant the start of film screenings at *Ons Huis*; it was shown there in collaboration with the *Nederlandsche Vereeniging van Huisvrouwen*, 1921-05-24. For this and general documentation about Van Nelle's film screenings, see: GAR, 'Archief Van Nelle', toegangscode 944, inv. Nr. 2021, 'Stukken betreffende reclamefilmvoorstellingen, 1919-1938; cf. Dicke, 2007: 55.

³¹² DE KOFFIE (1922, Van Nelle); the first part is about the cultivation of coffee in Brasil, the second part is about the processing of coffee at the Van Nelle factory.

³¹³ Dicke, 2007: 46.

In 1926, Willy Mullens was asked to make a new, short version of the tea film³¹⁴. About two months later the film was ready and Mullens was then asked to record the construction of the new factory (BOUW VAN DE VAN NELLE FABRIEK, 1926-1930). It was made for documentary purposes, a record, in terms of Hediger and Vonderau. Through the connections that Van der Leeuw as well as the architects Brinkman and Van der Vlugt maintained with the Filmliga, Ivens also paid attention to the factory in his film NEW ARCHITECTURE, and Mannus Franken did so in MODERNE NEDERLANDSCHE ARCHITECTUUR (1930). Additionally, Van Nelle enabled Henk Alsem to carry out a form study (VAN NELLE FABRIEK, 1930), which was never finished, however. Van der Leeuw then commissioned Jan Teunissen to make a short film in the same spirit (i.e. THE BUILDINGS OF DE ERVEN WED. J. VAN NELLE AT ROTTERDAM, 1931)³¹⁵. It shows the factory from different angles; it was filmed with a moving camera, so that the architecture seems to be liberated from gravity³¹⁶. This experiment was presented at the Filmliga, and as part of lectures that Van der Leeuw gave in the USA³¹⁷.

When the building finally operated, Van Nelle commissioned Polygoon to make the diptych ACHTER GLAS! ("Behind Glass!", 1931). Polygoon had not only become the largest and most professional Dutch film company, but it had also made itself a name for progressive, innovative films³¹⁸. From one perspective, ACHTER GLAS! is a straight portrait of the processing of tea and coffee, but in fact it actually deals with the brand new building itself. The factory design was conceived upon the idea to offer good labour conditions, and one of the preconditions was a maximum amount of light inside the building. This film shows bright, clean and spacious surroundings. This transparent building displayed itself, its constructions and its inside life and organisation, which was all highlighted and amplified by this equally 'functionalist' film³¹⁹.

Parallel to these films, and several commercials too, Van Nelle commissioned Andor von Barys to make photographic records of the construction of the factory, while Jan Kamman was asked to make photographs that highlighted its modern appearance, in avant-garde style, in addition to the straight photographic documents by Evert van Ojen³²⁰. It shows that Van der Leeuw followed different approaches, within a complex strategy of generating and transmitting values that promoted modernity.

While Brinkman & Van der Vlugt built the Van Nelle factory, they also constructed a grain silo for the GEM (1929-1930). Both buildings are to be seen, for example, in Von Barys's 'absolute film' ROTTERDAM (1934), and many other films and newsreels would follow³²¹. In

³¹⁴ It included material of the former, with additional images, ref.: Contract between Van Nelle and Haghefilm (Mullens), 1926-03-30, GAR, 'Archief Van Nelle', toegangscode 944, inv. Nr. 2020, 'Stukken betreffende de producties van de eerste Van Nelle reclamefilms, 1919-1936.

³¹⁵ Correspondence between C.H. van der Leeuw and G.J. Teunissen, April-June, 1931 – GAR, 'Archief Van Nelle', toegangscode 944, inv. Nr. 2020, 'Stukken betreffende de producties van de eerste Van Nelle reclamefilms, 1919-1936. The film was shown at the Filmliga (in Rotterdam on 1931-04-11), under the heading 'Fragmenten', together with STALEN KNUISTEN and TRIOMF (1931, Jan Jansen).

³¹⁶ Ibid; the film was edited on the music of an unknown gramophone record that Teunissen sent to Van der Leeuw together with the positive print (1931-04-11 and 1931-04-15).

³¹⁷ Ibid, Van der Leeuw was enthusiastic about the film, and he immediately agreed upon Teunissen's proposal for a commercial, 'but with a plot or very stylised, and with sound' (letter by Teunissen to Van der Leeuw, 1931-06-17). Due to difficulties with sound film production, however, Teunissen was not able to make that film, but the idea remained. It was finally executed by Visiefilm (IN DEN TIJD VAN..., 1933, Max de Haas), but still with productional troubles, see: Hogenkamp, 1988: 83.

³¹⁸ e.g. EN GIJ, KAMERAAD? (1928, Jan Jansen), GROEI (1930, Jo de Haas), STALEN KNUISTEN (1930, Jo de Haas). It is likely that ACHTER GLAS! was also made by Jo de Haas, who soon afterwards, together with Max de Haas and Ab Keyzer, established Visie Film; among their first commissions was Van Nelle's promotional film IN DEN TIJD VAN... (1933, Max de Haas).

³¹⁹ More films would be made that also showed the work in the factory, e.g. RECLAME VAN NELLE (1936, Polygoon). See for other titles: www.cinemacontext.nl/id/R001222 (2008-07-10).

³²⁰ See: Halbertsma & Van Ulzen (eds.), 2001: 330.

³²¹ Besides general recordings of the port in which the GEM appears, there are also more specific reports, e.g. ZILVEREN JUBILEUM VAN DE GRAAN ELEVATOR MAATSCHAPPIJ (1933, Profilti).

terms of cultural ecology, the connection between these projects is established ‘when the coffee meets the biscuit’. Such a systemic relationship is about the organisation of flows of energy, matter, human resources, and liquid assets, channelled through cultural values.

Various other films can be mentioned that deal with alimentation. It is actually no coincidence that one of the first industrial films made in Rotterdam was commissioned by Van den Bergh’s Margarine factory³²². This enterprise, that later became known as Margarine Unie / Blue Band, produced many more films afterwards. Among them is a short film about the Blue Band factory (1930, Willy Mullens³²³); the factory is subsequently shown in an experimental commercial (1932, Profilti). The latter is among the first with sound, and it is therefore interesting to see that it consciously addresses the aspect of sound, through various close-ups of a speaker, with graphic slogans superimposed on it, while a voice-over promotes the product.

Blue Band was at the basis of the multinational Unilever. Its headquarters were built by Herman Mertens (1930-1931), who was, like Brinkman and Van der Vlugt, also an active member of the Filmliga. It was a moderate modern building, monumental, but with a rather open interior space that could be divided and arranged by boards. Mertens would subsequently build the highly modern HAKA factory (1931-1932), another food producing and processing facility, which I have just discussed regarding the Polygoon film on its construction. These projects show the connection between the port, the food industry and urbanism, and how this propelled a culture in which both architecture and cinema could develop.

Many more ‘food films’ can be mentioned³²⁴. They can be seen next to the ‘fuel films’, which include for example the films that Mullens (1921, 1923) and Transfilma (1927) made for the *Steenkolen Handels Vereeniging*, and other films, like those made for the oil company Shell. Shell commissioned all kinds of films that promoted and documented its business and developments in which it had a special interest, such as aviation³²⁵. Exemplary is the long documentary AARDOLIE, VAN PUT TOT POMP (1932, C.W.A. van Bergen & Willy Mullens). It shows the process of oil winning, its transportation to the port of Rotterdam, where it is processed, with extensive imagery of the refineries – and the observation of safety measures, and finally the consumption of oil³²⁶. ‘Food and fuel’ points directly to Steward’s notion of subsistence in respect of the ‘culture core’, which radiates into the field of film production.

mobility

Before WWII, the Hofplein was a major square where all kinds of traffic came together. It has been shown in various films that presented it as the motor of the modern city, such as the well-made amateur film HOFPLEIN (1932, K.L.A. & R. van der Leeuw). Since it was also a fragmented square, it was subject of an ongoing discussion among architects and planners, which would not be resolved before the war.

Architecture and planning had to accommodate new means of transport and complicated logistics. Regarding railway facilities, it had been the trade of Sybold van Ravesteyn, who built signal-houses and stations, among them ‘Station Beurs’, which were hallmarks of *Het Nieuwe Bouwen*. Mobility also required innovative constructions, such as railway bridge ‘Koningsbrug’ (*De Hef*, 1924-1927), by Van Ravesteyn’s colleague Pieter Joosting. It had already attracted

³²² I.e. MARGARINEFABRIEK SIMON VAN DEN BERGH (1913, Hollandia Filmfabriek).

³²³ Already before Mullens made a film for Van den Bergh (192x).

³²⁴ E.g. EEN KIJKJE IN DE FABRIEKEN VAN C. JAMIN (1920, F.A. Noggerath); various productions by Mullens (e.g. FYFFES BANANEN, 1925), by Alex Benno (e.g. GRAANSILO’S TE ROTTERDAM, 1925), and by Otto van Neijenhoff (e.g. H. RINGERS’ CACAO- EN CHOCOLADEFABRIEKEN, 1926; SCHOLTES ADVOCAATFABRIEK, 1927).

³²⁵ E.g. SHELL OIL, 1930; AARDOLIE, VAN PUT TOT POMP, 1932, C.W.A. van Bergen & W. Mullens), UITBREIDING INSTALLATIES PERNIS, 1936 – on aviation: e.g. LUCHTVAART EN SHELL, 1934. In 1934, a Shell Film Unit was established in London, which started to produce films itself (cf. Boon, 2008: 77).

³²⁶ As such it is an example of what Tom Gunning has called a ‘process film’, to make a difference with what he calls a ‘place film’, which applies to most other films dealing with Rotterdam. Gunning quoted in: Sørenssen, 1999.

media attention during its construction (Polygoon, 1926-10-05). Once it was finished, it featured in Ivens's *THE BRIDGE*, in the city promotion film *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* (1928, Andor von Barys), in the sponsored film *KONINGSHAVEN TE ROTTERDAM* (1929, W. Krieger) that was presumably made for the new Blue-Band margarine factory next to it, as an act of branding³²⁷, and in the city-symphony *DE MAASBRUGGEN* (1937, Paul Schuitema), among others. This bridge accommodated movements of ships and trains, while it could move itself as well. What counts here is movement, which is engineered as a functional affair. *De Hef* is an example of engineering and architecture that are connected to a new kind of urbanism.

This urbanism also involved the port. Considering the link between urbanism and the port, one should consider various kinds of buildings like factories and engineering works, including constructions such as locks, cranes and elevators³²⁸. Such installations enable the port to be a world of mobility *par excellence*, which has always appealed to the imagination – something that is especially reflected by amateur films³²⁹. An early example of a film that articulated the port's aesthetic features was the short Polygoon production *TECHNISCH FILMSPEL IN ÉÉN BEDRIJF* ("Technical Film Play in one Act", 1923), which showed the choreography of loading bridges, docks, tug boats and various other ships – the film also draws a connection to Polygoon's newsreels. Innumerable films have subsequently highlighted the spectacle of the port, with Von Barys's films, including *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* (1928) and *TUSSCHEN AANKOMST EN VERTREK* (1938), as the most remarkable ones. Next to that, film was also used to visualise rather specific concerns of navigation and its coordination, for example a film by Mannus Franken on radiotelegraphy (1934).

In this system, the port is a dramatic environment of movement, a stage for ongoing industrial performance, of great intensity, according to elaborate logistical, almost dramaturgical scripts. This 'symphony' of cranes, vessels and engines turned the port into a moving city, with the ships and cranes as its building blocks. As such, the dockyards became its productional force, and as an organisational structure also the model for what it produced: the engineering of movement. It was exactly for this reason that Henry Ford visited the yards in Rotterdam in October 1930 – and of course to reinforce an international network of industrialists. Both reasons are shown in a news report by Polygoon: Ford not only visits the docks, but also club house 'De Maas'³³⁰. Such buildings, therefore, are part of the 'moving city' too, for their organisational architecture, as stable points of a social-economic structure that enables movement. Ford and docks like RDM, Fijenoord and Wilton, shared interests in the modernisation of society, based on an overall mobility, in which the production of ships are structurally coupled to the production of cars, which, furthermore, involves the production of roads, and an urbanism and architecture that makes such a development possible. It also involves an urban culture that promotes such values, which is exemplified in Rotterdam by car races, among other.

Cinema, in its turn, as a modern medium based on movement, articulated such values. An example is the *NON-STOP-RIT FORD* (1926-12-07), a commercial and newsreel in one, made by Polygoon, which showed a seven days non-stop car rally through the Netherlands, passing Rotterdam. Also illuminating is the work of Simon Koster, since he first made the experimental film and theatre play *NUL UUR NUL* (1927-1928), and subsequently the fiction film *LENTELIED*

³²⁷ 'Blue-Band' (a Unilever subsidiary) had a large advertisement on the bridge, which is to be seen at the end of the film. This image is also prominently present in a promotional booklet: *Blue-Band Fabrieken*, Rotterdam: Drukkerij J. van Boekhoven, 1936. In various ways, Blue-Band made use of film as a promotional medium, e.g. *ENKELE SNAPSHOTS UIT DE BLUEBAND FABRIEKEN* (1930, Willy Mullens).

³²⁸ For locks, see e.g. *INGEBRUIKNEMING PARKSLUIZEN TE ROTTERDAM* (1933, Profilti); for grain elevators, see e.g. *ZILVEREN JUBILEUM VAN DE GRAAN ELEVATOR MAATSCHAPPIJ* (1933, Profilti).

³²⁹ Examples of well-made amateur films about the port include: *KRUISENDE WEGEN* (1933-1935, K.L.A. van der Leeuw); *HAVEN VAN ROTTERDAM* (1937, N.J. Polak), among others.

³³⁰ *BEZOEK HENRY FORD* (1930, Polygoon, newsreel 30-18). Club house 'De Maas' (1908-1909, arch. Michiel Brinkman), belonged to the rowing and sailing club 'De Maas'; it served above all as a meeting point for the 'harbour barons'. For more information on this building, see: Groenendijk & Vollaard, 2007: 83.

(1936). Both concern movement, as a subject, and as an aesthetic motive, which is reflected by their dynamic montage. In the former the train was ‘the vehicle to the future’; in the latter it had made place for the car and the aeroplane.

Over the course of the 1930s, the car became the dominant engine for city planning, although the railways remained important. Inside the agglomeration the tramway was still a convenient way to move, which, in the 1920s, changed from steam and horse traction to electricity. Its importance was emphasised by a film about the Rotterdam Tramway Company, which was made on the occasion of its fiftieth anniversary, a typical moment to reflect upon one’s history and development (RTM, 1878-1928, Willy Mullens). Besides the tram, the train remained important, for long distance traffic, which the Dutch Railways emphasised with a film on its centenary (NA 100 JAAR, 1939, Max de Haas)³³¹.

The car nevertheless came to the fore, which gradually became manifest. It was concretised by a project like the ‘Maastunnel’ (1937-1941, Van Bruggen and Van der Steur). It exemplifies how space directs urban flows, and that it is a crucial factor within city management and an integral part of city planning, as Michelle Provoost has argued (1996: 13). She even called it the ‘masterpiece’ of city planner Witteveen, who had previously worked for, indeed, the Dutch Railways. His role was decisive in the final work.

As Provoost has explained (1996: 13), the ‘Maastunnel’ was a traffic project on the route between The Hague and Dordrecht (and Antwerp eventually). It made Rotterdam part of a larger network that had been created since 1927, when the state department for traffic (*Rijkswaterstaat*) presented the *Rijkswegenplan*³³². As a part of the research that preceded this plan, Polygoon was asked to document the situation, to provide study material (WEGENFILM, HOLLAND OP Z’N SMALST, 1926)³³³. This road movie follows the main roads across the country. Regarding Rotterdam it includes images of its busy main road, the Coolsingel, and the traffic congestion that took place at the Maas bridges, and various impressions of its connections to other cities (i.e. Delft and Dordrecht). When the Maastunnel was under construction, Polygoon recorded this as well, step by step, to be shown in its news show. However, rather than merely monitoring the development of Rotterdam and the Netherlands, this was an active participation in channelling visions and transmitting values of mobility. In fact, the recordings of the Maastunnel were made for the “Municipal Department of Public Works” (Gemeentewerken). Various film versions were made, which were used for different purposes. Polygoon also used the material for its newsreels.

Within the city, the Maastunnel route opened up the new residential districts in the south, and the new districts Blijdorp and Overschie in the north, which were also built according to plans by Witteveen (i.e. *Studie voor den algemeenen uitleg van Rotterdam*, 1928³³⁴). The routes became part of the architectural project of the Maastunnel, which is especially clear in the case of the ’s Gravendijkwal, a road with a trench to accommodate fast automobile flows³³⁵.

According to Provoost (1996: 15), the aesthetics of the tunnel was merely ‘adding public architecture to the city’, well-detailed and well-furnished (with Gispens lamps). It is striking that the idea of a tunnel was seriously criticised by Han van Loghem (1935; 1936), who was a radical advocate of functionalism. According to him a tunnel did not have the same monumental or architectural value as a bridge, as expressed in the design by J. Emmen, which had been made as an alternative to the tunnel. Only the tunnel’s ventilation buildings could have such a function, as an addition to the main thing. A tunnel lacked the overwhelming experience of perceiving the river from above. Striking about his criticism is the rhetoric in terms of aesthetics.

What he did not recognize, however, is the possibility of a tunnel to have such an effect too. A tunnel can be an instance of ‘urban montage’; a cut from one scenery to another. What

³³¹ Including views of Rotterdam, from the railway to The Hague, and from the railway across the Maas.

³³² Supervised by G.J. van den Broek, see: Provoost, 1996: 21 e.a.

³³³ This is not a ‘finished version’; the material was used for study purposes, and not intended for public screening.

³³⁴ See: Provoost, 1996: 9. Cf Van de Laar, 2000: 357.

³³⁵ Cf. Van de Laar, 1996: 185.

speaks in favour of Van Loghem, however, is his concern with quality. It was not an easy for him, as a proponent of functionalism. It was the time that Oud and Van Ravesteyn advocated an artistic turn, to highlight visuality rather than functionality³³⁶. For Van Loghem, 'vision' was a function of architecture. When the tunnel was eventually being built, Van Ravesteyn designed the 'Diergaarde Blijdorp' (Zoo, 1937-1941), with a renewed attention for ornaments, curves and decorations. It highlights the growing contrast between what was considered as civil engineering and art; the 'Maastunnel' became a matter of planning, straight figures and facts, not the least in the way it was presented by newsreels and informative films.

This discussion was also at issue regarding the steamship 'Nieuw Amsterdam' (1935-1938) – named after the Dutch settlement that became New York, to which the ship would travel. This 'sea castle' was built by the *Rotterdamsche Droogdok Maatschappij* (RDM) for the Holland America Line. The HAL had grown because of the migration from Europe to America³³⁷. Since the 1920s, it had to change its strategy. Travelling had to be more attractive. For the new ship, architects, designers and artists worked on its interior, among them Van Ravesteyn and Oud, next to Merkelbach & Karsten and others, headed by Th. Wijdeveld.

The ship was a small city in itself, with various 'urban functions' such as a cinema (design by Oud)³³⁸. It became a hallmark of engineering and design. Media contributed to that reputation, like Polygoon, which spent various reports on its construction and trial runs³³⁹. However, in a special issue of *De 8 & Opbouw* (1938/12) on architecture and ship design, Johan Niegeman, who had previously worked for Wijdeveld as well as Merkelbach & Karsten, concluded that the architects had been 'putting a cloth around a carcass'³⁴⁰. Instead of decorating, architects had to collaborate with the engineers on the organisation of the ship, which was a chaos of interior spaces. He illustrates this statement by a rhetorical passage.

We do not want to go seriously into possibilities that today's technology enables already. For many it would be too Jules Vernes like when we assert that one should apply more courageous, interesting and newer constructions, which could make travelling on such a ship an even bigger experience, such as extended decks of glass that suspend over the surface of the sea, or, at the bottom of the ship, a space with wall and floor elements of glass, which offer a sight into the sea that will be lit, or a combined aeroplane ship construction, a drifting-floating-flying vehicle.³⁴¹

This is more than a casual remark; it is a critique that depicts the ideal modernist image of architecture, by using the latest technology, in order to create an exciting experience, like cinema.

³³⁶ This renewed attention for the artistic aspect of architecture is most of all articulated in an article by Arthur Staal in *De 8 & Opbouw* (see: Staal, 1938: 88), in which he criticises the uncritical and uncommitted continuation of abstract art, after twenty years of experimentation. It was a reaction to articles in the previous edition of *De 8 & Opbouw* (1938, vol. 9/8: 69-78) concerning an exhibition of abstract art in the *Stedelijk Museum* in Amsterdam.

³³⁷ See: Van de Laar, 2000: 196.

³³⁸ For a description of the *Nieuw Amsterdam* and the work of Oud, see: Reinhartz-Tergau, 1990: 122.

³³⁹ E.g. DE EERSTE REIS VAN DE 'NIEUW AMSTERDAM' (Polygoon, 1938-02-15) – the ship is moved from RDM to Wilton for the finishing works on it; DE 'NIEUW AMSTERDAM' KIEST VOOR HET EERST ZEE (Polygoon, 1938-03-21) – its first travel to New York; OFFICIELE OVERDRACHT VAN DE 'NIEUW AMSTERDAM' (Polygoon, 1938-04-23) – with shots of its exterior and interior, including a swimming pool, cinema, lounge, and shots of the official inauguration. See also: DE NIEUW AMSTERDAM LOOPT VAN STAPEL (1937, Profilti).

³⁴⁰ An example of a project that was more in line with the functionalist ideals was the interior design of the tanker 'MS Pendrecht' by Ida Lieftrinck (Holsappel, 2000: 18).

³⁴¹ 'Wij willen hier tenminste nu niet ernstig ingaan op mogelijkheden, waartoe misschien de hedendaagsche techniek ons reeds in staat stelt. Voor velen zou het te Jules Vernes-achtig zijn, wanneer wij zouden beweren, dat men meer gedurfde, interessante en nieuwere constructie's toe moet passen, welke het reizen op een dusdanig gebouwd schip tot een nog grooter beleven zouden kunnen maken, zooals bv. overstekende dekken uit glas boven de zee-oppervlakte of op den bodem van het schip een ruimte met glazen wand- en vloergedeelten, welke een blik in de te verlichten zee bieden, of een gecombineerde vliegtuig-schip constructie, een drijvend-zwevend-vliegend gevaarte.' (Niegeman, 1938: 128-129).

Architecture was envisioned as a new mode of perception, and the construction of buildings would almost collide with the engineering of ships and aeroplanes, comparable to Kazimir Malevitch' conceptual 'Future Planits for Earth Dwellers' (1923-1924) and 'Architektons' (1920-1926)³⁴². Similarly, in one of the following issues of *De 8 & Opbouw* (1938, vol. 9/23) dedicated to the subject of 'flying', aeroplanes were discussed as models for architecture, but not uncritically. Mart Stam stated that 'the architects' side is the human side', which is also the title of his article. The designs of certain aeroplanes show an unknown consistency, they are of 'a straightness and an unconstrainedness' that one can hardly see anywhere else³⁴³. However, the human being in the aeroplane has become secondary to the machine, almost irrelevant. Moreover, Stam pointed to the fact that aeroplanes are developed for war, rather than for holidays. 'Let us be only impressed', he concluded, 'in everything we do, and above all in our work, by the quality, and above all the human quality'³⁴⁴.

³⁴² D'andrea, 1990: 152-155/160-161. Niegeman, who had worked in the USSR (1930-1937), must have been familiar with this work.

³⁴³ Stam, 1938: 225; original quote: 'van een zakelijkheid en een ongedwongenheid'.

³⁴⁴ Stam, 1938: 226; original quote: 'Tenslotte, laten we in alles en vooral in ons werk ons slechts door de kwaliteit en boven alles door de menselijke kwaliteit imponeren.'

CHAPTER 3. EVENTS

§ 1. between image and space

Architecture is not a matter of meeting the preconditions for construction, but constructing preconditions for events to take place, according to Bernard Tschumi (1994). In his view, architecture is both about space and the events that take place in it. Architecture does not determine such events, since there is no hierarchical cause and effect relationship – such a relationship used to be the assumption of the modern movement, according to Tschumi, but it does not correspond to the actual functioning and experience of architecture. Architecture enables the emergence of new relationships between space and events. This, however, happens only when the architecture itself elaborates on actual sociocultural and economic conditions, and the accompanying media processes. Architecture, after all, should be experienced through events that occur in it, for which the architecture provides strategies. In the view of Tschumi, an event is a movement that happens between and across spatial categories. An event is an activity, even a thought. It is a turning point, rather than a beginning or an end. As such it is different from the modernist statement of form following function. Examples are the architecture exhibition by *Opbouw* in the former town hall, and the art exhibitions by *De Rotterdammers* in the former old men's home (*Oudemannenhuis*) in 1923, and by *De Branding* in the former post-office in 1926³⁴⁵. Form and function were detached, but the presence of the buildings created an opportunity for these events to take place.

Events might be roughly conceptualised into three kinds, which have all been largely mediated (e.g. by newsreels). First of all are 'contingent occasions', from private encounters and social meetings (or disruptions), to the experience of novelties like motorised traffic flows and movements in the harbour – from fire, ship accidents, to something like the transportation of elephants³⁴⁶. Such events are often unexpected and are not intended to be an attraction. When it concerns private experiences, they are mostly hidden. When it concerns accidents, they are hardly ever recorded on film at the moment they occur – instead, we get an account afterwards or learn about their consequences. Such events must be re-enacted to be shown, which happens through fiction films; they can frame the individual drama or impact of such events. As such we can consider a feature film like *MODERNE LANDHAAIEN* (1926, Alex Benno)³⁴⁷. American travellers arrive at the harbour. They are invited to a party, where they get robbed. With outdoor shots being taken in Amsterdam, Rotterdam and The Hague, the film addresses the changing conditions of the city in general.

Secondly, there are organised events, including formal and regulated happenings, which often attracted a lot of attention. This ranges from political gatherings to the launching of ships or

³⁴⁵ The exhibition by *Opbouw* took place in *Het Oude Raadhuis*, 1923-10-18 – 1923-10-31, ref. Affiche Opbouw, ontwerp: Paul Schuitema, GAR: G-0000-0111. The exhibition by *De Rotterdammers* included work by Hendrik Chabot, Adriaan van der Plas and Jan Kamman; the exhibition by *De Branding* included work by Chabot and Hermann Bieling (see: Van de Laar, 2000: 375-376).

³⁴⁶ Concerning traffic, see the collection of Polygoon newsreels archived as *VERKEER* (1929, Polygoon), and additionally, e.g. the feature length documentary about the Rotterdam Tramway Company (RTM, 1878-1928, Willy Mullens) as well as educational films by A.M. van der Wel (*MET DE PAARDENTRAM NAAR OVERSCHIE*, 1925, *VEILIG VERKEER*, 1930). For fire, see e.g. *BRAND LEUVEHAVEN* and *GROOTE BRAND TE ROTTERDAM* (Profilti, 1935, 1937); for ship accidents, see e.g. *STRANDING VAN SS STUART-STAR TE HOEK V. HOLLAND* (1923, F.H. van Dijk); another remarkable accident was a collapse of a façade of a workshop and a trade house (at Hang 33/35/37), due to the deteriorated condition of the building and a boat that crashed into it (1925-12-04); see: *INGEVALLEN PUI BIJ HET HANG* (Polygoon, 1925); *OLIFANTENTRANSPORT NAAR ENGELAND* (Polygoon, 1928-week29); three elephants are hoisted from the embankment into a ship.

³⁴⁷ It was shown across the country for various years, in Rotterdam at Corso and at the Prinses Theater, see: *cinemacontext* (2009-01-15).

the inaugurations of buildings³⁴⁸, and also receptions of famous people – in particular film stars, sports champions and statesmen³⁴⁹.

Lastly, one might consider deliberately planned manifestations, to attract large audiences and media attention, such as exhibitions, parades, demonstrations, sports games, music events, and various celebrations³⁵⁰. It is already exemplified by the film *HISTORISCHE OPTOCHT IN ROTTERDAM* (1913, Alex Benno), about the celebration of one hundred years of independence. There are, however, earlier examples of the link between events and films, including recordings of fair grounds in the late 1890s, being the cradle of cinema itself³⁵¹. As such, ‘going to the movies’ is another kind of event that can be mentioned here. The films themselves add a layer of complexity to this web of events. Moreover, the presence of journalists, like the cameramen of Weisbard, Tuschinski and Polygoon, increased the importance of events. They turned them into news, adding value to it. In this way, media paved the ground for more and greater events to take place.

Events imply a certain temporality. Yet, they also affect spatial, visual and social structures, with long lasting effects, whether through buildings, films or social networks. Moreover, events enable following events to take place, and so they are weaving a fabric that animates the city. Events are intermediaries between people and the city, between the present and a continuing history, between time and space, space and image, image and idea.

I will focus here on planned manifestations, which turned out to be highly important within the cultural ecology at large. The first case has to do with sports games, which I have framed under the heading of ‘urban playgrounds’. The second deals with aviation, as a particular kind of traffic. This will be followed by the *Nenijto* exhibition, which was a huge event to promote the city, by integrating different media. All this has been of major importance within the cultural history of Rotterdam, for the values on which it relied and which it elaborated, although relatively little has been published about it. In the case of the *Nenijto*, Marlite Halbertsma has established a connection between this event and the world exhibitions of Barcelona (1929) and Antwerp (1930), among others. The article was published in the book *Interbellum Rotterdam* (Halbertsma & Van Ulzen, eds., 2001), which accompanied an exhibition that was organised on the occasion of Rotterdam being Europe’s ‘cultural capital’ – itself a major event within a certain tradition, as it turns out.

One important reason that the *Nenijto* and other events have not been canonised within the history of Dutch urbanism, architecture and other disciplines is probably the aspect of

³⁴⁸ e.g. *COMMUNISTISCHE DEMONSTRATIE TEGEN DE VLOOTWET* (1923-18, POLYGOON); *VERTREK ‘STATENDAM’* (1929, Orion); *OPENING VAN HET DAMESZWEMBAD ‘DE KOUS’ TE ROTTERDAM* (1928, Henk Alsem); *OFFICIELE OPENING KONINGINNEBRUG* (Polygoon, 1929-06-14), *INGEBRUIKNEMING PARKSLUIZEN TE ROTTERDAM* (1933, Profilti), among many others.

³⁴⁹ Film stars like Asta Nielsen (*HET BEZOEK VAN ASTA NIELSEN AAN ROTTERDAM*, 1920, Mullens), Eddy Polo (*AANKOMST EDDY POLO*, Polygoon, 1931-04-01), Hertha Thiele (*AANKOMST VAN FILMACTRICE HERTHA THIELE*, Polygoon, 1933-03-17), sportsmen like the Dutch world champion sprint cycling Antoine Mazairac (*ONTVANGST MAZAIRAC*, Polygoon 1929-week21) or the French world champion boxing light-heavyweight Georges Carpentier (*CARPENTIER’S TOCHT TE ROTTERDAM*, 1921, Karl Weisbard), politicians and statesmen like the Japanese prince-regent (and later emperor) Hirohito (*HET BEZOEK VAN HIRO-HITO AAN ROTTERDAM*, 1921, Karl Weisbard), a.o.

³⁵⁰ Examples of events and film reports about them: cattle show: *PAASVEETENTOONSTELLING IN ROTTERDAM* (1928, Orion); week of illumination: *LICHTWEEK ROTTERDAM* (1930-02-22, Orion); motorcycling games *MOTORBEHENDIGHEIDSWEDSTRIJDEN* (1937-09-11, Polygoon); sailing matches: *DE EERSTE KRALINGSCHE ZEILWEEK 1937* (1938, J.A. van Pelt); *INTERNATIONALE MARATHONLOOP GEORGANISEERD DOOR HET WEEKBLAD ‘HET LEVEN’* (1938-05-22, Polygoon); *LUNAPARK LAND VAN HOBOKEN* (1939, J.A. van Pelt).

³⁵¹ e.g. *DE KERMIS*, 1899, Stefan Hofbauer; another example of recordings of an event is *PARADE ROTTERDAMSCHER SCHUTTERIJ*, *ibid*); a self-reflexivity regarding ‘going to the movies’, as an event, but still part of variety shows, is present in *OPNAME UITGAAN DER MIDDAG-VOORSTELLING (VAN CASINO VARIÉTÉ) VAN ZATERDAG 21 JUNI L.L.* (1902, *ibid*).

temporality. However, the notion of temporality itself was important within the general cultural discourses of the 1920s, as it was related to the idea of continuous change. But the results are hard to grasp, and traces are not always obvious. There seems to be an insuperable paradox. The more successful they had been, the less visible they are. It suggests that the quality of temporal works is actually not to be found within notions of materiality and aesthetics, but most of all in the effects these works have had outside their own realm. This demands another way of thinking, especially in the case of architecture history. It is at this point that media become all the more important. However, media historians face a similar difficulty. Media products that have been made in relationship to events have had a very restricted presence too.

As a counter argument one can say that all cultural artefacts, whether buildings or films, have a temporal use value. That is exactly the point and events just make that clear. One could argue, however, that events have been seriously analysed for centuries within theatre and music studies. But there is a difference. Music and theatre performances, and in fact also sports events, are typical instances of the cultural realm, whether they are considered in terms of classical or popular culture. Industrial exhibitions instead, not unlike product demonstrations, or even traffic circulation, and also political acts for example, have a different character. Such events necessarily demand a cross-disciplinary perspective in order to understand their cultural value.

My intention is to look at events as dynamic complexes. Events are not individual works, but collective projects. As such, they have a different dynamic, and a different value. This is not to say that we should ignore individual achievements. But to recognise such individual achievements, we need to understand how they have been contributions to larger projects; we need to trace relations within broader developments, to follow motivations and aims. In order to understand the value of an event, and its constituents, we have to think of an event as a 'network within a network'. In this way, we can perceive and conceptualise a multitude of layers and connections between different objects and settings.

urban playgrounds

To explain the active role of media in the evolution of 'the urban playground', I will consider sports games first of all. Illuminating is a case about an away match of football club Sparta Rotterdam, against HFC Haarlem (1921-02-27), including the travel of Sparta supporters to Haarlem. The newspaper *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad* took the initiative for this travel, which by 1921 was still a major enterprise. The newspaper arranged a convoy of trucks, packed with people. The tour started at the Coolsingel Boulevard, in front of the brand new town hall, where an enormous crowd had gathered. Whereas the Coolsingel used to be a canal (Coolvest), Mayor A.R. Zimmerman had proposed to turn it into a metropolitan boulevard, including a new town hall (in neo-Renaissance style) and the central post office³⁵². The plan was accepted in 1909. The last stage of this project, the stopping up of the Coolvest until Hofplein, was completed at the beginning of 1921³⁵³.

The convoy moved from the Coolsingel to the Hofplein, and further onwards, via the Schiekade up to the north, all the way flanked by thousands of people, as if it were a victory parade. As a confirmation of Tschumi's thesis, the Coolsingel and the Hofplein thus provided the spatial preconditions for such an event to happen, immediately when this possibility was there. Elaborating on this thesis, we might draw an immediate connection to the accompanying media processes. Next to the *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, and its journalists being present to report the event, the 'expedition' was shown in detail in a report produced by Abraham Tuschinski (VOETBALWEDSTRIJD HAARLEM – SPARTA, Tuschinski, 1921-02-27). Three of Tuschinski's operators were simultaneously shooting, which was still something remarkable for newsreel

³⁵² For these two buildings, see: Groenendijk & Vollaard, 2007: 48-49 – town hall: 1912-1920, arch. H.J. Evers; post-office: 1915-1923, G.C. Bremer.

³⁵³ Van de Laar, 1996: 180.

production. Besides the trucks and general overviews, the cameramen portrayed many of the people in the crowd, who all wanted to see themselves that night in the cinema. The report concluded with images of the match, won by Sparta (1-2). Although the match was not a final or such, the media presence made it important. Rather than a sports event, it was a media event, which was, after all, enabled through a new configuration of urban space.

Remarkable is the fact that Polygoon too reported the match. At first sight it might look like any other report made by Polygoon, but it was actually part of its very first news show³⁵⁴. Until then, Polygoon had only produced reports and documentaries by commission, while Tuschinski, by that time, had already created the news show TUSCHINSKI ACTUALITEITEN (since 1920). Because of the attention from Rotterdam for this match, Polygoon also went there – not much of an effort, since Polygoon was based in Haarlem. It was the onset for the production of newsreels by Polygoon, although this history is not exactly clear³⁵⁵. To be able to do so, Polygoon also needed to set up its distribution, for which it depended on the cinemas. With Tuschinski producing his own newsreels, it seems that Polygoon must have sought new players to collaborate with³⁵⁶.

In the next years, Polygoon managed to establish a firm position. For its newsreels to be shown across the Netherlands, including in Rotterdam, various other events were reported, like aviation shows and sailing races on the Nieuwe Maas (1922). Gradually more political and economic events in Rotterdam were reported, like a communist demonstration against military agitation and governmental measures to strengthen the Dutch navy (1923, wk-18), or, for example, a visit of about one hundred representatives of the American railway authorities, with the aim of improving conditions for American tourism (1924, wk-32)³⁵⁷.

Entertainment and sports remained nevertheless among the favourite subjects of newsreels dealing with Rotterdam. All kinds of matches and international tournaments were reported, ranging from boxing and swimming to cycling, but over the course of the 1920s, football became the most popular. Whereas Sparta received special attention in the beginning, Feyenoord came soon to the fore, after it celebrated its first Dutch championship in 1924. The earliest recordings of Feyenoord were made during a match against Sparta (1925)³⁵⁸. Many more reports would follow, including one of a ‘fancy dress match’ on the occasion of its 20th anniversary (1928), while at the same time a film was made for Sparta that had its 40th anniversary³⁵⁹.

³⁵⁴ Albers (2004: 291) mentions that it was one of the three newsreels in the first news show of Polygoon; the others were: STAPELLOOP ‘LYBERTY GLO’ and 1-MEI DAG (TE DORDRECHT). The report on the football match has, according to B&G’s archiving order, document identity number 3 (docid: 3). The only Polygoon report at B&G classified as *Polygoon Hollands Nieuws* that has a higher document identity (docid: 2) is the report on the launching of the ship Lyberty Glo from Wilton’s Dry Docks in the port of Rotterdam (rec.: 1921-02-03). The latter might actually be part of a commission, which seems not unlikely considering the interest in film by Bart Wilton.

³⁵⁵ It might be that the report on the match by Polygoon is actually the material from the Tuschinski production, since the Tuschinski film kept in the collection of GAR actually misses the images of the match. The Polygoon report, in any case, shows various fragments of the match, with a.o. the Haarlem players Arie Bieshaar and Willy Angenent (goal keeper), and the Sparta players Cees Roem (goalkeeper), Cas Ruffelse and Harry Nippius (information from B&G).

³⁵⁶ A particular case in this respect is a news report concerning the brand new *Ooster Theater* (owned by Frans Berkhout), showing school children getting out of the cinema after the screening of the educational LENTEFILM (1923), made by Polygoon itself. It is an articulated example of self-monitoring. The report is called: UITGAAN VAN HET OOSTERTHEATER NA EEN VOORSTELLING VAN DE LENTEFILM VOOR DE SCHOLEN (*Polygoon Hollands Nieuws*, rec.: 1922-03-07). It is still one of the first news reports made by Polygoon.

³⁵⁷ It concerned ladies and gentlemen of the American Association of Passenger Traffic Officers (with its president H.B. Callaway) and the American Association of Railroad Traffic Officers (source: B&G).

³⁵⁸ VOETBALWEDSTRIJD SPARTA – FEIJENOORD [1-0] (1925, Polygoon). It was a crucial match in the western district competition, which was won by Sparta.

³⁵⁹ The fancy dress match was played at Feyenoord’s old home at the Kromme Zandweg. Important matches, however, were played at the Sparta stadium. The Sparta film included a match against Feyenoord, in the year that the latter became Dutch champion again. Of special interest are also two matches of ‘the classic’ which were shown as shorts in

By the time that Polygoon's newsreels were shown by Tuschinski too, Polygoon made a report on a match between teams of Tuschinski employees, one from Amsterdam, the other from Rotterdam, with Abraham Tuschinski and his family among the supporters (1927-04-15, Polygoon). It exemplifies the close collaboration between Polygoon, as the main Dutch film production company, and Tuschinski, as the main Dutch film exhibition enterprise. Although Tuschinski continued to produce films incidentally, it also commissioned Polygoon to make recordings, for example on the Rotterdam Golden Independent Cup (*Gouden Onafhankelijkheidsbeker*, 1928-11-18), at the Sparta stadium. In this relatively long report, shown at Tuschinski theatres, a selection from Rotterdam plays against the Dutch national football team, for 17,999 fans. Many faces are to be seen, once more. Moreover, the camera tilts from the tribune to a billboard above it, which is an advertisement for Tuschinski. The first goal of the Rotterdam team is shown, made by the outside left player, through a diagonal ground shot. The match results in 2-2, but Rotterdam's Mayor Droogleever-Fortuyn gives the cup nevertheless to the team from his own city. The relationship between Tuschinski and Polygoon is finally exemplified by a football match between the firms, watched by their directors Abraham Tuschinski and B.D. Ochse (VOETBALWEDSTRIJD TUSCHINSKI – POLYGOON, 1931-12-26). It was, obviously, recorded by Polygoon and shown at the Tuschinski theatres. Football was a way to settle things informally and to reinforce connections, while it was also turned into a public event.

The preoccupation with sports was not confined to specially designated spaces; sports events and the activities connected to them extended to the urban space in general. André van der Velden has mentioned a particular event that I would like to recall here³⁶⁰. It was a 'live report' of the football game between the Netherlands and Belgium on the 4th of May 1930. The game was held in Amsterdam. In Rotterdam thousands of people stood in front of the office building of the *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, where a big screen was mounted that simulated a football field. On the screen were items to indicate the positions of the players, which were moved mechanically, informed by a radio-connection. This event can be considered as a pre-television screening, which attracted so many people that one spoke of the 'Hofplein stadium'. The Hofplein, notwithstanding its problematic profile, was a space that enabled events to take place.

The *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, with Rotterdam as *Standort*, turned its city into *Tatort*. It amplified and extended certain events, taking place in Haarlem, Amsterdam or elsewhere, to make it a media event that enhanced the urban experience in and of Rotterdam. Whereas Van der Velden has conceptualised it as 'a projector in the urban space', it adds a dimension to the monitoring function of media, which we might call 'projective reflexivity'. The newspaper actively participated in the course of things taking place in the city, while reporting on it at the same time. It is an instance of active and creative monitoring, which is a matter of both oscillation and memory, both generating and transmitting cultural values. Sports games offered good opportunities to that, since they attracted a critical mass.

Sports games continued to attract attention and hence providing opportunities to extend the urban space as playground³⁶¹. Whereas media enabled broader audiences to watch sports, this

the cinema: VOETBALWEDSTRIJD FEIJENOORD – AJAX [2-4], 1932-05-01 and VOETBALWEDSTRIJD AJAX – FEIJENOORD [1-3], 1932-05-05. These were matches in the national play-offs, which were won by Ajax.

³⁶⁰ Van der Velden, 2001: 115-117.

³⁶¹ Regarding the link between sports and urban space as a playground, we might pay extra attention to an annual swimming competition, which took place in the river Schie. It is a particular kind of space that provided the precondition for such an event to happen, which also raised attention, e.g. Polygoon newsreels. See for example the edition of 1931, which was won by the Olympic champion Marie 'Zus' Braun (3 KM ZWEMWEDSTRIJDEN, Polygoon, 1931-07-11). Also worth mentioning is the international marathon of Rotterdam, which was organised by the weekly magazine *Het Leven*, another instance of news media involved in turning the city into *Tatort*, see the news report INTERNATIONALE MARATHONLOOP GEORGANISEERD DOOR HET WEEKBLAD 'HET LEVEN' (Polygoon, 1938-05-22) – the marathon was won by the Belgian athlete Meskens. Important became also, among various other events, the annual Concours Hippique (see e.g. 1931, Polygoon).

was paralleled by spatial mediation, in particular through the construction of a new stadium for football club Feijenoord (1934-1936, Brinkman & Van der Vlugt). Whereas media enabled the sharing of an experience across a broad environment, acting as a centrifugal factor for spatial diffusion, the event that it brought under attention functioned as a centripetal force, with a strong spatial concentration. There seems to be a direct correlation between the increase of the former and the latter, resulting in bigger accommodations for ever larger events to take place.

Exactly a month after Polygoon reported that the stadium was finished, with detailed images of its architecture, it recorded the inauguration of the stadium on the 27th of March 1937. It started with a relay run through Rotterdam-Zuid, to bring the Feijenoord flag from the old field to the new one. Next there was a speech and then the kick-off by Mayor Droogleevers-Fortuyn for the match between Feijenoord and the Belgian football club Beerschot, which was won by the home team (5-2), for 37,825 spectators. About two months later (1937-05-02), the Dutch national team played here for the first time, against Belgium (1-0). As a record for the Netherlands at that time, 60,000 supporters came to see the match, which required the service of seventy extra trams and four hundred controllers, who could hardly handle the crowd³⁶². Once the stadium was there, it provided the opportunity for other events to take place as well³⁶³.

Although sports games were turned into major events that cut across social and political divisions, this, however, became problematic on the 11th of December 1938, when the Dutch national football team was about to play a match against the German team³⁶⁴. Since the *Kristallnacht* (1938-11-9), a public discussion had taken place if the match should be cancelled, but the Dutch football union KNVB wanted it to be played. In the end, it was nevertheless cancelled by Mayor P.J. Oud (who had just been installed, see: Polygoon, 1938-10-20). The official reason was to avoid disorderliness, since one expected demonstrations and actions against the German regime, and counteractions of Dutch national-socialists (NSB)³⁶⁵.

Besides sports, we can extend the argument of the city turned into mediatised urban playgrounds by considering other events. Among them is the annually held VVV-week, which was organised to stimulate tourism in the city. Part of the 1934 edition was a folkloristic procession, as reported by Polygoon (1934-09-05). Such a national exposure by Polygoon was important, since it stimulated people from elsewhere to come to Rotterdam, to watch another event: an advertisement parade moving through the city, including various cars with billboards, horsemen with flags, and floats decorated with flowers. The parade was, subsequently, made into a cinema commercial, commissioned and presented by cinema Colosseum, and also produced by Polygoon (DE VVV WEEK, 1934). Moreover, Colosseum was one of the participants in the parade, making publicity for its own film screenings, while the parade also moved along the building itself that is to be seen in the commercial³⁶⁶.

It turned out to be good publicity for Colosseum, and the next year it commissioned Polygoon to make another commercial³⁶⁷. Colosseum even extended the formula, and started to make its own city news reports, in collaboration with Polygoon³⁶⁸. In the following years the VVV-week became more spectacular. In its 1935 edition, it revolved around the theme of

³⁶² www.fortunecity.com/wembley/goodison/185/Dekuip1.htm (2007-09-15)

³⁶³ For example the famous boxing match between Bep van Klaveren and Assane Diouf (won by the former), which was also reported by Polygoon (1939-06-25), making use of slow-motion images to increase the dramatic action.

³⁶⁴ Not unlike other sports games that were organised previously between the Netherlands and Germany, e.g. athletic games for women, organised in Rotterdam as well (ATHLETIEK NEDERLAND – DUITSLAND, Polygoon, 1938-07-11).

³⁶⁵ Van der Pauw, 2006: 27. See also: www.xs4all.nl/~jurryt/kuip97.htm Article: 'De Tweede Wereldoorlog: inleiding' (website visited: 2007-09-18).

³⁶⁶ With a billboard on the façade advertising the film DE JANTJES (1934, NL, Jaap Speyer) while a billboard in the parade makes publicity for the film IK BEN GEEN ENGEL/I AM NOT AN ANGEL (USA, Wesley Ruggles), 'with Mae West'.

³⁶⁷ I.e. BUITENOPNAME VAN HET COLOSSEUM THEATER, Polygoon, 1935-06-06, showing the façade of the cinema, with an advertisement for NANA (1934, USA, Dorothy Arzner), with Anna Sten, while people queue up to get inside.

³⁶⁸ See: COLOSSEUM NIEUWS (1938, Polygoon).

navigation, with various replicas of ships exhibited in the city, among them a large pirate ship³⁶⁹. Finally, one might draw here a cross-connection to other promotional activities to stimulate tourism; in 1934 the national tourist association ANVV commissioned Visie Film to make a feature length film on the highlights of the Netherlands (NEDERLAND SPREEKT, Max de Haas), which was also released as separate films, including one on Rotterdam, featuring the port and the city centre³⁷⁰.

Next to promotional means that combined entertainment and commerce, other events were organised, such as an exhibition about Rotterdam, called *Ontdek Uw Stad* (“Discover Your City”, 1937-1938, design: Pieter den Besten)³⁷¹. This event, which was initiated by the municipality as a relief project for unemployed youths (*Centraal Comité voor Jongere Werklozen*), gave an overview of what had been established in Rotterdam concerning trade, planning, industry and shipping, while it also presented certain cultural and social institutions. Opbouw contributed to it through the presentation of a plan for urban vegetation and relaxation areas. As an event, it was organised from the belief that a great latent interest existed in all that lives in the city³⁷². The exhibition became a success indeed, with more than fifty thousand visitors, thanks to the media attention, like that of Polygoon (1937-12-07)³⁷³. It raised a general interest in, and an engagement with urban development.

§ 2. amazing air-evolutions

According to Le Corbusier, traffic was one of the key functions within urban planning. He framed it in a functionalist perspective, in terms of transportation and connections, which implied the modern values of movement and technology. I will consider a case that explicitly draws upon these values, and how they have contributed to urban development. I will do so by paying attention to the most extreme form of traffic that developed in Rotterdam at that time, which is aviation, with the arrival of the Zeppelin as its pinnacle.

In 1919, the decision was made to build an airport in Rotterdam, called ‘Waalhaven’ (1919-1921, Gemeentewerken)³⁷⁴. It would become the first civil airport of Europe³⁷⁵. Besides its importance as an accommodation for passenger flights, it also became important as a platform for the ‘spectacle of aviation’. Because of the airport, there were often aeroplanes in the sky over Rotterdam, which gave the city a futuristic appearance. Flying was one of the ultimate technological achievements, and as such a feature of modern culture that stimulated the imagination. As such it was also a matter of leisure and entertainment. In that respect ‘Waalhaven’ is of special interest as an urban space that offered opportunities for events to take place, in particular the so-called ‘aviation shows’³⁷⁶. Fun and function went together.

On a limited scale, such shows had already taken place in Rotterdam since the early 1910s. It was also reported through newsreels, which got titles like “sensational flying demonstration by the French air acrobat Pégoud” (1912) and “the amazing air-evolutions of the famous aviator Pégoud in Rotterdam” (1913), which were shot by Herman Luijnen for Pathé

³⁶⁹ DE VVV-WEEK TE ROTTERDAM; DE ROTTESTAD IN FEESTDOS (Profilti, 1935). For the following year, see: RIDDERTOURNOOI EN WAGENRENNEN OP Woudenstein (Polygoon, 1936-09-12); PRINS PHILIP VAN SPANJE WOONT DE VVV-WEEK BIJ (Polygoon, 1936-09-05)

³⁷⁰ Port with industry (as an attraction), ‘SS Statendam’ a.o., and the city with the town hall, a mill, De Bijenkorf a.o.

³⁷¹ ‘Tentoonstelling Rotterdam 1937-1938; *ontdek uw stad*’, organised by the ‘Centraal Comité voor jonge werklozen’ (see: Van Gelderen, 1938: 203).

³⁷² Van Gelderen, 1938: 203.

³⁷³ The reports showed a large number of urban models.

³⁷⁴ Moscoviter, 1996: 33; Van de Laar, 1996: 192/308. It was made under the supervision of *Gemeentewerken* director A.C. Burgdorffer.

³⁷⁵ Arense, 1990. It received immediately a lot of attention, also from other cities, see e.g. BEZOEK BURGEMEESTERS AAN HET Vliegterrein Waalhaven (1922, Willy Mullens).

³⁷⁶ But not exclusively, since other events would be organised here too, like motor performances, see for example: MOTORBEHENDIGHEIDSWEDSTRIJDEN (rec.: 1937-09-11, Polygoon).

Frères³⁷⁷. In this way an immediate connection can be drawn between cinema and aviation. The connection was notably reinforced when Abraham Tuschinski organised, and recorded of course, a great aviation show at sports park Woudestein (VliegDemonstratie op Woudestein, 1919). Two years later Tuschinski was the first to show aerial views of Rotterdam and its surroundings. On the 21st of June, the Italian pilot Umberto Maddalena, as a representative of the *Regia Aeronautica Italia* (Italian Air Force) and accompanied by his wife, publicly demonstrated the hydro-aeroplane Savoia S 16. Tuschinski made an agreement to fly with him. The *Nieuwe Waterweg* (“New Waterway”, Port of Rotterdam) served as a runway, which was then followed through the air. In this way the agglomeration of Rotterdam was shown, still in quite some detail³⁷⁸. It was a revolutionary new way to perceive the city, which became valuable to modern city planning³⁷⁹.

In 1922 the Waalhaven airport organised the *International Concours Aviatique de Rotterdam* (ICAR, 1922-09-02), which was reported by Polygoon. It addressed the involvement of military representatives and the Royal House, with Prince Hendrik opening the accompanying exhibition on the state of the art of aeroplane navigation. The ICAR combined technological interests, warfare possibilities and entertainment³⁸⁰.

Aviation shows were not without risk. That year one of the aeroplanes collapsed and its pilot Saveur was killed. His funeral was subsequently reported and shown at Tuschinski’s *Cinéma Royal* (1922-09-15)³⁸¹. Film amplified the tragedy, which actually reinforced the sensation of the shows. Shown in cinemas, the events were recreated. Film became a reference and a perceptual model for the shows. Many aviation shows followed, throughout the 1920s and 1930s, which were frequently reported³⁸². We might particularly mention the occasion of the test flights of the ‘pander baby’ aircraft, which was a production of the Pander factory in The Hague. This aircraft, as a report by Polygoon (1924-11-18) makes clear, was made for the *Salon d’Aviatique* in Paris. It reveals a network that accompanied the airlines of passenger flights, especially those of the KLM (Royal Dutch Airlines).

KLM was founded by Albert Plesman in 1919, with the aid of firms in Rotterdam³⁸³. It had its base at Waalhaven, and soon at Schiphol (Amsterdam), where it established its headquarters³⁸⁴. The aviation network was reinforced by other services, air mail in particular,

³⁷⁷ 1912 – SENSATIONEELE VliegDemonstratie door den Franschen Luchtacrobaat PÉGOUD; 1913 – DE WONDERVOLLE LUCHT-EVOLUTIËN VAN DEN BEROEMDEN AVIATEUR PÉGOUD TE ROTTERDAM. See also: VliegDemonstratiën van PÉGOUD TE ROTTERDAM (1913, Willy Mullens).

³⁷⁸ The film shows, respectively: Oostplein, Kralingen, Hoge Boezem, Gedempte Slaak, Plantage, rangeerterreinen Maasstation, Maasbruggen, Witte Huys, plantsoenen op Oosterkade, Oude Haven, Nieuwe Haven, Haringvliet, Goudsche Singel, Noordereiland, Schiehoofd/Schiemond, Ruige Plaatbrug, Wilton, Koushaven, IJsselhaven, Lekhaven, Schiedam, Schiedam-Zuid, Vlaardingen, Oude Haven, Buitenhaven, Maassluis, polders, Keilehaven, Petroleumhaven, Gemeentelijke droogdokken, Schiehaven, Centraal Station, Diergaarde; Rotterdam-noord, Rotterdam-west/Heemraadsingel, Delfshaven, Kralingse Plas.

³⁷⁹ In this respect one might also consider the “Diorama of Rotterdam” that Jaap Gidding designed for the world exhibition in Antwerp (1930), a mural that presented in detail the agglomeration of Rotterdam. According to Halbertsma (2001: 215), this painting was based on the use of aerial photography.

³⁸⁰ The military interest was, for example, also present in the training at Waalhaven (a.o.) of KNIL-soldiers (KNIL = *Koninklijk Nederlandsch-Indisch Leger* = Royal Army of the Dutch East Indies), as addressed by the film: Vliegfeesten te Rotterdam (1928, Orion). See also, e.g. Vliegfeest (Polygoon, 1929-06-23/1929-06-30), portraying Prince Hedrik together with J.M.J.H. Lambooy, Minister of Defense, attending the *conours aviatique* at Waalhaven.

³⁸¹ DE BEGRAFENIS VAN DEN GEVALLEN Vlieger SAVEUR TE ROTTERDAM (1922, Tuschinski)

³⁸² The year 1928 might serve as an index to consider a range of reports: Vliegfeest (1928, Polygoon); Vliegfeesten te Rotterdam, 1928, Orion; Polygoon, 1928-wk04, 1928-wk19, a.o.

³⁸³ i.e. Wm. H. Müller & Co, and *Rotterdamsche Bankvereniging*; Van de Laar, 2000: 309.

³⁸⁴ Van de Laar, 2000: 309. This location was above all motivated by the fact that it had a more favourable position to access The Hague.

which was also articulated through film³⁸⁵. Following Tuschinski, KLM soon established its own photographic service, which released films and aerial photographs, like those in the publication *Rotterdam, Photographed From the Air* (1923)³⁸⁶. This booklet also included pictures of the airport itself, which was accompanied by the remark that ‘A visit to the aerodrome is more and more experienced to be one of the pleasant excursion trips.’ Watching aeroplanes at this ‘flight station’ (*vliegstation*), while enjoying a drink at the terrace of *Hotel-Café-Restaurant Waalhaven*, became a major attraction, even on week days.

In a similar way, KLM made company films, with views of the workshops at Waalhaven for example, as well as aerial recordings of the Netherlands, starting with Amsterdam and Rotterdam (*RONDVLUCHT BOVEN NEDERLAND*, 1925, KLM). KLM also collaborated with other film producers, like Orion and Profilti, which made a film that stressed flying as a spectacular mode of perception (*VLIEGEN MET DE KLM*, 1927, Orion-Profilti)³⁸⁷. In this film, people get on board at Waalhaven to see with their own eyes what they had already seen in the cinema before. Many other films would be produced by KLM in the next years that presented Rotterdam and the Netherlands from the air³⁸⁸. Among them is also *ROTTERDAM* (1937, KLM), to promote the city as a tourist destination, which KLM produced in collaboration with Spido (harbour boat trips), and the zoo, where the film had its premiere too³⁸⁹.

One might finally draw a cross-connection to football once more: Tuschinski’s football team not only played against Polygoon, but also against the team of KLM (won by the latter: 1-2), as reported by Polygoon (*VOETBAL TUSCHINSKI – KLM*, 1938-05-29). Although the trinity of film, flying and football might be occasional, the link between film and flying was a firm one, and many more films would be made to exemplify it³⁹⁰. This even resulted in a fiction film, *AFFAIRE D-63* (1936, Dahl-Film), a detective parody, which was made through a collaboration between members of the *Rotterdamsche Smalfilmliga* and the *Rotterdamsche Aeroclub*³⁹¹.

the arrival of the Zeppelin

The climax of the air shows was the arrival of the Zeppelin in Rotterdam in June 1932. What made it unique was not just the Zeppelin itself, which stayed hardly half an hour in Rotterdam, but primarily the programming around it. Already in 1918, during WWI, a whole fleet of Zeppelins passed Rotterdam when Germany used them to attack England. A decade later, in September 1928, the first German airship after the war, the ‘Graf Zeppelin’, made its premiere flight. Two weeks later it made a flight to Rotterdam, although it did not land. The next year, in October 1929, the ‘Graf Zeppelin’ made a special *Hollandfahrt* with Rotterdam as its destination³⁹². It was reported by Tuschinski in his news show, and it was also an item in the Orion

³⁸⁵ Van de Laar, 2000: 309. Since 1920-07-26, to London. See also, for example: *MET DE FOKKER VII EN DE EERSTE LUCHTMAIL NAAR MARSEILLE VANAF WAALHAVEN* (1926, Henk Alsem).

³⁸⁶ Published by H.A. Kramers and Son and edited in collaboration with the Municipality of Rotterdam.

³⁸⁷ At the same time Orion also made the news report *VLIEGVELD WAALHAVEN* (1927), and the next year *VLIEGFEESTEN TE ROTTERDAM*.

³⁸⁸ i.e. *BEDRIJFSFILM KLM WAALHAVEN – SCHIPHOL* (1930, KLM); *LUCHTOPNAMEN ROTTERDAM KLM* (1930, KLM); *ROTTERDAM... THANS* (1938, KLM). Besides that, other enterprises became involved with aviation too, such as Shell, since it provided fuel. It showed its engagement by way of film as well, e.g. *LUCHTVAART EN SHELL* (1934, Shell), including images of Schiphol and Waalhaven (see also: *LUCHTVAARTFILM*, 1934, Shell).

³⁸⁹ Premiere at the *Sociëteitsgebouw der Rotterdamsche Diergarde*, 1937-10-29, see: *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1938: XLV.

³⁹⁰ See for example certain highlights, a.o. reports on the first Dutch female pilot: *NEDERLANDS EERSTE AVIATRICE BEP VERSLUYS* (Orion, 1930-12-04) and Polygoon, 1930-wk33; American pilots visiting Rotterdam: Polygoon, 1930-wk12; see furthermore: Polygoon, 1931-wk13; Polygoon, 1932-wk35; Polygoon 1933-wk04 (about the flight of M.A.G. van der Leeuw and his wife to Africa, where they had made film recordings too, see: Dicke, 2007: 132); Polygoon, 1934-wk37; 1934-wk38; Polygoon, 1937-wk25, among others. See also: *NAAR WAALHAVEN* (1932, Henk Alsem), and a film on the aeroplane factory of Koolhoven (1938, H. Maas).

³⁹¹ Smits, 2002: 13.

³⁹² Areense, 1990: 70.

Revue (1929-10-18). Since it was a ‘media event’, images of the Zeppelin were also included in the film *GROOT ROTTERDAM* (1929, Co van der Wal), which promoted the magazine with that name. Masses of people went out in the streets to catch a glimpse of the ‘air castle’ (which also did not land). ‘It seems as if the Rotterdammers were looking in the air for something they could not find on the earth’, as Halbertsma and Van Ulzen have framed it (2001: 12)³⁹³. On the 18th of June 1932 the ‘Graf Zeppelin’ made another *Hollandfahrt*, from Friedrichshaven to Rotterdam, with the purpose to land at Waalhaven. The event was initiated by the *Rotterdamsche Aeroclub* and organised by Jacques Kleiboer³⁹⁴. It was a ‘cinematic event’, not only because it was widely covered by film reports and other media, but even more so for the way it was organised.

First of all, the arrival was announced long before, which created a general suspense. Everybody knew about it, everybody was talking about it, and everybody was out in the streets at the moment supreme, turning the city into a tremendous hive. Secondly, the airport had been dressed as ‘festive grounds’. The event was sold-out. Fifty-thousand people bought a ticket to attend the show, besides a further fifty-thousand people who were present at the Airport Twente (Enschede), in the east of the Netherlands, where the Zeppelin made a stopover (it was no coincidence that the organiser Kleiboer came from Enschede himself). These 100,000 people made the event a commercial success. In order to attract all these people to the airport, even though they could see the Zeppelin perfectly anywhere else, the organisation arranged several attractions. At Waalhaven were performances by gymnasts and musicians, as well as aviation shows, and aerial tours. The latter was a highly sophisticated attraction, since people could make flights above the city to see all the masses out in the streets – the event created its own conditions to be a real event. However, the biggest attraction was, as they called it, ‘the voice of the giant’.

Radio was still something new, and so was the use of loud-speakers in open air. Pilots of escorting aeroplanes reported on the voyage. At the airport, a narrator, Mr. Slot, made a story out of it for the thousands of people waiting there. The *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad* (1932-06-20) wrote:

His voice went over the area in mighty waves, whipped up by 1200 Watt; it reached the remote auditors, and then ebbed away to hazy distances. The audience listened with close attention: ‘The Zeppelin flies above North-Holland’...³⁹⁵

The suspense was brought to a climax. The deliberate use of sound made the audience aware of other sounds as well. In the same newspaper article, the journalist mentioned the noise of a Hawk airplane that accompanied the Zeppelin and said:

The Hawk descended. The engine turned silent. From the direction of the city a mighty ‘organing’ sound was coming. The Zeppelin. Suddenly all boats in the harbour started to whistle. It was an Old-Years’ night-sound, impressive. The gigantic airship fared straight towards the airfield. All the people became taciturn. One-hundred-thousand faces were directed to the cloudy sky, where a new cloud appeared with a silver shine. ‘Graf Zeppelin’, one read.³⁹⁶

The arrival of the Zeppelin was a truly audio-visual event.

³⁹³ Original quote: ‘Het lijkt wel alsof de Rotterdammers in de lucht zochten wat ze op aarde niet vonden.’

³⁹⁴ Areense, 1990: 72.

³⁹⁵ Original quote: “Zijn stem ging in machtige golven, opgezweept door 1200 Watt, over het terrein, bereikte de verste toehoorders, ebde af naar nevelige verten. Gespannen hoorde men toe: ‘De Zeppelin vliegt boven Noord-Holland’.....”

³⁹⁶ “De Hawk daalde. De motor zweeg. Uit de richting van de stad kwam een machtig, orgelend geluid. De Zeppelin. Opeens begonnen alle booten in de haven te fluiten. Het was een Oudejaarsnacht-geluid, indrukwekkend. Het reusachtige luchtship voer rechtstreeks naar het vliegveld toe. De menschen werden er stil van. Honderdduizend gezichten richtten zich naar den bewolkten hemel, waarin nu een nieuwe wolk kwam met een zilveren schittering. ‘Graf Zeppelin’ las men.”

This show took place at a time that cinema in the Netherlands was at an impasse. From 1930 to 1934, no Dutch feature film was released. The film industry could not yet handle the introduction of sound technology, while many theatres had problems with it too until 1932. The arrival of the Zeppelin can be seen as a reality substitute for the cinema, where the cinema used to be a substitute for reality, although its cinematic quality is also reflected by film reports, first of all those by Profilti and Polygoon (1932-06-18). Both companies were still in their first year of producing newsreels with sound, with a voice-over commenting on the event. Besides this, we might mention amateur recordings³⁹⁷, and a film impression by avant-garde filmmaker Paul Schuitema (*DE GRAF ZEPPELIN IN NEDERLAND*). He showed both the spectators and the Zeppelin, flying diagonally through the film frame, while it subsequently seems to turn rapidly around because of the camera moving around its axis. Notwithstanding the different motivations of the filmmakers, all of these images highlight a futuristic moment in the history of Rotterdam.

However, by that time, Waalhaven had definitively lost its battle with Schiphol airport. The plan for a tunnel under the river Nieuwe Maas, to reduce the time to access Waalhaven from the north, did not make a change, nor did the increasing number of aeroplanes visiting the airport³⁹⁸.

§ 3. Neniĳto

During the summer of 1928, when the Olympic Games took place in Amsterdam, Rotterdam wanted to profit from its attention by organising the *Nederlandsche Nijverheids Tentoonstelling*, called Neniĳto for short³⁹⁹. This industry exhibition included contributions from the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Great Britain, France, Denmark and Austria, continuing the tradition of world fairs that had started in the 19th century. New, however, was the heterogeneous combination of product information and entertainment, as Marlite Halbertsma has argued (2001: 214). Moreover, the exhibition was organised as a matter of city marketing, for which tactics of theatre and advertisement were used. I would add media to this as well, which played an important role, including newspapers and magazines, photography, film, sound, performances, and various forms of visual art⁴⁰⁰. In this way, the Neniĳto became a mass event that attracted one-and-a-half million visitors in four months⁴⁰¹. For the time being, the Neniĳto became part of big city life, even though the exhibition area was situated outside the actual city, in the Blijdorp polder. Many people went to the exhibition every week, at the expenses of entertainment in the city, especially the cinema. The revenues of the cinema theatres that year were 90,000 guilders less than the year before⁴⁰². So the exhibition became a kind of substitute for the cinema.

According to Halbertsma (2001: 211), the Neniĳto was the beginning of a two-fold marketing strategy that highlighted the city's modern architecture and its harbour. The exhibition itself, with its industrially made, temporal pavilions in geometrical forms, was a major example of contemporary architecture. Its masterplan and design was made by the young Rotterdam architect Christinus Bonifacius van der Tak (•1901-†1977)⁴⁰³. One entered the exhibition through a large semi-circular building flanked by two towers. Behind it was the Rotterdam Pavilion, designed by city architect Adrianus van der Steur (•1893-†1953). This cubist building, which was rather different in style from Museum Boymans that Van der Steur would make too, was considered one of the sensations of the exhibition, both for its architecture and the huge scale

³⁹⁷ E.g. anon., 1932; J. de Klerk, 1932; K.L.A. van der Leeuw.

³⁹⁸ Van de Laar, 2000: 310. In 1933 there landed 4,799 aeroplanes at Waalhaven. By 1938 Rotterdam faced the threat of having no airport altogether, which was countered by a unique publicity campaign (Van de Laar, 2000: 312).

³⁹⁹ It took place from the 26th of May to the 30th of September.

⁴⁰⁰ e.g. art works by Hermann Bieling, Hendrik Chabot, Leendert Bolle, Laurens van Kuik (Van de Laar, 2000: 376).

⁴⁰¹ Halbertsma, 2001: 209.

⁴⁰² Halbertsma, 2001: 209.

⁴⁰³ He became later the city architect of Amersfoort. His oeuvre is stylistically related to that of Willem Dudok and the architects of functionalism – see: Groenendijk & Vollaard, 1998: 86.

model of Rotterdam and its harbours that it presented. In this model, the river Nieuwe Maas served as a walkway to watch the city. Through this model one could simply locate the various enterprises that were presented in the halls.

Van der Tak designed four big halls, of which three were identical. They consisted of iron constructions covered with wooden panels, finished with white plaster, for which reason the *Nenijto* has also been called “The White City”⁴⁰⁴. They were decorated with horizontal and vertical coloured stripes, like all other buildings, which had been the most striking element of the exhibition according to the accounts of visitors⁴⁰⁵. The colours of the stripes were reinforced by the deep red geraniums in the flower-boxes at the kiosks. Moreover, this formed a contrast with the well-designed abundance of greenery all over the area. A resemblance with colours used by *De Stijl* seems likely, but little is known about this⁴⁰⁶. Although many images have been made of the exhibition, all documentation is in black-and-white.

Between the four halls, Van der Tak drew an avenue with more than twenty kiosks, each six metres in height, in an expressive cubist style. At the end of the avenue, Van der Tak designed *Café Caland*, also in a typical modernist style. Next to it was a similar kind of pavilion for the designers associations VANK-BKI, marked by a slender tower, and some kiosks, like that of *Celotex* (arch. H. Th. Wijdeveld)⁴⁰⁷. Along the avenue ran a 2.5 kilometre railway track with a small steam-train that pulled a long row of open passenger wagons. It connected the entrance building to the amusement park behind the avenue and *Café Caland*. This Lunapark was one of the biggest of Europe and the biggest ever created in the Netherlands at that time. It included a hippodrome, a ‘waterchute’, a ‘Bergbahn’, a ‘Niagara waterfall’, a car track, where one could drive real cars, dodgems and a swingmill⁴⁰⁸. The organisation of the Lunapark was the responsibility of the entertainment firm Hommerson, which had actually grown from a travelling film company⁴⁰⁹.

During the exhibition several activities were organised, like a parade of decorated cars, an automobile game of skill, a tribute to the Olympic swimming champions Marie ‘Zus’ Braun and Marie Baron, a festive visit of the queen-mother Emma, a ballooning show, and a great lottery to win a Cadillac Sedan and other cars, as well as various consumer goods⁴¹⁰. One of the most striking presentations at the *Nenijto* was that of the brand new medium of television, by the British inventor John Logie Baird, which followed after presentations that he had held in London and Berlin shortly before. This show got much attention in the press and on the radio, but it was postponed several times. Only at the last day of the exhibition (1928-09-30), the demonstration of the Baird-televisor actually took place⁴¹¹. It was immediately picked up by Philips, with serious broadcasting plans as a result, but that would eventually take another twenty-five years⁴¹².

⁴⁰⁴ Daalder, 1990: 327.

⁴⁰⁵ See: Den Ouden, 2003; this CD-ROM is a collection of memoirs and general information about Rotterdam.

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid. About the colours is a ‘call for memories’, addressed to people who have been there.

⁴⁰⁷ The design of the *Celotex*-kiosk integrated typography and architecture (Broos, 1989: 20). The participation of Wijdeveld is of interest, since he who would design the Dutch pavilion at the world exhibition in Antwerp two years later, see: OPENING NEDERLANDSCH PAVILJOEN OP DE WERELDTENTOONSTELLING IN ANTWERPEN (1930, Orion) [filmography Rotterdam]. It was a show that elaborated on the idea of an exhibition based on theatre and advertisement tactics.

⁴⁰⁸ De Winter, 1988: 4.

⁴⁰⁹ This family company, directed by Hendrikus Hommerson, who was trained as an artist, began its history at fairs around 1896. After a few years Hommerson began, for which he produced films himself, especially newsreels and local recordings. This was continued until 1917, when Hendrikus Hommerson died. His sons took over and introduced other kinds of entertainment. www.hommerson.nl/bedrijfsinforhistorie.html (2009-04-01).

⁴¹⁰ The Cadillac for 6-7 persons was worth 13,600 guilders. See a poster (end of May 1928) that announced the lottery – ‘Krantenkipsels *Nenijto*’, GAR: ‘Rotterdamse Bibliotheek’, nr. XXVI B80.

⁴¹¹ Wieten, 2003.

⁴¹² In Rotterdam, film operator Max Vis of the W.B. Theatre, also started to experiment with television, using a Nipkow-disc, while he developed a special kind of lamp, which would be produced (and patented) by Philips. In 1936,

Philips was present at the Neniĳto to promote its radio sets, which were present in every exhibition space, while Philips introduced also sound installations along the avenue, which were the so-called ‘singing towers’ (*zingende torens*). A surprised journalist reported that there was suddenly violin music in the air, or any other kind of sound, coming from any place at any moment⁴¹³. Highly involved in the organisation of the exhibition, and clearly visible, was the presence of the printed press. The *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad* had its own impressive pavilion, next to that of the city of Rotterdam. The newspaper also presented itself by way of a film, made by Polygoon⁴¹⁴. The NRC, in its turn, had a big stand in one of the halls. Besides their presentations, they also reported on the happenings. The *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad* even published a daily Neniĳto-paper, while the NRC published a weekly special Neniĳto-edition. Besides the press there were also cinema newsreels, starting with the construction of the exhibition and various activities that were organised (Polygoon, 1928)⁴¹⁵. Among them are also recordings of an ‘African village’ where one could observe the daily life of about one hundred Senegalese people that were exhibited here⁴¹⁶. Such images were screened as newsreels in the cinemas, in Rotterdam and elsewhere, as extensions of the event, while some of them were also shown at the event itself (e.g. *KONINKLIJKE FAMILIE OP DE NENIĲTO*, Willy Mullens).

The organisation of the Neniĳto made an agreement with Willy Mullens’ film production and distribution company Haghe Film to show industrial films at the event. Therefore a small cinema theatre was made at the Neniĳto, for free shows of about one hour, which took place throughout the day⁴¹⁷. For this occasion, several promotional films were made, by Haghe Film especially Transfilma⁴¹⁸. The latter made, for example, films commissioned by Daniel van Beuningen, the main financier of the Neniĳto and director of the coal trading association (SHV) and various other enterprises⁴¹⁹. These films, which were made by Andor von Barsy, presented a diverse image of the harbour, with movements of ocean liners, tug boats, Rhine barges, and cranes for loading and unloading, but they had also one thing in common. They emphasised efficiency and modernity.

Similarly Transfilma also made films about modern alimentary production, such as milk and bread, and one about beer⁴²⁰. In the case of the latter, *ORANJEBOOM, HET BIERBROUWBEDRIJF* (1927), a witty reference is made to the Neniĳto. The end of the film shows a Dutchman, a Chinese, an African, and a Bavarian, uniting the world by drinking beer together. Rotterdam had a large Chinese community, since many Chinese worked as sailors for Dutch

when the BBC had a series of test transmissions, to be received within a radius of 40 kilometres, Vis could nevertheless receive the programmes on his system, and BBC technicians came over to see how it worked; Vis in: De Vries, 1983.

⁴¹³ NRC, juni 1928 (week after opening), front page of special edition Neniĳto, GAR: ‘Rotterdamse Bibliotheek’, nr. XX C48.

⁴¹⁴ The film is missing, but Polygoon also made a news report out of it: *OPNAME VOOR ROTTERDAMSCH NIEUWSBLAD* (1928, wk01).

⁴¹⁵ All these Polygoon reports have been collected under the title *NENIĲTO* (1928) at GAR, see: Polygoon. See also: *DE NENIĲTO IN AANBOUW* (Polygoon *Hollands Nieuws*, 1928); *OPSTIJGEN VAN BALLON* (Polygoon, 1928-08-11).

⁴¹⁶ *AMADOU SECK HET NEGERJONGETJE VAN DE NENIĲTO* [mother with baby] (Polygoon, 1928-07-08); *NEGERDORP OP DE NENIĲTO TE ROTTERDAM* (*DOOPLECHTIGHEID SENEGALEZEN OP DE NENIĲTO ROTTERDAM*) (1928, Orion).

⁴¹⁷ NRC, juni 1928 (week after opening), front page of special edition Neniĳto, GAR: ‘Rotterdamse Bibliotheek’, nr. XX C48. The theatre was located in ‘Hal A’. There is no record left of the films that were shown here; the films were announced per day by way of a notice board. See: ‘Wat er op de Neniĳto te zien is’, in: *Schiedammer Courant*, 1928-05-28 (‘Krantenknipsels Neniĳto’, GAR: coll. ‘Rotterdamse Bibliotheek’, XXVI B80).

⁴¹⁸ Examples of Haghe Film productions shown at the Neniĳto are N.V. CORNS. SWARTTOUW’S STUWADOOR- EN MACHINEBEDRIJVEN [Rotterdam] and HEEMAF’S MOTORENFABRIEK [Hengelo] (both: 1928, Willy Mullens) – ref.: advertisement by Haghe Film in *De Telegraaf* and *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 1928-06-08 (‘Krantenknipsels Neniĳto’, GAR: coll. ‘Rotterdamse Bibliotheek’, XXVI B80).

⁴¹⁹ E.g. *STEENKOLEN HANDELSVEREENIGING NEDERLANDSCH HAVENBEDRIJF* (1927, Transfilma); *STOOMSLEEPDIENST V/H VAN P. SMIT JR.* (1927, Transfilma); *NEDERLANDSCHE RIJNVAARTVEREENIGING* (1927, Transfilma) – see advertisement Haghe Film, previous note.

⁴²⁰ e.g. *HYGIËNISCHE MELKSTAL DE VAAN*, and *MODELBEDRIJVEN DER VOLKSVOEDING*.

shipping companies⁴²¹, while the African and Bavarian referred to the extraordinary attractions of an African village, next to, indeed, the *Ober-Bayern* beer hall, with drinking, singing and games. Here one could drink Oranjeboom beer, which was another major sponsor of the event.

The Neniĵto began as a private initiative of businessmen in order to promote the port of Rotterdam. The municipality was initially involved with it for practical reasons, but later also to manifest itself. While Van Beuningen and others had several promotional films at their disposal, the municipality realised its absence as such, but it was not yet too late⁴²². They immediately asked Von Barys and Transfilma to make three shorts, about the municipal docks and ferries, the gas works and the electricity works⁴²³. They show that the harbour serves the importation of coal, neatly connecting to the films by SHV, which is subsequently transported through the city to be used and processed by the factories.

At the Neniĵto, architecture, design and various media communicated a common direction for urban development, and as such it is a clear instance of *Medienverbund*. Some of its expressions only make sense in connection to one another, which is exemplified by the sequence of the four men drinking Oranjeboom-beer in Von Barys's film. Such references would otherwise be missed. By taking the interconnections into account, one can recognise the sensation of modernity that the event provided, by presenting the harbour, industry, and urban space as vehicles of a prosperous future. As such the Neniĵto was both an expression of modern city life and a model for further development.

Besides these prospects, the Neniĵto also provided the city with a concrete facility. After the exhibition was over, the halls were used for the annual 'Primavera', a horticulture exhibition that took place since 1929⁴²⁴. It was the precursor of the Floriade (since 1960). As the buildings of the Neniĵto were dismantlable, the halls were also used for other events elsewhere in the city, over a period of about fifty years⁴²⁵.

⁴²¹ Since 1911, when Chinese replaced striking Dutch sailors. By 1927 more than 3,000 Chinese worked on Dutch ships (Van de Laar, 2000: 192). See also the short film KATENDRECHT (1925, anon.), on Chinese residents.

⁴²² During the exhibition Haghe Film addressed the possibility to show films, by way of an advertisement in *De Telegraaf* and *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 1928-06-08 ('Krantenknipsels Neniĵto', GAR: coll. 'Rotterdamse Bibliotheek', nr. XXVI B80).

⁴²³ HET GEMEENTE ELECTRICITEITSBEDRIJF; HET GEMEENTE GASBEDRIJF ROTTERDAM (1928, Transfilma).

⁴²⁴ See e.g. KONINKLIJK BEZOEK AAN BLOEMENTOONSTELLING IN NENIĴTO GEBOUW (1929, Orion), and the reports by Polygoon: OPENING BLOEMENTOONSTELLING (rec.: 1929-04-24) and KONINGIN MOEDER BEZOEKT BLOEMENTOONSTELLING (rec.: 1929-04-25), VIJFDE PRIMAVERA EN NAJAARSTENTOONSTELLING (1935-11-06), PRIMAVERA BLOEMENTOONSTELLING (1936-04-09), HM DE KONINGIN BEZOEKT PRIMAVERA (1938-04-08).

⁴²⁵ De Winter, 1988: 7.

CHAPTER 4. ANDOR VON BARSY

§ 1. the man with the camera

One of the most remarkable filmmakers who lived and worked in Rotterdam in the late 1920s and 1930s was the Hungarian filmmaker Andor von Barsy (•1899-03-14, Budapest – †1965-12-24, Munich). In the Netherlands he became known for films such as the city symphony *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* (1928) and his avant-garde short *HOOGSTRAAT* (1929). As a cinematographer, Von Barsy collaborated with documentary filmmakers such as Joris Ivens, Hans Richter, Leni Riefenstahl, and Slatan Dudov. He was also the cameraman of several Dutch fiction films, among them *ZEEMANSVROUWEN* (1930, Henk Kleinman), *DEAD WATER* (1934, Gerard Rutten), and *LENTELIED* (1936, Simon Koster). For *DEAD WATER* Von Barsy received the prize for best cinematography at the Venice Film Festival (1934). He was, however, reluctant to any kind of film ideal, and in general he was sceptical of the film industry; he regarded himself as someone who marched along in the margins⁴²⁶. But the facts suggest a different picture. In addition to the previous titles, he also shot one of the first German colour films, *DAS BAD AUF DER TENNE* (1943, Volker von Collande). For his contribution to the avant-garde fiction film *JONAS* (1957, Ottomar Domnick) he won the prize for best cinematography at the Berlin Film Festival. At that time he was also a cameraman for and advisor to the just established *Bayerisches Fernsehen*, and he helped to set up the *Institut für Film und Fernsehen* in Munich, where he became a teacher. Notwithstanding these facts, Von Barsy remained a man behind the scenes.

In spite of his achievements, still little is written about Von Barsy and until now he has remained a rather enigmatic figure within the history of Dutch cinema. Some data are provided by Emiel van Moerkerken, who started his career as an assistant of Von Barsy for *DEAD WATER* and *LENTELIED*⁴²⁷. Van Moerkerken regarded Von Barsy as his ‘teacher’⁴²⁸. According to him, Von Barsy was at that time technical-theoretically better grounded than anybody else in the Netherlands. Since he was twenty-six, he had already published articles on cinematographic technology in German film journals⁴²⁹. A similar picture is drawn by Rutten in his autobiography (1976), who compared Von Barsy’s work to that of a scientist and an inventor, since he made many optical instruments himself, or adjusted existing ones. Van Moerkerken described all the kinds of cameras and objectives (23 pieces in a cherished suitcase) that he used. Besides this, Van Moerkerken also considered him a teacher for many other things, like art history, philosophy (Schopenhauer) and music (Mozart). He praised his erudition and characterised him as ‘admirable, courteous, sometimes haughty-ironical – he never raised his voice and he had never neurotic manners’⁴³⁰. In addition, he mentioned that Von Barsy used to flirt with nice girls who were around⁴³¹.

Other information is very little. This can hardly be explained by Von Barsy’s own attitude of ‘walking along in the margins’. Instead, we might consider the following.

In the 1950s, the *auteur* theory championed the director as true author of a feature film. The notion was rapidly and widely accepted: for too long, particularly in the Hollywood studio system, the director had been regarded as little more than a technician. Now, however, directors increasingly provided the key impetus within the new, independent cinema movements that began to flourish internationally, following the example set by the French *nouvelle vague*. ... Today, too often in film criticism and education, and even among many practising professionals, the cult surrounding

⁴²⁶ ‘Ich marschiere nur so am Rande des Filmgeschäftes mit’, in an interview with Manfred von Conta; ‘Subjektiv am Objektiv’, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 1957-07-26.

⁴²⁷ Van Moerkerken, 1966; 1967.

⁴²⁸ Van Moerkerken, 1966: 13.

⁴²⁹ Cf. Bolbrinker, 2005: 312.

⁴³⁰ Van Moerkerken, 1966, 15; original quote: ‘Von Barsy was steeds beminnelijk, hoffelijk, soms wat hautain-ironisch, verhief nooit zijn stem en had nooit zenuwlijdersmanieren.’

⁴³¹ In the case of *DEAD WATER*, VAN MOERKERKEN: 1967: 54, *Lentelied*, p55.

the director means that the other arts and crafts which combine to produce a film are rarely sufficiently cherished or even acknowledged. (Ettegui, 1998: 7)

These are the first words from the book *Cinematography* (1998), written by film producer Peter Ettegui, which is the first title of a popular series called *Screencraft*⁴³². The series, published in various languages, is a major inside attempt to call attention for the broad range of creative faculties that make a film. 'In revealing their roles in the film-making process, they will shed light on the way films evolve through a fusion of forces which at first glance might appear to be incompatible: art and industry, vision and compromise, design and accident' (Ettegui, 1998: 7). As the title already suggests, craftsmanship is brought to the fore. This is not so much about the technical skills of the cameramen, but about 'transmitting their individual, personal perspective on the language of film' (ibid, 8). The book deals with the way aesthetic devices are used to 'create an emotionally charged visual arena for the action of a film' (ibid). As such Janusz Kaminski is quoted too (ibid): 'All one's experience of life subconsciously informs every creative decision one makes. That's what makes each individual cinematographer different.' Whereas this applies to fiction films, it certainly applies to documentary filmmaking, where the attention, concentration and way of seeing of the cameraman are often of crucial importance.

In the case of Von Barys, we might have a closer look at his work for its outstanding cinematographic qualities, but also for the way it has contributed to urban image building and city branding regarding Rotterdam. Von Barys presented Rotterdam, its harbour and its industry in several films that were shown at the International Dutch Industry Exhibition 'Nenijto'. During following years he made similar kinds of productions for other big events. Through the figure of Von Barys and his work, a broad development of film in Rotterdam might get a personal shape. I will make an attempt to pay attention to his biography as well, to understand his relationships, as part of larger networks, and the general conditions that enabled him to make his films.

a biographical itinerary to Rotterdam

Andor József von Barys, who inherited the title of 'Baron', was born in Budapest in 1899. His father, Adolf von Barys, worked as an artist. For the purpose of painting frescoes in churches he used a photo camera as a projection device. In this way the young Andor, at about ten years old, learnt his first photographic tricks, and started to make photographs himself⁴³³. After the early death of his father, Andor went to a military secondary school near Vienna. When he finished school at the end of WWI, the *Donaumonarchie* Austria-Hungary collapsed and Von Barys became officially stateless, for which reason he received a so-called 'Nansen-passport'. He moved, together with his mother Anna Mária Strohofer-Von Barys, to Fürstenfeldbruck, near Munich where he continued his studies at the *Staatliche Höhere Schule für Fototechnik*⁴³⁴. In 1923 and 1924 Von Barys followed its new programme for cinematography; within this context he made his first film, the fiction short PER ASPERA AD ASTRA (1923)⁴³⁵, which got a positive review in the *Süddeutsche Filmzeitung*.

The *Münchner Fotoschule*, as the school has also been called, was unique and it became internationally renowned. It attracted talents from various countries. Among them were several students from Hungary and other Eastern European countries, like the young Latvian Ortrud

⁴³² Published by Focal Press and edited by Barbara Mercer, since 1998.

⁴³³ Manfred von Conta, 'Subjektiv am Objektiv', *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 1957-07-26.

⁴³⁴ See: 'Münchner Fotoschule – Verzeichnis der Schülerinnen und Schüler 1900 – 2000', compiled by Barbara Stenzel for the publication *Lehrjahre Lichtjahre. Die Münchner Fotoschule 1900 – 2000* (U. Pohlmann & R. Scheutle, eds.), Schirmer/Mosel. <http://arthistoricum.net/index.php?id=1524&alph=z> (visited: 2010-02-02). Andor von Barys is mentioned as 'Barys, Andreas' (according to the custom to germanify foreign surnames). The *kinotechnische Abteilung* existed from 1921 to 1935.

⁴³⁵ Aubinger, Joseph; 'Per aspera ad astra', *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 1923-10-12; see also: Conta, Manfred von; 'Subjektiv am Objektiv', *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 1957-07-26. The film was directed by J. Pelerin and produced by his company Pelerin-Film in Fürstenfeldbruck.

Johanna Balkin (born in Riga, 1904), with whom Von Barsy fell in love. She followed the regular photography curriculum (1922-1924), and when Von Barsy came to live with her in Munich she was selected for the so-called *Meisterklasse* (1924-1925).

Von Barsy moved to Berlin in 1926⁴³⁶. He was then asked to make film recordings for the opera 'Doktor Faust' (1926, reg. Otto Erhardt), which was to be performed in Stuttgart. To use film in opera, and especially to have the images synchronised with the music and the play, was still a novelty, and afterwards Von Barsy wrote an article to explain how this worked⁴³⁷. How he then came to the Netherlands is not exactly clear. Emiel van Moerkerken thought that Von Barsy was invited by the German filmmaker Theo Güsten, but he was not sure about it⁴³⁸. I will take it as a point of departure.

Güsten, who was the same age as Von Barsy, worked for the *Kulturfilm* department of the UFA in Berlin. When Von Barsy came to Berlin, however, Güsten had already moved to Paris, then to Brussels, and eventually to The Hague, where he arrived in 1926⁴³⁹. Güsten became friends with the young set designer Gerard Rutten, with whom he started to do some decoration work, in the late summer of 1926⁴⁴⁰. Shortly afterwards, Güsten founded the production company Germania⁴⁴¹. Its first film was a commission from industrialists and businessmen from Rotterdam to promote their firms and the port in general⁴⁴². Güsten was looking for a cameraman, in order to make a difference from Haghe Film and Polygoon, and to that end he asked Von Barsy, who came over from Berlin at the end of 1926⁴⁴³. The film itself has been lost, and only reviews give an idea of its imagery to which I refer in the next section. Here I will make an attempt to trace the connections that made it possible and which enabled various other films to come.

It seems that before Güsten, Von Barsy was already in touch with people in and around The Hague, among them Lajos von Ébneth, Simon Koster and Gerard Rutten – with whom he would produce various projects. The Hungarian artist Von Ébneth had studied engineering and visual arts, first in Budapest and subsequently in Munich, at the time when Von Barsy had also lived in Munich. In 1923, Von Ébneth moved to Berlin and met László Moholy-Nagy, who maintained contacts with artists in the Netherlands⁴⁴⁴. At the end of 1923 Von Ébneth moved to Scheveningen, near The Hague. He became part of a circle of people related to De Stijl, among them the Hungarian artist Vilmos Huszár. The two of them started the so-called *Mechano-Marionetten Theater* and on the 12th of February they gave a show at the *Rotterdamsche Kring*⁴⁴⁵. One month later they gave a performance at the *Groote Koninklijke Bazar* in The Hague, as part of a 'puppet- mask- and shadow exhibition' that was organised by *Wij Nu!*, an association for

⁴³⁶ Westhoff, 1995: 6; see also the research files of this publication at B&G (archieff Stichting Film & Wetenschap > Von Barsy); Von Barsy officially moved from Munich to Berlin at 1926-05-20.

⁴³⁷ Op de Coul, 2004: 193-195, for the article (also mentioned by Op de Coul) see: Von Barsy, 1927.

⁴³⁸ Van Moerkerken, 1966: 13.

⁴³⁹ Westhoff, 1995: 24.

⁴⁴⁰ Rutten: 1976: 128. Rutten mentions that he was friends with Güsten, with whom he made a decoration for the Passage cinema in The Hague, on the occasion of the screening of a Russian film. According to www.cinemacontext.nl (2007-09-29) this must have been BRONENOSETS POTYEMKIN (1925, USSR, Sergei Eisenstein), which was shown there at the 10th and 17th of September 1926.

⁴⁴¹ i.e. Germania Filmfabriek; at www.cinemacontext.nl (2008-10-13) it is mentioned that D. Polak was its director (1927-1929), but no further data are available. Westhoff (1995: 24) mentions Güsten as its leader.

⁴⁴² A review of this film appeared in the NRC (1927-01-12); 'Een film van Rotterdam'. It is also mentioned by Westhoff (1995: 24); the title of the film is unknown; given title: FILM OVER DE ROTTERDAMSCHEN HAVEN EN PLAATSELIJKE INDUSTRIE EN HANDEL.

⁴⁴³ The film was released at 1927-01-11, see: 'Een film van Rotterdam', in: NRC, 1927-01-12.

⁴⁴⁴ Ex, 2002: 14.

⁴⁴⁵ Brentjens, 2008: 148.

experimental theatre and film⁴⁴⁶. This exhibition was initiated by Simon Koster and Gerard Rutten.

Soon afterwards, Koster moved to Berlin, as a foreign correspondent of the NRC (one of the commissioning enterprises of the film by Güsten). At the same time Rutten moved to Berlin as well, after he had fallen in love with the Berlin based Latvian dancer Wy Magito, who had given a performance in Scheveningen⁴⁴⁷. Through her he got to know Berlin, where he, just like Koster, became friends with various performers, artists and filmmakers, among them Leni Riefenstahl, Curt Oertel and Walter Ruttmann⁴⁴⁸. Since Von Barsy's girlfriend Ortrud Johanna Balkin came from Latvia too, we might draw a connection here. As Rutten and Koster were interested in theatre and film, the involvement of Von Barsy with the opera 'Doktor Faust' might have provided another link. It must have inspired Koster to create NUL UUR NUL, for which Rutten designed the set, while Von Barsy provided footage from industrial films that he would make in Rotterdam, next to studio recordings that were made by Curt Oertel⁴⁴⁹.

After all it seems that Rutten recommended Von Barsy to his friend Güsten, and that Koster and Von Ébneith played a role in this exchange too. In this perspective, one might also consider a 'Hungarian factor', even though Von Barsy himself was concerned little with his nationality. This is at least suggested by the presence of Von Ébneith, who was not only friends with László Moholy-Nagy and Vilmos Huszár, but with other compatriots as well, among them the architect Pali Meller⁴⁵⁰. The latter worked for the studio of J.J.P. Oud, and both of them, as well as Von Barsy, would become involved with the Filmliga Rotterdam⁴⁵¹. Various other Hungarians might be mentioned here that extend the network in different directions⁴⁵². Such

⁴⁴⁶ The exhibition took place from the 23rd of February till the 28th of March 1926. Von Ébneith and Huszár gave their performance at the 16th of March. See: Invitation card of the exhibition, Archive Simon Koster, Theater Instituut Nederland, inventaris 48, nr. 215. For information on *Wij Nu!*, see also: Rutten, 1976: 44. Brentjens, 2008: 146-151.

⁴⁴⁷ Wy Magito was the leader of a modern dance group from Berlin that gave the performance 'Maskentänze' at the Kurhaus in Scheveningen, early 1926. Interested in masks, Rutten visited the show, and came in touch with the dancers – among them Leni Riefenstahl. He accompanied them back to Berlin, and he subsequently travelled along with them for months, on a tour through Europe, including Russia. Back in Berlin, Rutten stayed a while with Magito. Rutten recalls this history in his autobiography (1976: 45-49); he calls her 'Wu Magito', and mentions almost no dates, while the suggested chronology is not always correct. The tour took place, most likely, in 1926-1927; another reference is a performance at the *Volksbühne Berlin*, i.e. *Tanzmatinee 'Maskentänze'*, 1927-12-04, with Wy Magito, Carletto Thieben and Ursula Falke; www.volksbuehne-berlin.de > Volksbühne > Archiv > Spielzeitchronik (visited: 2010-02-02).

⁴⁴⁸ Rutten, 1976: *ibid* and 54.

⁴⁴⁹ Mentioned on a flyer and a film production photo in the Archive Simon Koster, Theater Instituut Nederland, inventaris 48, nr. 215.

⁴⁵⁰ Von Ébneith made 'reliefs' and 'constructions' that looked like architectural models (e.g. *Compositie met Haakvormen*, 1926). One of them was presented by Pali Meller in a house of J.J.P. Oud at the Weissenhofsiedlung in Stuttgart, in 1927 (see: Ex, 2002: 45, 61).

⁴⁵¹ Smit (2005: 32) mentions Meller as one of those who originally signed the manifesto of the Filmliga Rotterdam, while Oud was its founding chairman.

⁴⁵² This might be exemplified by the feature film *LENTELIED* (1936, Simon Koster), for which Von Barsy did the cinematography, Von Ébneith the set design, and Victor Palfi the editing – the latter was another Hungarian who had worked in Berlin before (see: Dittrich, 1987: 56), where he had met Simon Koster (together they produced a theatre play for children: *Bob und Bobby*, 1931 – Archive Simon Koster, Theater Instituut Nederland, inventaris nr. 48, p26). In a monograph on Von Ébneith, Sjarel Ex has remarked (2002: 18) that in the 1920s, Hungarian artists who moved to the Netherlands were introduced to more experienced colleagues by the Hungarian embassy. Akos Farkas was another important Hungarian cinematographer in the Netherlands, based in The Hague. He worked for different production companies, including *Monopole-DLS* in Rotterdam. He was responsible for the cinematography of two major feature films set in Rotterdam: *BOEFJE* (1939, Detlef Sierck) and *ERGENS IN NEDERLAND* (1940, Ludwig Berger). George Pal worked as an animator for Philips in Eindhoven (Kamphuis & Schepp, 1983), for which Von Barsy, with Hans Richter, made a film as well: *FROM THUNDERBOLT TO TELEVISION SCREEN*, 1936). Several other names might be mentioned here, among them the cinematographer László Schäffer, who collaborated with Gerard Rutten too, and also people who maintained contacts with people in the Netherlands, in particular László Moholy-Nagy (and to some degree also László Peri and Marcel Breuer, see: Ex, 2002: 14). The Hungarian architect Alexander Bodon was also in touch with Von Ébneith, and although he was based in Amsterdam, he designed various projects in Rotterdam. Bodon, in his turn,

connections show the emergence of a network and its geographical nodes that gave rise to a broad movement that is characterised by what is alternatively called ‘swarm intelligence’, notwithstanding the existence of individual signatures⁴⁵³.

§ 2. functional cinematography – Transfilma

The film by Güsten and Von Barsy resulted in a cinematic tour through Rotterdam. It begins with the not yet finished railway bridge ‘De Hef’ (*Koningsbrug*), the subject of Ivens’s later film. It is followed by office tower *Het Witte Huis* and other landmarks of modern Rotterdam. The film had to promote the companies that commissioned it, among them tobacco, beer and soap enterprises, as well as the NRC. On the 11th of January 1927, it was shown to invited guests, at the Grand Theater, with the request to give ‘sharp comments’. A critic of the NRC replied the next day.

That criticism does not need to be very sharp, to reach the conclusion that this new film is nothing else than an advertisement for a limited number of firms, glued together with recordings of harbour and city. It is self-evident that in this way the logical connection would be lacking. An appropriate image of harbour traffic and of Rotterdam’s trade and industry is not provided by this film, and as means of propaganda it does not suit.⁴⁵⁴

The critic added that this was all the more a pity since Von Barsy’s cinematography was good, particularly the shots of the port.

Von Barsy’s talent was not left unnoticed, and so he was asked to work for the new Rotterdam-based company Transfilma (*Transcontinentale Filmfabrikatie en Handel-onderneming*). It was established by the young German baron Friedrich von Maydell, who had previously directed the film *ZWISCHEN MORGEN UND MORGEN* (1924)⁴⁵⁵. His business partner was H. von Reitzenstein, who would write the film scripts. They found residence in the *Groote Schouwburg*, the city’s main theatre, where they furnished a studio and a laboratory. The company existed for less than three years; it disappeared in the same way as it had appeared, leaving hardly any trace.

Being employed by Transfilma, Von Barsy definitively moved to Rotterdam, and started to work on a one-hour film for the coal trading association SHV, STEENKOLEN HANDELSVEREENIGING (1927), which was commissioned on the occasion of its 25th anniversary⁴⁵⁶. It starts with the development of the SHV, and emphasizes that the influx of German coal has largely contributed to the growth of Rotterdam’s port. The camera moves through the port and shows its different facilities, in order to arrive at Waalhaven, where it pays much attention to the port’s rapid modernisation, with its cranes, bridges, elevators and grabs. It caused a critic to say that ‘this film will get documentary value for Rotterdam, because it contains characteristic aspects, which are already disappearing due to the rapid growth of the

shared a studio with the Hungarian photographer Eva Besnyö, but the latter was not in touch with Von Ébnet (see Ex, 2002: 122n72), nor with Von Barsy (telephone conversation of FP with Besnyö, 2003-09-02).

⁴⁵³ With a reference to entomology: Bonabeau, Dorigo, Theraulaz, 1999: 11; the emergence of trail networks in ants is taken to illustrate collective self-organisation, through stigmergy. ‘This does not exclude the existence of individual chemical signatures [this literally applies to cinema too] or individual memory which can efficiently complement or sometimes, replace responses to collective marks.’

⁴⁵⁴ ‘Een film van Rotterdam’, *NRC*, 1927-01-12. Original quote: ‘Die kritiek behoeft niet bijzonder scherp te zijn, om tot de conclusie te komen, dat deze nieuwe film niet anders is dan een reclame film voor een beperkt aantal bedrijven, aaneengelijmd met opnemingen van de haven en de stad. Het spreekt vanzelf dat op deze wijze het logische verband geheel moest ontbreken. Een juist beeld van het havenverkeer en van Rotterdam’s handel en industrie geeft deze film niet, en als propagandamiddel deugt zij niet.’

⁴⁵⁵ His name of birth was Frederich Karl Viktor von Maydell-Felks (born 1899-10-10), www.filmportal.de > Von Maydell (visited: 2007-10-04)

⁴⁵⁶ The film was made in a period of two months, and had its premiere on the 1st of April 1927; see e.g. ‘De S.H.V.-Film’, in: *Het Dagblad van Rotterdam*, 1927-04-02.

technology'⁴⁵⁷. Besides the machines the film shows the workers too, at work, and in the canteens and bathrooms. This film was furthermore accompanied by another one, on shipping on the river Rhine, between Rotterdam and cities in Germany.

SHV director Van Beuningen owned various firms, and separate films were made about them, for example on tugboat company P. Smit. This film, made on the occasion of its 50th anniversary, shows the towing of things as different as ocean liners, docks and lock gates. In a letter of thanks to Transfilma, the company said that the film was 'not only a brilliant advertisement for our enterprise, but many of its recordings are truly works of art'⁴⁵⁸. This was also expressed by the press. It was remarked, with a reference to Güsten's film, that this film instead did not lack an overview of the activities in the port⁴⁵⁹. Very enthusiastic, even lyrical, was a critic of the *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, who emphasised the speed and rhythm of the film, as well as its visual poetry and beauty⁴⁶⁰. He and other critics especially liked shots made during a storm at sea, and the departure of the American cruiser 'Memphis'. Due to its success, fourteen copies of the film were made for foreign distribution⁴⁶¹.

The films were shown at different occasions. Besides the screenings during the anniversary celebrations, they were shown, for example, to a group of invited guests from shipping enterprises in Hamburg, the main competitor of Rotterdam, where they were enthusiastically received⁴⁶². These films were also shown at the industry exhibition 'Nenijto' (1928), of which Van Beuningen was one of the main sponsors. This event, prepared since 1926, increased the demand for industrial films in Rotterdam. It is even possible that Van Beuningen, with his extensive relationships in Germany, may have encouraged the establishment of Transfilma in Rotterdam, by pointing to this prospect⁴⁶³. Various other firms commissioned indeed films to be shown at the Nenijto, such as Burgerhout's Shipbuilding and Engineering works, which was located next to Van Beuningen's shipyard and engineering works of P. Smit Jr. in Rotterdam-Zuid.

With Transfilma, Von Barys created films for companies in the port, for food factories, and for the municipality⁴⁶⁴. In these films, raw material is brought into the harbour, transported through the city, to the plant, where it is processed, and subsequently brought into the city again. This collection shows already the relationship between the port and the city, and how it accommodates energy and food production.

One of these films, shown at the Nenijto too, which followed such a generic script, was the feature length documentary about one of the other main sponsors, beer brewery

⁴⁵⁷ 'Een film der S.H.V.', in: *Maasbode*, 1927-04-02, cf. 'Een film van de Steenkolen Handelsvereniging', in: *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, 1927-04-08. Original quote: 'De film zal voor Rotterdam documentaire waarde krijgen, daar zij tal van karakteristieke gegevens bevat, die door den snellen groei der techniek reeds nu bezig zijn te verdwijnen.'

⁴⁵⁸ Original quote: 'De film is niet alleen een schitterende reclame voor ons bedrijf, maar tal van opnamen zijn ware kunstproducten.' Letter bij P. Stuiver (SHV), 1927-07-20, reproduced in an informational brochure of Transfilma (1928, p2), sent with a letter by Transfilma to Burgemeester en Wethouders, 1928-04-20, dossier 'Havenfilm van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4216: 1928, nr. 211.1, volgnr. 1., GAR.

⁴⁵⁹ 'Jubileum P. Smit Jr. – Een film van het bedrijf', in: *Dagblad van Rotterdam*, 1927-07-09.

⁴⁶⁰ 'Een Film van het Sleepbootbedrijf', in: *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1927-07-11.

⁴⁶¹ 'Een film van het Sleepbootbedrijf', in: *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1927-07-11; 'Jubileum P. Smit Jr. - Een Film van het bedrijf', in: *Dagblad van Rotterdam*, 1927-07-09; 'Het Gouden feest van P. Smit Jr. – De Jubileumfilm', in: *Maasbode*, 1927-07-09.

⁴⁶² 'Rotterdamer Hafenverhältnisse im Film', in: *Schiffahrt-Zeitung der Hamburger Börsenhalle*, 1927-07-01; 'Rotterdamer Hafenverhältnisse im Film', in: *Hamburger Korrespondent*, 1927-07-01, a.o.

⁴⁶³ While the first Transfilma productions were made for Van Beuningen, from its beginning Transfilma had been concerned with the Nenijto, see: 'Transfilma', *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 30, 1927.

⁴⁶⁴ E.g. concerning food: HYGIËNISCHE MELKSTAL DE VAAN and MODELBEDRIJVEN DER VOLKVOEDING; concerning municipal companies: HET GEMEENTE ELECTRICITEITSBEDRIJF, HET GEMEENTE GASBEDRIJF ROTTERDAM (1928); director of these films: Von Maydell, cameraman: Von Barys, script: Von Reitzenstein.

Oranjeboom⁴⁶⁵. Since it was the largest industrial film by Transfilma, we may consider it representative for its productions. The film shows barley being brought into the port, which is transported through the city to the brewery. Step by step, one sees how it is processed and made into beer, and how this product is finally brought back into the city again. In this way the film explained the magic of industrial production, for consumers to trust it, and even more so, to appreciate its ingenuity. The credits of *ORANJEBOOM, HET BIERBROUWBEDRIJF* (1927) mention only 'Transfilma', and no specific names; the film was conceived as an industrial artefact, as an extension of the production process that it showed. However, Von Barys put nevertheless his 'signature' on it, not only by way of the cinematographic quality, including interchanges of overviews and more abstract close-ups, but also literally by way of a witty reference, when suddenly a close-up shows the text 'Hungary', written on a train wagon that delivers barley⁴⁶⁶.

While respecting the idea of effectivity, the film pays special attention to the relationship between man and machine; they are extensions of each other. Next to that, the film highlights the human dimension. There is an example of a huge beer barrel under construction. A man climbs out of it through a small opening, like a pigeon through a pigeon-hole. Remarkable is also a shot at the end of the film, when a pan of the camera portrays all the workers of the factory. It shows the social commitment of the filmmaker, who himself remains anonymous.

The film contains some experimental parts too, for example an animation made with hundreds of beer barrels that run out of the factory through a small opening, like a giant spitting mouth. And at a certain moment there is a direct reference to Fritz Lang's *METROPOLIS*, which was released earlier that year (1927). Within a sequence that shows the machine chamber there is a shot of 'The Great Switch-Board', as an intertitle calls it, where two men are checking the measures, while moving rather mechanically. It resembles a crucial scene of workers in *METROPOLIS*, handling the machines of a world under pressure that might run out of control. It illustrates the way industrial films link up to the world of cinema at large. This, moreover, also appears from the fact that Von Barys provided images of machinery from this film and others – even before they were released – to be used in Simon Koster's experimental film and theatre play *NUL UUR NUL*.

The next film, of one hour, was about the production of milk (1928). In the meantime the municipality, which supported the *Nenijto* too, had also become interested and commissioned three films: one about its docks and ferries, one about its electricity works (*GEB*) and one about the production of gas. The latter starts with coal being brought into the harbour, and ends with the use of gas, which is enjoyed by two fashionably dressed women in a kitchen, by women moving elegantly in a heated room, a man with snow on his coat entering a house, and a young girl playing in a light, spacious bathroom. There is also a large bakery, a hotel kitchen, and an ironing workshop. These images either promote the idea of modern housing or show places as extensions of the factory and the continuation of the production process. The flow of energy relates all (modern) environments.

The spatial features of each level, whether it is the street, the harbour, the factory, or the house, are visualised by different movements and speeds; the camera itself is interchangingly static and dynamic, with pans and tracking shots. Next to that the spaces are articulated by contrasts in editing, through an interchange of total, medium and close-up shots. This spatial focus is characteristic for the cinematography of Von Barys. His work shows sophisticated compositions and experimental points of view. Surprising perspectives are emphasised by the editing, of overviews and details that become abstract images. In this way expressive sequences are built up, which result in a rhythmic montage.

⁴⁶⁵ See: 'Bedrijfsfilm D'Oranjeboom', in: *De Maasbode*, 1928-01-14.

⁴⁶⁶ At the same time this also seems to be a reference to the president of the *Nenijto*, B.C.D. Hanegraaff, who was also consul for Hungary in Rotterdam.

Movement is an important issue in the films, but the films are first of all functional: they intend to inform about the subject portrayed, which they do smoothly and in a subtle way. Yet within the attempt to show the production process as well as possible, several experiments were carried out. A nice example is to be seen in the film about the gas works; coal carts move one after another through the air by way of a monorail. Von Barsy sits with his camera in one of them, so we, the spectators, look from the perspective of the coal. The cart is swinging, and so does the camera. Carts ahead of us open their bottom doors and release the coal that falls into a container below. We know that the next cart will be ours, and then there is another image. Besides such grotesque imagery Von Barsy also finds ways to show a 'human touch'. At the end of the same film there is an image from the gas factory that shows hundreds of all kinds of kettles with tea and coffee, brought in by the workers and put on a common stove in the canteen, to be used during the lunch. It is a sensitive image within the context of the rational production process of the factory.

Before the films for the municipality were shown at the Nenijs, they were presented at an international exhibition of film (ITF) in The Hague in April 1928, where they were enthusiastically received⁴⁶⁷. One of the organisers of this event was Luc Willink, who was also a member of the Filmliga, just like Von Barsy⁴⁶⁸. In the same circle of people we find the designer Piet Zwart, who created the design of the exhibition, including its publicity material. The connection with Zwart is of particular interest. In 1927 he started to experiment with photography, and in analogy to functionalism in architecture he spoke of 'functional photography'⁴⁶⁹. We could similarly speak of 'functional cinematography' in the case of Von Barsy. This is also legitimated by the fact that Zwart himself got involved with cinema too, as he did the graphic design of a film for the PTT, which was directed by Theo Güsten⁴⁷⁰.

It is exactly for the functionalist approach that Von Barsy has remained out of focus, notwithstanding the ideas and experience that are to be found in his work. This is related to Von Barsy's own interests and his attitude. Quoting Emiel van Moerkerken (1966: 13)⁴⁷¹, 'Von Barsy was not at all a cinephile..., did not pay any attention to whatever 'film-art' ideals, regarded the whole film business as something of doubtful character, and certainly wanted nothing else than being a 'photographer', a film-photographer. But as such he aimed for the greatest possible perfection.' Von Barsy's cinematography was a matter of finding the right approach for the purpose at issue, a matter of functional design from a modernist perspective. Although he would also apply ideas of the 'absolute film', as expressed by Menno Ter Braak and others, which have

⁴⁶⁷ For Zwart and the ITF, see: Brentjens, 2008: 171. For Transfilma and the ITF: letter by Transfilma to Burgemeester en Wethouders, 1928-04-20, dossier 'Havenfilm van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4216: 1928, nr. 211.1, volgnr. 1., GAR.

⁴⁶⁸ According to Hogenkamp (1988: 55), Von Barsy was a member of the board of the Filmliga Rotterdam.

⁴⁶⁹ Brentjens, 2008: 179. At that time other designers began to use photography as well, for example Von Ébne, who made a series of photo montage advertisements for the concrete company Wernink's Beton in Leiden; the images were selected by Piet Zwart for the film and photo exhibition in Stuttgart (FIFO, 1929, see: Ex, 2002: 122 and 134/137). Others started to experiment with film as well, among them Paul Schuitema, and Gerrit Kiljan (i.e. SCHEVENINGEN, 1930). An immediate link can be drawn here with Von Barsy and other filmmakers, especially in The Hague, among them Otto van Neijenhoff, who moved in the same circle of people in and around The Hague and Rotterdam. Van Neijenhoff, moreover, had also made a film for the Bruynzeel company (1926), for which Zwart frequently worked.

⁴⁷⁰ This film, ALLE ZEVEN DAGEN (1930), is the only one mentioned by Brentjens (2008: 225) in her monograph on Piet Zwart. We might wonder, however, if Zwart has also played a role, in one way or the other, in the case of some other films by Güsten. In 1929 he made already two films for the PTT, i.e. TELEGRAAF EN TELEFOON IN DIENST and DE PTT IN DIENST VAN DE WERELDVREDE (1929). Whereas Zwart had also a steady relationship with the Bruynzeel company, Güsten also made a film for it (1928). Although this might have been an immediate result of Güsten's well-known feature length documentary ZAA NSTREEK (1927), it could even be that in the case of the latter Zwart had played some kind of mediating role (for a filmography of Güsten, see: Westhoff, 1995: 25).

⁴⁷¹ Original quote: 'Von Barsy was allerminst een film-enthousiast..., schonk geen enkele aandacht aan welke 'filmkunst'-idealen dan ook, vond het hele filmbedrijf iets van twijfelachtig allooi, en wilde beslist niets anders zijn dan 'fotograaf', film-fotograaf. Maar als zodanig streefde hij dan ook naar de grootst mogelijke perfectie.'

dominated the historiography of the Filmliga, and that of Dutch cinema (see: Linssen and Schoots 1999), he considered first of all the aims of the films. Because of the functionality of many of Von Barsy's films, as well as the rational production processes they showed, they have not been considered as a matter of artistic expression. However, nowadays such ideas on functionality are considered as an artistic notion itself, which is the reason why many designers from that period have gained much attention in later years. In the year 2000, the BNO (*Union of Dutch Designers*) even proclaimed Piet Zwart as the most influential Dutch designer of the twentieth century. The idea of 'functional cinematography' applies to all the productions that Von Barsy made for Transfilma, including its most outstanding film, *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* (1928).

The city that never rests

During the production of various films about the port and the industry of Rotterdam, the ambitious plan emerged within Transfilma to make a film called 'Rotterdam, symphonie van den arbeid', based on a script by Simon Koster. It was inspired by, and had to become the equivalent of *BERLIN, DIE SYMPHONIE EINER GROSSSTADT* (1927). It was conceived as an 'absolute film', without intertitles. Music would be important, composed by Anton Blazer, of the Rotterdam conservatory. The first recordings were made in March 1928, when Transfilma worked on the film for the electricity works (GEB). The GEB supported this idea, especially its director, H.H. Ehrenburg, who was an enthusiast of photography and film, and as such he had already been involved with a film production for the Schoolbioscoop⁴⁷². The GEB offered Transfilma the opportunity to make use of its complex at the Schiehaven – currently the heart of the audiovisual quarter of Rotterdam – where it could use the gigantic power supply of the company for spectacular nocturnal shots, while the GEB personnel moved all kinds of (staged) machines and installations according to the instructions of Von Maydell and Von Barsy⁴⁷³.

While this film was gradually developing, Transfilma also talked to Mayor and Aldermen about possibilities to collaborate and to sponsor it. The municipality was interested and an entirely new film resulted from it, not less ambitious, that gradually eclipsed the original plan. The new film was called *VAN VISSCHERSDORP TOT WERELDHAVENSTAD* ("From Fishing Village to World Port City") which was later renamed *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS*. Although it became a remarkable film, there are only a few film historical references to it. Film historian Nico Brederoo (1986: 201) mentions the film briefly in his study about the influence of the Filmliga, only to remark that it is less experimental than Von Barsy's *HOOGSTRAAT*. Bert Hogenkamp (1988: 21), in his turn, considers the film as a progressive step in the Dutch documentary tradition. None of them, however, have seen the original version, which remains missing to this day. Remaining today are only parts and derivatives, like the recycled films by A.V. Blum, which the German film historian Thomas Tode (1997: B8) has classified as 'a rather conventional cultural film series' (without knowing that the material originally belonged to *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS*). Instead of considering this film in terms of avant-garde, documentary, or educational film, it makes more sense to frame its purposes and conditions, and to reveal cross-connections between different fields. Moreover, the somewhat enigmatic biography of this film, and its disappearance, may be illustrative for the nature of 'applied cinema' or 'functional

⁴⁷² Ehrenburg collaborated with Van der Wel on *ELECTRICITEIT EN HAAR TOEPASSINGEN* (1927); 'Een film over electriciteit', p4 in: *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 23, 1927. For Ehrenburg, see: Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis > Ehrenburg, Hillebrand Hendrik; www.iisg.nl/ondernemers/pdf/pers-0423-01.pdf (2008-11-04)

⁴⁷³ See the article 'De symphonie van den arbeid', p6 in: *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 36, 1928; cf. 'Nieuws van Monopole', p4 in: *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 39, 1928. It was also remarked in a review on *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS*: "'Van Visschersdorp tot Wereldhavenstad", een welgeslaagde Rotterdamsche jubileumfilm', *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1928-08-16.

cinematography'. The function determines the life of the film. What follows is an attempt to trace the history of the film that has been so important within the career of Von Barsy⁴⁷⁴.

In April 1928, after Transfilma had already produced several films for the municipality, it discussed the possibility of a port promotion film with aldermen De Groot, De Jong and De Zeeuw⁴⁷⁵. As a result of it Transfilma wrote a proposal, which was accompanied by a draft of a script⁴⁷⁶. In its letter, Transfilma argued that several harbour cities had recently made use of film as a means of propaganda; in this way, according to its own information, Transfilma had already made films about Hamburg and Lisbon⁴⁷⁷. An extra argument for Rotterdam was the celebration of its 600th anniversary. The intention of the film was to give an attractive impression of the city and its port and an overview of its modern facilities and possibilities, in order to gain a broad support for its development and the interest of (foreign) clients. It had to communicate industrial values and efficiency, and as such it can also be considered as a matter of Record, Rhetorics, and Rationalization (Hediger & Vonderau, 2007: 22).

The Mayor and Aldermen asked L.W.H. van Dijk, director of Gemeentewerken, for advice. In his reply he mentioned that initially he thought that the film DE HAVEN VAN ROTTERDAM (1925), made by Schoolbioscoop director Van der Wel, was sufficient, but having seen the work of Transfilma, he was convinced of the quality and the power that the proposed film would have⁴⁷⁸. The city council voted in favour of its production, and on the 9th of July Transfilma got the commission⁴⁷⁹. For the production of this film, Van Dijk became the municipality's executive.

The film had to be produced within the extremely short period of six weeks, presumably to have its premiere taking place within the period of the Nenijs exhibition. Although it was already difficult enough to make the proposed film within this short time, the Mayor and Aldermen also asked to include images of the city, so the original plan was changed, and more recordings were made. This resulted in the feature length film DE STAD DIE NOOIT RUST (THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS), directed by Von Maydell, and shot by Von Barsy⁴⁸⁰.

The premiere, for the elite of Rotterdam and a number of foreign guests, was planned to take place at the *Groote Doelenzaal* on the 15th of August 1928. However, a month before Mayor Wytéma suddenly died. All the activities concerning the celebration of the 600th anniversary were therefore cancelled⁴⁸¹, except for the production of this film. In the end, it turned out that there was not even a 600th anniversary, since Rotterdam received its city rights in 1340 (and not in 1328)⁴⁸².

⁴⁷⁴ At the time of writing this thesis, a restoration project has been initiated by FP, which is carried out (2009) by Simona Monizza (NFM), with thanks to Mark-Paul Meyer (NFM), and Anouk de Haas (GAR).

⁴⁷⁵ Letter by Transfilma to Burgemeester en Wethouders, 1928-04-20, dossier 'Havenfilm van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4216: 1928, nr. 211.1, volgnr. 1., GAR.

⁴⁷⁶ *ibid.*

⁴⁷⁷ *ibid.*, however, no further references to these films are known.

⁴⁷⁸ Letter to Burgemeester en Wethouders by L.W.H. van Dijk, 1928-05-26, dossier 'Havenfilm van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4216: 1928, nr. 211.1, volgnr. 2., GAR.

⁴⁷⁹ Letter by the 'secretaris der Gemeente' to Transfilma, 1928-07-09, dossier 'Havenfilm van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4216: 1928, nr. 211.1, volgnr. 4., GAR.

⁴⁸⁰ F.C. von Maydell was its director, but Von Barsy is usually mentioned as the principle filmmaker of this and other Transfilma films, see e.g. 'Filmkritiek, Rotterdam als Film-Epos,' *Het Vaderland*, 1928-08-16; '“Van Visschersdorp tot Wereldhavenstad”, een welgeslaagde Rotterdamsche jubileumfilm', *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1928-08-16.

⁴⁸¹ See: *Rotterdamsch Jaarboekje*, 1929 (GAR). His funeral took place on 1928-07-16, see: BEGRAFENIS BURGEMEESTER WYTEMA (1928, Polygoon); see also: NIEUWE BURGEMEESTER: MR. P. DROOGLEEVER FORTUYN (1928-10-15, Polygoon).

⁴⁸² In 1299, Wolfaert van Borsselen granted Rotterdam city rights, but they were soon reversed since he got killed. In 1328 Rotterdam got new privileges, and in 1340 it finally received its city rights; see: Cornelisse, 1971: 4.

Two days before the screening, the film was sent to the censor, although it was not yet finished. During these last days Von Bary went on making recordings, on location, and in the studio, where he shot animated maps, until the day of the premiere⁴⁸³. The film that was officially presented was therefore slightly different from the one seen by the censor, and also new to the commissioner.

The film starts with the historical growth of Rotterdam, from a fishing village to a world port. First are water and reed, and suddenly the St. Laurens tower rises into the film frame, followed by ‘an explosion of technical violence’, in the words of a critic of the *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad* (1928-08-16). There is the novelty of an electrical train, there are aeroplanes at airport Waalhaven, and there is the swarming traffic in the city. The camera moves through the old city, through its streets and canals and underground passages.

The facades bow away to the left and to the right; trams and cars glide along, the city swings and shakes in the frame of the white screen. Streets open up and close again; squares unfold; masses of houses burst open in dark cracks and push other streets in front of the lens; dark distances break apart and all of a sudden inland harbours full of ships lie naked. Rotterdam!⁴⁸⁴

The port is shown as a highly dynamic city in itself with ‘moving architecture’ – vessels that are the state of the art in industrial design and engineering, and barges that turn the harbour into a ‘Waterstad’. Different kinds of ships pass by. There are also ferries, with trucks on it, as well as horses. Next to them are the bridges across the Nieuwe Maas, including *De Hef*. Porters carry heavy loads, while cranes make a veritable choreography out of unloading coal, grain, timber and all other kinds of cargo.

The film, which is an instance of cartographic cinema, gives an accurate account of the city and its port: its current state, and its past and future development. It provides an overview by way of (animated) maps that indicate what is shown, and by way of aerial shots. They are followed by images of the different harbours, marked on maps too, and the activities going on there: bulk transshipment on the left bank, like grain and oil, and piece good handling on the right bank. At the end is the Merwehaven under construction, with images of dredging works. Finally there are maps showing plans for further extensions of the city and the port, including the Pernis project in the south-west, to tranship and process oil. But it is not all about big-scale imagery. Von Bary had an excellent eye for detail and the human dimension, which is exemplified by a pedlar on a victualling boat taking orders, to serve coffee and snacks, or a man washing his hair over the railing of his fast moving barge, while on the roof of it lies a bike. The critic of the *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad* summarised the film with the words: ‘Rotterdam from inside, from above and from under.’

Although the film was enthusiastically received by the press⁴⁸⁵, it was nevertheless changed in the next weeks, after Van Dijk and his colleagues of the department of “Public Works” had discussed it with Transfilma, and decided to change the order of some of the topics

See also: E. Wiersum; Gedenkboek Rotterdam 1328-1928, Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, 1928, quoted by www.engelfriet.net/Alie/Aad/privilege.htm (2008-10-19).

⁴⁸³ Letter to Burgemeester en Wethouders by L.W.H. van Dijk, 1928-10-29, dossier ‘Havenfilm van Rotterdam’, archief: ‘Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4216: 1928, nr. 211.1, volgnr. 19., GAR.

⁴⁸⁴ Original quote: ‘Naar links en naar rechts buigen de gevels weg; trams en auto’s glijden voorbij; de stad schommelt en schokt in de lijst van het witte doek. Straten openen zich en sluiten zich; pleinen onttollen zich; huizenmassa’s breken in donkere spleten open en schuiven andere straten voor de lens; donkere verten breken vaneen en binnenhavens vol schepen liggen plotseling bloot. Rotterdam!’, in: ‘Van Visschersdorp tot Wereldhavenstad’, Een welgeslaagde jubileumfilm’, *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1928-08-16.

⁴⁸⁵ Reviews in a.o. *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, *Het Vaderland*, *NRC* (all 1928-08-16) and *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie* (1928-08-17).

and to remove some weaker parts⁴⁸⁶. The renewed film was finally released and shown at Tuschinski's Thalia cinema, during one week in October 1928⁴⁸⁷. Later that month the English, German and French language versions were ready too, which were indeed needed: immediately after the premiere the municipality received requests to show the film abroad. It emphasizes the importance of the film as a medium to promote Rotterdam and its port abroad. But also within the Netherlands it had a role to play, as was remarked by Luc Willink, film critic of *Het Vaderland* from The Hague⁴⁸⁸. He concluded his review by praising this film as a plea for labour, for showing the achievements of Rotterdam that many in The Hague tend to overlook, adding that everyone who loves his country will be touched by this film and that The Hague and the rest of the Netherlands needs this film, as Rotterdam deserves the national pride.

The film would be shown in The Hague indeed, at the Trianon theatre, which was the home of the Filmliga, with Luc Willink as an active member⁴⁸⁹. This screening, however, did not happen before the film was shown in the 1928 November programme of the Filmliga Rotterdam – actually by coincidence, as the originally programmed film was not available. With Von Barsy being a member of the Filmliga, this turned out to be a practical alternative.

afterlife

In the months after the premiere of *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS*, Transfilma entered into a dragging dispute with the municipality about the expenses of the production, since the final film had become much longer. It was finally settled in early 1929 in favour of Transfilma, whose argument was supported by Gemeentewerken director Van Dijk⁴⁹⁰. Although the dispute was solved, the struggle marks the beginning of a turbulent period for Transfilma, and a curious cinematic biography that was already implied by the film's title: due to ongoing, rapid changes in the city and the port, the film was re-edited and shortened several times⁴⁹¹. Moreover, in order to give a quick overview of the port to visitors, or as part of presentations at congresses or fairs, a short version was needed, and so the film was cut into about one quarter of the original⁴⁹². What exactly has happened is hard to trace, and also who was involved.

While the film was at the disposal of the municipality, which had its own screening copies, Transfilma kept the copyrights and the right to distribute it commercially in the

⁴⁸⁶ Letter to Burgemeester en Wethouders by L.W.H. van Dijk, 1928-10-29, dossier 'Havenfilm van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4216: 1928, nr. 211.1, volgnr. 19., GAR.

⁴⁸⁷ In Thalia it was shown from the 5th up to and including the 11th of October 1928. Letter to B&W by Transfilma, 1928-10-03, dossier 'Havenfilm van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4216: 1928, nr. 211.1, volgnr. 11, GAR.

⁴⁸⁸ Willink, Luc; 'Rotterdam als Film-epos; Filmkritiek', in *Het Vaderland*, 1928-08-16.

⁴⁸⁹ The film is mentioned under the name VAN VISSCHERSDORP TOT WERELDSTAD (but left uncredited) in the filmography compiled by Beusekom and Chamuleau in: Gunning/Linssen/Schoots (1999, 288). The film was shown at Corso by the Filmliga Rotterdam in the programme of the 17th of November 1928; www.cinemacontext.nl (visited: 2007-09-20) mentions also 1928-11-16, and that it was shown in The Hague at (Filmliga) theatre Trianon (1929-03-08). www.cinemacontext.nl/id/F009334

⁴⁹⁰ dossier 'Havenfilm van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4216: 1928, nr. 211.1, volgnr. 9-27, GAR.

⁴⁹¹ A reference to that is made in a review about the film *TUSSCHEN AANKOMST EN VERTREK: 'Een Nieuwe film over de Rotterdamsche haven,' Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, 1938-05-01. Different versions of the film exist in the collections of the *Nederlands Filmmuseum* (NFM) and the *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam* (GAR). See also a letter by the director of the Havenbedrijf to the Algemeen Rijksarchief Den Haag, 1939-01-09, Havenbedrijf classification: 1938, nr. 22.50, at: GAR, archive: 'Secretarie afd. Kunstzaken', toegangsnr. 487.01, bestanddeel 6.

⁴⁹² A critical reference to this short version is to be found in: dossier 'Geluidsfilm van de Haven van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4247: 1931, nr. 314.1, GAR. It is not exactly clear which one is this short version, since various versions and parts of *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* exist today (mainly at the NFM), while the original itself is missing. From all four languages versions parts have been cut out, so it seems that all of them have been made into the same short version.

Netherlands and abroad⁴⁹³. For distribution in the Netherlands it collaborated with the Rotterdam based film company Monopole, while Transfilma itself took care of its distribution abroad. It is not clear if the shorter version that the municipality used, by 1930, is the same as the eighteen minute film WELTHAFEN (1929), which was edited by the Austrian master of compilation films, Albrecht Viktor Blum⁴⁹⁴. This recycled version of THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS had passed the German censor already in March 1929, while it was still credited as a Transfilma production directed by Von Maydell and shot by Von Barsy, who must have known Blum already⁴⁹⁵. Soon afterwards Blum re-edited the film again, into a series of three silent shorts of about seven minutes each that were distributed by Prometheus⁴⁹⁶. It is remarkable that after these films were released, the original film was still to be shown in Frankfurt and Hamburg, through diplomatic exchange with the municipality⁴⁹⁷. The reason for this divergence seems rooted in the earlier dispute between the municipality and Transfilma, which was no longer bothered by the municipal bureaucracy, while it also shifted its focus (see next section).

While Blum worked on his series, he also worked for Prometheus on the feature film JENSEITS DER STRASSE (1929). This fiction film included exterior shots that were recorded in Rotterdam. According to Thomas Tode (1997: B6, F3⁴⁹⁸), they were shot by the cameraman Friedl Behn-Grund, under the direction of Blum, and this had been enabled through the assistance of Joris Ivens and the Dutch Filmliga (both Blum and Ivens were active communists). The link with Ivens also leads to Von Barsy, who at that time collaborated with Ivens (see next section). Although Blum and Behn-Grund might have recorded material themselves, it seems likely that for this fiction film they also used material from THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS. It seems that Blum concealed the course of things from the outside world; as such there appears an immediate parallel to the so-called Vertov scandal, which occurred at exactly the same time (Tode, 1997: B6): Vertov was accused of plagiarism, copying Blum, which turned out to be the other way round. The main reason had been a financial one, since the prospects for Prometheus were also not good (Tode, 2005: 549). For the time being, the Rotterdam shorts enabled Prometheus to continue its business. One year after the release of WELTHAFEN, Blum made another version of Von Barsy's film, now with a duration of twenty-five minutes, which was then credited as a Prometheus production: STADT UND HAFEN ROTTERDAM (1930, A.V. Blum). Since sound had

⁴⁹³ Letter (1928-09-15) by L.W.H. van Dijk to alderman A. de Jong, dossier 'Havenfilm van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4216: 1928, nr. 211.1, volgnr. 13, GAR.

⁴⁹⁴ These films, and the other titles by A.V. Blum, seem to be missing, according to information from the Nederlands Filmmuseum, and the Austrian Film Museum (research project 'Proletarian Cinema in Austria', 2006).

⁴⁹⁵ The 18 minutes version WELTHAFEN has been credited by Tomas Tode (1997: F3) as a production of Transfilma (from Berlin !?), with Von Maydell as the director, Von Barsy as the cameraman, and Blum as the editor; the film passed the German censor on 1929-03-14, nr. B.21977 – see also: www.filmportal.de > filme: 'Welthafen' > credits (2009-09-09). It seems that Blum (from Austria), and Von Barsy (who had also lived in Austria) knew each other directly, or indirectly through Simon Koster. The production of NUL UUR NUL (1927-1928, Simon Koster) hints in that direction. Besides recording by Von Barsy, the film included recordings that were made by Curt Oertel in Berlin, at the time that Oertel also worked on the feature film HOPPLA, WIR LEBEN (1927), for which Blum did archive film research and editing.

⁴⁹⁶ The film was made into two different films that were brought to the censor again (1929-06-27): ROTTERDAM (206m = 7'30") and a shorter version of WELTHAFEN (7'30"). Additionally, Tode has remarked (2005: 549) that in the meanwhile another short was made out of the original film: KANÄLE UND GRACHTEN (for which Tode refers to *Filmtechnik*, 1929-05-25). Occasionally, Von Maydell is also mentioned as the director of the Rotterdam series: cf. www.filmportal.de > Von Maydell (visited: 2008-06-23)

⁴⁹⁷ The film was shown for example, to 300 invited guests in Frankfurt a.M., at the theatre of the Physikalischen Vereins, organised by the Dutch Chamber of Commerce and the Holland-Institut of the Universität Frankfurt (1929-07-10), and subsequently at the Deutsche Kulturfilmgesellschaft 'Urania' in Hamburg; dossier 'Havenfilm van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4216: 1928, nr. 211.1, volgnr. 28-38, GAR.

⁴⁹⁸ Tode refers here (1997: B6) to *Film-Kurier*, 1929-05-10 and 1929-06-26; at the time of these publications, Blum also worked on the series of shorts mentioned in the previous note.

been introduced, he re-edited it finally all again into four short sound films (with music by Georg Fiebiger)⁴⁹⁹.

Regarding the existence of these shorts with sound it is remarkable that in March 1931 Mayor Droogleever Fortuyn (a supporter of the Filmliga⁵⁰⁰) asked the clerk's office, in the person of play writer Albert van Waasdijk, to find out if a short sound film could be made to promote the port⁵⁰¹. Van Waasdijk thought of Ivens, had a meeting with him, and became enthusiastic. However, for the proposed film of half an hour, Ivens calculated 30,000 guilders: five times the price paid for THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS. Van Waasdijk then talked to B.D. Ochse of Polygoon, who made an offer for 10,000 guilders, while Ed Pelster of the *Centraal Bureau voor Ligafilms* (De Uitkijk), asked 26,000 guilders for a film to be directed by Simon Koster and shot by Eugen Schüfftan, both based in Berlin, which was accompanied by an ambitious plan for international distribution, whose revenues would approach the expenses.

Van Waasdijk wrote quickly a report, but rather than an informative document it became a plea for sound film. Less than three years after the release of THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS he referred to it as an outdated and lengthy silent film without much movement, except for the movement of the camera itself⁵⁰². It had to be completely different, and Ivens, he argued, would be the right person to do it, in spite of the other offers. The financial committee of the municipality rejected the plan, and so did Alderman De Jong (Public Works)⁵⁰³. The Mayor, however, kept the idea, and in early 1932 he asked the opinion of Nicolaas Koomans, the director of the newly established municipal port enterprise (*Havenbedrijf*)⁵⁰⁴. The latter thought a film would be useful, but only if its revenues through exhibition could indeed cover the expenses. That was unlikely. Half a year later, there was a competing offer from the new film company Visie, which originated from Polygoon, with Max de Haas knowing about the plan. He proposed to make a fifteen minutes film for less than 4000 guilders⁵⁰⁵. But in 1932 the Great Depression reached rock bottom, which hit Rotterdam, and in this period, of cutting municipal expenses, the plan for a sound film still had to wait, till 1938, when Von Barys made TUSSEHEN AANKOMST EN VERTREK, as we will see. It is striking, however, that he had not been mentioned in the earlier plans and discussions. What had happened to Transfilma and Von Barys after the release of THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS?

After the Nenijs had taken place, there were less requests for industrial films, although Transfilma still produced a few of them, including one for the cooperative association *De Vooruitgang* ("Progress"), about its bakeries and milk factory. Through this contact, Transfilma made the enigmatic feature film DE MAARSCHALKSTAF ("The Marshal's Baton", 1929, see:

⁴⁹⁹ STADT UND HAFEN ROTTERDAM; ROTTERDAM, DER PULSSCHLAG DES WELTHANDELS; ROTTERDAM, WASSERSTRASSEN UND BRUECKEN; ROTTERDAM, WUNDER DER TECHNIK; and next to that Blum also made HOLLÄNDISCHE REISE – all 1930 – Tode (2005: 549) mentions these titles, which he had previously indicated (1997: F4) as silent films.

⁵⁰⁰ In 1927, he was a member of the recommending committee in The Hague – promotional folder of the Filmliga The Hague, NFM 'Archief Filmliga', correspondentie 1927, 131-168, map 11, nr. 141.

⁵⁰¹ Letter (1931-03-30) by Albert van Waasdijk to A.M. van der Wel, dossier 'Geluidsfilm van de Haven van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4247: 1931, nr. 314.1, GAR. Droogleever Fortuyn had been a member of the advisory board of the Filmliga The Hague in 1927.

⁵⁰² It seems, however, that Van Waasdijk was mistakenly referring to the 1927 film by Güsten. In the letter above (previous note), Van Waasdijk asks the director of the Schoolbioscoop if he has a copy of THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS, and its extract, in order to see it. In his report (1931-05-11), *Geluidsfilm van de Haven van Rotterdam*, Van Waasdijk also criticises the film for respecting too much the advertisement requests of the private sponsors, which applies to the film from 1927, but not to that of 1928; dossier 'Geluidsfilm van de Haven van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemene Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4247: 1931, nr. 314.1, GAR.

⁵⁰³ Letter to B&W (1931-07-14), *ibid.*

⁵⁰⁴ Letter to the mayor by N. Koomans (1932-01-22), *ibid.*

⁵⁰⁵ Letter to Van Waasdijk by Max de Haas (1932-08-29), *ibid.*

5.§2), which was commissioned by the union of cooperatives⁵⁰⁶. Von Barsy would be its cameraman, and, from his circle of friends, Filmliga member and critic Luc Willink⁵⁰⁷, who had been enthusiastic about THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS, was asked to be its director. The idea for this ‘applied fiction film’, presumably suggested by Transfilma itself, illustrates its ambition to produce feature films, in a serious way. It was a highly professional production, with most of the interior shots being recorded at the Staaken studio, near Berlin. However, as an applied fiction film – still a matter of ‘functional cinematography’ – it had its own distribution circuit, which may explain why the film remained unnoticed by critics and historians – to such an extent that the film is even missing today.

While Transfilma produced DE MAARSCHALKSTAF, it also continued to work on the plan for the ‘free Rotterdam film’ that was called ‘Rotterdam, Symphonie van den Arbeid’. However, since one had already made THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS, a new script was written, for a fiction film that would be called: EEN LIED VAN DEN ARBEID (“A song of labour”, 1929). The German actor Walter Janssen was asked to direct it, which was his debut as such⁵⁰⁸. The film is missing too, and even less is known about it⁵⁰⁹. An advertisement published by its (Rotterdam-based) distributor Monopole called it a ‘film of workers, workers who work with their heads and workers who work with their hands. [It is a] film of machines that act like living and struggling beings’⁵¹⁰. It was a serious attempt to make a film that would have an international appeal, with the main characters being played by Maly Delschaft, Sybill Morel, Alexander Granach, as well as Walter Janssen, who were among the stars of German silent cinema⁵¹¹. According to a critic, the film was a success, not so much for the script, but especially since it was ‘a conscious attempt to let the camera speak its own clear language’, with ‘excellent cinematography’ by Von Barsy⁵¹².

The film was released in the Netherlands in August 1929. Notwithstanding the artistic success, the film brought Transfilma into financial problems, due to its high costs. The investments of Transfilma had simply been too big and the risks too high. Moreover, sound film conquered the world, which was too much of a competition for this film. Still in August, the producer and owner of Transfilma, Friedrich von Maydell, went to Berlin, where he made an agreement with distributor Mondial-Film. This film and THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS, of which Transfilma had still the exploitation rights, were turned into bills of exchange. As such, EEN LIED VAN DEN ARBEID was released anew in Germany as KAMPF UMS LEBEN⁵¹³. In the case of THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS, Mondial-Film must have passed the rights to Prometheus-Film.

What exactly has happened, concerning the exchanges and transactions of Transfilma, is difficult to reconstruct⁵¹⁴. Part of the arrangement with Mondial-Film, it seems, was that Von Maydell would collaborate on a new film as the executive producer. The production history of that film, STURMFLUT DER LIEBE (1929), is rather misty. Whatever happened, it meant the

⁵⁰⁶ It was commissioned by the *Centrale Bond van Nederlandsche Verbruikcoöperaties*.

⁵⁰⁷ Luc Willink was one of the founders of the Filmliga branch in The Hague, see: *Filmliga* vol. 1/3 (1927), p13.

⁵⁰⁸ Walter Janssen would direct a few more films in the 1930s, but he is mainly known as an actor. In 1968 he received an honorary award for his ‘continued outstanding individual contributions to the German film over the years.’ www.imdb.com > Walter Janssen (visited: 2007-10-04).

⁵⁰⁹ There is no copy of the film preserved in Dutch film collections, but there could be probably in Germany or Austria.

⁵¹⁰ *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, 1929-08-30. Original quote: Film van werkers, werkers met het hoofd en werkers met de handen. Film van als levende wezens handelende en strijdende machines.’

⁵¹¹ For more information on these actors, see http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maly_Delschaft and http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sybill_Morel and http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexander_Granach (visited: 2007-10-02).

⁵¹² ‘Rialto’, in: *Het Volk*, 1930 – the article is signed with ‘P.B.’; it is part of the personal archive of Von Barsy (kept by Ruth Barsy, Munich – 2005).

⁵¹³ Date of censor: 1929-11-11 www.filmportal.de > ‘Kampf Ums Leben’ (visited: 2007-10-04)

⁵¹⁴ Von Maydell signed a contract with A. Staib, as mentioned in a report on the bankruptcy of the firm (part of the research file of SFW-werkuitgave no. 9, see: Westhoff, 1995, at the archive of B&G). The transactions passed on the 13th of August 1929.

bankruptcy of Transfilma, late 1929⁵¹⁵. Even the trustee in Rotterdam that had to settle the case spoke of a confused course of things that he did not expect to be resolved⁵¹⁶. In the meantime Von Maydell left the country, without a clear destination. He ended up in Finland, where he would direct two feature films before returning to Germany⁵¹⁷.

§ 3. a new episode

As soon as Transfilma got in trouble, Von Barsy started to look for other possibilities for work. Due to his involvement with the Filmliga Rotterdam, he was asked as a cameraman for the fiction film *BRANDING* (1929, Joris Ivens & Mannus Franken)⁵¹⁸. Ivens subsequently asked him for his next project, the union film *NVV CONGRES* (1929, Ivens)⁵¹⁹. Besides that, Von Barsy collaborated with director Henk Kleinman on the fiction film *ZEEMANSVROUWEN* (1930)⁵²⁰. It was recorded in Amsterdam, in the autumn of 1929, and it was the first attempt to make a sound film in the Netherlands, but it could not actualise this ambition in the end, for financial reasons⁵²¹. Although it had some success in the cinemas, critics considered it a failure, except for Von Barsy's cinematography, which was reviewed as striking and avant-gardist, based on the 'Russian school'⁵²².

Among the many creditors of Transfilma, Von Barsy was the main one. He was finally appointed to take over the studio and its equipment, which turned out to be a great advantage. In this way he started his own company: *Filmfabriek A. von Barsy*⁵²³. Since the Filmliga had just got its own distribution agency, *De Uitkijk* in Amsterdam, Von Barsy then decided to make the short 'absolute film' *HOOGSTRAAT* (1929), on which he worked for about three months⁵²⁴. The

⁵¹⁵ (See also previous note.) *STURMFLUT DER LIEBE* was shot in Romania. The credits mention Martin Berger as its director. It is mentioned in a text about the German director Martin Berger by the German Film Institute (www.deutsches-filminstitut.de/dt2tp0125.htm). It says that that the film was produced by Transfilma, which is called a Dutch-Romanian film company that went bankrupt because of this film. The Dutch director Gerard Rutten has revealed a different story (1976: 68-71). Already after one day of shooting in Romania, director Berger dropped out because of blatant misbehaviour, and Rutten became the director instead (a production still with Rutten as the director is included in his book). Rutten, however, was not to be mentioned in the credits, but Berger, because of the success of his previous film. Rutten agreed with it for the reason that it was not his ideal 'first appearance'. Rutten mentioned Mondial Film in Berlin as the production company, which initially contracted him as the assistant-director, at the time that he lived in Berlin. IMDB mentions Friedrich von Maydell as the producer, and Mondo-Film-Vertrieb as the production company, whereas Mondial-Film is mentioned as the distributor (it seems that Mondo-Film was an occasional name for Mondial-Film, in order to produce this film): www.imdb.com/title/tt0131039/ (visited: 2007-10-04). In any case, it has been the only Transfilma-related production that was *not* shot by Andor von Barsy. The cinematography of this film was done by another Hungarian: László Schäffer, who was one of the cameramen of Ruttman's *BERLIN, DIE SINFONIE EINER GROSSSTADT* (1927), see: www.imdb.com (2008-06-19).

⁵¹⁶ As mentioned in a report on the bankruptcy of the firm (part of the research file of SFW-werkuitgave no. 9, see: Westhoff, 1995, at the archive of B&G).

⁵¹⁷ The films made in Finland are: *ERAMAAN TURVISSA* (1931, Von Maydell, Kalle Kaarna); *DIE TUNDRA* (1932, Von Maydell).

⁵¹⁸ It is mentioned by Jef Last in the article 'Het Rotterdamsche kongres van het N.V.V. door Joris Ivens en A. von Barsy', *De Nieuwe Weg*, vol. 6/2 (1931). Cf. Van Moerkerken, 1966: 13.

⁵¹⁹ Mentioned in a review by Jef Last; 'Het Rotterdamsche kongres van het N.V.V. door Joris Ivens en A. von Barsy', in: *De Nieuwe Weg*, vol. 6/2. The film was released separately, and also as a part of *WE ARE BUILDING* (1930, Ivens).

⁵²⁰ With Kleinman he had already made a film about Amsterdam in 1928.

⁵²¹ In 2003 the film made a come-back; the Nederlands Filmmuseum restored it, while additionally a completely new, synchronised sound track was made by musician Hennie Vrienten.

⁵²² cf. Bishoff, 1986: 103. An example of such a critique was given by Jef Last; 'Voor de Lens, Zeemansvrouwen', in: *De Nieuwe Weg*, vol. 5/nr. 6-7 (1930).

⁵²³ Located at the former Lijnbaanstraat 39a; source: *Adressenboek Rotterdam*, 1928 [for Transfilma] and 1930 [for Filmfabriek A. von Barsy] – collection GAR. Von Barsy was temporarily associated with Bedijs, but no further information is available about the latter (ref. 'De Hoogstraat', *Dagblad van Rotterdam*, 1929-12-31).

⁵²⁴ 'De Hoogstraat: beeld van de wereld', in: *Courant van de Hoogstraatweek*, 1st week of November 1930 [personal archive Von Barsy]. See also: 'De Hoogstraat', *Dagblad van Rotterdam*, 1929-12-31. Filmliga member Henrik Scholte (1933: 36) also mentions a port film that Von Barsy made himself. It is not exactly clear if this is *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* or a derivative of this film.

Filmliga magazine (1930, 3/8), which put a still from it on the cover, recommended it as an 'excellent short film', and a study based on 'absolute movement' that proceeded 'from the school of Ruttmann'. This short film is a portrait of the main shopping street of Rotterdam at that time. The camera is the actual subject of the film, like a flaneur in the city. It strolls through the street while observing the diversity of people and the way they behave. The camera also registers ordinary things that people do not normally notice, like an old shoe left on the pavement.

The film begins and ends with a small puppet theatre, as a welcome and a good-bye to the show. HOOGSTRAAT is a show about showing: the show cases of the shops, performers giving shows, the people in the street showing themselves, which all together make up the show of the city. The glass window is central to the film. It is a medium itself, because of its function of exhibition, its framing, transparency, reflections and its effect of double images and visual layers. It is also literally a medium between inside and outside, an interface between private and public, rich and poor, objects and people. The old shoe in the street is a good example of that. It is the counter stage of the new shoe behind the window; it shows the *curriculum vitae* of things. It is animated by the people that use it – the feet of the people we see in the film. Von Barsy emphasizes it furthermore by an absurd image of a 'sandwich man' who wears, upside down, a giant shoe over his head.

Searching for new ways to make a living, Von Barsy also carried out photographic commissions, including the photographic booklet *Rotterdam 1930*, which contained images just of the harbour⁵²⁵. It was commissioned by the municipality and a number of firms, to accompany the presentation of Rotterdam at the world exhibition. Regarding the booklet, Marlite Halbertsma (2001, 215) has remarked that the photographs were made 'in a severe New-Objective language of forms, which underlined the modern character of the port of Rotterdam'⁵²⁶. If the photographs can be called 'new-objective' (*nieuw-zakelijk*), so can Von Barsy's films. It supports the idea of 'functional cinematography'.

In Rotterdam, Von Barsy took photographs for various firms, among them De Bijenkorf and Van Nelle. He might have done so in collaboration with his girlfriend Ortrud Johanna Balkin, whom he finally married, in Rotterdam on New Year's Eve in 1930⁵²⁷.

In the meantime, Von Barsy got in touch with the Rotterdam-based advertisement agency Samson, and through them he started to make commercials for companies such as De Bijenkorf, radio factory Vollebregt, liquorice factory Gilda, Pfaff sewing machines and many more⁵²⁸. He was not the only one. At that time another producer of commercials, Puvabi, established itself in Rotterdam⁵²⁹. But rather than competing with each other, Von Barsy produced mainly commercials for firms from Rotterdam, and Puvabi for firms from elsewhere. Von Barsy continued to produce commercials over the course of the 1930s, which secured his finances.

In 1931, a big project was started. Gerard Rutten was asked to make a sound film for the Rotterdam based company Electra. In turn, Rutten asked Von Barsy to do the cinematography. As a counterbalance to NIEUWE GRONDEN ("New Earth", 1930-1933) that Joris Ivens was making about the reclamation of the Zuiderzee, Rutten proposed a 'less industrial' and 'more human' film

⁵²⁵ The architect of the Dutch pavilion, Th. Wijdeveld, also designed the cover of the booklet.

⁵²⁶ Original quote: '... in een streng nieuw-zakelijke vormentaal, die het moderne karakter van de Rotterdamse haven onderstreepte'.

⁵²⁷ This is not certain, but he would do so with his second wife, Ruth Gossert, in the 1950s and 1960s. It might be that at that time Johanna Ortrud Balkin had begun studies of medicine instead, as she worked as a physician later on (according to Monique Benning, 2005-04-11, email correspondence).

⁵²⁸ e.g. for Maison Spaans (1930), Pfaff sewing machine (1930), Veka chocolate (1931), De Bijenkorf (1932, 1933), Vollebregt (1932, 1934), Gilda Drop (1937), Gemeentelijk Gasbedrijf (1938), which are all mentioned by Westhoff, 1995: 7. They were commissioned by advertising agency Samson, see: www.cinemacontext.nl/id/R001136 (2007-10-02), which mentions various other titles that might have been made by Von Barsy too.

⁵²⁹ It was directed by Jos. van Biene, see: www.cinemacontext.nl/id/R000445 (visited: 2007-10-04). He had previously been director of UFA Netherlands and vice-president of the *Nederlandse Bioscoop Bond* (NBB), see: *Het Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 45, 1926.

with a similar kind of title: *TERRA NOVA* (1931-1932), on the same theme, but from the perspective of the fishermen whose lives were changing dramatically (Rutten, 1976: 78).

In order to prepare their film, Rutten and Von Barsy went to the village of Volendam, where they stayed for a while, and where they worked with the local people. Rutten was very enthusiastic about the landscape, the village, its people, their homes and especially the way Von Barsy filmed it. Rutten wrote (1976: 83):

[Andor von Barsy] was a special man. Besides him being a photographer and a cameraman, he was actually a scientist too. He calculated new lenses and objectives and he rebuilt his film camera entirely, adapting it to his special wishes. He was a magician with light. I wanted the film to be shot in a Rembrandtian atmosphere, but without too much picturesqueness. Andor von Barsy knew how to accomplish that.⁵³⁰

When they were finishing the film, the wife of the producer, who had an interest in the production, demanded a change in the editing, which resulted in a fight and finally the collapse of the project. Although the film was finished eventually, it did not reach the cinemas. Rutten wanted to make the film again, together with Von Barsy:

We decided, by lack of a producer, to work as a 'collective' [= *Nederlandsche Filmgemeenschap*]. Almost without payment! In Rotterdam, Andor von Barsy had a small laboratory...and a film factory, just behind the Grand Theatre. He had also a couple of spot-lights. He owned the camera! So the basis was there. And above all there was our common enthusiasm.⁵³¹

The production process was repeated, and again they got the collaboration of the villagers. With the material they went back to Rotterdam, where they developed and edited it. Rutten came in contact with the 'Sound City' film studios in England, showed the work, and managed to arrange a contract. They could do the synchronisation and moreover, they were willing to do the exploitation of the film, and so they provided Rutten with the money to finish the film. But, something unexpected happened (Rutten, 1976: 84):

In the small editing room I started the job. All the negative material and the working copy lied in that space. Neatly numbered and sorted and in tin cans. On the 9th of March 1933 I felt ill. I decided to stay at home and to leave the work to Andor. I had a fever...influenza. Late in the evening I woke up with a shock. In front of my bed stood Andor. Clothes scorched...face full of soot. Trembling. I understood it in one second. Fire! All was burnt. The whole film...negative and positive. All gone...! And it was true. That night Andor sat at the editing table. All of a sudden the bulb light above the table burst. A piece of glowing filament fell down in a big basket full of film. At that time still inflammable film. In a blink the whole space was in flames. The film boxes exploded like grenades. With pain Andor managed to escape from that hell. // The film factory was in the Lijnbaanstraat, right behind the Grand Theatre. That night there was a play by Ko van Dijk and Else Mauhs in a Hungarian comedy 'In the night of the 17th April'. The theatre was sold out. The performance had to be interrupted because the auditorium was full of smoke.⁵³²

⁵³⁰ Original quote: 'Hij was een bijzondere man. Behalve fotograaf en cameraman was hij eigenlijk ook een wetenschapsmens. Hij berekende nieuwe lenzen en objectieven en zijn filmcamera was door hem geheel omgebouwd en aan zijn bijzondere wensen aangepast. Hij was een tovenaer met het licht. Ik wilde de film in een Rembrandtieke sfeer gefilmd hebben. Zonder echter te veel schilderachtigheid. Andor von Barsy wist dat te bereiken.'

⁵³¹ Original quote (Rutten, 1976: 83): 'Wij besloten, bij gebrek aan een producent, maar als een 'collectief' te gaan werken. Vrijwel zonder betaling! Andor von Barsy had in Rotterdam, vlak achter de Grote Schouwburg, een klein laboratorium...en filmfabriekje. Hij bezat ook een paar schijnwerpers. Hij bezat de camera! Dus de basis was aanwezig. En vooral ons gezamenlijk enthousiasme.'

⁵³² Original quote: 'In de kleine snijkamer begon ik aan dat karwei. Al het negatief materiaal en de werkkopie lagen in die ruimte. Keurig genummerd en gesorteerd en in blikken bussen. Op de 9de maart 1933 voelde ik mij ziek. Ik besloot die dag thuis te blijven en het werk over te laten aan Andor. Ik had koorts...ik had griep. // 's Avonds laat werd ik met een schok wakker. Voor mijn bed stond Andor. Geschroeide kleren...gezicht vol roet. Trillend. Ik begreep het in één

Neither the film nor the studio was insured. Only the cameras had been saved, since Von Barsy had kept them at home. They still did not give up and made the film once more, yet with another, better script, written by Simon Koster. Also the title changed: DEAD WATER, after a remark by a fisherman in Volendam during a conversation with Rutten, looking over the former Zuiderzee. The cutter of DEAD WATER became Lien d'Oliveyra, who was the daughter of the well-known producer and director Adrienne Solser, who lived and worked in Schiedam (near Rotterdam), and with their help he found a studio there too⁵³³.

DEAD WATER tells the dramatic story of two generations in the traditional fishing village Volendam that have to deal with the damming and the reclamation of the Zuiderzee. The film shows the human struggle with the impact of modernisation. The story is preceded by a long prologue that shows the plans for the reclamation, and the work that has been done to make it possible. In itself, this part seems to celebrate progress, and it does so in a constructivist mode. Featuring cranes and building activities, the imagery resembles the harbour films by Von Barsy. Part of the prologue is also an animation, for which Von Barsy collaborated with Svend Noldan and set designer Lajos von Ébneth, which has much in common with Von Ébneth's earlier shadow-plays.

The prologue forms a sharp contrast with the subtle images that follow, which show the traditional villagers and their environment. Characteristic for the cinematography is the application of *clair-obscur* techniques, on which Von Barsy published too (e.g. 1935, 1936). More than once, Von Barsy emphasised that cinema had much to learn from painting, especially from the work of Rembrandt⁵³⁴. Next to that are, for example, impressionist images of the sea, with water and clouds shown in all tones of black and grey. Von Barsy's first assistant was his friend Alfons Lusteck, who had been a fellow student in Munich.

The premiere of DEAD WATER was at the film festival of Venice (1934-08-15), where it won the prize for 'best cinematography'. Besides the Netherlands, the film became also a success in Germany. As a result of it, Rutten was invited to work for the UFA in Berlin, which he first accepted, but then rejected, after he understood that it had become an instrument of the Nazi regime.

In the meantime, the municipality had found Von Barsy again. For the port authorities he made the short 'port symphony', yet without sound, which he simply called ROTTERDAM (1934). This 'absolute film' – devoid of explanatory texts, can be considered as the counterpart of the short 'city symphony' HOOGSTRAAT. For ROTTERDAM he used material from THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS, which was supplemented by images of new facilities. The film starts with a map of Europe and the position of Rotterdam, followed by images of the sea at Hoek van Holland. Besides the seaport Von Barsy shows the airport, and takes subsequently an aeroplane himself to shoot the city from above, with images of the oil industry at Pernis, the Wilhelminapier with its

seconde. Brand! Alles was verbrand! De hele film...negatief en positief. Alles weg...! En zó was het! Die avond zat Andor aan de snijtafel. Plotseling sprong er de gloeilamp boven de montagetafel stuk. Een stukje gloeiend draad viel in een grote mand vol met film. Toen nog brandbare film! In een oogwenk stond heel de ruimte in vlammen. De Filmdozen ontploften als granaten. Met moeite wist Andor uit die hel te ontsnappen. // Het filmfabriekje van von Barsy lag vlak naast de Grote Schouwburg, in de Lijnbaanstraat. Tegen de Schouwburg aan. Die avond speelde Ko van Dijk en Else Mauhs in een Hongaars blijspel 'In de nacht van de 17de april'. De schouwburg was uitverkocht. De voorstelling moest onderbroken worden omdat de schouwburgzaal vol met rook kwam.' (p84)

⁵³³ Archive Simon Koster, Theater Instituut Nederland, inv. nr. 48, nr. 8. The address book under consideration (dark red / brown, on which is written: 'adressen') is from the period 1925-1933. It is updated several times. This makes it difficult to trace exact dates. It mentions by pen: 'A. von Barsy, Schietbaanlaan 56A Rotterdam [which was his home address, and with pencil is added:] tot 26 apr.', and above is written a new address: '31803 L. Nieuwstr. 87 Schiedam'.

⁵³⁴ Von Barsy mentioned it, for example, in a lecture: 'Das Film ABC (III): Kameratechnik und Bildgestaltung', IX. *Internationales Filmtreffen*, Bad Ems, ref. Informationsdienst 1957-10-17 (archiv Hochschule für Fernsehen und Film, München).

passenger terminals, up to the bridges across the Nieuwe Maas. Various kinds of ships are shown from eye-level, like the ‘SS Statendam’, through diagonal compositions and tracking shots. In a similar way there are shots of all kinds of cargo, such as coal that is unloaded by large cranes, and grain being conveyed to the extended GEM silo (arch. Brinkman & Van der Vlugt). There are tracking shots of the abstract patterns of masses of oil and beer barrels, pipelines, wooden boxes, baskets and bags. Similarly Von Barsy makes expressive compositions by moving his camera along timber supplies, which are piled up near the Van Nelle factory. The latter itself is also shown in detail, by panning and tilting shots of its façade. The film ends with ship building, people fixing the enormous screw of a ship, and finally the farewell of the passenger ship ‘SS Slammat’ that steers course.

Von Barsy also collaborated with the Bulgarian director Slatan Dudow, who had escaped Berlin and moved to Paris, on the short fiction film SEIFENBLASEN (1934). Rutten, in his turn, made plans for the feature film RUBBER (1936), on the theme of rubber plantations in Sumatra, an island of the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia).

Of course I wanted to have Andor von Barsy behind the camera again. To learn about the Sumatran landscape and so, Andor visited the ‘Colonial Institute for the Tropics’. There he found out, to his fear, that on Sumatra there were many wild animals... especially tigers. Andor decided, to my dismay, not to go along to that dangerous country. There was no way to change his mind.⁵³⁵

Instead, Von Barsy and Koster decided to shoot LENTELIED, in 1935, which was ready the next year – and shown in Rotterdam at Tuschinski’s Studio 32⁵³⁶. The film, financed by the wife of the actor Jan Teulings⁵³⁷, has become known for the ‘naked knee’ of actress Ank van der Moer, which the censors demanded be removed⁵³⁸. With Jan Teulings and Ank van der Moer lying alone in the dunes, this image was considered to be too suggestive. This incident is quite ironical, since Simon Koster had exactly addressed such a censorship in his theatre and film show NUL UUR NUL, with the enacted protest of spectators against a woman in a négligé.

The film is a love story set in nature, about two couples that change partners. The son of a rich industrialist has a relationship with a young woman whose father is also president of an industrial company. A mechanic who is fired from that company has a relationship with the daughter of a miller on the countryside (i.e. Zeeland). The love story is simultaneously a story of modernity and tradition, which is emphasised by parallel editing. There is an interchange of speed and quietness, city and countryside. In a striking montage-sequence, shot by Von Barsy’s assistant Emiel van Moerkerken⁵³⁹, Rotterdam is briefly characterised through a collection of images of modern buildings and the industry of the city. This associative and selective way of editing is the work of the Hungarian editor Victor Palfi. Set and setting reinforce these contrasts, as well as the perspectives and the framing of the camera. On the one hand is the idyllic image of the mill, even though its wooden machinery is dynamically framed. On the other is the harbour and the industry of the city, with large machines and the modern interior of the office of the firm’s president, designed by Lajos von Ébneth and inspired by Gispén.

In 1935 too, Von Barsy also collaborated with Hans Richter on FROM THUNDERBOLT TO TELEVISION SCREEN (1936, Richter), which was made for Philips in Eindhoven⁵⁴⁰. It is an avant-

⁵³⁵ Rutten, 1976: 100. Original quote: ‘Ik wilde natuurlijk Andor von Barsy weer achter de camera hebben. Om zich een beetje te oriënteren over het landschap enz. van Sumatra bezocht Andor het ‘Koloniaal Instituut voor de Tropen’. En constateerde dáár tot zijn schrik dat er in Sumatra veel wilde dieren waren... tigers vooral. En Andor besloot, tot mijn schrik, niet mee te gaan naar dát gevaarlijke land. Hij was niet om te praten.’

⁵³⁶ It was first shown at Studio in The Hague (1936-03-06) and since 1936-04-10 at Studio 32 in Rotterdam (and afterwards also at De Uitkijk in Amsterdam, a.o.).

⁵³⁷ Rutten, 1976.

⁵³⁸ Dittrich, 1987: 31.

⁵³⁹ Van Moerkerken, 1967: 55.

⁵⁴⁰ Hogenkamp, 2004: 43.

gardistic ‘symphony of industry’, which has remained relatively unknown. He was subsequently asked to be a cameraman of OLYMPIA (1938, Leni Riefenstahl), about the Olympic Games in Berlin (1936), for which he made the *Stimmungsbilder*⁵⁴¹. This invitation was largely the result of DEAD WATER, which had established his name as a cinematographer. Because of his experience, Von Barsy was also invited by the director of the *Rijksacademie* in Amsterdam, the state academy of visual arts, to discuss the possibility to start a film department, but this plan still had to wait⁵⁴².

In 1937 the city of Rotterdam, finally, asked Von Barsy to make an entirely new film, with sound, about the port. It resulted in TUSSCHEN AANKOMST EN VERTREK (“Between Arrival and Departure”), which had its premiere at Tuschinski’s Grand Théâtre (1938-05-28)⁵⁴³. It is another ‘absolute film’ about the port, which is, in terms of canvas, a refinement of the previous film (ROTTERDAM). In a dynamic way, with elaborated compositions, it gives a concise impression of its activities. Cranes are shown from a low perspective, in contrast with the sky. Oil tubes run through the film frames. Floating barges interchange with large vessels that lie at anchor. New ships are being built in the docks. The film is characterised by Von Barsy’s sophisticated compositions, and a montage of contrasts, which together emphasise the power of the harbour. There are also poetic images of the industrial areas at twilight, with picturesque reflections in the water. While the night approaches, passengers embark on an ocean liner, in order to enter another adventure. The ship leaves.

The production of this sound film was supported and internationally distributed by the Dutch-German film company Tobis-Klangfilm⁵⁴⁴. With music composed by Anton Schweitzer of the Rotterdam Philharmonic Orchestra, the film was described by a critic as a ‘voluminous symphony of cranes, walk cats, tug boats and ocean liners...’⁵⁴⁵. To call it a symphony was, apart from its musical score, also a reference to the genre of the ‘city-symphony’, and the critic refers indeed to Ivens’s THE BRIDGE and Von Barsy’s HOOGSTRAAT. Moreover, there is no spoken word to explain the film. In the same review it was said that ‘Von Barsy has succeeded to transfer his own artistic vision upon the subject on to the camera, and thereby he has exclusively used pure filmic means.’ The commentator heralded the film as a good example of avant-garde film-making, expressing his relief that Von Barsy had kept to his path, unlike many others within the avant-garde. Next to that, the film was simultaneously appreciated as a good documentary that obeyed objective criteria, and as good propaganda that promoted the harbour. Objective propaganda? In those days the classifications of ‘documentary’ and ‘propaganda’ were not thought to be excluding each other. When the objective of a film is clear, one can evaluate the way it is created. It is another way to address what I have labelled as ‘functional cinematography’. Von Barsy was above all a ‘master of light’⁵⁴⁶. As such he transcended specific categories and genres.

§ 4. after Rotterdam

After WWII had started, Von Barsy worked on a few fiction films that were directed by Rutten⁵⁴⁷, and recorded at the Cinetone Studios in Duivendrecht, where Theo Güsten had become the director. However, none of them would be completed, since Cinetone was taken over by the Germans.

⁵⁴¹ Van Moerkerken, 1966, 15.

⁵⁴² Van Moerkerken, 1966, 15.

⁵⁴³ See: ‘Dagelijkse Kroniek 1938’, *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1939: XXIX.

⁵⁴⁴ The film is also known as LE PORT DE ROTTERDAM and GIGANTEN DER ARBEIT. There is no English version left, but it possible that it was also shown at the world exhibition in New York (1939).

⁵⁴⁵ Kijzer, P.; 1938: 124. Original quote: ‘Von Barsy is er in geslaagd zijn eigen artistieke visie op het onderwerp op de camera over te brengen en heeft daarbij uitsluitend gebruik gemaakt van zuiver filmische middelen.’

⁵⁴⁶ For a short description of his lighting characteristics, see: Van Moerkerken, 1966: 13. Von Barsy wrote also an article about his methodology, titled ‘Die Grundtypen der Szenenbeleuchtung’ (*Filmtechnik*, 1936).

⁵⁴⁷ IK FLUIT...IN DE HOOP DAT JIJ ZULT KOMEN; OOST, WEST, THUIS...?; DE MAGIËR VAN AMSTERDAM [on Rembrandt], all 1941, dir. Gerard Rutten.

Von Barsy stayed in Rotterdam during the first two years of the war, but there was no work for him to do anymore. In April 1942, Von Barsy and his wife moved to Baarn, a small town, where they got a large house in a green environment. It was actually too large for the two of them, and a young woman, named Amelia, came to live with them. Von Barsy had met her in The Hague, where she played the piano for a dance class. It seems that she became Von Barsy's muse, posing for his still camera⁵⁴⁸. However, he soon left for Berlin, to work there, although he rejected the Nazi regime⁵⁴⁹. His wife stayed in the Netherlands and wrote him several letters in which she asked him to come back; she did not understand how he could work in the country that so many had begun to hate⁵⁵⁰. Germany offered opportunities for him to continue his profession, which no longer existed in the Netherlands, but he refrained from working on propaganda films. He became the cameraman of the comedy *DAS BAD AUF DER TENNE* (1943, Volker von Collande), which was one of the first German colour films (shot on Agfacolor). In the same year he published the book *Raumbild-Fotografie*, a technical exposé of stereoscopic (3d) photography⁵⁵¹, which he had started already in Rotterdam.

Up until 1945, Von Barsy remained officially a resident of the Netherlands. In November of that year he moved to Munich, while he got divorced from his wife, who stayed in the Netherlands. He continued his work as a photographer and collaborated also on various documentaries. One of them was a production on a large event for European youth, at Loreley in 1951⁵⁵². During the shooting he met a twenty-two year old girl, Ruth Gossert, who attended the meeting. A complicated relationship started, since he lived with another girl, but in 1953 Andor and Ruth would marry. Assisting him, she quickly mastered the skills of photography, and for many years they collaborated on photographic projects. At the same time he worked as the leading cinematographer of the *Bayerisches Fernsehen* (1953-1956)⁵⁵³. Next to that he helped to set up *Das Deutsche Institut für Film und Fernsehen* in Munich (now: *Hochschule für Film und Fernsehen*), where he became a teacher⁵⁵⁴.

As the cameraman of the experimental German feature film *JONAS* (1957), directed by the avant-garde filmmaker and nerve-specialist Ottomar Domnick, he won the prize for best cinematography at the *Filmfestspielen* in Berlin. After *JONAS*, Von Barsy worked once more with Gerard Rutten, with whom he made the dramatised documentary *DE VLIEGENDE HOLLANDER* ("The Flying Dutchman", 1957), about Anthony Fokker. It did not become a success, largely due to, according to Rutten, the experimental soundtrack of the film, 'for which the public was not yet ready'. In 1960, Domnick and Von Barsy collaborated again on a feature film, *GINO*, called after the main character, who was a *Gastarbeiter* from Italy.

In the next years he mainly worked as a teacher, and as a photographer, together with his wife. She also drove him around in their Messerschmidt, and they often went walking in the mountains, where they loved to make stereoscopic photographs. At Christmas 1965 he suddenly died of a heart attack.

§ 5. reflections

Within the career of Von Barsy, *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* played a key role. It accurately mapped the port, literally, which made it a successful promotion of Rotterdam. This can be related to Tom Conley's idea of *Cartographic Cinema* (2007), which says that maps appear in almost every movie, and that films are a kind of maps within themselves. 'A film, like a

⁵⁴⁸ Ref. Monique Benning, daughter of Amelia Horselenberg, 2005-04-11, email correspondence.

⁵⁴⁹ Van Moerkerken, 1966: 15.

⁵⁵⁰ Letters in the personal archive of Von Barsy (collection of his second wife Ruth Barsy-Gossert, Munich, 2006)

⁵⁵¹ *Raumbild-Fotografie*, by Andor von Barsy, 1943, Verlag Wilhelm Knapp, Halle (Saale) – Bibliothek Carl Zeiss; www.stereoskopie.com > Literatur (2008-05-27).

⁵⁵² i.e. *EUROPA RUFT UNS [LORELEY, BEGEGNUNG EUROPÄISCHER JUGEND]*, 1952, Willi Mohaupt.

⁵⁵³ Kézdi-Kovács, 1996: > Barsy.

⁵⁵⁴ *Allgemeine Zeitung – kai*, 1965-12-30: 'Andor von Barsy †'

topographic projection, can be understood as an image that locates and patterns the imagination of its spectators. When it takes hold, a film encourages its public to think of the world in concert with its own articulation of space' (Conley, 2007: 1). Moreover, 'the occurrence of a map in a film is unique to its own context' (p5). The maps in *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* show the places where Von Barys had been shooting, which make it also possible to locate the films that he had shot before. Such places prompt Conley to say: *to each film its map*. 'To each its own "points de capiton," or points of stress that plot its relations with space, history and being' (ibid). This means an ontology of film beyond photographic realism and beyond the aesthetics of cinematography, editing or mise-en-scene. Such a mapping is a matter of film being part of an environment, for how it enables a film production. The maps shown by *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* show a segment of much larger maps that plot Von Barys's itinerary, of which this film is a sediment.

Von Barys's itinerary, as far as it concerns Rotterdam, starts with the film that he made with Theo Güsten. This failure, to communicate the potentiality of the port, generated a kind of 'noise'. It became the precondition for new commissions. The next films, however, would not have been made if the Olympic Games had not taken place in Amsterdam in 1928. It was because of this event that the *Nenijto* was organised in Rotterdam, which caused Transfilma to make several films. This history exemplifies how contingent events and individual efforts can make a difference, through positive feedback. I have illustrated it by the 'social life' (or the 'rise and fall') of *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS*. After the *Nenijto* was over, Transfilma used it as an exchange to secure its finances, in order to produce fiction films. While the film started to live a life of its own, to end up in pieces, Transfilma went bankrupt in the end. An additional factor to it was the arrival of the sound film, which required another practice of production, and more investments, but credits were difficult to get, due to the international economic crisis. All of this makes up an 'atlas' of maps related to *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* and various other films.

If Transfilma would have succeeded in its attempts, Von Barys would not have taken over the studio of Transfilma, and his career would have been a different one. He would not have made *HOOGSTRAAT*, for which he became known as an avant-garde filmmaker. This also applies to *DEAD WATER*, in which case we might add another contingent factor: the burning of his studio. Without the success of this film, Von Barys would not have worked on Riefenstahl's *OLYMPIA*, and because of that *TUSSCHEN AANKOMST EN VERTREK* would have been a different film, since it was supported by Tobis-Klangfilm. It was released in Germany as *GIGANTEN DER ARBEIT* and, together with the films that Von Barys made before, it contributed to Rotterdam's image in Germany, not the least within the higher ranks of the Nazis. The status that Rotterdam and its port established before WWII became the reason for its destruction, but also the precondition for its growth afterwards, and hence for its success as a modern city. This should not be misunderstood. There is no clear cause-and-effect as far as it concerns the films at stake. There is rather a contingency, a coincidence of things that bump into one another and that get reinforced as such.

A series of contingent events, which are characterised by trial-and-error, move things into a certain direction. In this way we might also see the diversity of films that Von Barys worked on: industrial productions, commercials, fiction films for entertainment, and avant-garde experiments. They did not oppose one another, but all helped to establish a common framework of modernity. Noise and randomness, idiosyncrasy and individual achievement, diversity and openness, allow for emergence to appear at a higher level. This, however, cannot happen if there would not be some kind of structure or regulation at the same time⁵⁵⁵.

Although it is hard to speak of creativity in terms of 'geometric functions' (Scott, 2000: 12), we still have to consider physical environments and social webs, to provide references and continuity. Concerning physical environments there are, in this case, the cities of Budapest, Munich, Berlin, and Rotterdam – through The Hague, and in respect of contacts we might

⁵⁵⁵ Cf. Bonabeau, Dorigo, Theraulaz, 1999: 10.

mention the network that linked these places, and in particular people like Gerard Rutten, Simon Koster, Emiel van Moerkerken and Curt Oertel, among others, with whom Von Bary kept in contact for many years.

Individual acts are important, but not in terms of authorship. On the one hand, one has to take into account the objectives at issue, and how one tries to achieve them, which I have addressed in terms of 'functional cinematography'. On the other hand, one should consider forces that may obstruct the course of things, interfere with them, or which change the objectives after all. Whether one tries to offer additional value to the subject matter, or when one tries to change one's orientation to find new opportunities, one has to be inventive to open up possibilities, in order to appropriate the things one encounters and the ideas and visions related to them.

CHAPTER 5. SHARED AGENDA

§ 1. improving conditions

In 1865, Rotterdam counted about 100,000 inhabitants. Fifty years later it was already about half a million, due to the rapid growth of its port. While the department of “Public Works” (Gemeentewerken) took care of the infrastructure and public facilities, private companies developed housing projects, mostly jerry-building. Besides that, there were highly deteriorated parts of downtown Rotterdam. Along with the problem of housing came social problems, and various socially engaged individuals and organisations took initiatives to address the issues and to improve the situation. This became a matter of a broader movement to change, modernise and to develop society, which was accelerated as a result of the events that took place during the first World War.

Although the Netherlands remained neutral during World War I, the country also suffered from it, especially Rotterdam, for its dependency on international trade⁵⁵⁶. According to Paul van de Laar (2000: 323), it was the collapse of the ‘transito’ economy and the end of Rotterdam as a ‘transitopolis’. World War I greatly affected, in ecological terms, the ‘biotic’ and ‘abiotic’ parameters of Rotterdam. Due to this crisis, unemployment rapidly increased, while there was also a shortage of food and fuel. At the same time there was a growing lack of appropriate housing; public health decreased and epidemic diseases proliferated. It caused protests, strikes and riots, which were countered by the army⁵⁵⁷. In this period general suffrage was introduced in the Netherlands (1917). As a consequence, the 1918 elections for the national parliament were won by the SDAP (socialists).

Besides that, prominent members of the SDAP in Rotterdam, Johan Brautigam and Arie Heijkoop, founded an overall and powerful union for transportation workers (CBTA). Together with the Rotterdam SDAP leader Arie de Zeeuw, and the general SDAP leader P.J. Troelstra, they proclaimed the revolution in the Netherlands, and first of all in Rotterdam, in November 1918. As Van de Laar has made clear (2000: 319), the conservative Mayor Zimmerman and the spokesman of the employers, SVZ-chairman H. Paul Nijgh, counted already on the assumption of power, after secret discussions had taken place with the SDAP-leaders. The idea of a revolution, however, was thwarted through military intervention⁵⁵⁸.

Shortly afterwards, when women’s suffrage was introduced too, the SDAP won the municipal elections in Rotterdam (1919), although they had to share power with others. Arie Heijkoop and Arie de Zeeuw were appointed as aldermen, for social interests and education respectively⁵⁵⁹.

housing models

While the problems of the old quarters in Rotterdam were addressed, various initiatives were taken to develop new residential areas. In 1913 the banker Karel Paul van der Mandele took the initiative for the development of garden village ‘Vreewijk’. He asked Hendrik Berlage, who drew ‘Plan Zuid’ in Amsterdam, to design the masterplan, which was elaborated by Marinus Granpré Molière⁵⁶⁰. The latter started on it while he was still an architect of the department of public works, and continued to work on it when he established his own studio. The project would subsequently be recorded on film by Willy Mullens (1919-1920). At the same time the garden village ‘Heijplaat’ (1913-1918, arch. H.A.J. Baanders) was built for the workers of the

⁵⁵⁶ In the period 1913-1917 the number of ships visiting the port of Rotterdam had dropped by 70% – Van de Laar, 2000: 315.

⁵⁵⁷ Van de Laar, 2000: 318.

⁵⁵⁸ Van de Laar, 2000: 319-320.

⁵⁵⁹ Besides the conservative mayor Zimmerman, the college counted five aldermen, with two of them representing confessional parties, and one being a progressive liberal; Van de Laar, 2000: 323.

⁵⁶⁰ Halbertsma & Van Ulzen (eds.), 2001: 98.

‘Rotterdam Dockyard Company’ (RDM)⁵⁶¹. These privately developed garden villages offered a blue-print for the ‘model projects’ that would be created by the municipality.

Being the Alderman for Social Interests, Arie Heijkoop became responsible for the municipal housing department (*Gemeentelijke Woningdienst*), which was directed by Auguste Plate (1917-1923). An early achievement of the department became the district ‘Spangen’, including the famous ‘Justus van Effencomplex’ (1919-1922, Michiel Brinkman)⁵⁶². It is a housing complex with public yards inside, from where one enters staircases to elevated walkways all around at the second floor. They offer access to the houses, enable door-to-door services, and facilitate contact between neighbours that stimulates community development. Next to that, the complex included public facilities such as a common laundry and a bathing house. When Brinkman worked on it, he and Willem Kromhout founded the architects association *Opbouw* (1920)⁵⁶³.

Opbouw was closely related to De Stijl. It included various artists and architects, among them Theo van Doesburg and J.J.P. Oud. They attempted to connect different artistic realms, largely based on the ideas of Berlage. It was Berlage, in his turn, who recommended Oud to the municipal housing department. Oud began to work on a project in Spangen as well, for which he invited Van Doesburg as an artistic collaborator. Unfortunately it resulted into a serious conflict between them, and the collaboration came to an end, but the principles of De Stijl would still inform the work of Oud. This was first reflected by his design for ‘Oud-Mathenesse’ (1922-1924). This modern residential quarter, built as a village outside the city, offered a new home to 350 families from the city centre, whose deteriorated houses were broken down. It was a social experiment, since socially troubled families were housed amidst well-doing neighbours⁵⁶⁴. Oud prepared the plans in collaboration with Th. Van Lohuizen, who came to work as a researcher for the housing department in 1921, where he developed a survey combining economic and demographic data. It marked the beginning of the rational, scientific city planning practice in Rotterdam⁵⁶⁵. Besides *Het Witte Dorp*, as the quarter was also called, Oud designed ‘Hoek van Holland’ (1924-1927) and the ‘Kieffhoek’ (1925-1930), which received international acclaim as models for social housing. They are also highlighted by the film *ROTTERDAM EN HOE HET BOUWDE* (1940, Wim ten Bosch)⁵⁶⁶.

These projects were built with the purpose to increase the so called *Existenzminimum*, to improve the living conditions of the working class. Oud did so through rationalizing the organisation of the dwellings and the allotment. He was assisted by Ida Liefrinck, who developed new concepts for the interior, including furniture, based on her conviction that planning and housing required a reorientation of society⁵⁶⁷. Cost-effectiveness and efficiency was, at the same time, combined with public facilities⁵⁶⁸.

Besides the projects that were carried out by the municipality itself, Heijkoop got involved with projects of external companies and architects. Among them are experiments of building in concrete, especially the housing quarters ‘Stulemeijer I’ (1921-1923, arch. J. van Hardeveld, J. Pauw) and ‘De Kossel I & II’ (1921-1924, arch. J. Hulsbosch)⁵⁶⁹. However, these innovative projects, with their cubist forms, raised resistance among the conservative members of the city council. For Heijkoop and the SDAP it became a matter of principle, which meant that he

⁵⁶¹ See: Groenendijk & Vollaard, 2007: 225.

⁵⁶² Wagenaar & Steenhuis, 2001; Van de Laar, 2000: 362.

⁵⁶³ As an alternative for the more traditional *Vereeniging Bouwkunst en Vriendschap*, cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 360.

⁵⁶⁴ Van de Laar, 2000: 363. This quarter was initially built for a period of 25 years.

⁵⁶⁵ Wagenaar, 1992: 53-58.

⁵⁶⁶ Extensive literature exists on these projects. An important entry to this literature is provided by a monograph on Oud, edited by Taverne (e.a.), 2001.

⁵⁶⁷ Holsappel, 2000: 3.

⁵⁶⁸ Taverne e.a., 2001: 274, 277.

⁵⁶⁹ Groenendijk & Vollaard, 2007: 254.

and De Zeeuw eventually withdrew as aldermen in 1921, in order to return two years later, when the SDAP won the elections once again⁵⁷⁰. The projects were continued, and more would follow. Among them was the project 'Lange Hilleweg' (1928-1929). It was developed by the private housing company *N.V. Volkswoningbouw*, which was established by Auguste Plate, the former director of the *Woningdienst*, together with the architect Willem van Tijen and with the support of Van Nelle director Kees van der Leeuw. Van Tijen researched the possibilities of different pre-fabricated construction systems, and chose for *Korrelbeton*, based on casting grinded slags. It had been developed by W. Greve, who had applied it in 'Betondorp' in Amsterdam, which is to be seen in the film *BETON EN WONINGBOUWFILM* (1923, Cor Aafjes). Such developments would inspire the author Ferdinand Bordewijk, who worked in Rotterdam, to write his science-fiction novel *Blokken* ("blocks", 1931)⁵⁷¹. He imagined a rectangular, rational world, a socialist state that would be as much utopian as dystopian.

However, Heijkoop also supported, for example, 'Het Colosseum' in the working class neighbourhood Hillesluis, close to the projects just mentioned. Its plan (1927-1929, arch. Wim ten Bosch & Henri Le Grand) combined a large cinema with housing, shops and a café with a public library⁵⁷². Rather than separating functions, it united various facilities to increase the attractiveness and service level of the district.

Notwithstanding the success of the municipality regarding housing, the depression of the 1930s turned the tide. It also implied a change of ideals, which is expressed, for example, by the film *KENT U HILLEGERSBERG?* (1932, Icrofilm), which promotes living in the wealthy suburb Hilleegersberg, with its traditionalist villas. While such environments became the ideal, less money was available for innovation and socially motivated projects. The Rotterdam City Council voted for a radical cutback of municipal expenditure, which caused socialist Aldermen Arie de Zeeuw and Johan Brautigam (who succeeded Heijkoop) to withdraw in 1932. In the next year Oud also left the *Woningdienst*, which was reorganised⁵⁷³. Private developers, particularly Auguste Plate, continued to build socially motivated housing projects. One of his most famous projects became the 'Bergpolderflat' (1932-1934), designed by Van Tijen and, not by coincidence, Brinkman & Van der Vlugt. With nine floors, it was the first high-rise housing block in Rotterdam built with a steel framework. It became a model for future developments.

Schoolbioscoop

While housing could improve the daily circumstances of the masses, education could do so by providing means to understand the world in which one lived. The educational film was thought to serve this purpose in an effective, innovative and entertaining way. Following the example of the Schoolbioscoop in The Hague, which was established in 1918, and directed by SDAP-member David van Staveren⁵⁷⁴, Alderman De Zeeuw founded the *Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop* in

⁵⁷⁰ The conflict became known as the *anti-beton campagne* (or *alkoofstrijd*), since the other parties preferred private developers to create social housing projects according to traditional principles (Van de Laar, 2000: 325).

⁵⁷¹ It was published by *De Gemeenschap* (Utrecht) that also published writings on architecture and film, by people like Van Ravesteyn and Ter Braak, a.o.

⁵⁷² This cinema, with more than 1000 seats, was an initiative of Carel Zwanenburg, after he had sold his Luxor cinema to the German UFA, in 1926 (see: www.bonas.nl > Wim ten Bosch, visited: August 2007).

⁵⁷³ See: Taverne e.a., 2001: 197. In 1936, the *Gemeentelijke Woningdienst*, the departments of *Stadsontwikkeling* and *Gemeentewerken* became the new *Gemeentelijke Technische Dienst*, see: De Klerk & Moscoviter, 1992: 5.

⁵⁷⁴ Its precursor was established in 1915, by Herman van Capelle, the director of the *Museum ten bate van het Onderwijs* in The Hague, of which it became a part, see: [http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Herman_van_Cappelle_\(geoloog\)](http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Herman_van_Cappelle_(geoloog)) (2008-11-02). In 1918 it became a separate institution. Van Staveren was appointed by Johan Albarda, SDAP-alderman in The Hague for finance (1917-1923) – for Albarda see: Knegtman, 2002; for Van Staveren see: Hogenkamp, 1995, for the schoolbioscoop in general, see: Hogenkamp, 1985; De Haan, 1995: 29-31. *Schoolbioscopen* and related institutions were established in Alkmaar, Amsterdam, Arnhem, Delft, Krommenie, Leeuwarden, Leiden, Rotterdam, The Hague and Zutphen. In some other cities portable projectors were used, which were promoted and traded by Polygoon (De Haan, 1995: 29-31). Polygoon organised also a travelling school cinema, across the Netherlands, since 1921 until at least 1927 (De Haan, 1995: 47).

Rotterdam, in July 1920⁵⁷⁵. Its director became Abraham Melis van der Wel (•1879-†1961), who had been a teacher of drawing before⁵⁷⁶. The institute made use of a theatre, with eighty seats, in the *Scheepvaartkundig Instituut en Museum* (“Naval Institute and Museum”)⁵⁷⁷. The films covered geography and biology above all, and furthermore physics, economics and history. They were shown to children from the last two grades of elementary school (age 10-12), and explained by Van der Wel, every school day, in four programmes, from 9 am to 4.15 pm. In this way, each school class attended three programmes per year.

Teachers were invited to attend a screening before, and to prepare the lessons with their pupils at school. To that end, Van der Wel provided detailed descriptions of the films in advance, which turned out to be an effective method, according to reactions of the teachers. Soon there were requests from secondary schools to attend screenings as well, but the *Schoolbioscoop* did not have the capacity to help them too⁵⁷⁸. Van der Wel tried nevertheless to find opportunities during the evening, and as such he started to organise screenings for adolescents (*rijpere jeugd*), next to a number of interested professional organisations⁵⁷⁹.

Due to the success, the accommodation was soon too small. This was also remarked by the Rotterdam branch of the “Dutch Fellowship of Teachers”, in a letter to the Mayor and Aldermen⁵⁸⁰. It even argued for *five* school cinemas, one in every part of the city, so that pupils did not have to travel across the whole city, and that they could attend film programmes more frequently. The municipal department of education received offers from various organisations to use their accommodation, among them the theatre of the progressive community centre ‘Ons Huis’, and a catholic community centre at Afrikaanderplein in the south of Rotterdam⁵⁸¹. The latter would become an auxiliary branch. ‘Ons Huis’, with 400 seats, was a serious option, but in order to control the pupils, and for Van der Wel to explain the films, it was too big. Eventually the main theatre was established in the building of the “Union of Dutch Teachers” (*Bond Nederlandsche Onderwijzers*), which could host 160 pupils⁵⁸².

The programmes depended on the available titles, which were distributed by a few film production companies, the school museum in The Hague and occasionally by industrial enterprises, such as Van Nelle (i.e. THEEFILM [Java], 1919, Dick van der Leeuw). Although there was an increasing demand for educational films, there were a few companies involved with producing them, among them IWA, Haghe Film and Polygoon. Van der Wel got actively

⁵⁷⁵ Cf. De Ruyter-De Zeeuw, 1990b. Westhoff (1995: 78)

⁵⁷⁶ Van der Wel worked as a teacher of drawing since 1903 (Westhoff, 1995: 78). See also the letter of 1922-06-23/27 of Mayor and Aldermen to the city council, on the conditions of the appointment of Van der Wel, coll. GAR, archive ‘Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam, afd. Onderwijs’, toegangsnr. 351.01/1061-76 (*Schoolbioscoop*), volgnr. 3a.

⁵⁷⁷ This museum was located at Haringvliet 68. A visit to the museum before or after the screening was highly recommended (as mentioned on the visiting schedules that were sent to the schools, see 351.01/1061-76 (*Schoolbioscoop*), volgnr. 1). Extensive documentation about the programmes, and the classes that visited them, can be found in the collection of the GAR, archive ‘Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam, afd. Onderwijs’, toegangsnr. 351.01, inv. nr. 1061 (1922: dossier 76), 1079 (1923: dossier 82), 1093 (1924: dossier 114), 1111 (1925: dossier 111), 1126 (1926: dossier 110), 1138 (1927: dossier 64), 1157 (1928: dossier 64), 1177 (1922: dossier 64), 1196 (1930: dossier 65).

⁵⁷⁸ *Verslag van den Gem. Schoolbioscoop, dienstjaar 1921, 1922-06-19*, coll. GAR, archive ‘Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam, afd. Onderwijs’, toegangsnr. 351.01/1061-76 (*Schoolbioscoop*), volgnr. 8.

⁵⁷⁹ E.g. an association for the graphical industry (*Nederlandsche Vereeniging van Chefs in het Grafisch Bedrijf*).

⁵⁸⁰ Letter of the *Nederlandsch Onderwijzers-Genootschap, afd. Rotterdam*, coll. GAR, archive ‘Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam, afd. Onderwijs’, toegangsnr. 351.01/1079-82 (*Schoolbioscoop*), volgnr. 1.

⁵⁸¹ Letter by ‘Ons Huis’ (Mr. W. Drucker) to Alderman A. van der Hoeven, 1923-05-08, and letter by the ‘R.K. Vereenigingsgebouw’, Afrikaanderplein, to the ‘Referendaris Bureau Onderwijs’, 1923-11-22, coll. GAR, archive ‘Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam, afd. Onderwijs’, toegangsnr. 351.01/1079-82 (1923, *Schoolbioscoop*), respectively volgnr. 9 and volgnr. 6.

⁵⁸² The decision was made by the city council on 1925-12-17. On the 8th of April 1926 the new accommodation was opened, at Goudsche straat 26 (ref. *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1927: XXIV). *Gemeentewerken* had rebuilt it (a map is part of the documentation). Much of the correspondence of the *Schoolbioscoop* in 1924 concerns the creation of this theatre, see: GAR, archive Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam, afd. Onderwijs’, toegangsnr. 351.01/1093-114 (1924, *Schoolbioscoop*).

involved with them⁵⁸³. Most famous is the feature length Polygoon production DE RIJN VAN LOBITH TOT AAN ZEE (1922, A.M. van der Wel, I.A. Ochse) about the Dutch part of the river Rhine. This geographical film has been praised for its aesthetic qualities, which was the work of Polygoon cameraman Iep Ochse⁵⁸⁴. From a boat on the river, one sees the landscape and towns along the Rhine, from Lobith, where it enters the Netherlands, to the port of Rotterdam and the sea. In this way the film shows the position of the city, that is, how it is connected to different places⁵⁸⁵. There is hence a direct relationship between the sequences of the film (2,572m) and the course of the river (170 km in NL), with a ‘scale’ of 1:65. In the meantime Van der Wel started to make films himself, from February 1922. This engagement with production was still before the association of Dutch municipalities (VNG) put the issue of the production of educational films on the agenda for a special meeting in June 1922⁵⁸⁶. This was a call to come to a frequent production output, which the film industry was yet to meet. Van der Wel partly filled this gap. In September 1922, the programme of the Schoolbioscoop included the first film made by Van der Wel, about mounted police in Rotterdam. Various films followed⁵⁸⁷. Within eleven years, Van der Wel, assisted by an operator, would make more than forty films in total, from about ten minutes to more than an hour⁵⁸⁸.

The production of these films finally caused Van der Wel to establish the *Gemeentelijke Filmfabriek*, in 1925⁵⁸⁹. The films were first of all made for the youth of Rotterdam, but several of them were distributed too, while others were shown to groups of adults as well. An example is

⁵⁸³ According to the NFM, Van der Wel collaborated on the film MAAN (“Moon”, 1921), together with Otto van Neijenhoff (IWA) and George Debels (who did the animation). With Mullens, Van der Wel made VELUWE (1922). Most important, however, has been the connection with Polygoon. This company was founded in 1920, by Jules Stoop, who had previously made educational films with Hollandia, which he wanted to continue with his new company. Polygoon started to make a series on Northsea fishing: DE NEDERLANDSCHE NOORDZEEVISSCHERIJ (“The Dutch North Sea Fishing”, 1921-1923, Polygoon). While the images were recorded by I.A. Ochse and C. Aafjes, it was directed by Dr. Jan Metzelaar, a lecturer on fishing, and A.C.P.E. Vermeulen, director of the *Visscherijschool* in Vlaardingen. Van der Wel, who had already included films by Polygoon in his programmes before, would play the role of an intermediary (Hogenkamp, 1988: 30); the Schoolbioscoop was based in the naval institute, while Van der Wel had also contacts with other educational organisations in the region. The first part of the series was about trawler fishing that operated from the port of IJmuiden (released in 1921, when it was also included in the programme of the Schoolbioscoop). The second part would be about herring fishing, mainly from Vlaardingen (released in 1922, also part of the Schoolbioscoop program), while the third part was about *beugvisscherij* (static fishing), which operated from Vlaardingen too.

⁵⁸⁴ Hogenkamp, 1986: 154.

⁵⁸⁵ A similar view on Rotterdam would later be expressed at the world exhibition in Antwerp in 1930, where a panoramic mural was presented that was called “The hinterland of Rotterdam” (desig: Jaap Gidding), which showed the river Rhine from Rotterdam to Basel, see: Halberstma, 2001: 216.

⁵⁸⁶ Letter of the *Vereeniging van Nederlandsche Gemeenten*, 1922-06-14, coll. GAR, archive ‘Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam, afd. Onderwijs’, toegangsnr. 351.01/1061-76 (Schoolbioscoop), volgnr. 4.

⁵⁸⁷ The films were first presented to education authorities, see: ‘Schoolfilms’, p6 in: *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 6, 1923. Mentioned are: VELUWE, MELK EN MELKPRODUCTEN, LANGS DUIN EN STRAND (all 1922).

⁵⁸⁸ This number corresponds approximately to the titles mentioned in the filmography. The number of forty is also mentioned by J.E. van der Pot (letter of 1934-10-04 to Stichting ‘Bevordering van Volkskracht’ – collection: GAR, toegangsnr. 618, inventarisnr. 904, Schoolbioscoop 1934-1935). Next to that, a collaboration was established with H.K.J. van den Bussche, a teacher at the Prinses Juliana School in Djokjakarta (Java), who made educational films about subjects in Java. He had approached Van der Wel after reading an article in the NRC about DE RIJN VAN LOBITH TOT AAN ZEE, letter of 1923-01-21, coll. GAR, archive ‘Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam, afd. Onderwijs’, toegangsnr. 351.01/1079-82 (1923, Schoolbioscoop), volgnr. 10. For a confirmation of this collaboration, see a letter by the alderman for education to Van der Wel, 1924-05-06, toegangsnr. 351.01/1093-114 (1924, Schoolbioscoop).

⁵⁸⁹ The first request as such was expressed in a letter by Van der Wel to the alderman for education, 1923-02-26, coll. GAR, archive ‘Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam, afd. Onderwijs’, toegangsnr. 351.01/1079-82 (1923, Schoolbioscoop), volgnr. 10. For further preparations, see various documents at the GAR, archive ‘Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam, afd. Onderwijs’, toegangsnr. 351.01/1093-114 (1924, Schoolbioscoop). This includes a plan by *Gemeentewerken* (accompanying a letter by M. de Roode to alderman A. de Jong for *Plaatselijke Werken*) to rebuild the space (6 x 12m) for this purpose. The *Filmfabriek* would be located at the C.P. Tielestraat 12; it was opened on the 23rd of August 1925 – ref. *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1926: XXXV.

MET DE PAARDENTRAM NAAR OVERSCHIE (1925). It is about the phenomenon of the horsetram, with the cameraman being a passenger. As the film shows, the tram runs from the city to the village of Overschie, just outside Rotterdam. It was made as a historical document, since the horse tram was about to be substituted by an electric tram⁵⁹⁰. Like the boat at the Rhine, the tram itself is the cinematic vehicle. The film offers the viewer a mobile perspective, and an ongoing change of scenes, with contrasting images of busy and quiet places. Like this film, as a historical document, Van der Wel also made DE VISCHMARKT TE ROTTERDAM, 1881-1930, which showed the delivery and trade of fish as it used to be for many decades. Historical recordings of yet another kind were those of the severe winter of 1928-1929, with exceptional images of cars driving at the frozen river Nieuwe Maas.

Van der Wel often collaborated with specialists in the fields at issue. In 1927, for example, he made the film ELECTRICITEIT EN HAAR TOEPASSINGEN in collaboration with electrical engineer H.H. Ehrenburg, head of the municipal electricity works (GEB)⁵⁹¹. In a similar way he collaborated with B.G. Meyer, head of the municipal traffic department, on the film VEILIG VERKEER (“Safe Traffic”, 1930). The latter, of about half an hour, is one of the most remarkable films by Van der Wel. At the beginning, it is explicitly mentioned that it is not just meant for a youth audience. It is a quasi slap-stick, about things that go wrong in traffic, followed by a teaching what one should do instead. There are images how one should enter a tram, or how to cross a street when you are with a school class. Several times one sees a school class crossing the street, in rows and fronts. In another scene one sees a busy street, with children playing on the sidewalks and a hand cart that bumps into a pedestrian. The image that follows shows a playground for children. It corresponds to the ideas of modern urbanism advocating zoning. According to the CIAM principles, traffic and leisure should be separated, just like working and living, which are the other main functions of the city.

VEILIG VERKEER smoothly integrates traffic rules with ideas of how a modern city should function. This is emphasised by an image of a big traffic square that functions as a roundabout. An intertitle says: ‘modern traffic in a big city: Circulation System’. The film creates an awareness of and an engagement with urban development, which was considered a precondition for social development. The main purpose of the Schoolbioscoop was to educate the city youth and to develop their ideas concerning their environments. This links up with a remark on CIAM and Le Corbusier by political anthropologist James C. Scott.

The original manifesto of CIAM called for primary school students to be taught the elementary principles of scientific housing: the importance of sunlight and fresh air to health, the rudiments of electricity, heat, lighting, and sound; the right principles of furniture design; and so on. These were matters of science, not of taste; instruction would create, in time, a clientele worthy of the scientific architect. Whereas the scientific forester could, as it were, go right to work in the forest and shape it to his plan, the scientific architect was obliged to first train a new clientele that would “freely” choose the urban life that Le Corbusier had planned for them. (Scott, 1998: 114)

⁵⁹⁰ Whereas the horse tram itself had come instead of a steam tram, in 1890, which had been too dangerous.

⁵⁹¹ Van der Wel and Ehrenburg, who established his name through the construction of the power stations at the Galileïstraat (i.c.w. city architect V.A. Van der Steur) and the extended one of the Schiehaven (a.o.), had previously already discussed the idea of an educational film, for national distribution, which resulted in a film that was shot in Amsterdam and produced by another production company (names unknown). Teachers who attended its first screening were unsatisfied, since it did not suit educational purposes. This opinion was shared by Van der Wel and schools inspector Kreiken, and one decided, together with Ehrenburg, to make a new film. ‘Een film over electriciteit’, p4 in: *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 23, 1927. For Ehrenburg, see: Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis > Ehrenburg, Hillebrand Hendrik; www.iisg.nl/ondernemers/pdf/pers-0423-01.pdf (2008-11-04)

The manifesto was 'Die Erklärung von La Sarraz', which was the result of the first CIAM congress, held in La Sarraz, Switzerland (1928). One of the four headings concerned 'architecture and public opinion', which was a statement to educate people in the way Scott explained it.

The link to CIAM might have been a direct one. At the CICI conference in La Sarraz one year later, filmmaker and Filmliga member Mannus Franken was the Dutch representative⁵⁹². He was also the chairman of an association for educational films (*Vereeniging voor Onderwijs- en Ontwikkelingsfilms*), which was a collaboration of school cinemas from different cities⁵⁹³. As a member of the Filmliga he established also a link with educational cinema⁵⁹⁴. This completes the circle, since the architects within the Filmliga had direct links with CIAM, among them Cornelis van Eesteren, who was its chairman (1930-1947). Mannus Franken, in his turn, concretised the shared agenda by his film *MODERNE NEDERLANDSCHE ARCHITECTUUR* (1930).

In the case of Van der Wel, however, the films were not *about* modernity, but *for* modernity – to paraphrase Elizabeth Lebas (2000: 141). Besides the film on traffic being an early example of its kind, one can detect other programmatic links with architecture and urbanism. Many of the films by Van der Wel concern nature and agriculture⁵⁹⁵. In the *SLOOT EN PLAS* (1925), for example, children go out in the fields to discover the treasures of nature⁵⁹⁶. Other films are detailed records of the life of various plants and animals. A remarkable example is a film about birds in and around Rotterdam (1930), in the city centre, in parks and in nature areas close to the city (e.g. *De Beer*). This film, of almost an hour, was coloured through green, blue and yellow tinting. Like some other films by Van der Wel, it was accompanied by a text book, written by schools inspector H.G.C. Kreiken. The film starts, as explained by the book (p3), with a critical note on modern poultry farming, since chicken had become 'food machines'; the film shows instead how birds actually live their lives in nature. The film was based on the idea that modern human beings should respect nature, and that the connection with it should be revitalised.

Similar ideas underlay the modern movement within architecture and planning, which became manifest in Rotterdam through garden villages, Witteveen's idea of parkways, and various plans for city parks, like 'Vroesenpark' (1921, Willem Kromhout), and most important, the 'Kralingse Bos- en Parkplan' (1921-1927, Klijnen, Granpré Molière, Verhagen, Kok)⁵⁹⁷. The latter was a forestry plan for the 'Kralingerhout' to create woods in direct connection to the city. Van der Wel also paid attention to it, through the film *BOOMPLANTDAG IN DEN KRALINGERHOUT TE ROTTERDAM* (1928). In this film we see masses of school children planting trees. This film, as well as others in which school children appeared themselves, actively engaged them with their surroundings, especially since they could subsequently see themselves in the film.

Whereas such films addressed the importance of nature, modern architecture had to make space for open and green cities, to integrate nature and the built environment. In that perspective we can also view Van der Wel's films about the countryside and various provinces of the Netherlands⁵⁹⁸. One should realise here that they were first of all made for the youth of the city,

⁵⁹² The *Congrès International d'Architecture Moderne* (CIAM) was organised by Hélène de Mandrot at her castle in La Sarraz. The next year she organised the *Congrès International de Cinéma Indépendant* (CICI). Among its participants were Alberto Cavalcanti, Walter Ruttmann, Hans Richter, Béla Balázs, Sergei Eisenstein and Mannus Franken (see: Heijs, 1982: 439). CIAM got a follow up in Frankfurt (1929). It was organised by Ernst May, who himself related film and architecture in an overall media concept under the banner of *Das Neue Frankfurt*, as addressed by Elsaesser (2005b). After this occasion, a series of congresses followed, so that it began to function as a permanent international platform.

⁵⁹³ Hogenkamp, 1985.

⁵⁹⁴ On the 4th of November 1927, a conference was organised in The Hague for representatives of the Filmliga, the *Vereeniging voor Onderwijs- en Ontwikkelingsfilms* and the *Volkshogeschoolen* (VU), in order to look for possibilities to collaborate, see: *Filmliga* 1927/3, p13.

⁵⁹⁵ e.g. *MELK EN MELKPRODUCTEN*, 1922; *KAASVERVAARDIGING*, 1925, *LANDBOUWBEDRIJVEN*, 1927.

⁵⁹⁶ Other examples are *DE LIBELLE* (1922), *DE STINKZWAM* (1925), *VOORJAAR* (1927) a.o.

⁵⁹⁷ For the history of these plans, see e.g. Van de Laar, 2000: resp. 307, 359, 355/368.

⁵⁹⁸ This includes films about the Veluwe (1922), Zuid-Limburg (1925), Drente (1927), Zeeland (1932), among others.

and a part of this youth came hardly ever outside it⁵⁹⁹. If we take both the cinematic countryside and the real city together, we have the ideal image of the films: an environment that is both urban and green, which propels the trinity of fresh air, and an abundance of light and space.

A case that exemplifies yet another dimension of the programmatic links is the film *SCHOOL VOOR VROUWENARBEID* ("School for Women's Labour", 1933). It was made because of the 25th anniversary of the school, to which it was presented by the municipality during the official celebrations (1933-10-24)⁶⁰⁰. The purpose of the film, however, was to stimulate girls to continue their education at one of the five schools of the association⁶⁰¹. It was a progressive institution, which was founded to offer chances to working class girls⁶⁰². The first part of the film consists of acted scenes. A mother and daughter see an advertisement for a job as a housekeeper, the daughter applies, but she makes mistakes. Training at the *School voor Vrouwenarbeid* offers the solution. The film shows, in a straightforward way, how the girls learn writing and things like sewing, washing, first aid, baby-care, and cooking, which happens in a large and spacious kitchen, and afterwards they enjoy their meal. Besides practical experience, the school was also important to create a sense of community, which the film emphasizes through a school camp (at *Huis ter Heide*).

Considering the film's purpose, there is a direct link to housing issues. While this film was being made, the architect Han van Loghem was asked to build a new *School voor Vrouwenarbeid* (1934-1935), or actually to rebuild two existing schools and to make extensions⁶⁰³. Although this 'renovation' might not seem to be an important architectural project at first, it was well received by critic W. van Gelderen in the magazine *De 8 & Opbouw* (1935: 95-97). He even considered it to be exemplary for modern school accommodation. The exterior is of little interest here, but the interior is all the more important. It contained two complete model dwellings, each with two floors and a staircase. Van Loghem also designed the furniture, which was made of steel and wood. The furnishing of the rooms in general was of 'the greatest possible simplicity and effectivity [*zakelijkheid*]'. In that way the dwellings truly functioned as templates, and as such they were of educational value themselves, as Van Gelderen pointed out. This counted for all other classrooms too, like the kitchens and laundries, which were described as 'open, liberated spaces, where the future housewives work and learn in an atmosphere that they will later consider as a precondition for their dwellings'⁶⁰⁴. The girls were not only trained in housekeeping, but they were also taught what modern living is about.

The article by Van Gelderen in *De 8 & Opbouw* was followed by a printed version of a radio lecture held by D. Oppenheimer-Belinfante (1935), from the Dutch Association of Housewives. She advocated that modern living, and the development of modern housing as its consequence, is first of all a matter of training housewives. They, in turn, set their standards, which is a major power for the development of housing design. This statement, which was endorsed by the editorial board of *De 8 & Opbouw*, followed about ten years after the publication of Bruno Taut's influential book *Die Neue Wohnung. Die Frau als Schöpferin* (1924), which, in its turn, was based on the famous American book *Household Engineering; Scientific*

⁵⁹⁹ See, for example, the documentary *EENE WONING VOOR DEN WERKMAN* (1972, Leo Akkermans), with explanations by residents of garden village 'Vreewijk'.

⁶⁰⁰ It followed after speeches by Chairman J. Drost, Minister of Education H. Marchant, Alderman of Education F. Nivard and others. See: 'Zilveren jubileum School voor Vrouwenarbeid', in: *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1933-10-25 and 'School voor Vrouwenarbeid', *NRC*, 1933-10-25.

⁶⁰¹ I.e. Jonker Fransstraat, Drievriendenstraat, Schinkelstraat, Dillenburgstraat, Lange Torenstraat.

⁶⁰² It was founded (1908), as a private initiative, by Willem Baartz, director of the Oranjeboom beer brewery, and his wife Baartz-Van Hall (GAR: archive 'Familie Baartz-Van Hall, entry nr. 935). Due to their efforts, the school would also be supported by the municipality, the province of Zuid-Holland, and the state. See: 'Zilveren jubileum School voor Vrouwenarbeid', in: *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1933-10-25.

⁶⁰³ i.e. at the Koningsveldstraat.

⁶⁰⁴ W. van Gelderen, 1935: 97.

Management in the Home (1919), by Christine Frederick. The architects of the modern movement, first of all in Germany, where the book was published in 1922, realised that the woman, as a housewife, was crucial for the development of modern housing. According to Mark Peach (1995: 458; cf. Heynen, 2001: 718), the modernists tried to improve the conditions for women, but in general they did not question social institutions themselves. He argues that most architects still saw the modern woman as a housewife, for whom they sought to make day-to-day tasks less burdensome, by making her work more efficient. The kitchen, as the place of intensive home labour, was therefore considered to be the main focus for functionalist reform. This is not only reflected by the school design of Van Loghem, but also by the famous Bruynzeel kitchen designs of Piet Zwart, a couple of years later.

However, the conclusion of Peach, that the modernists did not question the role of women, is a problematic one. Architecture was indeed a male dominated profession, and it might also be true that most of them followed middle-class values. But as Peach himself points out, in order to change social roles and institutions, alternatives must be elaborate enough to be interesting for the masses. And indeed, the great majority of the women at that time, in the Netherlands even more than in Germany, were housewives. In order to make change possible, gradual developments were most likely to be successful. In the case of Rotterdam, it was not so much a case of moderate ideas, on the contrary – consider for example the ideas of Ida Liefrinck – but still a matter of exploring real possibilities. Politicians, architects and filmmakers, among other, contributed to social reform. The example of the *School voor Vrouwenarbeid* shows that Van der Wel with his film, and Van Loghem with his design mobilised the girls, in order to develop new living standards and individual prospects.

The film SCHOOL VOOR VROUWENARBEID was the last film that Van der Wel would produce. The Schoolbioscoop came to an end in December 1933, when new aldermen had been installed – no socialists – and government expenses were cut, which had similarly affected the municipal housing department⁶⁰⁵. There were attempts to continue the Schoolbioscoop as part of the *Maatschappij tot nut van 't Algemeen* in Rotterdam, a privately funded organisation that was concerned with people's development through education. The idea to integrate the Schoolbioscoop in its activities was proposed by its secretary Johannes van der Pot, the director (librarian) of the influential *Rotterdamsch Leeskabinet*, who had previously been the vice-chairman of the Filmliga Rotterdam (which was also dissolved in 1933). In this way, it was argued, the children from the highest grades of 210 schools could still attend film screenings, three times a year, and this service would be for free since the organisation worked with volunteers. Moreover, films by Van der Wel were still available, and additional titles would be rented for a small amount of money from the Schoolbioscoop in The Hague. To cover additional costs Van der Pot applied for funds from the private foundation *Bevordering van Volkskracht* ("Promotion of People's Power"). Within two days the application was rejected, but without a clear motivation⁶⁰⁶. Exactly one year later, on the 4th of October 1935, Van der Pot wrote another letter to ask once more for support, since the conditions had changed. The municipal electricity works (GEB), in its new high-rise office tower, was now in charge of the films and organised screenings. The link with the GEB had already been established with the production of the film

⁶⁰⁵ Mentioned in the letter by J.E. van der Pot (see below). In the meantime, a prominent figure in the field of youth work in Rotterdam, dr. W.E. van Wijk (former director of *De Arend*, see: Selten, 2005: 65), was appointed director of the school museum and the related *Schoolbioscoop* in The Hague shortly before (*Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1934: XXVIII). He was in favour of continuing the Schoolbioscoop in Rotterdam, as well as former schools inspector H.G.C. Kreiken, with whom Van der Wel had closely collaborated before, and J.C.J. van Schagen, municipal administrator of education, next to librarian J.E. van der Pot who wrote a letter (1934-10-04) to the board of Stichting 'Bevordering van Volkskracht' to ask for funding – collection: GAR, Stichting 'Bevordering van Volkskracht', toegangsnr. 618, inventarisnr. 904, Schoolbioscoop 1934-1935.

⁶⁰⁶ Reply (letter) of 6 October 1934 of the stichting *Bevordering van Volkskracht* to the board of 'het Departement Rotterdam der Maatschappij tot Nut van 't Algemeen', collection: GAR, 'Stichting Bevordering van Volkskracht', toegangsnr. 618, inventarisnr. 904, Schoolbioscoop 1934-1935.

ELECTRICITEIT EN HAAR TOEPASSINGEN (1927), in collaboration with H. Ehrenburg, who was also a photography enthusiast⁶⁰⁷. Van der Pot then asked for support to organise screenings in the south of Rotterdam as well. This was rejected again⁶⁰⁸. The Schoolbioscoop continued in some form, but no production would be carried out anymore. Van der Wel, in his turn, left Rotterdam and would make no more films⁶⁰⁹.

Taken together the Schoolbioscoop in Rotterdam exemplifies a process of collective learning and communication within and through a particular environment, in which places are marked by buildings and films, as references or ‘stigmas’, in order to appropriate and develop the environment subsequently. This suggests a correspondence to ‘stigmergy’, which is a concept that was first coined to explain the emergence of complex structures among social insects, and more recently it has been applied to human communication systems as well as human cognition and culture (Bonabeau, 1999; Susi & Ziemke, 2001)⁶¹⁰. Stigmergy is a notion to address the environment as a medium of communication⁶¹¹. Agents encounter stimuli that provide local information, in order to add to, or to change the configuration that subsequently provides information again, and so on. Stigmergy applies to the environment and information about it, which in this case concerns film, as part of, and augmenting the environment.

§ 2. social engagement

Over the course of the 1920s, social movements in Rotterdam became well organised and they were supported by various media. This included the publication of magazines and newspapers, such as the locally published socialist newspaper *Voorwaarts*⁶¹². Film was also frequently applied, for example by HAKA, an association of cooperatives for consumption products. It commissioned films to promote a socialist way of producing and trading. An early example is PROPAGANDAFILM VERBRUIKSCOÖPERATIE IN NEDERLAND (1924), which was produced by Polygoon that came to the fore as an innovative and progressive film company, especially through its young and talented cameraman and vice-president Cor Aafjes. More films followed in the next years, among them OP VOOR DE COÖPERATIEVE PRODUCTIE (1928, Polygoon)⁶¹³. It not only shows the HAKA companies and their production processes, but it also addresses its social programme, for example by showing the HAKA youth library. Remarkable is a futuristic drawing that presents an imagined HAKA complex, like a tower of Babel. It is highly suggestive, especially because of the next shots of Rotterdam, and particularly the place where a new factory is planned. This would be the subject of the already mentioned construction film DE COÖPERATIEVE PRODUCTIE GROEIT (1932, Polygoon). And still more films followed⁶¹⁴.

A related and highly remarkable production, commissioned by the *Centrale Bond van Nederlandsche Verbruikscoöperaties*, was the feature fiction film DE MAARSCHALKSTAF (“The Marshal’s Baton”, 1929), which was produced by Transfilma, directed by Luc Willink and shot by Andor von Barys, who were both members of the Filmliga. However, this film is now missing

⁶⁰⁷ Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis > Ehrenburg, Hillebrand Hendrik; www.iisg.nl/ondernemers/pdf/pers-0423-01.pdf (2008-11-04).

⁶⁰⁸ Letter of 1935-10-04 by Van der Pot to St. ‘Bevordering van Volkskracht’, and a reply of 1935-10-10, collection: GAR, Stichting ‘Bevordering van Volkskracht’, toegangsnr. 618, inventarisnr. 904, Schoolbioscoop 1934-1935.

⁶⁰⁹ Westhoff, 1995: 78.

⁶¹⁰ cf. CALResCo, 2008: §6.12; Bonabeau, Dorigo, Theraulaz, 1999: 14; the term was coined by the French biologist Pierre-Paul Grassé in the 1950s. It is derived from the Greek words *stigma* (sting, mark) and *ergon* (work, action).

⁶¹¹ Bonabeau, Dorigo, Theraulaz, 1999: 16. For the conception of the environment as a medium in respect of urban complexity, see also e.g. Salingaros, 2005: 230.

⁶¹² Van Vree, 2001: 142.

⁶¹³ See also: WAAROM JUFFROUW PIETERSE LID VAN DE COÖPERATIE WERD (1925) and the fictional RECLAME FILM HAKA. EEN AVONTUURLIJKE WASDAG (1925).

⁶¹⁴ DAT IS VAN ONS (1934, Polygoon), to promote HAKA products and their production process (at a time of crisis); NEDERLAND BOUWT AAN ZIJN TOEKOMST (1937, Polygoon), on HAKA and progress in the Netherlands; DOOR EENDRACHT STERK! COÖPERATIEF AAN 'T WERK! (1937, Polygoon), like the previous, but focused on Rotterdam.

and forgotten, except for a reference in the filmography of Dutch silent fiction films compiled by Geoffrey Donaldson (1997: 273). According to him, it tells the story of the owner of three large stores, and a young ambitious owner of a cooperative shop. The first believes in the free market, the other in cooperative trade. When the daughter of the first wants to marry the second a problem arises, which escalates, but when a grandchild is born things come to change, and finally the older man joins the union of cooperations, and the son-in-law becomes the new manager. The film seems to be an immediate reaction upon a fiction film made shortly before, called *KLASSENSTRIJD* (“Class Struggle”, 1928, Willy Mullens), which expressed the opposite message, favouring liberalism⁶¹⁵. Since *DE MAARSCHALKSTAF* was not a regular feature film, its distribution must have been different from the usual cinema circuit too⁶¹⁶.

Although it is not clear where this film was shown, we might draw a link to the *Instituut voor Arbeidersontwikkeling* (IvAO, “Institute for Workers Development”). It was an educational institution, established by the socialist party SDAP and the general union NVV, with its own film department (*Filmdienst*, 1925-1935). It was initially headed by Jef Last, who drove all over the Netherlands with the “Red Car” (*Roode Auto*): an ambulant cinema for the masses, showing socialist films to various organisations⁶¹⁷. Through the IvAO some films were made too, like in 1926 when Polygoon’s Cor Aafjes made a film for the *Arbeiders Jeugd Centrale* (PINKSTERFEEST AJC).

The IvAO had also connections with ‘Ons Huis’, a cultural institution to educate the working class. In its centre at the Gouvernestraat (later Lantaren/Venster), it had a theatre with 400 seats for performances, lectures and film screenings, while it also held exhibitions, organised by people like Piet Zwart and Paul Schuitema⁶¹⁸. They, as well as Jef Last and Joris Ivens, among others, were not only members of the Filmliga, but also of the politically motivated *Links Richten* (“Left Direction”), a Rotterdam based organisation of writers, artists and filmmakers, which published a magazine and organised activities like demonstrations⁶¹⁹. Many cross-connections existed between different social organisations in Rotterdam, which were all largely inspired by the Soviet Union. Whereas Schuitema visited the country and made his film *RUSLAND* (1931), Joris Ivens went there as well, to visit its film industry. Back in the Netherlands, Ivens gave a lecture about it in Rotterdam, as a special event that marked the start of a new season of the *Volksuniversiteit*⁶²⁰.

Ivens would return to the Soviet Union to make *SONG OF HEROES* (1932), about the emergence of this new industrial society, illustrated by the construction of the industrial city Magnitogorsk that was built after a masterplan by Mart Stam⁶²¹. The latter, in his turn, had previously been the chairman of *Opbouw*, while he worked on the design for the new Van Nelle factory – which was in itself a major attempt to improve the conditions of the workers, based upon theosophical motivations, as conceived by Van der Leeuw, which had also informed *Opbouw*⁶²². As chairman, Stam was succeeded by Han van Loghem who had already gone to the

⁶¹⁵ This film is also described by Donaldson (1997: 272). Although the film is preserved (NFM), still little is known about it. It is not clear if it was commissioned or Mullens’s own initiative (to attract commissions from large enterprises?).

⁶¹⁶ Something similar counts for another fiction film produced by Transfilma, *EEN LIED VAN DEN ARBEID* (1929), directed by Walter Janssen and shot by Von Barsy as well, which left even less traces today. An advertisement was published in: *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, 1929-08-30.

⁶¹⁷ Wester, 2001; Van der Steen, 2007. Last was in charge from 1925 to 1928.

⁶¹⁸ Struyvenberg, 2001: 87. They showed for example posters from the Soviet Union.

⁶¹⁹ Struyvenberg, 2001: 87; Stierner, 1992: 22-25.

⁶²⁰ This took place on 1930-10-02 at De Doelen, ref.: correspondence between Van Dugteren (VU) and Ivens, June and July 1930, coll. GAR, archive ‘Volksuniversiteit’, toegangsnummer 75, inv. nr. 275.

⁶²¹ The link between Ivens and Stam has not become fully clear. It is known, however, that Stam and Ivens lived in Rotterdam at the same time, and both went to Berlin in 1922. Both of them were in contact with Arthur Lehning, who would publish the magazine *Internationale Revue / i10*, to which both Stam and Ivens contributed.

⁶²² Van der Leeuw was a member of Krishnamurti’s theosophical movement, the ‘Order of the Star in the East’, just like the architect Michiel Brinkman, one of the founders of *Opbouw*. The latter received also the commission to design

Soviet Union before, to build, among others, the industrial colony of Kemerovo (1926-1927)⁶²³. These connections with the Soviet Union, and the cross-connections that existed between various organisations, supported an international network and an exchange of ideas. The Filmliga was an important node in it. Besides the publication of articles on Soviet cinema, it often showed Soviet films in their monthly programmes that circulated in the different cities. Moreover, together with the architects' association Opbouw, it invited several prominent Soviet directors⁶²⁴.

In 1929, Vsevolod Pudovkin came to the Netherlands to give lectures in Amsterdam and Rotterdam, but due to objections by the authorities the latter was finally cancelled. Less problematic was the visit of Sergei Eisenstein the next year. He arrived by train in Rotterdam, and one of his hosts was the architect Han van Loghem. The next day he visited the Van Nelle factory as well as Van der Leeuw's private house (1927-1929, Brinkman & Van der Vlugt). Eisenstein's presence was recorded on film, by Polygoon, and by Henk Alsem, who was probably asked by Van der Leeuw, since he had also made recordings of the factory⁶²⁵. One year later Dziga Vertov gave presentations in both Rotterdam and Amsterdam.

Important too is the fact that the chairman of the Filmliga Rotterdam, Johan Huijts, was a foreign news editor of the NRC specialised in the Soviet Union. Whereas the Filmliga Amsterdam was mostly interested in cinema as autonomous art, Huijts was much more interested in the social potential of film, just like the founding chairman Oud⁶²⁶. According to them (Schoots, 1999: 184), cinema, like architecture, was a technological achievement that needed to be appropriated for daily use by the masses and to be improved to serve society at large. From that perspective, the Filmliga Rotterdam was not against commercial cinemas, they just had to change their programming. Contrary to the Filmliga Amsterdam, Rotterdam was also not opposed to commercial feature films that were meant for entertainment. It just had to be good entertainment. This opposition caused tensions within the Dutch Filmliga. It was also one of the reasons why the Filmliga Amsterdam wanted to dissolve the organisation in 1931. Rotterdam continued for two more years, and, as Celine Linssen has pointed out (1999: 136), its chairman Johan Huijts managed to make the Filmliga accessible to a broader public.

En Gij, Kameraad?

Due to the connections with socialist organisations, Polygoon's Cor Aafjes was approached by the "Central Union of Transport Workers" (CBTA) to produce the feature length propaganda film EN GIJ, KAMERAAD? ("And You, Comrade?", 1928, Joannes Ratté)⁶²⁷. It became an important production for Polygoon, since it turned out to be highly successful. A critic from the NRC, for example, compared the film to the work of Dziga Vertov, saying that it actualised his theories in practice⁶²⁸. However, the film has remained largely underexposed afterwards, although film historian Bert Hogenkamp (1988: 34) has pointed to its innovative style and the role it has played within the course of Dutch cinema as the first major union film⁶²⁹. He, however, left the connection to Rotterdam unnoticed. I will explore this by following Elsaesser's AAA, through which a network appears of people, functions and ideas related to the city. At the same time it will be clear that the *auteur* paradigm does not apply to this film, nor the classification of *avant-garde* as it is usually understood.

the factory, but he suddenly died in 1925, and his son Jan took over, together with Leen van der Vlugt. See: Lambla, 1999; Livesey, 1999.

⁶²³ See: Abrahams, 1994.

⁶²⁴ Hogenkamp, 1985.

⁶²⁵ i.e. HET BEZOEK VAN EISENSTEIN AAN HOLLAND (1930, Henk Alsem); RUSSISCHE REGISSEUR BEZOEKT ONS LAND (1930, Polygoon).

⁶²⁶ For Huijts' take on film, see his article about *gemeenschapskunst* in the magazine *Filmliga* 1928/6, p11. For the interest of Oud, see Schoots, 1999: 184.

⁶²⁷ Hogenkamp, 1988: 30.

⁶²⁸ NRC, quoted in: 'Wat de Pers Zegt', p6 in: *Tweede Blad van De Transportarbeider*, 1928-12-08.

⁶²⁹ The film is also briefly mentioned by De Haan, 1995: 53.

The commissioning CBTA had its headquarters in Rotterdam, where it was established in December 1917, the year of the Russian revolution, and a time of social upheaval in Rotterdam since it suffered from the international crisis⁶³⁰. Moreover, the union had played a major role in the attempt to proclaim the revolution in the Netherlands one year later – with its leader Johan Brautigam as one of the key figures⁶³¹. Next to that it took an active share in the harbour strike of 1920, when 18,000 workers put down work for a period of ten weeks⁶³². Notwithstanding these events, the union chose a different strategy in the end. It decided to increase its number of members and to propagate its ideas in different ways. Therefore the board also commissioned this film. It was motivated by at least two reasons.

Firstly, the film had to show the achievements of the union during its first ten years, and to explain the work of the organisation to its own members. The workers had to pay their monthly subscription fee, and some of them began to complain about the size of it. At that time, unions took care of things that became later part of the welfare state, including social securities like unemployment wages, disability wages, health insurances and so on. The film thus had to communicate the need of the union. To that end the wives of the workers were invited too. In fact, the union had also a women's brigade, the *vrouwen brigade*, which is present in the film as well, for example in shots of demonstrations where they carry large banners.

Secondly, and most important, had been the idea to raise the number of members from 15,000 to 20,000. To that end the members were asked to invite their colleagues and friends who were, as they called it, 'unorganised'. They succeeded, and even more so, within two years the union counted 30,000 members. It was made possible by arranging special screenings in normal cinema theatres, with regular entrance fees, in more than eighty towns all over the Netherlands – in a period of about four months. Before the screening of the film, or during a break, a speech was given by one of the union leaders. The film itself was usually accompanied by the socialist folk singer Dumont (= Gerrit van den Berg), who played the guitar. At the end of the film, the audience joined him singing 'The International', the anthem of the international socialist movement and the Soviet Union.

The story of the film is told in four acts. The first one gives a general impression of transportation work, in the harbour and in the city of Rotterdam, showing various modes of traffic. There are dockworkers, stokers of steam engines, as well as bus and taxi drivers, among others. This part is of a documentary nature, in the style of the city symphony, to emphasise that the film is about 'reality', rather than fiction, to make its message more convincing. The next act is about the need for workers to organise themselves. We see, among others, the hardships of what they called the 'capitalist' WWI. This is illustrated by alimentation coupons, which had become symbols for crisis and especially hunger. The third act shows how the union functions, with images of the offices, a telegram that is sent by workers calling for immediate support, and images of the union newspaper *De Transportarbeider* being printed – with its editor and director of the film, Joannes Ratté, watching it. The film also shows other means of expressing the ideas of the union, through the production and distribution of pamphlets, booklets and papers. There is also a family reading *De Transportarbeider*, as well as progressive newspapers like *Het Volk* and *Voorwaarts*. Altogether it exemplifies Elsaesser's idea of *Medienverbund*. The final act is about the ideals and possibilities of the union, like living in garden villages, which is illustrated by

⁶³⁰ Cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 317.

⁶³¹ Brautigam had been one of the founders of the CBTA (1918), together with Arie Heijkoop (see: De Ruyter-De Zeeuw, 1990a and 1990b). Both of them were also members of the socialist party SDAP, which Brautigam represented in the Rotterdam city council, while Heijkoop became alderman for social interests. Next to him was Arie de Zeeuw, as alderman for education. Since the latter had enabled the establishment of the *Schoolbioscoop*, which had already collaborated with Polygoon, the film for the CBTA followed these connections. Moreover, it had been Cor Aafjes who had been the cinematographer of *DE NEDERLANDSCHE NOORDZEEVISSCHERIJ* (1923), an educational film, whose initiators had come into contact with Polygoon through *Schoolbioscoop* director A.M. van der Wel.

⁶³² Van de Laar, 2000: 324.

images of 'Vreewijk', leisure activities, safety at work, and international cooperation between workers.

This story is interwoven by the repetition of various images. Among them are shots of the transport work itself, speeches of the leaders, and most important, the portraits of individual workers, interchanged by shots of collective demonstrations, to say that the individual needs to support the collective organisation, in order to support the individual worker. This repetition is typical for the film, and it also occurs within single sequences. An activity is often shown twice, through a total shot and a close-up, to emphasise the action. This was something new at that time, and also the fact that the film tried to explain things just visually, without intertitles. When text was needed, it was shown by way of papers, flags and signs. The film even does not show its own title, neither the names of its makers. Instead, it shows the portraits of its director, Joannes Ratté, and cameraman Jan Jansen, at the very beginning.

The most important feature of the film, according to Hogenkamp (1988: 34), is the fact that Jan Jansen showed the faces of the workers, addressing them as individuals, and masses of workers together, as a social class. The two different kinds of images were combined into a dynamic montage. Elaborating on the argument of *Medienverbund*, we can draw a connection to a famous graphic design by Paul Schuitema. In 1930, he made a poster for the CBTA which expressed exactly the same idea, both in form and content. In this photo-montage, a man calls the workers to join the union. His body is made of another photo, showing a mass of people. On it is written the figure 30,000 (union members). Behind the head of the man is a picture of a ship in the docks. In the exhibition and the book *Interbellum Rotterdam* (2001, Halbertsma & Van Ulzen, eds.), the poster is presented as one of the hallmarks of the culture of Rotterdam in this era. In the accompanying text, Schuitema's own explanation of his work is quoted⁶³³: 'The mass [is] synthesised into a calling body. The individual is called, who must choose the same direction as the mass....'

To ascertain the requested content of the film, Polygoon closely collaborated with the CBTA. The union put much time and effort in it, and its leaders were also committed to make the film artistically valuable. Therefore Cor Aafjes wrote the script together with CBTA-chairman Johan Brautigam and Joannes Ratté, who had just become the chief editor of the union magazine *De Transportarbeider*. Ratté was also appointed as the director of the film – since it is the only film he ever made, he missed the attention of most film historians.

For the cinematography Aafjes worked together with the young cameraman Jan Jansen. The shooting of *EN GIJ, KAMERAAD?* started in June 1928, during the biannual congress of the union. Towards the end of the production, in October, Cor Aafjes suddenly died at the age of thirty-two. Cameraman Jan Jansen, only twenty-four years old, finished the film one month later. The premiere took place in Rotterdam at the City Theater, on the 11th of November 1928. Besides journalists, who were all enthusiastic, it was attended by leaders of various unions. They were very enthusiastic too, and immediately wanted to have films to promote their organisations as well. In the next years there was a lot of work to do for Polygoon and Jan Jansen. The latter was, furthermore, also asked to record the funerals of CBTA-leader and SDAP politician Arie Heijkoop and in the same year (1930) that of SDAP-leader Troelstra⁶³⁴.

more union films

Despite the success of *EN GIJ, KAMERAAD?*, it was almost deemed to oblivion afterwards, except for the attention paid to it by Bert Hogenkamp (1988: 33-34). It might be telling though that instead of its director Ratté, or Brautigam or even Aafjes, Hogenkamp, notwithstanding his concern with social issues, has given Jansen most of the credit. Ratté and Brautigam were above

⁶³³ Original quote: 'De massa als een roepend lichaam gesynthetiseerd. De roep gaat uit naar de individu, die dezelfde richting moet kiezen als de massa.' Schuitema quoted by Eefke van Nuenen in: Halbertsma & Van Ulzen, 2001: 313.

⁶³⁴ i.e. BEGRAFENIS W.A. HEIJKOOP (1930, Jan Jansen); BEGRAFENIS P.J. TROELSTRA (1930, B.D. Ochse).

all union leaders, not filmmakers, and therefore it is hard to see what their roles were, besides (academic) difficulties that may play a role regarding professionalism. Aafjes passed away, and although Hogenkamp has paid special attention to various of his films, his fame died along with him. Jansen, finally, remained unknown to the wider public, working his whole life as an anonymous cameraman for Polygoon, but he received appraisal from colleagues and critics. This, however, was especially the case regarding his next union film, TRIOMF (1931), for the NVV, which was indeed directed by himself, and it which was shown by the Filmliga, albeit partly⁶³⁵.

It is exactly for the screening at the Filmliga that TRIOMF, and Jansen along with it, is mentioned in the context of the Dutch avant-garde. The same counts for STALEN KNUISTEN (1930), which his colleague Jo de Haas made for the union of metal workers (ANMB)⁶³⁶. Even though these films were a direct result of the success of EN GIJ, KAMERAAD?, they have attracted much more attention from film historians. Their screenings at the Filmliga were crucial for that, even though these shows were merely additional; they were above all intended to recruit members through special screenings, which have hardly been documented as such.

The argument can be continued, since the success of EN GIJ, KAMERAAD? affected other filmmakers, among them Ivens⁶³⁷. In May 1929, the union of construction workers (ANBB) approached him, since THE BRIDGE had shown his interest in construction. It resulted in the feature length WE ARE BUILDING (1930), which showed various aspects of building and how it was supported by the union. Related to the project was a short on a congress of the 'union of unions', the NVV (9-12 September 1929)⁶³⁸. The status of this film, which has been lost, is not clear. It must have been the first part to be finished, issued separately, and probably used for the NVV only; it was finally not used in WIJ BOUWEN. It is nevertheless of interest to understand Ivens's ideas.

For this film, Ivens asked Von Barsy to collaborate. The two of them recorded the discussions simultaneously, from all possible angles, in order to make them visually expressive and to present the union leaders as heroic figures. According to Jef Last, however, in a review for the revolutionary socialist magazine *De Nieuwe Weg* (1931/2), these images were hollow, inflated amplifications, since one did not get to know the things discussed. Last criticised Ivens for not being politically educated enough to understand the difference between enthusiasm for the Russian revolution and the spirit of Dutch unionism. Such a criticism is remarkable, for the fact that Jef Last was a member of the Filmliga (in Rotterdam)⁶³⁹, and also the author of the story of Ivens previous film, BRANDING (1929) – on which Von Barsy had collaborated too. Last recognised Von Barsy's 'technical mastery' in shots of the union members visiting the port⁶⁴⁰, but he was also critical on him. 'It appears, however, that he is already corroded too, for his tendency to make out of nothing something enormous, and so he uses all the time high-sensitive stock, creating striking cloud effects, but therefore the images get an exaggerated, unpleasant harsh tone.' Von Barsy also made various shots of Ivens recording Alderman De Zeeuw, who received the union members at the town hall. However, according to Jef Last, this was all too much about

⁶³⁵ In Rotterdam they were shown on the 11th of April 1931, see: Gunning, Linssen, Schoots, 1999: 294.

⁶³⁶ By the Filmliga Rotterdam at 1931-04-11, for other cities see: Beusekom & Chamuleau, 1999: 294.

⁶³⁷ Ivens worked for the photography shop of his father, CAPI, which was for Polygoon the local agent for film commissions in Amsterdam, The Hague, Groningen and Nijmegen in the 1920s (De Haan, 1995: 23). Next to Ivens one might also mention Jan Hin, who first worked for Ivens, and then established Hinfilm. Hin made the Catholic union film KENTERING (1932). Afterwards he moved to Rotterdam, where he made HET LICHT INWENDIG (1933, Jan Hin), for the catholic union of the blind, St. Odilia – see: Hogenkamp, 2004: 36 and 77.

⁶³⁸ www.iven.nl/NL/ChronologieVakbondsfilms.htm (below) 2007-10-21.

⁶³⁹ Schoots, 1999: 189. See also: Smit, 2005: 40.

⁶⁴⁰ Original quote: 'Alleen blijkt hij ook al aangetast door de neiging om van niets iets geweldigs te maken en hij gebruikt dus voortdurend een overgevoelige film waarmee wel zeer treffende wolkeffekten bereikt worden maar waardoor het beeld tevens een overdreven onaangenaam harden toon krijgt.' In: Last, Jef; 'Het Rotterdamsche kongres van het N.V.V. door Joris Ivens en A. von Barsy', in: *De Nieuwe Weg*, vol. 6/2 (1931). For background information on Last and his connection to *De Nieuwe Weg*, see: www.jeflast.nl/biografie.html (visited: 2007-10-01).

the leaders, instead of the workers, who were not to be seen at all. Since Last was in close contact to Ivens, it seems he had already told him his opinion before publishing this review.

In any case, the other parts of *WE ARE BUILDING* do not show exaggerations and visual expressionism, while the workers became prominently present. Considering the constructivist formal perspective of *THE BRIDGE*, this marks a turn in the work of Ivens to social engagement. In a review for the *Filmliga* magazine, *Algemeen Handelsblad* journalist Chris de Graaff compared *WE ARE BUILDING* to Eisenstein's *THE GENERAL LINE* (1929).

If one compares the method of this great Russian to that of our young fellow-Dutchman, then it turns out (to the surprise of many of course), that Ivens, who simply kept himself to his task and who tried to make the best of it, has achieved a much more honest result than Eisenstein, who let a whole calculation of psychological effects precede his work. // That *THE GENERAL LINE* makes such a doubtful impression and that *WE ARE BUILDING*, notwithstanding its weak and lengthy middle part, remained pure from the beginning to the end, reinforces my opinion, that Eisenstein is a great individual artist, and Ivens a primitive-social one⁶⁴¹.

De Graaf advocated the documentary film as 'a pure medium' to propagate a vision of reality, and not as an artistic expression that is used for aesthetical or formal purposes. This applies to a few other union films too, but some were aesthetically challenging as well.

Among them is another one for the union of transport workers, the sound-film *VOOR ONZE KAMERADEN* (1937, Max de Haas), which was produced by Visie Film, a company that had been established by former Polygoon filmmakers. Bert Hogenkamp (1988: 91) has especially pointed to the first of its three parts, which he called a 'symphony of labour'. Characterised by its whirling montage, it is a tribute to the labour in the port. It was the work of Emiel van Moerkerken, who elaborated on his experience as an assistant cameraman of the feature film *LENTELIED* (1936, Simon Koster). Notwithstanding the aesthetic qualities of the first part, the most striking aspect of the film as a whole, I would argue, is the fact that three entirely different parts make up one film. The second one was a staged performance that presented the life of a transportation worker, while the third part was a registration of a mass meeting of the union: three parts, combining avant-garde, drama and journalism, which presented three different approaches with their own merits. The film became a cross-over that made the message legible to various audiences.

The union films are of special interest, as instruments of social relevance, with their own aesthetic qualities, which are related to their aims. Moreover, these films are not the work of *auteurs*, but the result of a 'scenius', to use the term coined by Brian Eno (see: De Jong & Schuilenburg, 2006: 119-120). It is the genius of the scene that enables such productions. In this way, the efforts of the unionists are particularly important, which, in turn, establishes direct links to Rotterdam – to such a degree that we can link the 'ideal images' of garden village 'Vreewijk', for example, to Ratté and Brautigam, who lived there themselves. It shows an alternative film practice that seems characteristic for Rotterdam.

Since there was a proliferation of union films after 1928, the scenius can be considered in yet an even broader perspective, and be related to a general development that Julian Steward has drawn concerning industrialisation and urbanisation. Towns became, as Steward had it (1976 [1955]: 211), centres for marketing, public facilities, commercial services, political and religious organisations, and the distribution of mass media. At the same time, these functions changed the

⁶⁴¹ Original quote: 'Vergelijkt men de methode van den grooten Rus met die van onzen jongen landgenoot, dan blijkt (natuurlijk tot veler verbazing) dat Ivens, die zich eenvoudig aan zijn opdracht heeft gehouden en getracht heeft "to make the best of it" een veel eerlijker resultaat heeft bereikt dan Eisenstein, die een geheele berekening van psychologische effecten aan de uitvoering van zijn werk liet voorafgaan. // Dat "De Generale Linie" zulk een twijfelachtigen indruk maakt en dat "Wij Bouwen", ondanks het zwakke en veel te uitvoerige middengedeelte, van het eerste tot het laatste beeld zuiver blijft, versterkt mij in de overtuiging, dat Eisenstein een groot individualistisch artiest is, en Ivens een primitief-sociaal kunstenaar.' De Graaff, 1930: 42-43.

internal composition of towns, they ‘differentiate the population into special segments, classes, or sociocultural groups: wealthy commercial and professional personnel; civil servants, transportational workers, and servicing and building trades groups; and skilled and unskilled laborers’ (ibid.). Steward’s observations might be recognised through various kinds of media practices. Since professional specialisation was accompanied by social-economic differentiation, all kinds of professional and social-economic groups (subcultures or ‘scenes’) articulated their own interests. Union films make that particularly clear, since they define groups, stress differences and address tensions that highlight the emerging complexity. This, however, was not limited to union films only, which can be illustrated by a range of other socially engaged productions.

§ 3. slums, crisis, renewal

Already in 1903, the writer M.J. Brusse published the youth novel *Boeffje*, in which he addressed the problems of the slums in the old city centre. It tells the story of a boy that has a fight with his parents, leaves home and becomes a petty thief. A clergyman takes care of him, and he is subsequently brought to a Catholic boarding school. The book became a bestseller, which was subsequently made into a theatre play (1922, dir. Cor van der Lugt Melsert), and due to its success it was finally turned into a film (1939, dir. Detlef Sierck). On the basis of location studies by Sierck, the architect Henk Wegerif built the studio sets. In this way the film shows the life in the dirty and dark alleys and the worn-out houses that are packed upon one another.

Whereas the Catholic Church played a prominent role in this film, already many years earlier it had commissioned a film about its charity work for youths in these problematic quarters: *HET ST.FRANCISCUS-LIEFDEWERK TE ROTTERDAM* (1925). This documentary was made by the Rotterdam based photographer and filmmaker Frans van Dijk, who received various commissions from the Catholic milieu. The film includes various street shots and gives some general impressions of the activities organised there, such as boys playing games. It was part of a larger campaign of the charity organisation, after it had moved to a new accommodation and started a new program⁶⁴².

Various other recordings would be made in the slums. Polygoon news, for example, also reported on charity in the area, with adults and children coming out of the houses with cans, pans and buckets to collect soup (Polygoon, 1929-02-27). The social problems of the old city were addressed in various ways, from different perspectives. Filmliga member Henk Alsem, for example, subtly addressed it in his intentionally controversial commercial *DROOMEN* (1931) for *De Bijenkorf*, which was located in the vicinity of the slums. In four minutes it tells the story of a poor girl, who sells flowers in front of a window of the department store. She falls asleep and dreams of a fashion show especially organised for her, of a life that she cannot afford. In the end a guard wakes her up. There are two versions of the story: one that respects the narrative order, and one that is edited in an expressive, experimental manner, in which the story completely dissolves, and association comes to the fore instead, with some additional abstract images. *De Bijenkorf* showed both of them to different audiences.

A similar contrast between rich and poor is drawn at the beginning of Jan Koelinga’s cine-poème *DE STEEG* (“The Alley”, 1932). It shows first of all the wealthy modern city, including an image of *De Bijenkorf*. It is opposed to the poverty and social life of the inhabitants of an alley (*Schoorsteenvegerssteeg*). With diagonally framed shots, many close-ups and a fast montage, *DE STEEG* shows the street life of the inhabitants and the bad conditions of the quarter, yet with a strong community life.

Koelinga’s production, which was the initiative of the filmmaker itself, and distributed by *De Uitkijk* in Amsterdam, also shows the turn within the avant-garde towards explicit social

⁶⁴² Shortly before, *Sint Franciscus Liefdewerk* established itself in a new accommodation at the *Schiedamschen Singel* – advertisement in the magazine *Katholieke Illustratie*, October 1924.

engagement, which was extra motivated by the international financial crisis that started in October 1929. It is a shift of focus that is also recognizable in the work of people like László Moholy-Nagy, who had been a guest of the Filmliga Rotterdam shortly before⁶⁴³. Already earlier such a tendency developed, in the case of *Links Richten*. It even organised a solidarity action to raise money in order to support residents of the slums in their struggle against the landlords⁶⁴⁴.

In 1932, when the international crisis reached rock bottom, Polygoon reported on the “crisis committee” in Rotterdam that collected money for the poor (Polygoon, 1932-01-15). As the report shows, attention was raised in different ways, for example by a camel with a driver passing on the sidewalk and a boat that was put on wheels and driven through the streets. Next to that, Polygoon reported on measures proposed by Mayor Droogleeveer-Fortuyn, to invest in the port in order to beat the recession⁶⁴⁵. At the same time, money was collected at the cinemas, for which publicity was made by slides⁶⁴⁶. In this way the reports by Polygoon helped to raise funds to relieve the pain⁶⁴⁷.

The crisis, however, also affected the company itself, which was reinforced by problems within the film industry after the introduction of sound film. As a result it became much more pragmatic. Its most idealist filmmakers, Ab Keyzer, Jo de Haas and Max de Haas, decided to leave the company and to start Visie Film. Its first production was FAKKELGANG (1932, Max de Haas), about alcohol abuse, made for the leftist “Dutch Association for the Abolition of Alcoholic Drinks”⁶⁴⁸. Due to unemployment and the lack of good perspective, especially in the slums, alcohol abuse became a serious problem⁶⁴⁹. This film followed the ideas of Soviet cinema, both in form and content. It shows alcohol consumption in deteriorated neighbourhoods in both Rotterdam and Amsterdam, which is opposed to healthy people in modern environments. The film was part of one of the last central shows of the Filmliga (in Rotterdam at Corso, 1932-12-10). Early in 1933, the Filmliga was dissolved⁶⁵⁰.

The disappearance of the Filmliga meant the end of an organised film avant-garde. Some filmmakers continued individually and focused on social concerns, although it is unknown if this social engagement ever found a public release. Jan Koelinga, for example, documented the crisis by filming boats at anchor (OPGELEGDE SCHEPEN IN CRISISTIJD, 1934). The recordings are almost still images that, as motion pictures, emphasise the problems at issue; also because they make a contrast regarding the highly dynamic images of the various harbour films that had been made before. Next to that, Koelinga also shot general impressions of the crisis, of poverty and people queuing (CRISISJAREN 1934-1936). Paul Schuitema made the short film BETOGINGEN

⁶⁴³ In 1931, see e.g. Rietbergen, 2001: 50. This shift in the work of Moholy-Nagy is exemplified by the differences between, on the one hand, his film LICHTSPIEL: SCHWARTZ-WEIß-GRAU (1930), and, on the other, the films GROBSTADT ZIGEUNER and IMPRESSIONEN VON ALTER MARSEILLE HAFEN (both released in 1932).

⁶⁴⁴ Stiemer, 1992: 23. Cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 328 – about large demonstrations against malpractices of landlords (1930-11-27), and strikes by residents (*huurstaking*, July 1931).

⁶⁴⁵ BURGEMEESTER MR. P. DROOGLEEVER FORTUIN OVER DE ROTTERDAMSE HAVENS (Polygoon, 1932-11-03)

⁶⁴⁶ www.cinemacontext.nl > Samson Reclame Rotterdam, 1934.

⁶⁴⁷ It is a different picture from the one drawn by Gold and Ward (1997: 64) in the case of Great Britain, where ‘[n]ewsreels had often contained positive images of poor housing conditions being briskly solved by slum clearance since 1930’, and where fuller-length documentaries addressed the other side, of planning.

⁶⁴⁸ i.e. *Nederlandsche Vereeniging tot Afschaffing van Alcoholhoudende Dranken*

⁶⁴⁹ This problem was also addressed through various other means, e.g. drawings by the artist (and filmmaker) Wout van Heusden (Stiemer, 1992: 18).

⁶⁵⁰ The Filmliga ended in 1933, officially because of a conflict that arose when several members, first of all Jo Otten, protested against the screening of the German film MORGENROT (1933, Vernon Sewell & Gustav Ucicky), which was produced before, but released after Hitler came to power, and turned into Nazi propaganda. According to Céline Linssen (1999: 133-136), the exact reasons have remained somewhat vague. Under influence of the developments in Germany, opposed tendencies developed within the Filmliga itself. On the one hand it showed communist sympathies, on the other hand a growing number of students in Rotterdam, who visited the Filmliga screenings, sympathised with national-socialism and asked for German and Italian films. According to Chairman Huijts this was the immediate reason to dissolve the Filmliga (cf. Hogenkamp, 1986: 172).

(“Demonstrations”, 1935). Through an expressive framing it shows a political demonstration against the government policy, with banners saying ‘Do we have to starve?’ At the same time Schuitema wrote a rhetoric questionnaire in the magazine *De 8 & Opbouw* (1935: p229).

1. which task had the original avant-garde? 2. is there now not even a greater need of avant-gardists? 3. or does one expect that the cinema will purify itself within the industry? 4. is the mediocrity of the contemporary film not a consequence of its defective content? 5. is the form not a direct consequence of the content and the technical means? 6. is the content a consequence of the more or less cunning scripts, or is it the reflection of the problems of the age? 7. is there a relation between the spirit of the age and the spirit of the film? 8. thus is the new film a consequence of the new content? 9. thus is the renewal of the film not a matter of social renewal?⁶⁵¹

More questions followed, which similarly addressed the idea that film should be a matter of social engagement. By publishing this ‘manifesto’ in *De 8 & Opbouw*, Schuitema directly appealed to the architects and designers that had actively supported the Filmliga before.

At the same time (1935), the SDAP won the municipal elections again. It was even the first time that Rotterdam got an administration with only socialist aldermen, which offered new perspectives⁶⁵². Unionist and SDAP prominent Johan Brautigam became the Alderman for “Public Works” and “Social Housing” and reorganised the departments. He abolished the practice of building alcove-dwellings, and gave direction to a renovation plan regarding the slums of downtown Rotterdam. Therefore, Brautigam closely collaborated with city planner Witteveen. The latter drew plans for the breakthrough of the slums near the town hall, to build the Meent, a major new east – west connection⁶⁵³. As an antipode to slum clearance, Witteveen also drew the extension of the city, for the actualisation of the residential quarters Bergpolder and Blijdorp⁶⁵⁴. These plans were carried out by private developers, but supervised by and with financial support of the municipality⁶⁵⁵. A great number of the houses here, as well as parts of the Meent, were designed by Wim ten Bosch, who had gradually come to embrace modernism. He also showed these projects in his film *ROTTERDAM EN HOE HET BOUWDE* (1940), while highlighting the role of Brautigam and Witteveen too, among several other big men.

Notwithstanding such developments, the architects Oud and Van Ravesteyn, who had been pioneers of the modern movement and actively involved with the Filmliga, advocated a new direction that favoured a much more individualised, disciplinary and monumental approach. The modernist project, however, was still fiercely defended by people like Mart Stam, Han van Loghem and Ida Lieftrinck⁶⁵⁶. Within such a divergent movement, however, there was hardly a common direction anymore, let alone a shared agenda between architecture and cinema.

⁶⁵¹ Schuitema, 1935: 229; original quote: ‘1. welke taak had de oorspronkelijke avant-garde? 2 is er nu nog niet meer behoefte aan avant-gardisten? 3. of verwacht men dat de film zich binnen de industrie vanzelf zal zuiveren? 4. is de middelmatigheid van de hedendaagse film geen gevolg van de gebrekkige inhoud? 5. is de vorm niet een direct gevolg van de inhoud en de technische middelen? 6. is de inhoud een gevolg van de min of meer listige scenario’s of is ze de weerspiegeling der tijdproblemen? 7. is er verband tusschen de tijdgeest en de geest der film? 8. is dus de nieuwe film een gevolg van de nieuwe inhoud? 9. ligt dus de vernieuwing van de film niet in de maatschappelijke vernieuwing?’

⁶⁵² i.e. Brautigam, De Zeeuw, R.J. van Dijk and J.B.J. Ratté (who had directed the film *EN GIJ, KAMERAAD?*, 1928).

Due to the crisis of the early 1930s, much of the expenses had been cut by the previous college, but that was still not enough, according to the central government in The Hague. In 1936, the Dutch Minister of Finance, P.J. Oud, was therefore appointed to sanitise the municipal expenses of Rotterdam. In 1938 he would become the city’s Mayor.

⁶⁵³ Cf. Van de Laar (2000: 295).

⁶⁵⁴ The plan for Blijdorp was a modification of an earlier plan, by Kromhout (1921), now taking into account the Maastunnel-tracé, see: Van de Laar, 2000: 355.

⁶⁵⁵ De Ruyter-De Zeeuw, 1990a.

⁶⁵⁶ Cf. Holsappel, 2000: 9-10.

§ 4. towards the end of an era

Polygoon continued to make films with a social agenda, but in different ways. Since 1933, it also produced films for the national-socialist party NSB, among them *HOU ZEE!* (1936)⁶⁵⁷. It showed a proud country with a glorious past. The film starts with images of nature, like dunes and the sea, the Dutch landscape with mills, the beautiful cityscape of Amsterdam, and the powerful one of Rotterdam with constructions like the Willemsbrug and the industry. The next sequence shows the crisis: ships at anchor in the port, closed factories and still cranes, unemployed workers and kids in slums. The film argues that it is due to the democratic system, and especially class struggle, which has torn the people apart and caused the country's downfall. To resolve it the country needs a strong leader, in order to unify the people and to achieve great achievements again. NSB leader Mussert is the elected one, and comparisons are made to Hitler and Mussolini. Workers, however, did not choose for the NSB. Those who were dissatisfied with the SDAP, which had become more moderate, rather chose for the communist party or for related groups⁶⁵⁸.

Whatever the pragmatism of Polygoon may have done to the company, it subsequently made productions such as that for HAKA, *DOOR EENDRACHT STERK! COÖPERATIEF AAN 'T WERK!* (1937). This film too addressed the need to unite, as the title says, but in a totally different way. The film begins with a procession in Rotterdam at the 'International Co-operatives Day'; people carry banners with texts like "Profit trade brings war, co-operation brings peace"⁶⁵⁹. It highlights the need for class-struggle as a reply to internationally increasing political tensions. The solution to the hardship of the crisis is to support cooperative production, which everyone can do, which is exemplified by housewives buying products at HAKA shops⁶⁶⁰. The film addresses labour agreements between HAKA and the unions; the importance of leisure is emphasised through shots of people cycling, with kids in a sidecar, next to images of swimming and canoeing.

Next to that, Polygoon's *Hollands Nieuws*, reported on social events like the annual "Women's Peace March" (Polygoon, 1939-05-17), addressing the danger of the rise of national-socialism and its militarism that caused the international tensions⁶⁶¹. In the case of Rotterdam and the Netherlands, the issue of armament was also shown by Polygoon, as it reported on a military parade at the Coolingsel Boulevard and in front of the town hall⁶⁶². Whereas this was still a newsreel, it made a recruitment film for the Dutch Royal Navy as well⁶⁶³. Mobilisation had become an important issue, which was eventually also reflected by the feature film *ERGENS IN NEDERLAND* (1940, Ludwig Berger).

One case is of particular interest here. In the autumn of 1939, Profilti made the film *BESCHERM UW STAD* ("Protect your City", 1939). After the German occupation of Poland in September 1939, the municipality established a foundation for anti-aircraft defence (*Stichting Luchtafweer Rotterdam en Omstreken*). It tried to raise funds for armament, and therefore it commissioned this film, to ask for donations from movie goers. In about three minutes, a rapid montage-sequence is presented with images of Rotterdam, drawing an overview of old and new buildings, such as a constructivist white villa (1938-1939, G.W. Baas) and the new functionalist 'Beurs' ("WTC", 1925-1940, J.F. Staal). It is necessary to protect dwellings, shops, offices, schools and, above all, 'our women and children'. In a staged sequence, a class of school children seeks protection after the alarm is raised. This is followed by people putting on gas masks, and

⁶⁵⁷ Cf. Vermeer, 1987: 95. Instead of 1936 as the production year (source: B&G), Vermeer mentions that the premiere of the film took place on 1935-05-16 in The Hague. If this is correct, the film cannot have served, however, as she mentions, the provincial elections, since they took place in April 1935.

⁶⁵⁸ Van de Laar, 2000: 331. For the 'reconciliation policy' of the SDAP, see p333.

⁶⁵⁹ On 1937-07-03. Original quote: 'Winsthandel brengt oorlog, coöperatie brengt vrede'.

⁶⁶⁰ Shown are the HAKA shops: *Samenwerking, De Eendracht, De Volharding*.

⁶⁶¹ See also: *VROUWEN VREDESGANG* (1938-1939, Henk Hos).

⁶⁶² This was attended by Mayor P.J. Oud and the military authorities (*MILITAIR DÉFILÉ*, Polygoon, 1939-10-19).

⁶⁶³ I.e. *ONZE KONINKLIJKE MARINE* (1939, Polygoon), for its schools in Vlissingen, Rotterdam and Den Helder.

arranging shelters, as well as archival footage (from elsewhere) of fighter planes dropping bombs. A map of Rotterdam is shown with twenty-six circles across the agglomeration, corresponding to the positions of anti-aircraft arms. Following Grusin (2003), this might be called ‘premediation’, as an attempt to report things before they have actually happened, in order to direct them: this is a matter of pre-emptive warfare⁶⁶⁴. The montage-sequence finishes therefore with a text saying that the Dutch state spends millions on defence, but that it is not enough. The citizens of Rotterdam, Schiedam and Vlaardingen are asked to donate money, and a bank account number is shown. In another three minutes, Mayor P.J. Oud explains the passive defence measures taken so far, like the organisation of shelters and first aid services, but there is still the need to acquire a battery of anti-aircraft weapons, for which he asks support. “Protect Your City”, the last title says. It is a different kind of social engagement than that of the previous films, but one that turned out to be highly important.

That became painfully clear in the amateur film 77-BT LUA (1939-1940) of the reserve officer candidate M.H.H. Koenig. Still a student, he served the 77th battery, which was one of the units that operated the anti-aircraft weapons. Koenig filmed the preparations, from December 1939 up until the moment of fighting. The fighting itself is missing, since Koenig had no time to handle the camera, but in vain. Illegally, at last, Koenig filmed his unit being imprisoned in a garden. He ended with images, filmed through a window, of the nervous movements surrounding the negotiations between the Dutch and the Germans⁶⁶⁵. It resulted in the catastrophic event that awaited Rotterdam. Half a year after its call for help, the doom scenario of BESCHERM UW STAD became reality. Koenig himself would be killed in 1943⁶⁶⁶.

⁶⁶⁴ Richard Grusin, in reference to the war in Iraq, 2003: ‘First, where remediation entailed the refashioning of prior media forms, I claim that premediation entails the desire to remediate future media forms and technologies. In addition, I argue that premediation entails the desire to remediate the future before it happens, the desire that the future be always already pre-mediated. Finally, I suggest that this desire to premeditate the future before it happens is accompanied by the desire to insure that the future is so fully mediated by new media forms and technologies that it is unable to emerge into the present without having already been remediated in the past.’ From: ‘Premediation: Media Logics in Times of War’ – part of *The News about Networks*, organised by Richard Rogers and Noortje Marres, at De Balie, Amsterdam, 2003-11-12. www.debalie.nl/artikel.jsp?articleid=4473&podiumid=media (visited, 2007-09-25)

⁶⁶⁵ See also the Polygon report 1940-wk23, for the commemoration of the fallen soldiers. For information on the film, see: B&G, catalogue, file of the film (visited 2009-04-09).

⁶⁶⁶ See: www.luchtdoelartillerie.nl/oud/gesneuvelden.htm (visited 2009-04-09).

RECAPITULATION OF PART I – THE EMERGENCE OF A CINEMATIC CITY

The first film images that featured Rotterdam were made in 1898. Many recordings would follow in the next years, and most important in this respect was the Austrian operator Stefan Hofbauer, who worked for Casino Variété of Samuel Soesman. Film production and exhibition were initially closely related in Rotterdam. There were, moreover, connections to the realms of theatre, music and the visual arts – for publicity, set design and decoration of the cinema halls, and finally also architecture when, since the late 1910s, various cinemas were built. Following the theory of Allen J. Scott, I have recognised issues of ‘clustering’. A pivotal role in this was played by East-European Jewish immigrants between 1915 and 1935. They were involved with exhibition, and also the production of newsreels and documentary shorts that often dealt with Rotterdam. I have explained that they competed and collaborated with each other, which gradually resulted in a division of tasks regarding exhibition, distribution and production.

At the same time, locally produced newsreels, like those by Tuschinski, found themselves in competition with national productions. This turned finally into a collaboration too, with Tuschinski showing the newsreels of Polygoon from Haarlem. Although several film production companies appeared in Rotterdam over the years, a substantial part of the films about the city were produced by companies from elsewhere. Using a concept of Elsaesser, Rotterdam became mostly *Tatort*, while cities like Haarlem, The Hague and Amsterdam functioned in this case as *Standort*. As such, Rotterdam developed as a ‘porous’ system with various connections to other systems.

All kinds of films were made featuring Rotterdam, but non-fiction filmmaking became paradigmatic. This was propelled by the port and the related industry that I have identified as the ‘culture core’ in terms of Steward’s theory of cultural ecology. Common became films to advertise services in the port, to show and promote production processes – with an important share of films on ‘food and fuel’, hence energy flows – next to films on the construction of major buildings, as well as union films, among other. I have studied such films through Elsaesser’s triple ‘A’ model that asks for attention to *Auftraggeber*, *Anlass* and *Anwendung*. This is a way to find the reasons of a production, to understand the roles of different agents involved, and to draw networks between them.

Following this approach, I have shown, in the case of the ‘construction films’, that rather different motivations existed for each production, notwithstanding formal similarities. It has been exemplified by films for, among others, department store De Bijenkorf (made for reasons of publicity), the Dutch union of construction workers (for recruitment), the Van Nelle factory (documentation), and, for example, the municipal department of “Public Works” (as explanation). Alternatively, I have also found films that were rather different in style that served nevertheless the same purpose, as part of strategies to reach different audiences. By tracing network transmissions, I have thus come across connections between entities that were previously seen as being part of distinct realms, like art and industry, or social engagement and commerce. Similarly, links between cinema and architecture have come to the fore. The Van Nelle factory is a case in point. Its attempts to achieve modernisation allowed me to draw cross-connections to other media, including photography, graphic and industrial design, and architecture. Here I have applied Elsaesser’s concept of *Medienverbund*, to indicate the use of different media that serve a common purpose.

I have further elaborated on this concept in the case of the industry exhibition Neniĳto. Films, next to other media, helped to inform the visitors about the latest industrial developments. By doing so they presented Rotterdam as a modern city. This has also been observed regarding various other events, including sports games and aviation shows. I have referred here to Tschumi, for space does not determine events to take place, but creates possibilities that can be further explored and empowered, in which media play a role too.

Thinking about the concept of *Medienverbund*, as an alliance of different cultural productions, I have made an attempt to stretch it to the extent of cultural ecology. I have therefore amplified the shared agenda of different media to a shared attractor of systemic development that involves different cultural phenomena – particularly the attractor of rationalisation (the third ‘R’ of Hediger & Vonderau, 2007). This applies to the large collection of industrial films, and the social-economic institutions to which they were related. Here I have invoked Steward’s concept of ‘levels of sociocultural integration’, as a degree of coherence between cultural phenomena.

I have addressed such an integration at the level of the city as a whole by regarding both housing (*Gemeentelijke Dienst Volkshuisvesting*) and educational cinema (*Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop*). There was no direct interaction between the director of the housing department, August Plate, or the architect J.J.P. Oud, and the director of the Schoolbioscoop, A.M. van der Wel, neither were there any films made about housing projects. The films were not *about* modernity, but *for* modernity (cf. Lebas, 2000), according to what Heynen (2000) has called programmatic modernity, in contradistinction to transitory modernity. Regarding the way the housing department and the Schoolbioscoop developed has pointed to a connection at a higher level: that of the municipality and its progressive policy. Housing was organised to improve the living conditions of the workers, while films raised the knowledge of the environment. Architecture and educational films had a programmatic connection.

Films on local issues, like those by the Schoolbioscoop, which were shown to local audiences, immediately linked back to the city. I have explained it in terms of stigmergy, as a matter of local communication, in connection to the environment. Although this applies to industrial and promotional films as well, many of them were also shown outside the city, which fuelled national and international interest in Rotterdam. This was often paid back indirectly, since it involved various other stages. The interaction between Rotterdam and the rest of the world is, in the way Steward has put it, an interplay between environmental and historical factors. Here I have used Ulf Hannerz’s concept of the city as a ‘switchboard’, through which ideas are simultaneously locally appropriated and sent into the world.

In this way I have looked at the international networks of the avant-garde, and how Rotterdam developed its own path within it. The Filmliga has been considered as an ‘historical factor’. Following an international trend, it was initiated in Amsterdam, from where it got diffused across the Netherlands, including Rotterdam. It became embedded in the city’s own structures, with a strong involvement of architects, the business elite, as well as the press (in particular the NRC). Along with the establishment of the Filmliga, films were made like Ivens’s *THE BRIDGE* (1928) and Von Bary’s *HOOGSTRAAT* (1929), which appropriated the ideas of the genre of the ‘city symphony’, in order to send them into the world again. Similar observations have been made regarding architecture, for example in the case of Oud’s housing projects and the Van Nelle factory, which received substantial attention from abroad. I have related the idea of the city as a ‘switchboard’ to the logic of relationality (cf. Urry, 2003), which I have imagined as networks that exist within networks (cf. Hannerz, 1996).

By drawing networks, I have made an attempt to explain the emergence of particular productions such as *THE BRIDGE* (1928, Joris Ivens) as well as *NUL UUR NUL* (1927-1928, Simon Koster). I have done so by considering how they mediated relations and provided personal references. It has been another way to address how these productions fulfilled, using the words of Luhmann (1997), the functions of memory and oscillation, by considering both content and conditions and the connections between them. Along with this, various individual names have appeared, as members of a ‘scene’ and as nodes of a particular network. Its connections lead to other agents, events, and productions, such as – in the case of *NUL UUR NUL* – the fiction films *DOOD WATER* (1934, Gerard Rutten) and *LENTELIED* (1936, Simon Koster). Regarding the latter I have similarly pointed to the way the film propelled a modern image of Rotterdam.

A network within a network corresponds to a particular group or ‘scene’, which is largely responsible for the achievements of its individual members. It has been exemplified by the case of

the union film *EN GIJ, KAMERAAD?* (1928, Joannes Ratté). It was the result of a collective effort, not of an *auteur*, but of a ‘scenius’ (cf. De Jong & Schuilenburg, 2006, after Brian Eno). It provides another take on authorship, which comes in addition to the case that I have presented regarding the cinematographer Andor von Barys. It is no coincidence that Von Barys’s *HOOGSTRAAT* (1929) became his most famous film, since it matched the paradigms of the *auteur* and the art film. But a different perspective is created when drawing the networks that Von Barys was part of. They show his numerous involvements as a cameraman, especially regarding commissioned films, in which respect his name is sometimes not even mentioned at all. I have addressed his work in terms of ‘functional cinematography’, which applies also to his port films, including *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS*. Since Von Barys also worked on fiction films and commercials, next to photographic projects, cross-connections have appeared between different categories and genres. These cross-connections are largely the result of all kinds of reactions upon things popping up in one’s environment. As the production history of *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* (1928) has also illustrated, something may bump into something else that can have decisive consequences on the course of an individual career. In respect of a larger system, like a city, a multitude of such contingent acts constitute nevertheless a common movement, and common directions.

PART II.

THE CINEMATIC RECONSTRUCTION OF A CITY ROTTERDAM IN THE 1940s & 1950s

PROLOGUE TO PART II

the disappearance and reappearance of a city

On the 14th of May 1940, the German Luftwaffe bombed Rotterdam in order to force the Dutch capitulation. Neither the exact motivations nor the precise course of things have become entirely clear⁶⁶⁷. It might even have been a matter of contingency. The negotiations between the German and Dutch military forces preceding the attack resulted in misunderstandings; at the last moment the German general Schmidt decided to cancel the attack, but it was too late. The Heinkel aircrafts were already on their way. Light signals were fired, but they were not seen by most pilots – or they were ignored. The question remains if the attack was a matter of tactics or terror.

In any case, the Germans were well prepared to document the event on film, and the filmmakers knew what would happen. The recordings were not only used for the *Wochenschau* newsreel, but also for a propaganda film: ANGRIFF AUF ROTTERDAM (1940, UFA)⁶⁶⁸. It was made to convince the German nation of the need to occupy the Netherlands. The film explains that the attack had to prevent the allied forces to attack Germany via the Netherlands. In a staged discussion, which is the first part of the film, a man explains this to a bohemian who loves the good life and does not see any problem with Holland. This rhetorical discussion is interchanged with maps of Europe. The second part shows the German march into the Netherlands that leads to the ‘necessary destruction’ of Rotterdam. Like no other record, the film shows the air raid and the occupation of the city, with soldiers posted on strategic positions, and trucks entering the streets of Rotterdam. It has therefore been used in many films on the war afterwards, with one of the first being, THE DUTCH TRADITION (1943, John Fernhout), a propaganda film of the Netherlands Information Bureau in New York, to promote the reliability of the Netherlands as an allied partner⁶⁶⁹.

The bombardment put large parts of Rotterdam on fire. As a result, about 900 people died and 78.700 people became homeless⁶⁷⁰. About 11,000 premises were destroyed with 25,000 apartments, 2400 shops, 3500 offices, factories, workshops and warehouses, 500 cafes, restaurants and hotels, and 120 public buildings, including schools, churches, hospitals and cinemas⁶⁷¹. These numbers are not mentioned by the German film. Neither are there images of victims or people seeking refuge. There is no image of struggle, pain or fear whatsoever. Instead, the destruction of the city is shown as a clinical operation, merely an act of planning. The city is simply erased, which is shown by images from the air taken a few days later. In addition to this film, the propaganda campaign also included an illustrated story, made in a similar vein, to explain the attack to German children⁶⁷².

In general there are hardly any film recordings that show victims of the bombardment of Rotterdam. The newsreel producers Polygoon and Profilti still operated, but the country was in total confusion. The young cameraman Taede van Maanen of Profilti, working for the Dutch *LegerfilmDienst* (‘Army Film Service’), went to Rotterdam by car on the 14th of May, together with his chief, but due to the chaos they had to stop near Schiedam⁶⁷³. Van Maanen made some recordings in the city centre afterwards, but it seems that they were not used for newsreels⁶⁷⁴. Such images appear, however, in the American propaganda film WHY WE FIGHT (1942, Frank

⁶⁶⁷ Van de Laar, 2000: 404-407; Van der Pauw, 2006: ch 4. See also:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bombing_of_Rotterdam_during_the_Second_World_War (visited: 2008-01-14)

⁶⁶⁸ The film is also known as ANGRIFF AUF ROTTERDAM and AANVAL OP ROTTERDAM.

⁶⁶⁹ Fernhout also used these images in HOLLAND CARRIES ON (1945), a film on WWII and the prospects afterwards.

⁶⁷⁰ Van de Laar, 2000: 400; Van der Pauw, 2006: 848 and 854.

⁶⁷¹ ASRO, 1946 (inside cover); Besselaar, 1960: 8; Van der Pauw, 2006: 854.

⁶⁷² Cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 406.

⁶⁷³ De Haan, 1995: 158.

⁶⁷⁴ There is no record, either related to Profilti, the LegerfilmDienst or Polygoon that mentions a newsreel about the bombardment of Rotterdam.

Capra), which was made to motivate the American soldiers⁶⁷⁵. Yet, this film was made of recycled images from a large number of sources, including confiscated German material, and even fiction films. It is therefore not sure if the images shown are those shot by Van Maanen, or if they are shot in Rotterdam at all.

While Rotterdam was in ruins, it depended on others. Other cities had to perform its tasks and to help its citizens. This was reported by various newsreels. Citizens of Roermond, for example, collected furniture and the like, which was transported by ship to Rotterdam (Polygoon, 1940-wk33); in The Hague, toys were collected for evacuated children from Rotterdam (ibid, 1940-wk42). This dependency counted on a general, political level too. As a result a complex development was set in motion, through strategic alliances, in order to actualise visionary ideas of the modern city.

Only once World War II was over could Rotterdam think of managing itself again, which is exemplified by a report in which its citizens are asked to help their peers⁶⁷⁶. Citizens showed indeed a strong commitment to the city, which is probably best illustrated by amateur films⁶⁷⁷. Among them are recordings of the winter famine (1944-1945), which took about 4,300 victims in Rotterdam⁶⁷⁸. Next to various professional reports, many amateur recordings were made of the liberation, as a historic moment⁶⁷⁹. These records were individual attempts to serve a collective memory emphasizing the urge for self-determination and to improve one's conditions.

While architecture and planning played key roles within the reconstruction, this was not isolated from other cultural practices. However, cinema in Rotterdam lacked the possibilities to retain the conditions from before the war. Its film culture had simply been erased. Out of the eleven cinemas that existed in the city centre, only the German Luxor Palast, survived the bombardment of 1940⁶⁸⁰. Three cinemas built by Van Gelderen were destroyed (Ooster Theater, Grand Théâtre, City), and all Tuschinski's. Most tragically, Van Gelderen, Tuschinski, Chermoeck, Weisbard and others died in concentration camps.

The disappearance of film theatres, as well as distribution companies, broke down a general film infrastructure which also affected film production⁶⁸¹. Monopole, the main film production company, moved to Amsterdam⁶⁸². Andor von Barsy moved to Munich. New talents, among them Ytzen Brusse, Joop Burcksen, and Hans Koekoek, left the city as well. Certain other filmmakers were not allowed to work anymore for a period of time, among them Jan Koelinga and above all Jan Teunissen, since they had collaborated with the Germans. Yet, new films about Rotterdam were requested, which had to be made by companies from elsewhere.

⁶⁷⁵ Something similar counts for the film 5 JAREN (1946, Polygoon), showing the devastations that took place in WWII, made for the Red Cross to collect money to help the Dutch.

⁶⁷⁶ EN NU... ROTTERDAM VOOR DE ROTTERDAMMERS (1945, Profilti).

⁶⁷⁷ Which have been brought to the fore by Joop de Jong (= De Jong, 2005).

⁶⁷⁸ See: Van der Pauw, 2006: 901. HONGERWINTER 1944-1945 (Valk)* shows people gathering things to be used as fuel. VOEDSELDROPPINGS 29 APRIL 1945 (M.I. de Jong)*, a well-made report, shows the dropping of American canned food and its distribution through the Van Nelle factory. During the war, many people relied on the *gaarkeuken* ('soup kitchen') that had been established in 1940 (Polygoon, 1940-wk46), which was, however, not sufficient during the winter famine. The films marked by an * are included on the DVD that accompanies De Jong, 2005; see also next note.

⁶⁷⁹ e.g. ROTTERDAM NA HET BOMBARDEMENT EN NA DE BEVRIJDING (1945, H. Philipsen)*, BEVRIJDING ROTTERDAM (1945, anon.), EINDELIJK VRIJ (1945, A. Rijken), NOORDEREILAND 8 MEI (H. Heil)*, STRAATFEESTEN MEI 1945 (1945, Van Zuylen)*, BEVRIJDINGSFEESTEN (1945, H. de Klerk; see: filmography J. De Klerk)*. Next to these recordings, Polygoon-Profilti made also reports on the liberation (DIVERSE OPNAMEN KORT NA DE BEVRIJDING, 1945), and on following events, such as a funeral of resistance fighters (Polygoon, 1945-wk48). See also images shot by the US Army Film Service (WORLD WAR II, 1945, US Army Film Service / National Archives).

⁶⁸⁰ Cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 411.

⁶⁸¹ Something similar occurred in other disciplines, like literature. For writers in post-WWII Rotterdam, see: Van de Laar, 2000: 568.

⁶⁸² Monopole moved to Amsterdam, see: www.cinemacontext.nl > bedrijven > Monopole (2008-07-09)

Reconstruction films had clear objectives, and a parallel development can be found abroad, like in Glasgow. 'Like other films of national reconstruction, these promote consent to large-scale urban re-building and planning as part of a comprehensive redefinition of civil society after the war' (Lebas, 2007: 42). This new civil society became the welfare state, and Rotterdam was its urban template within the Netherlands (Wagenaar, 1992). This directed architecture and planning, and cinema alike, at least in terms of *Tatort*.

Once film production gradually established itself again in Rotterdam, in terms of *Standort*, it did so through the same attractors of economic and social development that directed the reconstruction. Over the course of the 1950s small companies came to the fore, which were largely based on industrial and municipal sponsorship⁶⁸³. Towards the end of the 1950s they were followed by bigger companies, especially the *Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij*. To an important degree, this development was intertwined with that of the port, as an overall conditional force. Also in terms of *Tatort*, it was not the reconstruction of the city that got most attention in the first place, but the port, which had been destroyed too. The port was the motor for social development and the emergence of the welfare state, which can be recognised through film practices too.

The fact that both the city and the port were ruined and needed to be rebuilt offers an insight into Rotterdam's 'subsistence activities'. In terms of an ecosystem, both 'biotic' and 'abiotic' parameters had changed. The city had to 'remake' its historical development of almost seven centuries in about two decades, which makes it possible today to analyse patterns of emergence. In the years after the war, the reconstruction of the port got the highest priority. Industry and economic development were needed to generate the required flows of goods and finances for the reconstruction of Rotterdam and the country.

The reconstruction of the port, before the reconstruction of the city, provides an opportunity to think of the 'interrelationship of exploitative or productive technology and environment' (Steward, 1976 [1955], 40). In this case, it concerns a technological complex related to shipping and transshipment, processing industries, and engineering works. If this constitutes Rotterdam's 'culture core', we may have a closer look at this business and how it relates to 'the behavior patterns involved in the exploitation of a particular area by means of a particular technology' (ibid). The question is how films link up to the technological complex and how the activities in the port inform and enable film productions, 'to ascertain the extent to which the behavior patterns entailed in exploiting the environment affect other aspects of culture'⁶⁸⁴.

⁶⁸³ E.g. *Synchroonfilm*; Jan Schaper's *Skan Film*; the animation studio *Maschilsto* (see: Hogenkamp, 2003: 274n91); Carel Borgers' *NV Filmproductie Rotterdam*; *Studio Freddy Lievense*.

⁶⁸⁴ Steward, 1976 [1955]: 40.

CHAPTER 6. GATE TO THE WORLD

§ 1. liquid city

An important reason for the German army to attack Rotterdam in May 1940 was the strategic importance of its port and its industry. When the city was occupied, they had to serve the military interests of Germany. Various yards would indeed produce for the German army, either voluntarily or by force⁶⁸⁵. Next to that, Rotterdam was important for its oil storage. For that reason, the British Royal Air Force attacked oil storage tanks in the port of Rotterdam, in February 1941, which was the operational debut of the RAF's first 4-engine heavy bomber, the Stirling⁶⁸⁶. To prevent allied attacks from being successful, the Germans prohibited anyone to take pictures of the harbour. Whatever the effects of this measure were, a major attack on the 3rd of October 1941 largely missed its targets, and the Germans immediately turned it into anti-propaganda⁶⁸⁷.

One of the few newsreels that was explicitly devoted to the port was about the incidental delivery of oranges, supplied to the youngest Dutch children who needed vitamin C (Polygoon, 1942-03-01). However, even in this report there are no images of ships and the like, but only of men and women handling the cargo. For the Germans, however, this was no guarantee that no images were taken and used for other purposes. That fear had its reasons. During the war, the allied forces would attack Rotterdam from the air about 120 times⁶⁸⁸.

Another major allied strike took place on the 31st of March 1943. This attack was even less successful. Instead of hitting its military targets, it killed hundreds of citizens and destroyed large parts of residential areas, which was shown through newsreels that were also used as anti-propaganda⁶⁸⁹. After March 1943, the Germans decided that any form of publicity on either the port or the reconstruction of the city was prohibited⁶⁹⁰. As Cor Wagenaar has explained, this had another reason too. The Germans wanted to avoid discussions on the development of Rotterdam, since it was not clear yet which role Rotterdam would fulfil in the new German *Reich*, once the war would be over, without the international trade that Rotterdam had served before. It was also not clear how the port of Rotterdam would relate to those of Hamburg and Bremen, and any form of publicity regarding Rotterdam could raise questions and unrest. However, not providing any information on the city and its port would also cause questions.

Another rare example of a newsreel regarding navigation and Rotterdam was a report on pupils at a training vessel for merchant shipping, which was obviously related to the port, but without showing anything of it (Profilti, 1944-wk11). It informed about a future that promised prosperous trade at times of peace. This was still far from reality. During the war, shipping enterprises suffered great losses too, also at sea. If we just take the case of Anthony Veder, the British Ministry of War Transport took possession of his five cargo and passenger ships that travelled to the USA, which were subsequently used for war purposes. Three of them sank due to torpedo and air raids⁶⁹¹. The prospect for the Germans became gradually less promising. During the last year of the war, the port was heavily destroyed, especially by the Germans, when they had to withdraw and tried to frustrate the allied forces.

⁶⁸⁵ See: Van de Laar, 2000: 436.

⁶⁸⁶ In the night of 10th-11th of February, 1941. www.worldwar-2.net/timelines/war-in-europe/european-air-war/european-air-war-index-1941.htm (2009-04-11).

⁶⁸⁷ i.e. Profilti, 1941 (nr42), Polygoon Hollands Nieuws, 1941-wk42;

⁶⁸⁸ Van der Pauw, 2006: 853.

⁶⁸⁹ Polygoon Hollands Nieuws, 1943-wk15 and 16.

⁶⁹⁰ Wagenaar, 1992: 158.

⁶⁹¹ Helderma, 2003: 251. The sacrifices would later be expressed through art; Anthony Veder was one of the initiators of a memorial for the fallen sailors of the merchant shipping, which became monument *De Boeg* (1956) by the Italian artist Federico Carasso (see: NTS JOURNAAL, 1956-08-30).

mediating subsistence

The condition of exhaustion, across the country, as a result of the winter of famine, was still urgent at the time of the liberation (1945-05-06 for Rotterdam). Before a structural reconstruction of the country could start, this required immediate action. Foreign support relieved the situation, which accompanied the arrival of the liberators, who also documented it, like the Canadian Army Film Unit (LCT'S HELP RELIEVE HOLLAND FAMINE, 1945-May⁶⁹²). It showed English ships arriving at the port of Rotterdam, with supplies of sugar, salt, flour, beans and cans of soup.

The issue of subsistence can be taken quite literally here, which is furthermore reflected by Polygoon's newsreels dealing with Rotterdam. One of the first was about the arrival of Canadian horses, for agricultural purposes, to substitute those taken away by the Germans (Polygoon, 1945-wk40). The next report was about the arrival of Irish cattle for slaughter (1945-42). Various other reports on the transshipment of food would follow, for example about the arrival of the first loads of oranges (1946-03), as well as bananas (1946-23). The latter is emblematic for port films, since the shipping of bananas had become an iconic image of the genre before the war. Moreover, the bananas emphasised the fact that Rotterdam was connected to the world again⁶⁹³. At the same time Polygoon produced some longer reports and documentaries, such as DE NOORDAM BRENGT DE EERSTE MARSHALL GOEDEREN (1948, Polygoon)⁶⁹⁴. The first Marshall Plan aid concerned, not by coincidence, the delivery of cereals.

Besides food, there was also a critical need of clothing. Therefore the Red Cross initiated the *Nationale Hulp Aktie Roode Kruis* (HARK, 1944-1947). It collected money and above all goods, from all over the world. As soon as the western part of the Netherlands was liberated, the HARK moved its headquarters from Tilburg to Rotterdam, due to its port, where it also got its warehouses and distribution centre⁶⁹⁵. The foundation had a staff of about one hundred people, divided over fifteen departments. That of *Pers en Propaganda* (press and propaganda) was responsible for the publicity campaign, to instigate people to donate clothing, shoes, tools, furniture and the like⁶⁹⁶. Its operations are an instance of *Medienverbund*, since the HARK made use of press, radio and cinema⁶⁹⁷, while it also created posters, folders, magazines, theatre performances, lectures, and exhibitions (for which a special department was established).

Already before the liberation, and hence secretly, the HARK commissioned Polygoon to produce a feature length propaganda film: 5 JAREN – EEN FILM OPGEDRAGEN AAN ALLE NEDERLANDERS (1945, A.J.W. de Groot & Heleen Ruygrok). In this montage documentary, editor Heleen Ruygrok applied the principles of Soviet cinema to footage from different newsreels and recordings by army film units. It started with an extensive general impression of the country before the war, with various cities and their industries, including Rotterdam and its port. The second part was the occupation of the country, with the UFA images of the bombardment. The end of the film shows an overview of the devastations, and subsequently the first aid. There are shots of the American ship 'Francis E. Siltz', with goods to support the Dutch, which arrives at the port of Rotterdam, and the cargo is subsequently transhipped to the Red Cross warehouse ('Pakhuismeesteren'), in order to be distributed across the country.

Besides issues that immediately concerned the port serving subsistence, Polygoon reported also on other activities taking place in the port. Highly remarkable is a report on Belgian reporters visiting the port (Polygoon, 1945-wk49). It is an instance of media reflecting upon media practices, which is especially interesting regarding the fact that it was among the first reports on Rotterdam after the war. It perfectly illustrates the port as the city's culture core

⁶⁹² LCT = Landing Craft Tank.

⁶⁹³ It took a few more years before the Netherlands, in turn, could export, through Rotterdam, large freights of food to America, see: KOOL VOOR AMERIKA (1951, Polygoon, for: Centraal Bureau van de Tuinbouwveilingen Nederland).

⁶⁹⁴ AKA: FOOD-SUPPLY BY MARSHALL AID. See also: Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws (1948-18).

⁶⁹⁵ Jongkoen, Van Creveld e.a., 1948: 25.

⁶⁹⁶ Ibid, p28.

⁶⁹⁷ For various short films by the HARK, concerning places other than Rotterdam, see: B&G.

radiating into other realms, which as such informs the media too. This, of course, also applies to Polygoon itself and all the reports it made on Rotterdam, showing the activities in the port⁶⁹⁸. Polygoon also reported on the reconstruction of the port, from the first achievements in 1946, to the final works a few years later⁶⁹⁹.

In fact, out of the about 450 Polygoon reports on Rotterdam made in the first fifteen years after WWII, 31% dealt with the port. Whereas the port served as a physical gate to the world, such reports did so in terms of information, communication and imagination. They both reported and supported the flows of the 'liquid city', and in this way the cinematic monitor was intrinsically part of the ecology of the port and its industries.

Besides Polygoon there have been others to address the role of the port and its reconstruction. One film should be mentioned here in particular, since it exemplifies the priority that was given to the port. Within the series of 'Reconstruction films' (*Wederopbouwfilms*), the Ministry of Reconstruction, in the person of minister Johan Ringer, commissioned ROTTERDAM AAN DEN SLAG ("Rotterdam Gets to Work", 1946, Allan Penning, Herman van der Horst)⁷⁰⁰. This first important reconstruction film on Rotterdam was produced by the *Nederlandsche Werkgemeenschap voor Filmproductie* (NWF), a nationally based co-operative with Paul Schuitema as one of its initiators⁷⁰¹. As part of a series of reconstruction films, it was shown in regular programmes of cinema theatres across the country⁷⁰². The film addresses the fact that on the 29th of September 1944, the Germans destroyed the port. About eight kilometres of embankments were ruined, including cranes and loading-bridges. The film shows sunken ships obstructing the port, fallen cranes, destroyed embankment walls, and exploded warehouses. The port is a dead industrial landscape, but it will be quickly reanimated again. As the film says, much of it has already been rebuilt, and what remains to be done will soon be carried out. The first loads flow into the port: food and emergency dwellings from Sweden⁷⁰³. Without the port there is literally no bread to eat, and no roof to sleep under.

Similar to ROTTERDAM AAN DEN SLAG, but more detailed, is a film by the newly established "Phototechnical Service" of the "Municipal Department of Public Works". In half an hour, ROTTERDAM HERSTELT ZIJN KADEMUREN (1947, Gemeentewerken) addresses that 40% of the embankment walls were destroyed in September 1944, and how it will be recovered through plans made by 'Diwero' (*Dienst voor de uitvoering van de Wederopbouw van Rotterdam*). Whereas the film is quite technical, the smooth editing keeps it going on. There is a continuous interchange of long shots and close-ups, of drawings and (animated) maps, and the heads and hands of strong workers and clever planners and engineers that are responsible for the complicated works to be carried out. There is first of all the removal of the ruins, and their

⁶⁹⁸ Rotterdam's role of 'gate to the world' is also illustrated by a report on the return of the ocean liner 'Nieuw Amsterdam' (1946-15), or, for example, a report on the Danish ship 'Marit Maersk' that shipped, of all things, a (Dutch) fair to Egypt, for a tour through the middle east (1947-11). Next to that, reports were made on the recovery of major enterprises, such as RDM (receiving a new dock, 1948-wk28), and the biggest dock of the continent that was being used again (1950-15).

⁶⁹⁹ HERSTELWERKZAAMHEDEN IN DE ROTTERDAMSE HAVENS (1946-36); HAVENBEDRIJF IN ROTTERDAM HERSTELT ZICH (1946-46); HERSTEL VAN ROTTERDAMS HAVEN (1948-43); ROTTERDAMSE HAVEN GEHEEL HERSTELD (1950-17).

⁷⁰⁰ Before WWII, Penning worked for the *Centraal Bureau voor Ligafilms*, and as such he had also an intensive contact with the Volksuniversiteit in Rotterdam (since 1932-06-10, letter of Penning / CBvL to Van Dugteren / VU, GAR: archive 'Volksuniversiteit', toegangsnr. 75, inv. nr. 275).

⁷⁰¹ It existed between May 1945 and May 1947, which has been accurately described by Bert Hogenkamp in his book 'The Dutch Documentary Film, 1945-1965' (2003).

⁷⁰² Another film about Rotterdam that was shown as such as Schuitema's MAASBRUGGEN (1937). To that end, the 'Union of Dutch Cinema Theatres' (*Nederlandsche Bioscoopbond*, NBB) had installed, in February 1946, a 'Cultural Advice Committee' to select the films, with Willem Sandberg, Paul Schuitema, and film critic Adrianus van Domburg among its members. See: Hogenkamp, 2003: 45.

⁷⁰³ In the next years more aid would come from Northern Europe, like pre-fabricated schools from Finland. Piles of timber were shipped to Rotterdam, and made into schools on site; see: BOUW FINSE SCHOLEN (1949-23, Polygoon), which shows the construction, from its beginning to its end, when children enter the classes.

recycling, and subsequently the application of different techniques for the construction of embankment walls and various installations, which is all shown through deliberate photographic compositions. There are some particularly striking images: besides the ravages this concerns, for example, shots of a floating concrete factory that is especially made for this occasion. The film includes also some additional impressions, for example of boys sitting on a big pole after swimming in the port. Different versions of the film were released: an extensive one with technical explanations for professionals, and a shorter one for a general public. Additionally, a book with photographs by Jan Kamman was published (*Herstel Kademuren Rotterdamsche Zeehavens*, 1949, Havenherstel Rotterdam)⁷⁰⁴.

§ 2. gate-keepers and viewfinders

While Rotterdam was of strategic interest to the Germans, its military importance continued to exist after the war, which is reflected by several film recordings, especially by Polygoon. An example is a film made on the occasion of the birthday of Prince Bernhard, in 1945, with special attention being paid to the ‘navy week’⁷⁰⁵. The relationship between the Navy and Polygoon became a close one. The Navy had its own information service, the ‘Marvo’ (Marine Voorlichting). It provided the so-called MARINE-JOURNAALS, which were produced by the *Leger Film- en Fotodienst* (“Army Film Service”), in collaboration with Polygoon, which also used them for its own newsreels. In this way Polygoon reported, for example, on the return of the submarine 0.23 to the Netherlands (1946-wk12), and less than a month later on a visit of Queen Wilhelmina, hosted by Mayor Oud, to the submarine 0.24 and torpedo-boat destroyer *Tjerk Hiddes*⁷⁰⁶. More than a significant ten percent of the Polygoon reports (1945-1959) concerned the Navy.

Polygoon made also a special film about the Navy’s submarine service, on the occasion of its 40th anniversary (1947). The film itself emphasised once more the royal engagement with the navy, through yet another visit of Queen Wilhelmina⁷⁰⁷. Although news service and commissioned films were officially two different things, spectators did not easily make such a distinction, and neither did Polygoon. It was reinforced by the typical voice of Polygoon news, that of commentator Philip Bloemendal, which was also to be heard in the case of commissioned films. Another example is a film from 1949 on the aircraft carrier ‘Karel Doorman’, which was a loan from the British Royal Navy, before it became permanently part of the Dutch fleet⁷⁰⁸. This film, which marked the transfer and as such the regained independence of the Dutch Navy, is a tour through the ship, and a record of the preparations for take-off and landing of firefly aeroplanes⁷⁰⁹. The film was directed by Theo van Haren Noman, who made another one for the purpose of recruiting women, *DE MARVA’S* (1950⁷¹⁰), as part of a special campaign.

These films were also shown in Rotterdam, accompanying an exhibition of the Navy at the large manifestation *Ahoy’* (1950), which was organised to celebrate the reconstruction of the port⁷¹¹. In addition some special events were organised too, which were subsequently recorded on film once more, such as the visit of the British Royal Navy. Two weeks later, the Dutch Royal Navy also gave a show, with its submarine 0.24 (a.o.). Other demonstrations followed in the next

⁷⁰⁴ English translation: *Reconstruction of the Quays of the Harbour of Rotterdam – 1944 to 1949*.

⁷⁰⁵ i.e. *DE VERJAARDAG VAN PRINS BERNHARD* (1945, Polygoon-Profilti).

⁷⁰⁶ i.e. *Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws*, 1946-04-09, see: *Marvo*.

⁷⁰⁷ i.e. *VEERTIG JARIG JUBILEUM VAN DE ONDERZEEDIENST TE ROTTERDAM* (1947, Leger Filmdienst).

⁷⁰⁸ See: *Marinevoorlichtingsdienst / Leger Film- en Fotodienst*.

⁷⁰⁹ I.e. *HET NEDERLANDSE VLEGKAMPSCHIP HR.MS. KAREL DOORMAN* (1949, Theo van Haren Noman). The Dutch Navy received subsequently a submarine from the US Navy, which was also reported by Polygoon (1953-wk17).

⁷¹⁰ Cf. Hogenkamp, 2003: 289.

⁷¹¹ Polygoon, 1950-wk29 (= 1950-07-13).

years, for example when the Navy celebrated the 50th anniversary of its submarine service⁷¹². As these cases make clear, one can draw connections between the military, entertainment, and media.

In the next years, Polygoon still frequently reported on the navy and its fleet travelling around the world⁷¹³. In military terms, the port of Rotterdam has always been a 'gate to the world', and vice versa, a gate to Europe. This is exemplified by the visit of the British Royal Navy, but also by other foreign visits, visits. In 1956, for example, the Soviet navy visited Rotterdam with its cruiser Sverdlov, and the US Navy visited it soon afterwards, before going to Egypt because of the Suez crisis. Whereas these visits were a kind of friendly 'monitoring', they themselves were closely monitored by the Dutch media⁷¹⁴. With the navy being a national gate-keeper, Polygoon, and the NTS JOURNAAL later on, was the 'national viewfinder'. They were linked through converging interests.

In 1957 the US paid another visit to Rotterdam, and with it the aircraft carrier Tarawa that attracted much media attention again⁷¹⁵. At that moment, the American movie star Jayne Mansfield made her European tour and visited the Netherlands. She went on board the Tarawa and posed willingly for the cameraman of the NTS JOURNAAL (1957-10-12). It is symbolic for the 'military-entertainment complex' that the American media scholar Timothy Lenoir has observed in the case of Hollywood and the military industry in California⁷¹⁶. Although crossovers were initially unplanned and opportunistic (2000: 328), the industry and media have shared economic and political interests at a higher level of socio-cultural integration.

Although it is not my intention to demonstrate the existence of a 'military-entertainment complex' in the case of Rotterdam, this instance nevertheless shows connections within a broader cultural ecology, in which the port is the culture core that informs media practices. In itself, the aspect of entertainment is merely occasional here. One might recognise it in the case of the reconstruction film *HOUEN ZO!* (1952, Herman van der Horst), for the joyful appearance of the navy band. Regarding fiction it might be recognised in the case of *DRIE DAGEN MET MONICA* (1956, Wil van Es), due to the involvement of Philips and Oude Delft, which developed optical and communication technologies for civil as well as military purposes. To them the film, through the subject of the port, was a showreel to an international audience of industrialists and investors.

More important, however, is the connection between the port and the application of film as a device within industrial processes and marketing strategies, which is above all reflected by non-fiction films. Shell, for example, has an extensive record regarding military concerns, which

⁷¹² E.g. VLOOTSCHOUW VAN DE KONINGKLIJKE MARINE (Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws, 1954-06-12). 50th anniversary of submarine service: Polygoon, 1957-wk24; NTS JOURNAAL, 1957-06-01.

⁷¹³ E.g. Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws 1950-03-13 = 50-11; also: 1951-01-26 = 51-04;.

⁷¹⁴ NTS Journaal, 1956-07-21 and 1956-10-30 + 1956-10-31; 'GROOTSCHEEPS' BEZOEK VAN AMERIKAANSE MARINE AAN ROTTERDAM, Polygoon, 1956-wk45 (= 1956-10-29). Previously, in 1953, the Dutch Royal Navy had already received a submarine from the US Navy, and was named 'Walrus' (AMERIKAANSE ONDERZEEBOOT VOOR DE KONINKLIJKE MARINE, Polygoon, 1953-17).

⁷¹⁵ I.e. NTS JOURNAAL, 1957-10-01. Other visits followed, see: e.g. AMERIKAANSE ATOOMONDERZEEER BEZOEKT ROTTERDAM (Polygoon, 1958-wk12 (= 1958-03-15): the atom submarine Skate crossed the Atlantic in eight days.

⁷¹⁶ Lenoir has pointed at connections between the entertainment industry and military concerns in respect of the development of computer graphics technology since the 1970s. Central in this has been the Computer Graphics Programme at the University of Utah. Its graduates became engaged in different areas (medical, military, film, games). A major node in this web of alumni has been LucasFilm ('Industrial Light and Magic' and its offspring Pixar). In 1999 the film industry and the US Army funded together a new research centre, called the Institute for Creative Technologies, hosted by the University of Southern California (Lenoir, 2000: 329). What Lenoir could only speculate by then, the institute also allows to draw connections at the level of content. After 9/11, for example, the institute hosted a secret meeting when the US Army turned to Hollywood for tactical advice, according to BBC News and *Variety*, explaining that filmmakers offered intelligence specialists understanding of plot and character and scenario training. BBC News: 'Army turns to Hollywood for advice', 2001-10-08. See:

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/entertainment/film/1586468.stm> Hollywood representatives were (a.o.) Steven E. De Souza (writer of *DIE HARD*, 1988, John McTiernan); Joseph Zito (dir. of *DELTA FORCE ONE*, 1999), Randal Kleiser (dir. of *GREASE*).

was supported by a range of films⁷¹⁷. The military interests of shipyards, such as Wilton-Fijenoord, has also been expressed through film⁷¹⁸. Building submarines have been especially important, for the port of Rotterdam as well as the Dutch nation in general. This, finally, links back to the presence of the Dutch navy and the monitoring practices of Polygoon and the NTS JOURNAAL. It is therefore also no surprise that the building of a submarine was among the very first items of the television JOURNAAL (NTS, 1956-01-28), in particular the launching of submarine fighter *Rotterdam* that was built at the docks of RDM⁷¹⁹.

§ 3. moving images: emigration

In the years after WWII, the Dutch state, like many European states, was concerned with reconstruction, on which it spent most of its efforts. Yet, there was shortage in many respects, and emigration was thought to be the solution⁷²⁰. The state actively stimulated its citizens to emigrate, for example at the Ahoy' exhibition in 1950. It links up with Hannerz's (1996: 69) frame of 'movement', as one of the four agencies that enable circulation and emergence of culture. The frame of movement concerns mobility and media networks. Although Hannerz has written on it (1996: 101) in respect of globalisation in the 1990s, his observations are also valuable for the processes that took place half a century earlier.

[M]igration and medialization run parallel, not to say that they are continuously intertwined. Take for instance Appadurai's (1991: 198 ff.) intriguing argument that through the globalizing uses of media technology, the balance between lived experience and imagination may have shifted. Everybody, almost everywhere, is more than ever before aware of many possible lives; fantasy has become a major social practice. Yet people may act on such fantasy in different ways. They may, for example, engage with the media, and then migrate to a possible life depicted there. But once such a move has been made, that which one left has become another possible life.

Media create new and alternative models that help to direct human movement. This is a result of media products circulating around the world. Yet, we can refine it to a more comprehensible scale and take a specific kind of film into consideration.

In the late 1940s and 1950s, a 'complex' of media and economic interests evolved around the issue of emigration. The short fiction film TROS (1956) by Van der Velde and Schaper is part of it, by addressing the psychological and social drama of emigration (i.e. to Canada). It reaches its climax at the end of the film, with the departure of the fully packed ocean liner 'Nieuw Amsterdam' of the Holland America Line, which collaborated on the film. A few more fiction films were made in Rotterdam on the theme of emigration, like the youth film DE LAATSTE PASSAGIER (1961, Jef van der Heijden), about the personal drama of a small boy that wants to take his dog along⁷²¹. Besides that, television documentaries also paid attention to the motivations to emigrate, and the social and psychological impact of it⁷²². Such productions complemented

⁷¹⁷ During WWII, the Shell Film Unit in London produced various films for British national defense, see: Elton, 1956.

⁷¹⁸ An example of a military ship is cruiser 'De Ruyter'; its inauguration, by Queen Juliana at the yard of Wilton-Fijenoord, is shown in a short film by Polygoon (1954). For the production of canons, see the film KANONNEN (195x – Wilton-Fijenoord), see also the instruction film S.A.K.T.d. 120 (195x – Wilton-Fijenoord). Various other yards can be mentioned here too, among them Verolme (e.g. COASTGUARDS FOR BRAZIL, 1956, Bob Kommer).

⁷¹⁹ The NTS Journaal would later also report the return of the submarines 'Walrus' and 'Zeeleeuw' after a travel to the West (NTS, 1958-03-08), and the launching of submarine 'Dolfijn' (NTS, 1959-05-21).

⁷²⁰ Cf. Van Rhijn, 1974: 13. In 1946, the Dutch state acquired three ships from the United States War Shipping Administration, which were built during WWII: 'SS Waterman', 'SS Groote Beer', 'SS Zuiderkruis'. They were first used for the transportation of troops to and from Indonesia, but soon they were used for emigration, in addition to the fleet of the major shipping companies (HAL, Lloyd, NSM), which operated as Stewards too. See: www.nationaalarchief.nl > emigranten; and > aankomst > achtergrondinformatie (2008-08-13).

⁷²¹ Premiere at Corso, 1961-04-06 – *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1962: 27.

⁷²² E.g. HET BESLUIT (1960, Kees van Langeraad for NCRV).

news reports about emigration, to Canada, Brazil, Australia, and other countries⁷²³. Moreover, they complemented a range of commissioned (fiction) films that promoted emigration⁷²⁴.

Of special importance, besides the HAL, was the shipping company *Koninklijke Rotterdamsche Lloyd* (Royal Lloyd of Rotterdam). Just after the war had begun in the Netherlands, J.C. Mol, the former director of Multifilm Haarlem, founded Multifilm Batavia (Jakarta) in the Netherlands East Indies, with financial support of *Rotterdamsche Lloyd*⁷²⁵. After the war it produced the newsreels of *Wordende Wereld*, with Charles Breijer as one of its cameramen. An example of its reports is FORT ROTTERDAM (1947, Multifilm Batavia), on a VOC-fortress from the 16th century, whose name hints at the long history that Rotterdam had with the Dutch East Indies. After WWII the fortress became the home of the families of Moluccan soldiers of the Dutch East Indies military force (KNIL), which the report shows.

Multifilm (Haarlem) also made a film, of forty-five minutes, on the construction of the Lloyd ship 'M.S. Willem Ruys' (M.S. WILLEM RUY, 1948), at De Schelde shipyards in Flushing. In 1940 the ship was ready to be launched, but as the war had started, it was kept ashore. In November 1947, this new hallmark of the Lloyd company made its maiden trip, and the film subsequently showed its arrival in Batavia. After the independence of Indonesia, Lloyd shifted its attention to Australia. It then commissioned J.C. Mol to make the film EEN NIEUWE TOEKOMST TEGEMOET ("Towards a new future", 1950) to promote emigration to Australia, and once again in 1953⁷²⁶. After Mol died (1954), Jaap Nieuwenhuis was asked to make films for *Rotterdamsche Lloyd*, which gradually shifted the attention to cruises, to the Mediterranean, and through the Suez Canal all the way to Singapore, and, alternatively, to South America and the Caribbean⁷²⁷.

While many Dutch emigrated, there was actually a double migration movement taking place. On the 17th of August 1945, Soekarno declared Indonesia an independent republic. The Dutch refused to recognise it, and tried to restore Dutch power by military force. Under pressure from the USA, the Netherlands finally recognised the independence (1949-12-27). Already before the agreement was signed, the first repatriation of Dutch soldiers had taken place, which was accompanied by the film THUIS (1948, Polygoon-Profilti). This film was made to inform them on the developments that had taken place in the Netherlands since the war. In the case of Rotterdam, images were shown of the emptiness of the city centre. From colonial aggressor, the military had to become domestic defender, and to protect the nation's achievements in the future.

In the meantime, the Moluccans declared themselves independent from Indonesia, which the latter did not recognize. Many of them came by ship to the Netherlands in 1951, where they arrived in Rotterdam, in transit to temporary accommodations, among others at camp Westerbork⁷²⁸. Repatriation was especially urgent after 1957, when the Indonesian government carried out a strong anti-Dutch campaign and large numbers of Indo-European citizens left the country in order to establish themselves in the Netherlands. The Dutch government chartered ships and arranged housing and other facilities. It was accompanied by the informational film DE REPATRIERING. EEN EIND EN EEN BEGIN (1958, Wim Povel). It includes images of the arrival of the ships in Rotterdam, and how people found their way in this new homeland⁷²⁹.

Promotional films for emigration continued to be produced in the meantime. Nieuwenhuis, for example, also made films for other shipping companies, such as Trans-Ocean,

⁷²³ E.g. on Canada: Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws, 1947-wk26 + 1948-wk12; Australia and New Zealand: Polygoon, 1948-wk51; on Brazil: Polygoon, 1952-wk37.

⁷²⁴ E.g. AUSTRALIË ROEPT (1954, Karel Nort), produced by Polygoon-Profilti.

⁷²⁵ Hogenkamp, 2003: 69-71.

⁷²⁶ The former was presumably shown at Ahoy', the latter is: EMIGRANTEN REIZEN PER M.S. SIBAJAK (1953, Multifilm), to promote emigration to Australia and New Zealand.

⁷²⁷ PASSAGE NAAR DE ZON (19xx, Jaap Nieuwenhuis ?); CIRCLING THE GLOBE IN COMFORT (1958, Jaap Nieuwenhuis), WIE VAART MEE OVER ZEE (1960, Jaap Nieuwenhuis).

⁷²⁸ See for example the report: AANKOMST TWEDE CONTINGENT AMBONEZEN IN ROTTERDAM (1951, Polygoon) and AANKOMST AMBONEZEN (1951, Herman Schutte).

⁷²⁹ Cf. Polygoon, 1958-wk04: 'ms Sibajak' arrives at the port, where it is welcomed by the Queen, while it is snowing.

for whom he made *ONDER GOED GESTERNTE* (1960). It is a fifty minute documentary about travelling with the ocean liner 'Waterman' from Rotterdam to Melbourne. People from different standings are crying when they say farewell; innumerable hands are raised. These feelings are soon turned into happiness on board of the ship, which is like a village, with various services – religious, medical, labour consultancy, all kinds of entertainment, and loads of food coming aboard in the harbours of exotic places that breath adventure. The Waterman travels east, through the Suez Canal, passing Port Said and Aden. The commentator refers to the things people learnt at school and says that “all our vague imaginations turn into reality here”. Yet, these are ‘scripted spaces’ that are briefly seen, and made into a ‘reality film’ by the shipping company. It is added that Trans-Ocean also goes to the west, which is illustrated by a sequence of images of New York. Stimulating the imagination through film, one is explicitly invited to enter this new world.

In all these films the port of Rotterdam is briefly shown, but it is still crucial, since it is the gate to the world. Because of both emotional and social pressure, in the case of emigration, next to imagination, promise and adventure, Appadurai has noticed a ‘split character’; ‘[o]n the one hand, it is in and through the imagination that modern citizens are disciplined and controlled – by states, markets, and other powerful interests’ (2001: 6). In this case it counts both for the films that stimulated emigration and for the reconstruction films that stimulated the imagination of a glorious new city and country (e.g. through Marshall-films). In the cinema we see the connection between ‘metropolis’ and ‘empire’. However, as Appadurai remarks (2001, 6-7):

[The imagination] is also the faculty through which collective patterns of dissent and new designs for collective life emerge. As the imagination as a social force itself works across national lines to produce locality as a spatial fact and as a sensibility (...), we see the beginnings of social forms without either the predatory mobility of unregulated capital or the predatory stability of many states. Such social forms have barely been named by current social science, and even when named their dynamic qualities are frequently lost.

As a striking example of dissent and new designs for collective life, we might return to Jan Schaper and the film *Hawser* (TROS). Schaper was both captured and liberated by his imagination. First he was taken by the possibilities of Hollywood and the idea of an actors’ studio, then he feared the effects of the Cold War, left America and Europe, and imagined a future in Australia. While ships full of emigrants were still going there, he came back again and had his film made. He combined ideas from American cinema with the realism of Dutch, French and Italian cinema. Considering the great number of applications for his actors’ group, the promise of cinema gave rise to a new way of life, supported by a rapidly growing economy.

Linking this back to the port, once more, it means a twist of perspectives. Instead of emigrants, the country needed immigrants. The great shipping companies faced changing conditions once again, offering new possibilities in the realm of leisure and tourism, adding another dimension to the port of Rotterdam and the city as a whole. In the meantime the city had been reconstructed, which attracted substantial attention from abroad, as a model of urban planning and modern architecture. Similarly, the shipping companies and the industries related to the port, and also the municipality, presented Rotterdam as a place to experience modernity, for businessmen as well as tourists, which had been made possible by the port itself.

§ 4. stretching the liquid

While the reconstruction of the port was taking place, the municipality had already started to work on its extension⁷³⁰. It encompassed plans for the ambitious ‘Botlek’ development (1947-

⁷³⁰ It became largely associated with Mayor Gerard van Walsum (1952-1965). In the years 1942-1945 he was the secretary of the influential *Kamer van Koophandel* (Chambre of Commerce), directed by K.P. van der Mandele, and largely concerned with the development of the new modern city (Van de Laar, 2000: 456). The first initiatives for

1955, Rijkswaterstaat, Gemeentewerken⁷³¹), to accommodate oil refineries and the petrochemical industry. The plans included various engineering works, such as refineries, factories, oil pipelines to Germany, and infrastructural works such as the Botlekbrug. While Gemeentewerken itself documented these projects on film, all of this received substantial attention from Polygoon and later on the NTS as well⁷³². Besides newsreels, there were also other kinds of productions, such as the educational films ROTTERDAM ALS DOORVOERHAVEN (1952), and RIJNVAART (1957), made by the *Nederlandse Onderwijs Film* (NOF). In fact, the NOF, which also organised the distribution of educational films for schools in the Netherlands, often used films made by various companies, such as Shell⁷³³. In this way the purposes of instruction and education merged with attempts to propagate the values of industrialisation and modernisation.

A major player in the Botlek development was indeed Shell, which established itself in the former villages Pernis and Hoogvliet. In the latter Shell built its headquarters (1954-1957, arch. C.A. Abspoel), while it also participated in the development of housing projects for its employees. To promote its business and to communicate the modern values on which it relied, Shell made many documentary and educational films, on a range of subjects, but mostly dealing with geography⁷³⁴.

Various other companies were involved with the development of the port, while making use of media as well, like the shipyard Verolme. In 1957, it opened a new yard and its headquarters, near the village Rozenburg, within the Botlek area. Besides that, it built also houses in Hoogvliet, and in Spijkenisse and Rozenburg as well. Through the efforts of Verolme's spin doctor Gert van der Hoest, this too was documented by Polygoon and by the newly established television JOURNAAL (NTS), while Verolme also commissioned various films to address his achievements⁷³⁵. Whereas Bussum/Hilversum was *Standort*, it was largely fuelled by Rotterdam itself, which strengthened its position as *Tatort*. This stretching of the 'liquid city' was first of all a matter of extending the city business, which was accompanied by various kinds of further radiating media practices. Here I will discuss a few more of them.

port affairs

Films dealing with the port had to raise the interest and support of the public, of both the city and the country, while international attention was needed to attract foreign investors. This was organised by the *Stichting Havenbelangen* (Port Promotion Council), a collective agency of enterprises related to the port, in which the Port Authorities participated as well. The films had to be informative, but also attractive, which resulted in fiction shorts. The first example is RHYTHM OF ROTTERDAM (1952, Ytzen Brusse)⁷³⁶. The love between a chief mate of a sea-going vessel, played by Kees Brusse, and the daughter of a bargeman from the river Rhine, played by Mariette Flink, is a symbol for the relationship between Line-shipping and Rhine-shipping⁷³⁷. In this way,

extension, which reinforced the port's priority position, were directed by Mayor P.J. Oud and Alderman Van Tilburg (port affairs, 1945-1956). For the link between Van Tilburg and Van der Mandele, see: Van de Laar, 2000: 487.

⁷³¹ Important too has been the role of the *Gemeentelijk Havenbedrijf* (dir. N. Koomans), cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 465.

⁷³² E.g. PALEN, 1950; DE BOTLEKBRUG, 1955; EUROPOORT, 1958 – all by *Gemeentewerken Fototechnische Dienst*. For other reports, e.g. on chemical factories, see: Polygoon, 1949-wk37; on the Botlekbrug, see: Polygoon, 1954-wk12; JOURNAAL, NTS, 1955-06-30; for oil pipelines, see: Polygoon, 1949-wk25; JOURNAAL, NTS, 1958-09-17; 1959-08-05.

⁷³³ Cf. [on N.O.F.] Kessler and Masson, 2007: 81.

⁷³⁴ Among the films by Shell are various titles made by Charles Huguenot van der Linden (1950s and 1960s); cf. Hogenkamp, 2003: 292.

⁷³⁵ Cf. Dekker, 2005: 143. For building the yard: BOUW VAN DE WERF OP ROZENBURG (1956, Verolme United Shipyards). For the opening of Verolme Rozenburg: NTS JOURNAAL, 1957-06-27; for other reports on this yard, e.g. NTS JOURNAAL, 1958-07-15; 1959-01-21. Examples of Verolme promotion films: OPENING VAN DE NIEUWE WERF VAN VEROLME OP HET EILAND ROZENBURG (1957, Polygoon); REZA SHAH THE GREAT (1958, P.H.); DELIVERY OF THE FIRST PERSIAN TANKER "REZA SHAH THE GREAT" (1958, Polygoon) and HET STAATSIEBEZOEK VAN ZKH DE SIAH VAN PERZIË (1959, Polygoon; cf. 1959-wk21; cf. JOURNAAL, NTS, 1959-05-22). Cf. filmography > Verolme United Shipyards.

⁷³⁶ Dutch title: HIJ, ZIJ, EN EEN WERELDHAVEN.

⁷³⁷ Cf. NFM retrospect. Kees Brusse, 2005. <http://lisa.filmmuseum.nl/keesbrusse/filmografie/reclame.html> (2009-04-11)

the film shows Rotterdam as a node of various connections. Besides logistics and facilities like warehouses, attention is paid to the industry, like the Van Nelle factory. In accordance to most other port films, there is the typical image of bananas being conveyed, as well as the loading and unloading of barrels of oil, a train, timber (trees), and even an elephant. While the city is good for industry, it is also hygienic, illustrated by laundry hanging outside, and thus a good place to live in – for people like the protagonists of the film that get married at the end. This promotional fiction short was shown at the Cannes Film Festival (1952), together with other Dutch films (by Haanstra, Van der Horst and Max de Haas). Together they were awarded a special prize for the best collection of ‘documentary films’⁷³⁸. Such a classification is a particular instance of the art film paradigm. Brusse was well aware of it, since the film had actually been conceived upon it, in order to get funding from the Ministry of Education, Art & Science (OKW). In this way the arts directly served economic interests, which, as such, was not addressed at all.

Because of the success of RHYTHM OF ROTTERDAM, filmmaker Wil van Es, who had worked on some small productions before, saw a chance to make another fiction film, and so he approached the *Stichting Havenbelangen*. The board of directors were interested, especially in respect of the manifestation E55⁷³⁹. The foundation wanted to use the most advanced techniques available to support its own image of an utterly modern port. The idea was to make a wide screen colour film, using Eastman, shot on the exceptional 70mm format through the new Delrama cinemascope system of Oude Delft optical industries⁷⁴⁰. Moreover, Philips would partake in the venture since it could provide the required projection technology. Besides that, Philips had developed new equipment for stereophonic sound, which it wanted to demonstrate at the E55 as well. This collaboration between the Port, Philips and Oude Delft, instantiates an industrial development strategy channelled through cinema.

However, this collaboration, including the organisation of E55 as well, was not enough to support the film and to make it in time. Yet the idea remained and the *Stichting Havenbelangen* found the “Government Information Service” (RVD) to support the project, but it had some remarks. It suggested working with a director of name and fame, in particular Herman van der Horst or Bert Haanstra. However, as Van Es had proposed the plan, *Stichting Havenbelangen* considered that unfair and felt obliged to work with him⁷⁴¹. In that case, the RVD proposed to involve a well-known production company, in particular Polygoon, since it had already made a widescreen colour film⁷⁴². In the end, *Stichting Havenbelangen* decided nevertheless to leave the whole project to Wil van Es, as its director, producer and cameraman⁷⁴³; only the story was

⁷³⁸ Bertina, 1994: 26. See also: Hogenkamp, 2003: 97.

⁷³⁹ Letter (‘oorspronkelijk plan’) of 1955-06-16 to the Council of Supervisors (aan de Leden Raad van Toezicht), by J. den Tex, secretary of the Stichting Havenbelangen. Gemeentearchief Rotterdam (GAR): archief Stichting Havenbelangen, nr. 317/49.

⁷⁴⁰ This company was later renamed as Oldelft/Delft Instruments. The film has been restored (2003) by Haghefilm Amsterdam, commissioned by the Gemeentearchief Rotterdam and the Nederlands Filmmuseum.

www.haghefilm.nl/Ni/NiEUWS/nieuwsrubriek.asp (2004-09-28) The film was the first one shot through Delrama lenses, which was then bought by Technicolor and called Technirama; March 2007: www.in70mm.com/newsletter/2000/61/technirama/birth.htm; www.cinematographers.nl/FORMATS2.htm

⁷⁴¹ Letter (‘oorspronkelijk plan’) of 1955-06-16 to the Council of Supervisors (aan de Leden Raad van Toezicht), by J. den Tex, secretary of the Stichting Havenbelangen. Gemeentearchief Rotterdam (GAR): archief Stichting Havenbelangen, nr. 317/49.

⁷⁴² Letter (‘vertrouwelijk’) of 1955-06-10 to the Council of Supervisors (aan de Leden Raad van Toezicht), by J. den Tex, secretary of the Stichting Havenbelangen. Gemeentearchief Rotterdam (GAR): archief Stichting Havenbelangen, nr. 317/49. Letter was sent to invite the members of the ‘council of supervisors’ of the Stichting Havenbelangen to watch the screening of the Polygoon films HIGHLIGHTS OF HOLLAND (made for KLM), VUUR EN VLAM (in colour, for: Hoogovens), BETWEEN TWO FLIGHTS (in largoscoop colour, for KLM).

⁷⁴³ Letter of 1955-06-20 to the Council of Supervisors (aan de Leden Raad van Toezicht), by J. den Tex, secretary of the Stichting Havenbelangen. Gemeentearchief Rotterdam (GAR): archief Stichting Havenbelangen, nr. 317/49. The letter was an invitation for a presentation by Wil van Es showing his previous works.

written by the well-known writer Simon Carmiggelt. It resulted in the 70mm cinemascope film *DRIE DAGEN MET MONICA* (“Three days with Monica”, 1956).

The film deals with a journalist from Rotterdam who is asked by his employer to show the city to an important foreign relation. Unexpectedly the visiting journalist, who arrives by a Sabena helicopter at Heliport Hofdijk, turns out to be a woman. She has come to write an article on the port. The man shows her the loading and unloading of ships (with bananas once more), of Rhine barges and ‘sea castles’ such as the ‘Nieuw Amsterdam’, the petrochemical complexes of the Botlek, and the dockyards, while providing her with all kinds of figures. The visiting journalist is the stand in for the audience to learn about the port. It suggests that film, rather than the press, ‘immediately’ transmits reality, which the 70mm cinemascope colour format rendered nevertheless into a spectacle at that time. The viewer takes the information for granted, because you are drawn into the story only because you wonder if a love affair will develop. On the last day, the man invites the woman for a trip by his private motor boat to the lake ‘Kralingse Plas’. But nothing really happens. There is only a melancholic image of the man saying farewell when she flies back by helicopter. We are just left with facts and figures of the port.

The film is different from most industrial and port films made in Rotterdam, or elsewhere. Regarding the optical industry, Carl Zeiss in Jena, for example, made films on its products that were recorded through its own lenses, while the films also addressed that the lenses were manufactured through Zeiss instruments. This self-referentiality seems a perfect match to Luhmannian system theory, as applied by Malte Hagener (2007: 289). In the case of *DRIE DAGEN MET MONICA*, however, there is no short circuit like this. Rather than a self-creating industry legitimizing itself, there is a general attractor of industrial development. The port functions thereby as an integrative factor to connect industries, through the spectacle of modernity: the highly advanced cinemascope system enabled an impressive view of ships, cranes and installations, transportation and logistics⁷⁴⁴. This modernity is also emphasised by the image of the heliport, and, in social-cultural terms, by the appearance of the emancipated woman.

Various other fiction shorts served industrial purposes, especially in connection to the port, such as *DE BLOEM DER NATIE* (“The Flower of the Nation”, 1956, Charles Huguenot van der Linden), made for the flower factory and bakery ‘Meneba’. It tells the story of a couple visiting Rotterdam for their ‘honeymoon’, which in Dutch is called *wittebroodsweken* (literally: ‘weeks of white bread’. The city is shown by images of the Coolsingel and the Maashaven, where the grain elevator company (GEM) is located, in order to follow the production of flour.

Films that applied fiction for promotional reasons were part of a broader tendency after WWII. Besides such promotional films, however, the port was also the setting for a film like *TROS* (“Hawser”, 1956, Wim van der Velde). This was not conceived as a promotional film, and its story, written by Jan Schaper, was more sophisticated, but it promoted the port nevertheless. One of the main characters is the captain of the tug-boat ‘Siberia’. It was an existing boat of the company Smit, which deliberately collaborated on the film, not unlike the Holland America Line (HAL), whose ocean liner ‘Nieuw Amsterdam’ is shown at the end. Both companies are also mentioned in the credits, as well as the Port Authorities (*Gemeentelijk Havenbedrijf*). It links this artistic production to the three previous films, in terms of preoccupations and interests, while alternatively one might also draw connections to various non-fiction productions⁷⁴⁵.

further radiations

According to Julian Steward, the exploitation of resources and the lay-out of settlements is mediated through particular modes of social organisation and ownership. Kinship is among the

⁷⁴⁴ Something similar applies to the panoramic photography of Frits Rotgans; in a press-notice for his book *Rotterdam, Stad en Haven* (1959), publisher Nijgh & Van Ditmar linked it to widescreen cinema, see: Suermondt, 1993.

⁷⁴⁵ Such as the Smit promotion film *STEADY AS SHE GOES* (1958, Ted de Wit/Carillon), and the HAL promotion film *VAREN IS GENIETEN* (1959, Max de Haas/Visie Film).

important factors, which can be recognised regarding the ‘harbour barons’⁷⁴⁶. Family histories show that kinship has played a role in the way the port has radiated into other realms of the city’s culture – including the fine arts and media. A case in point is that of Van Beuningen and the *Steenkolenhandelsvereniging* (SHV). It was established by Hendrik van Beuningen, in 1896. His son Daniël van Beuningen (1877-1955) subsequently became its president. After his death Museum Boymans received his private art collection, and the museum was renamed Boijmans-Van Beuningen (1958)⁷⁴⁷. Regarding media, something similar counts for the Veder dynasty⁷⁴⁸.

The Veder family originally came from the Shetland Islands and settled in Rotterdam in the early 18th century. Whereas the founding father was a simple sailor, the next generations climbed the social ladder. John Veder (1754-1833) became a captain of merchant shipping and started a coal company. It was the onset of a prosperous family business with important positions in the world of shipping, trade and finance. Part of this was the company Hudig & Veder, for line shipping to the USA. Through marriage, the Veder clan got a hold on shipping and trading company A. van Hoboken & Co. Anthony Veder Sr. (•1879-†1928) became its president, who was, concurrently, a pioneer of radio broadcasting⁷⁴⁹. His son Anthony Veder Jr. (•1914-†1967) was similarly interested in media. At the age of twenty-three he established, with support from his mother Maria van Hoboken, two shipping firms, which were rather successful⁷⁵⁰.

After WWII, he met Joop Landré (•1909-†1997), who was the president of Polygoon-Profilti, and also a scion of a well-known family from Rotterdam⁷⁵¹. Landré studied law, and through his family connections became a spokesman for Philips, and subsequently the director of the ‘Government Information Service’ (RVD, 1945-1952). In this function he was responsible for several film productions sponsored by the Dutch state, among them reconstruction films. Many of them were made by Polygoon, who asked him to become its director (1952-1959). The 1950s were the heydays of this enterprise, but over the course of the 1950s it increasingly felt the competition from television, which, by 1959, outran Polygoon. Landré got the idea to establish a new, commercial film company in Rotterdam, for the production of feature films.

Landré himself had 20,000 Dutch guilders at his disposal. He discussed his plans with Veder, who multiplied it by 20, providing 400,000 guilders additionally⁷⁵². In this way they founded, in 1959, the *Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij* (NFM), which was then one of the most ambitious film production companies in the Netherlands, with Landré as its president and Veder as one of the directors⁷⁵³. It contracted various talented filmmakers and it made various successful productions indeed, almost all of them being shot by the cinematographer Eduard van der Enden⁷⁵⁴. A number of them will be discussed in Chapter 13, in which I continue the history of the role of the port regarding the emergence of media practices in Rotterdam.

⁷⁴⁶ For the role of the elite regarding planning and housing (1860-1950), see: De Klerk, 1998; for the role of entrepreneurs in general (1850-1950), see: Dicke e.a. Both of them highlight social networks and family ties.

⁷⁴⁷ See: Dicke, 2003: 51; see also: http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Museum_Boijmans_Van_Beuningen (2007-09-08).

⁷⁴⁸ Information is mainly based on: Helderma, 2003.

⁷⁴⁹ He also financed a fund for scientific research on radio broadcasting: *Wetenschappelijk Radiofonds*, WERA, see: www.veron.nl/amrad/wera.htm (website visited, 2006-04-28).

⁷⁵⁰ In 1937, Veder Jr. (age 23) established the shipping agency Anthony Veder & Co., and the shipping company *Maatschappij Zeestransport NV*, which operated between Rotterdam and Chicago. After WWII he started the Rotterdam Terminal and the *Oranje Lijn*, travelling the St. Lawrence Seaway (Canada/USA). A film was released by the *Oranje Lijn* to introduce the new seaway, i.e. *DE ACHTSTE ZEE* (1954, Oranje Lijn). The company was finally taken over by the Holland America Line. For more information on Anthony Veder Jr., see: Helderma, 2003; Lichtenauer, 2007. For the film: see the film folder at Maritiem Museum Rotterdam, inv. nr. DB2949.

⁷⁵¹ Information of this paragraph is mainly based on: Landré, 1994. His father was the composer Willem Landré, who also worked as the head of the art section of the NRC newspaper.

⁷⁵² 20,000 guilders = app. 9,000 euros; 400,000 guilders = app. 181,000 euros (2002 rate, without corrections).

⁷⁵³ Landré, 1994: 57. Cf.: *De Filmkrant*, nr. 178, May 1997, ‘The Big Sleep’ > Landré www.filmkrant.nl/av/org/filmkran/archief/fk178/sleep178.html

⁷⁵⁴ For his first production, Landré asked director Fons Rademakers, because of his success with *DORP AAN DE RIVIER* (1958), which received an Oscar nomination. The cinematography was done by Eduard van der Enden (•1928), and

CHAPTER 7. THE APPEARANCE OF A NEW CITY

§ 1. the void, a matter of projection

On the 18th of May 1940, three days after the bombardment, the city commissioned city planner Witteveen to draw a reconstruction plan. In three weeks, on the 8th of June, a road plan was ready. The fact that Witteveen needed such a little amount of time means that the plans were already there⁷⁵⁵. Before the war, various plans had been made to modernise the city, which, however, encountered fierce opposition⁷⁵⁶. After the bombardment these plans could finally be carried out. Mayor P.J. Oud thought nevertheless of restoring, rebuilding and maintaining certain structures, but decisions were then taken in The Hague, by Johannes Ringers, who was appointed as the “General Deputy for the Reconstruction” (*Algemeen Gemachtigde voor den Wederopbouw*)⁷⁵⁷. Ringers installed a state office for Rotterdam, *Adviesbureau Stadsplan Rotterdam* (ASRO), and Witteveen became its director. It made the decision to clear the old city. ‘Clearing this rubble – the removal of cellars, foundations, piping and ducting, the levelling and the expropriation – was the most significant urbanistic project since the damming of the Rotte at the Maas in the 12th century’, according to Crimson Architecture Historians⁷⁵⁸. This void, or tabula rasa, became the precondition for an entirely new city that would be built, according to the modernist principles of CIAM.

Although the Germans destroyed 99% of the city centre, things could have had a different course. In Warsaw, for example, the historic city was to be rebuilt in its old glory. In Rotterdam, the St. Laurens church is one of the few examples of a severely damaged building that was to be restored – although that was not even sure for several years⁷⁵⁹. Its restoration would be shown once and again by many films, which helped it to become a symbol of the resurrection of Rotterdam⁷⁶⁰. This, however, distracted the attention from other buildings. At least 144 buildings

Rademakers introduced him to Landré. Eventually, Van der Enden would be the director of photography of virtually all NFM productions. In 1960 Rademakers’s film was ready (*THAT JOYOUS EVE / MAKKERS STAAKT UW WILD GERAAS*). The film tells the story, written by Jan Blokker, of three families in Amsterdam-Zuid that prepare for the traditional Saint Nicholas celebration (5th of December). One deals with a divorce, another with a rebellious son, and the third with the father looking for a ‘joyous eve’ elsewhere. Notwithstanding the power of the kinship structures of Veder and Landré, the theme of family disintegration addresses a general trend that accompanied modernisation and city life (for the Amsterdam connection, see: Hendriks, 2006: 87). The film won a silver bear at the Berlinale (1961), but it was no commercial success (Hofstede, 2000: 108). According to Landré it was because of the unhappy end. It was ahead of its time; it is now seen as a classic of Dutch cinema (i.e. an instance of culture serving a memory and an oscillator function). The second NFM film was *THE KNIFE* (1961, Fons Rademakers), written by Hugo Claus, which was also too artistic for the general public, different from the next film, *RIFIFI IN AMSTERDAM* (1962), by John Korporaal (who also made *DE VERGETEN MEDEMINNAAR*, 1963). In order to produce such films (as well as artistic documentaries such as *THE REALITY OF KAREL APPEL*, 1961, Jan Vrijman), the NFM also made commissioned films, but still with artistic ambitions. It is no coincidence that most of these films, contrary to the fiction films, dealt with the port. Here too, moving between fiction and documentary, art and industry, one sees the oscillating function. At the same time this is a matter of ‘emergent interfaces’ (Nowotny, 2005: 28), which causes cultural complexity: the splitting of the culture core and its ‘economic arrangements’ into various cultural branches. If the culture core of Rotterdam is a ‘liquid city’, its extension means ‘stretching the liquid’.

⁷⁵⁵ Oudenaarden, 2004: 42; Van de Laar, 2000: 301.

⁷⁵⁶ Ibid. p302, e.g. the case of stopping up the Blaak.

⁷⁵⁷ For Oud, see: Oudenaarden, 2004: 15; for Ringers, see: Wagenaar, 137 and 92-97 (a.o.).

⁷⁵⁸ I.e. English quote: Crimson, 2002: 34; original quote Crimson, 1995b: ‘Het puinruimen - het verwijderen van kelders, fundamenteen, buizen en leidingen, het egaliseren en het onteigenen – is het belangrijkste stedenbouwkundige project geweest sinds het indammen van de Rotte bij de Maas in de twaalfde eeuw.’

⁷⁵⁹ J.J.P. Oud was a member of the committee to investigate the possibilities for restoration. In 1950 he came with a plan to restore the tower, and to replace the nave by a square for contemplation and a new, modern building that would be detached from the tower, see: Taverne e.a., 2001: 462-463.

⁷⁶⁰ e.g. *OPBOUWDAG IN DE MAASSTAD* (1947-wk23, Polygoon); *OPBOUW SINT-LAURENSKERK* (1952, P. Rest), *DE RESTAURATIE VAN DE ST. LAURENSKERK BEGONNEN* (1952-wk21, Polygoon); *HOUEN ZO!* (1952, Herman van der Horst), the opening scene of the film concerns the church; *DE RESTAURATIE VAN DE ST. LAURENS* (1954-wk25, Polygoon); *ROTTERDAMSE ST. LAURENSKERK VLAGT* (1955-wk47, Polygoon); *JOURNAAL* (NTS, 1955-11-19 and 1959-

could have remained, according to an inventory made just after the bombardment⁷⁶¹. This is much more than the number of buildings that were finally saved, like the town hall, the central post office, the Schielandshuis, and the brand new trade centre ('Beurs'). It means that various buildings were simply broken down, among them the remarkable 'Groote Schouwburg' (1887, arch. J. Verheul)⁷⁶².

To remove the built structures of the city meant erasing its historical heritage. Empty space became empty time. The city had to reinvent itself, which happened as soon as one moved and left traces in the environment. These traces became means to distinguish between places where one had acted before, and where one still had to go. This is, as Niklas Luhmann has it, a matter of *memory* and *oscillation* that allow for *autopoiesis* (self-creation).

To be able to separate memory and oscillation, the system constructs time, that is, a difference of past and future states, by which the past becomes the realm of memory and the future the realm of oscillation. This distinction is an evolutionary universal. It is actualized by every operation of the system and thus gives time the appearance of a dimension of the 'world'. And if there are sufficient cultural guarantees for conceptualizing time, the distinction of time re-enters itself with the effect that past and future presents, too, have their own temporal horizons, their own pasts and futures. (Luhmann, 1997)⁷⁶³

Today the void offers the possibility to examine the way time comes into being as a human construct. This remains hypothetical, since neither the whole city had disappeared, nor did one forget about the times before, while one still interacted with other cities.

the cognitive appeal

The reconstruction of Rotterdam was not only a physical, but also a rhetorical act of planning, as Crimson has argued. They note that writers, by writing about the ruins, the emptiness and the plans, were immediately involved in the reconstruction process.

Up until that time [i.e. the destruction of the city], urban development had subsisted on the coincidence of the mental and organizational content of the city with its physical, three-dimensional form. Directly after the bombing the rubble-writers took as their theme the unhitching of city form from city substance. This was inevitable due to the fact that the idea of the city seemed to live on whereas the city as artefact had in fact vanished.⁷⁶⁴

Emptiness is the most extreme shape a city can have. Crimson raises a fundamental issue: what is a city like when it is no longer there? What is an object without its material form?

According to economist Sergio Conti, the 'identity' of a social system is closely related to its 'organisation'. Conti defines *organisation* as an 'ensemble of relations', and positions it against *structure*, which consists of 'material and historic qualities'. Conti says (2005: 33) that

10-30 a.o.); OPDAT HET WOORD WEER KLINKE (1959, B. Steggerda). In the next decade various reports would follow. The restoration was finished in 1968; see: SCALA (NTS, 1968-11-28); ROTTERDAM TE DEUM (NCRV, 1968-12-14); cf. Polygoon, 1968-wk49. It became once more a subject of reports when the church got its new organ, see e.g. NIEUW ORGEL IN DE ST. LAURENSKERK (Polygoon, 1973); LAURENSORGEL IN ROTTERDAM (Eelco Zwart/EO, 1974-02-28).

⁷⁶¹Cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 412; Roelofsz, 1989.

⁷⁶²For information on the 'Groote Schouwburg' at the Aert van Nesstraat, see: Van de Laar, 2000: 430.

⁷⁶³This argument can also be found in the work of others, among them the anthropologist Paul Bohannan (1995: 187), who considers time as the product of multilinear evolutionary processes. For the issue of time and feedback loops in artificial intelligence, see also: Bonabeau, Dorigo, Theraulaz, 1999: 41.

⁷⁶⁴English quote: Crimson, 2002: 41. Original quote: Crimson, 1995b: 'Tot op dat moment had stedenbouw juist bestaan bij de gratie van het samenvallen van de geestelijke en organisatorische inhoud van de stad met haar fysieke, driedimensionale vorm. Gelijk na het bombardement thematiseerden de puinschrijvers de ont koppeling van de vorm van de inhoud van de stad. Deze was onvermijdelijk geworden doordat het idee van de stad bleek voort te bestaan terwijl de stad als een materieel artefact was verdwenen.'

the structure changes more rapidly than the organisation, since ‘a radical modification of the relations that compose it can lead to the disintegration of the system.’ The structure is merely an outcome (ibid, 35). However, the identity might change too, as the organisation evolves over time, but according to its own laws (ibid, 33-34).

The question here is how a city is understood when it no longer functions as it should. When a city is in disorder, all cognitive functions are called upon to create order again, and to make sense of the city. Because of that, writers and artists have a task to fulfil. As Crimson has it:

At the moment when urban form is no longer an integral three-dimensional composition and a city’s significance no longer coincides with its physical shape, the urban form can only be described in terms of something other than itself. This goes far beyond simply describing the city in terms of the activities that take place there; it means – and here we touch upon an underestimated aspect in Rotterdam’s reconstruction – that the city is filled with stories, with narrative lines and points. Now that buildings and urban elements could no longer draw their significance from a general ground plan, they were artificially charged with rhetorical utterances on the identity of Rotterdam.⁷⁶⁵

Crimson argues that the city is filled with stories that give meaning to urban space, which cannot be found in the space that became emptiness. The emptiness, however, triggered the imagination.

The surface area of Rotterdam had no shape and no content. It presented a screen for all projections of a still imaginary Rotterdam, or a neutral table on which poetical utterances and centres of intensity could be jotted down.⁷⁶⁶

Besides architecture, other media were involved to create urban space, to put it in into perspective.

Crimson exemplifies it by a reference to a group of writers, including Ben Stroman, Leo Ott, M.J. Brusse and Anton Koolhaas, and analyses the case of the most influential literary piece of that time, which was the theatre play HET HART VAN ROTTERDAM (“The Heart of Rotterdam”). It was initiated by Koolhaas, together with J.H. Speenhof and Jan Musch, with contributions by several authors⁷⁶⁷. The play, which had its premiere on the 1st of September 1941, consisted of five tableaux, garnished by poems, songs, music, ballet, and slide projections, all made by different artists. The tableaux presented the city in a whirling imaginary journey through time, from the destroyed city to its roots in the middle ages, and back again: building the St. Laurens Church in the late middle-ages, the glory of the port in the 19th century, clearing the pieces after the bombardment, life during the war, and finally businessmen and shipping directors that find a new spirit in the brand new “Trade Centre” (“Beurs”)⁷⁶⁸. According to Crimson, the play shows that Koolhaas and his colleagues wanted to integrate the violent destruction of the city in a historical continuum that also included its emergence and its expansion.

⁷⁶⁵ English quote: Crimson, 2002: 43. Original quote: Crimson, 1995b: ‘Op het moment dat de stadsvorm geen integrale drie-dimensionale compositie meer is en de betekenis van een stad niet meer samenvalt met haar fysieke gestalte, kan de stadsvorm alleen vanuit iets anders dan haarzelf beschreven worden. Dit betekent veel meer dan dat men de stad alleen beschrijft vanuit de activiteiten die er plaatsvinden; dit betekent - en hier komen we bij een onderschat aspect van de wederopbouw van Rotterdam - dat de stad wordt gevuld met verhalen, met narratieve lijnen en punten. Nu gebouwen en stedelijke elementen geen betekenis meer konden onttrekken aan een algemene grondvorm; werden ze kunstmatig opgeladen met retorische uitspraken over de identiteit van Rotterdam.’

⁷⁶⁶ English quote: Crimson, 2002: 44. Original quote: Crimson, 1995b: ‘Het stedelijk grondvlak van Rotterdam kende geen vorm en ook geen inhoud; Het vormde een scherm voor alle projecties van een vooralsnog imaginair Rotterdam, ofwel een neutrale tabel waarop poetische uitspraken en centra van intensiteit genoteerd konden worden.’

⁷⁶⁷ According to Van de Laar (2000: 431) the play had its premiere at the 1st of September 1940. Authors of the play were Anton Koolhaas, Ben Stroman, W.A. Wagener, Albert van Waasdijk, G. Zalsman.

⁷⁶⁸ ‘Beurs’, 1925-1940, J.F. Staal; see: Polygoon Hollands Nieuws, 1940-15.

To visualise the history, different techniques were used, such as kaleidoscopic images by several projectors that showed great buildings, cranes, bridges and the iconic ocean liner ‘Nieuw Amsterdam’, accompanied by crescendo music and a choir singing⁷⁶⁹: ‘We ram and mason, we break and pull down. // We build the city. // We hammer, build, dig and strike. // Enlarge the city.’ HET HART VAN ROTTERDAM became a successful multimedia show about the identity of Rotterdam, which makes clear that the argument of *Crimson* is not limited to literature. This case makes already a link with cinema. Besides the use of projections, the initiators themselves were interested in filmmaking. Actor Jan Musch, for example, had previously played the main character in the film ‘Dead Water’ (Rutten, 1934), whereas Anton Koolhaas would become a script writer – and later the director of the Nederlands Filmmuseum.

Writing about the bombardment, *Crimson* argues, was already an act of city planning. We might extend this argument to other artistic disciplines too. We could mention the drawings made by artists for Museum Boymans and the “Municipal Archive”⁷⁷⁰, and also the photographs by people like Jan Kamman, J. van Rhijn, Cas Oorthuys, and Eva Besnyö. The series of photographs by Besnyö is well-known. While she had previously carried out several commissions for architects, she treated the ruins in a similar way, like sculptures, and without people. Besnyö discovered a certain beauty in them, similar to the way the romantics had been fascinated by ruins. In this case, however, it was not about natural decay, but about violent destruction. Because of this aestheticisation, with the human dimension lacking altogether, Besnyö distanced herself from these pictures later on. ‘I still feel ashamed for that’, she said in an interview for the *Groene Amsterdammer* (see: Hendriks, 2002).

Like the photographs by Besnyö, several films were made too. Besides the UFA-film, several Dutch filmmakers recorded the effects of the bombardment. Although most of these films showed the destructions from eye-level, the human tragedy is also absent in these documents. The films are testimonies of the death of the city as a built structure.

A cinematographically refined example of the ‘ruin-films’, is *VERWOESTINGEN IN ROTTERDAM* (1940) by former *Filmliga* member Jan Koelinga. Some of the images show people strolling through the city, watching the remnants that have almost become an ‘attraction’. Different from most static recordings by others, Koelinga made use of all kinds of mobile framing, including overview shots taken from a train. These well-made and unique images have long been left unconsidered. The reason might be that Koelinga moved from a socialist engagement towards national-socialist sympathies, which caused him to collaborate on various pro-German propaganda films, although that was not yet at issue in this case.

Among the recordings of the ruins are also the images shot by architect Wim ten Bosch (*ROTTERDAM NA MEI* 1940), as additional material to his project *ROTTERDAM EN HOE HET BOUWDE* (1940). Many projects that were initially recorded by the film and the book were erased by the war. Among the destructions that he documented were the *Grote Kerkplein* with the damaged St. Laurens church, and shopping street the Meent, where Ten Bosch himself had made his major works only a few years before. It is not clear if there actually was a revision of the film, or if the additional material has been publicly screened. It might at least have been the intention, since a revision of the book was published too (1941). It is, however, remarkable that the film shows the destruction, while the revised book has no additional pictures of it, but only of the

⁷⁶⁹Original quote: ‘Wij heien en metselen, wij sloopen en breken. // Wij bouwen de stad. // Wij hameren, timmeren, spitten en steken. // Verruimen de stad.’ It is translated in *Crimson* (2002: 36) as: ‘We ram piles, build in brick, demolish and break // Reconstruct the city // We hammer, put together, dig and rake // Extending the city.’

⁷⁷⁰In autumn 1940, Museum Boymans organised an exhibition of the work by six artists. Director D. Hannema commissioned them to make drawings and watercolours of the ruins, to compensate their losses during the bombardment. Following this example, Hendrik Hazewinkel, director of the “Municipal Archive” (GAR) also commissioned drawings of the ruins for the topographical collection. A selection of these images was exhibited in the archive in February and March 1941 under the title: ‘Rotterdamse Stadsbeelden’. Roelofs, 1989: 178.

temporary shops that were built by then. Whereas the film and the book were initially conceived in terms of ‘city walks’, the project became suddenly a testimony of a past period. The film and the book framed the city as it used to be, which offered a starting point for the new city to come. What that could be like was hinted at by the work of Ten Bosch himself. At a time that doubts concerning the development of modern architecture had been raised within the movement itself, Ten Bosch embraced *Het Nieuwe Bouwen*, which has also been expressed by his designs for some emergency shops. Illustrative are the additional photographs made of them by Jan Kamman, including the ‘modern classicist’ shop ‘Eckhart’ by Van Ravesteyn, and the ‘expressive modernist’ shop ‘Willem de Jong’ by Ten Bosch.

Various films were made about the destroyed city and its reconstruction, among them a large number of amateur recordings⁷⁷¹. The amateur films are of particular interest, since official film production was problematic during the war. Moreover, as individual records they testify to a collective memory; these films were made due to a historical awareness, to document extraordinary events, to remember them in later years, and to cope with them in the present.

An outstanding example of an amateur film is 1940 ROTTERDAM (J. de Klerk)⁷⁷². It is part of the collection of De Klerk family films, which also includes ‘newsreels’ (*journaals*) that show all kinds of events in Rotterdam⁷⁷³. It is likely that the films were shown at the furniture store of H.H. de Klerk, to its twenty-five or so employees, and its customers. This ten minute film first shows the destruction of the city, including shopping street Hoogstraat, where De Klerk had one of its main shops⁷⁷⁴. Nothing is left of it, but people still stroll through the street. The display of commercial novelties is substituted by the novelty of mass destruction. Improvised shops are opened elsewhere, like that of H.H. de Klerk, in an old warehouse. The film ends with emergency shops that are built already within a few weeks after the catastrophe – which was also reported by Polygoon (a.o.)⁷⁷⁵. Among them is a new shop for H.H. De Klerk & Zn (arch. J.A. Lelieveldt, constr. A.D. Nederveen)⁷⁷⁶. A modern steel frame is combined with traditional masonry, which is carefully registered by the camera.

De Klerk’s concern with the city shows a mixture of commercial and public interests. Private destinies were connected to that of the city as a whole; the improvement of one’s own situation depended on the improvement of the conditions of the city. Similar to the film by De Klerk, this is also reflected by the film NA DE BRAND VAN ROTTERDAM (“After the fire of Rotterdam”, 1940, anon.), made for Dobbelsmann’s tobacco.

Such films, for private or public purposes, articulate a conscious engagement with the city, which can be approached through the notion of stigmergy. It is the way agents interact with the environment, which subsequently provides information to others, and a process is set in motion that strengthens itself⁷⁷⁷. Humans reflect upon it too, but this reflection is largely subject to routine as well. Conscious acting is heightened when there is a breakdown of routines, which applies to the case of the destruction of the city. The amateur films mark a historic condition, in order to remember and to act upon it. Stigmergy is highlighted when an environment is changed by external perturbation⁷⁷⁸, which triggers an intensive local communication process in order to

⁷⁷¹ E.g. ROTTERDAM PUINSTAD (1940, Jan Tirion)*; DE BRAND 14 MEI 1940 (J. van Duyvenbode)*, MEI 1940 (Foka)*, ROTTERDAM NA HET BOMBARDEMENT EN NADE BEVRIJDING (1940-1945, H. Philipsen)*, HET CENTRUM NA DE BRAND (1940, anon.)*, HERBOUW ROTTERDAM (1940-1945, W.G. de Jong), OORLOG IN NEDERLAND (1940-1946, Ed Millicam). Titles marked by * are also included by: De Jong, 2005.

⁷⁷² I.e. title on the film itself; catalogued by GAR as VERBRAND ROTTERDAM.

⁷⁷³ See e.g. ROTTERDAM JOURNAAL (1932, J. De Klerk).

⁷⁷⁴ De Goey, 2002: 125.

⁷⁷⁵ See: Polygoon 1940-31 and 1940-41; see also the aforementioned film OORLOG IN NEDERLAND (1940-1946, Ed Millicam), with images of the temporary fashion houses C&A and P&C. For more information on emergency buildings, see: Ten Bosch & Wattjes, 1941: 199-205; Van de Laar, 2000: 433-434.

⁷⁷⁶ It was located at Walenburgerweg / Schepenstraat.

⁷⁷⁷ Cf. Susi & Ziemke, 2001: 29.

⁷⁷⁸ Cf. Bonabeau, Dorigo, Theraulaz, 199: 16.

recover the situation. Cinema, and not the least amateur film production, as a typically local practice, is part of this process. Cinematic records provide, for a longer time, negative feedback, which calls for a continued series of actions.

news at war

Before the war, Polygoon from Haarlem provided weekly newsreels for the Dutch cinemas, which was called *Hollands Nieuws*, while Profilti from The Hague made *Nederland in Klank en Beeld*. During the war they produced interchangingly, each week, for one news show: *Tobis Hollandsch Nieuws*, which was supervised by the German authorities. The collaboration between Polygoon and Profilti was the Dutch answer to German attempts to replace the Dutch news shows by the German *Wochenschau*, like elsewhere in the occupied territories. Eventually this would also happen in the Netherlands, but not before April 1944⁷⁷⁹.

Polygoon and Profilti made various reports on the destruction of Rotterdam and the plans for its reconstruction, providing both negative and positive feedback⁷⁸⁰. One of the latter is DE OPBOUW VAN ROTTERDAM (Polygoon, 1941-wk11), in which city planner Witteveen is to be seen, standing behind a drawing board together with two colleagues of the planning office ASRO (*Adviesbureau Stadsplan Rotterdam*). It is followed by images of workers being busy in an empty city covered by snow, which is an exceptional view of Rotterdam. New waterways and new roads, indicated by numbers, are constructed, which suggest that the plans by Witteveen are carried out immediately. Another example is a report that shows the model and maps of the future city that were exhibited at Museum Boymans in October 1941 (MAQUETTE “NIEUW ROTTERDAM”, Polygoon, 1941-wk45)⁷⁸¹. Articulating what is shown, the commentator emphasizes that the new city is a matter of facilitating modern housing and fast traffic. Since the condition of Rotterdam became importance to the whole country, the reports extended its stigmery. The city’s environment was virtually augmented through the cinema.

Although Polygoon and Profilti kept some of their independency, the Tobis newsreels had to incorporate a number of items on the Dutch national-socialist party (NSB)⁷⁸². Moreover, Polygoon and Profilti also had to make newsreels for the NSB’s own news show (‘Spiegel der Beweging’). The local support for the NSB, however, was minimal, and only a few items for its show were filmed here, merely dealing with formal events, such as NSB leader Mussert visiting Rotterdam (1941), and on the installation of NSB Mayor Müller (1942). Next to that, reports were made to stimulate the *Arbeitseinsatz* in Germany⁷⁸³. Different is a report, for both the NSB and Tobis, on vegetables that are cultivated in city parks and gardens. It corresponded to one of the main ideas of national-socialism, that a country would be independent regarding food supply (i.e. *productieslag*). In this way potatoes are grown in front of Museum Boymans (NSB, 1942; Polygoon 1942-32), to motivate citizens to grow their own crops. This was also promoted by harvest feasts, like the harvest of rye that is celebrated in the city (Polygoon, 1943-31). Rural and traditional life in general was cherished, rather than urban culture⁷⁸⁴.

Reports on war events were, furthermore, necessarily biased. This was also the case when the allied forces attacked the city’s industry, since it produced for the German army. As such, one

⁷⁷⁹ De Haan, 1995: 163-173. By 1944, Tobis Hollandsch Nieuws was replaced by NEDERLANDSCH NIEUWS, produced by the national-socialist *Nederlandsche Filmjournaal Maatschappij*.

⁷⁸⁰ For a rare example of a report by another news provider, see PUIN EN WEDEROPBOUW (1940, Pathé).

⁷⁸¹ The exhibition was called ‘150 jaar Baksteen/Nederland Bouwt in Baksteen’ (‘150 years of bricks/The Netherlands build with bricks’), and the tower of Museum Boymans was shown on the poster by Jan Kamman, which, however, did not show any brick, but a modernist graphic composition (cf. Van der Pauw, 2006: 817).

⁷⁸² See also: Vermeer, 1987.

⁷⁸³ See: Polygoon, 1942-18 and 1942-20.

⁷⁸⁴ See also other reports dealing with Rotterdam, for example one on an exhibition of the *Reichsarbeitsdienst* (Polygoon, 1941-42) and another one on the traditional craft of producing snuff (1942-17).

paid attention to the British Royal Air Force attack on the city, on the 3rd of October 1941⁷⁸⁵. Similarly, by way of anti-propaganda, it reported the controversial bombardment by the American Air Force on the 31st of March 1943, which took about four hundred victims⁷⁸⁶. It was intended as an attack on the shipyard Wilton-Fijenoord, but it destroyed large parts of the residential quarters Bospolder and Tussendijken. As a reaction to this, the national-socialist *Nederlandsche Volksdienst* organised support by collecting clothes and other goods, for which publicity was made through newsreels (e.g. Polygoon 1943-wk16).

According to Annemarie Vermeer (1987), certain employees of Polygoon did not mind the German involvement with the company, since it meant better working conditions. The directors of Polygoon, however, tried to minimise the German influence⁷⁸⁷. This has also been addressed by Jitze de Haan (1995), but he makes it clear that actually a large number of employees supported their directors⁷⁸⁸. Important is the fact that Polygoon combined its journalism with private commissions, which offered Polygoon a certain freedom. Especially in the last year of the war, when Polygoon was not allowed to make newsreels anymore, it made various films secretly⁷⁸⁹. When they had to go to Rotterdam for a particular event, they combined it with making recordings for long term films. These films, in their turn, also offered stock material for the news programmes⁷⁹⁰. For these reasons, no Dutch film company other than Polygoon and Profilti, was able to produce feature length films, or films that were made over a period of several years. Next to that, Polygoon had a well-established reputation in respect of commissioned films, and several films had been made in Rotterdam before. While the war began, Polygoon was working on a film about the Maastunnel (1937-1941). Twice a year, images of this film were used for newsreels too⁷⁹¹.

Polygoon also received the commission for the short *UIT ROTTERDAMS VERLEDEN*, ('From Rotterdam's Past', 1941), made for the *Rijksbureau voor de Monumentezorg* and the *Dienst Wederopbouw* (Diwero). Fragments of this film were used for a news report too⁷⁹². The film shows archaeological excavations concerning the Castle of Bulgersteijn from the 14th century, which were conducted at the end of 1940⁷⁹³. Archaeologists made use of the sudden opportunity that the bombardment had created. While a future city was being planned, the ground on which it would be built linked it back to the middle ages. Even more so, while drawings were made to suggest how the future city would look, the film showed drawings to reconstruct the image of the castle. This, however, was part of a strategy. Different from what is often suggested, city planner Witteveen wanted to build a new and modern city too, but one based on the historical

⁷⁸⁵ This attack took the lives of 130 people and ruined properties across the city, including the Norwegian sailormen's church and the library of the Rotterdamsch Leeskabinet. For information on this attack, see: Van der Pauw, 2006: 245. Another example of a 'propaganda report' is: Polygoon, 1941-wk29 (British fighter planes shot down).

⁷⁸⁶ Polygoon Hollands Nieuws, 1941-42; Polygoon Hollands Nieuws, 1943-15. Van der Pauw (2006: 847 and 855) mentions that the air raid of 1943-03-31 took 401 victims; 4600 dwellings were damaged, of which 2661 were completely ruined, which turned 16,500 people homeless. Besides that, a number of factories, workshops, stores, shops and public buildings were destroyed. The total number of victims of attacks by the allied forces counted about 750. For exact numbers, see: Van der Pauw, 2006: 847.

⁷⁸⁷ Vermeer, 1987: 69.

⁷⁸⁸ De Haan, 1995: 175.

⁷⁸⁹ De Haan (1995: 175) mentions a film for the Dutch red Cross, a film against tuberculosis and the short film *VRIJ NEDERLAND*, which anticipated the liberation from the Germans.

⁷⁹⁰ This is also clear if one considers the dates of recording, which are sometimes much earlier than the dates of the programmes in which they were shown.

⁷⁹¹ e.g. Polygoon Hollands Nieuws, 1940-12; 1940-46.

⁷⁹² *OP ZOEK NAAR OUDHEIDKUNDIGE SCHATTEN* (Polygoon Hollands Nieuws, 1941-01)

⁷⁹³ The castle was located between the Coolsingel and the Korte Hoogstraat (in the background are the 'Beurs', the 'HBU' and the St. Laurens church). The film shows the different steps of the excavation process, performed by various workers and scientists. The film makes use of old maps, and animations. Somehow striking is the fact that remnants from the 17th century are removed unproblematically.

city triangle, to respect the medieval structures and a historical development⁷⁹⁴. The film about the excavations can be seen in this perspective; in imagination, the new city was connected to the past. It respected the German preoccupation with a mythological history on which the national-socialist ideology relied. The film helped to create a historical narrative, which actually provided the opportunity to build a modern city, on top of and covering the remains of the past⁷⁹⁵.

§ 2. vision, strategy, network

Notwithstanding the emptiness, and the need to build a new city, the emergence of modern Rotterdam was not at all a *fait accompli* in the early 1940s. During the 1920s and 1930s, modern architecture and urbanism had manifested itself in Rotterdam, especially through the housing projects by J.J.P. Oud and the Van Nelle factory. However, it was still avant-garde, and hardly an established power. Instead of the architects of Opbouw, city architect Van der Steur preferred to commission projects to members of the more conservative *Bouwkunst & Vriendschap*⁷⁹⁶. Moreover, in the 1930s, a general turn to traditionalism took place. Some modernist architects too argued for a revision. Among them was Sybold van Ravesteyn, which is exemplified by his projects in Dordrecht, and by the ‘Blijdorp Zoo’ (1937-1941), which received substantial attention from the media⁷⁹⁷. These projects are characterised by symmetry, curved lines and ornamentation. After strong discussions within ‘De 8 & Opbouw’, Van Ravesteyn withdrew in 1938⁷⁹⁸. Oud, in his turn, who initially favoured the initiative of CIAM, criticised its rigidity later on⁷⁹⁹. Siegfried Giedion, who visited him in Rotterdam in 1938, said that he was ‘at a dangerous reactionary road’⁸⁰⁰. Oud too favoured a more classical approach.

Both Oud and Van Ravesteyn were among the architects that Witteveen appointed as supervisors for the reconstruction of the thirteen sectors in which he had divided the city centre⁸⁰¹. At that time, Oud also got the commission to build the ‘Savings Bank’ (1942-1957), which expresses his reorientation. He designed it together with A.A. van Nieuwenhuyzen, who also created, among others, the ‘Nationale Levensverzekering Bank’ (1941-1949, see the film: STERK IN DE STORM, 1959, C. Niestadt)⁸⁰². Other architects also applied classicist principles to their designs of bank buildings, among them Adrianus van der Steur, Cornelis Elffers, and H.M. Kraaijvanger (1941-1950, Blaak), who were also at the list of intended supervisors. One can hardly underestimate the force of these early reconstruction projects, for the fact that these banking companies were crucial for the financing of the reconstruction. This is also made explicit in the film STERK IN DE STORM, which, however, was made when finally a different direction was followed, something that is also reflected in its imagery.

C.H. van der Leeuw

A different course of things was envisioned by Opbouw, and a group of businessmen headed by the charismatic Van Nelle director C.H. (Kees) van der Leeuw (•1890-†1973). According to

⁷⁹⁴ Van de Laar, 2000: 415. Cf. Wagenaar, 1992: 16 (e.a.); Wagenaar draws an immediate link between the modern planning of Van Eesteren and Witteveen.

⁷⁹⁵ i.e. EN TOCH...ROTTERDAM (1950, Polygoon), and ROTTERDAMSE MIJMERINGEN (“Rotterdam Musings”, 1953, Alex de Haas, Piet Meerburg).

⁷⁹⁶ Van de Laar, 2000: 366.

⁷⁹⁷ The projects in Dordrecht are the office building ‘Holland van 1859’ (1937-1939) and theatre ‘Kunstmin’ (1938-1940). The media attention for the new zoo is exemplified by e.g. DIERGAARDE BLIJDORP GEREED (1940-50, Polygoon Hollands Nieuws), DE ROTTERDAMSE DIERGAARDE (1943, J.A. van Pelt), ZONDAG DER DIEREN / FLITSEN UIT BLIJDORP (1942, Rudi Hornecker), and ORCHIDEEËNKWEKERIJ IN DE DIERGAARDE ROTTERDAM (1939-1944, Jan Koelinga).

⁷⁹⁸ Groenendijk & Vollaard, 1998: 19.

⁷⁹⁹ Taverne e.a., 2001: 37.

⁸⁰⁰ Taverne e.a., 2001: 43. Original quote: ‘auf einem gefährlichen Weg der Reaktion.’

⁸⁰¹ Van de Laar, 2000: 417.

⁸⁰² Oud was assisted by the architect A.A. van Nieuwenhuyzen (cf. Taverne e.a., 2001: 437). Van Nieuwenhuyzen also designed the traditionalist ‘Nationale Levensverzekering Bank’ (1941-1949), ‘Bank NHM’ (1941-1950), and he carried out the renovation of the damaged bank building of Mees & Zoonen (1949-1950).

them, the proposed plan would be nothing else than an exercise to fill in the emptiness⁸⁰³. Rather than seeing the city as the sum of a readymade programme reduced to formal issues, and instead of dividing the city into sectors, they understood it as a totality that had to evolve over time. Plans had to be based upon functional and organisational schemes, rather than architectural prescriptions, as Witteveen proposed. This was not to ignore aesthetics, but to develop a different kind of 'style'. The group was against an urbanism that carried the signature of an individual planner, but favoured a 'style' that expressed the character and the needs of the population⁸⁰⁴.

The new city was thought to be entirely detached from the previous one. They rejected the idea to maintain the medieval principle of the 'city triangle' (*stadsdriehoek*) as the ground form for the city centre. They even did not want to maintain historical landmarks such as the 'Schielandshuis', neither the old 'Willemsbrug', nor the monumental neo-renaissance town hall⁸⁰⁵. However, they were also against Witteveen's idea of parkways – the green wedges that channelled traffic and nature into the city. To their minds, infrastructure had to be treated independently from the city's morphology, as a network, and not as an axis towards a centre.

We may have a closer look at the role of Van der Leeuw to see how the new Rotterdam emerged. Van der Leeuw's contribution to the reconstruction has been addressed by others before⁸⁰⁶, but the resonance in the literature is still limited in comparison to the attention paid to architects and planners. I will consider rhetorics related to social connections, and examine them in terms of an 'ego-centred network', which encompasses formal and informal relationships that correspond to situational involvements⁸⁰⁷. People perform different roles in different situations, according to different relationships (cf. Hannerz, 1980: 172)⁸⁰⁸.

Van der Leeuw first aspired to a career as an artist, but being the oldest son he joined his father's firm in 1913, at an age of twenty-three⁸⁰⁹. After four years, he became a director, and also a member of the executive board (*raad van bestuur*) of the private housing company *Maatschappij voor Volkswoningen*. He fulfilled a similar function in the case of the private *N.V. Volkswoningbouw* of the enlightened developer Auguste Plate and the architect Willen van Tijen, at the time that Van der Leeuw directed the building of the Van Nelle factory (1925-1930), and immediate connections can be drawn⁸¹⁰. After the factory was finished, Van der Leeuw went to Vienna to study medicine. He was a student of Adler and Freud and made his promotion in psychoanalysis in 1939. The same year he returned to Rotterdam, and started to work as a psychiatrist. Immediately after the bombardment, Van der Leeuw decided to take over the direction of Van Nelle again, and he did so indeed in June 1940⁸¹¹. His main concern, it seems, was not the production of coffee, tea and tobacco. The factory was the vehicle that enabled him to be involved with the reconstruction, and to fulfil his vision of a modern city.

This interpretation matches the observations by De Klerk (1998: 245), who has explicitly pointed to the correspondence between the ideas and planning processes of the Van Nelle factory and the 'Basisplan' for the reconstruction of Rotterdam. In the case of the latter, Van der Leeuw

⁸⁰³ Roelofsz, 1989: pp133-141.

⁸⁰⁴ See the *Nota betreffende den Wederopbouw van Rotterdam* (1942) by the *Kleine Commissie* of the Club Rotterdam, as quoted by Len de Klerk (1998: 236): 'De bevolking "moet zich dus kunnen uiten, wil er sprake zijn van een harmonie tussen bouwplan en behoeften, en van het ontwikkelen van een eigen "stijl", welke uitdrukking geeft aan het karakter van de bevolking en aan het kenmerkende van onze tijd."

⁸⁰⁵ For the town hall, see: Van de Laar, 2000: 462.

⁸⁰⁶ Roelofsz, 1989; Wagenaar, 1992; De Klerk, 1998 e.a.

⁸⁰⁷ It means that direct relations to Van der Leeuw are taken into consideration (i.e. a 'first-order star'), and sometimes connections between these relations (a 'first order zone', cf. Hannerz, 1980: 178). See also: De Certeau, 1997: 107.

⁸⁰⁸ In the case of Rotterdam, such roles are well-described regarding the elite of the city in the period 1850-1950, and I will make use of these studies (De Klerk, 1998; Dicke e.a., 2002).

⁸⁰⁹ Dirks; 2001: 154.

⁸¹⁰ When the factory was finished, its architects, Brinkman & Van der Vlugt, were asked to collaborate with Van Tijen on the highrise housing estate 'Bergpolderflat' (1932-1934), which was developed by the *N.V. Volkswoningbouw*.

⁸¹¹ Dirks; 2001: 154.

was not alone. The connectionism of his thinking was extended to the business society Club Rotterdam (est. 1928), and its active core, the so-called *Kleine Commissie*. Its chairman was Karel Paul van der Mandele, the president of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry (and the initiator of garden village 'Vreewijk'), who was among the first to develop ideas for the reconstruction⁸¹². Important too is that he kept in touch with Mayor Oud. Another active and socially engaged member was Jan Backx, the director of the stevedore company *Thomsen's Havenbedrijf*.

It has been said that the Club Rotterdam criticised the lack of public discussion about the plan, that the businessmen were not part of the process, and that even the municipality had little to say; most important, the plan did not meet the economic requirements of a modern port and trade city. This, however, seems merely a pretext for the fulfilment of their social visions⁸¹³. Any alleged self-criticism of Van der Leeuw in connection to the club (see e.g. Van der Pauw, 2006: 428), should actually be seen, in my opinion, as a matter of rhetorics.

Van der Leeuw was the driving force, but in such a way that it was the club or even 'the city' that expressed the ideas and requirements. Van der Leeuw mobilised the members of the group, by letting them appropriate and advocate the ideas of the modern movement. He deliberately conducted a strategy that has, I would argue, necessarily remained hidden, especially since it happened at a time of war. He turned his vision of the city as a 'totality' into a kind of 'conspiracy', vis-à-vis the Germans, conservatives, (architectural) traditionalists, and the revisionists among the modernists. Since it took place during the war, the city's future was all but clear. It required, as we might call it, a long term urban geopolitical strategy. Media were used too, which I will elaborate in the next section, especially regarding the 'total' reconstruction film EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM (1950, Polygoon-Profiliti), whose production started already in 1940.

In order to explain the position and role of Van der Leeuw, it might be illuminating to refer to Fredric Jameson, who wrote *The Geopolitical Aesthetic, Cinema and Space in the World System* (1992). In this book Jameson coined, in a constructive mode, the concept of 'totality as conspiracy' (1992: 9). The global society as a totality cannot be grasped by individuals. It is further complicated by the fact that what it is like is also affected by attempts to frame it. Understanding totality is therefore a kind of 'conspiracy'. The world system is of course of a different order than a single city, just like a city is different than a single building. Yet, a world view can be crystallised into a particular building, such as theosophy in the case of the private house of Van der Leeuw (Henderson e.a., 1999).

Jean-Paul Sartre has argued that one can only know that something is a cube if one has seen all six sides of it. However, one cannot see these six sides all at once. One can only see three of them, which in that case do not even appear as squares. One creates an image of something through the synthesis of different perceptions. Architect Jan Hoogstad (1990: 39), reflecting upon Sartre's Cube, has remarked that this implies movement and hence time, which turns an image into a process. In more complicated cases, like that of an entire city, the total image can only be created by different agents together. The resulting image is not absolute or fixed, but a collective approach and vision, or 'a conspiracy'.

Through the concept of 'totality as conspiracy', Jameson has proposed three directions for the 'cognitive mapping' of the world system. Firstly, Jameson asks how object-worlds can be 'allegorically prepared, disposed, and rewired in order to become the bearers of conspiracy'. It is a question of how one can appropriate the world of things to express its operations. Secondly he suggests 'to test the incommensurability between an individual witness – the individual character

⁸¹² On the 15th of May 1940, Van der Mandele invited various representatives of the municipality at his home to discuss the future of Rotterdam. He and Mayor Oud, among others, founded the 'Stichting Rotterdam 1940'. De Klerk, 1998: 160; Oudenaarden, 2004: 13.

⁸¹³ Cf. Wagenaar, 1992: 217.

of a still anthropomorphic narrative – and the collective conspiracy which must somehow be exposed or revealed through these individual efforts’ – i.e. to measure the individual experience of an overall process that one helps to bring about but that no one can fully grasp. And thirdly ‘the thing itself, namely, how the local items of the present and the here-and-now can be made to express and to designate the absent, unrepresentable totality; how individuals can add up to more than their sum...’ (Jameson, 1992: 10). These questions concern the relationship between the individual and the collective, part and totality, agent and system, by looking at the relationship between people and artefacts, including spatial structures and films.

The new city that was conceived could only evolve over decades. Moreover, it was an emerging complex system that enabled adaptations in the first place. The ‘void’ became a central notion to achieve that end, as explained by Crimson; it informed the design of the city and its buildings, as ‘the local items of the present and the here-and-now [that] were made to express and to designate the absent, unrepresentable totality’. The success of this ‘conspiracy’ depended on the way it was collectively conceived and carried out, by the scenius of the Club Rotterdam, and above all by the citizens. The new city could only become reality through ‘emergence’ – the way individuals add up to more than their sum. Within this process, Van der Leeuw may be considered as ‘the individual character of a still anthropomorphic narrative’.

Crucial information was passed to Van der Leeuw by Alderman Brautigam, who was in charge of the “Municipal Technical Service” (department of public works). He informed Van der Leeuw on the relationship between the city and the government in The Hague, concerning expropriation, allotments, and the general planning process⁸¹⁴.

Van der Leeuw would then also meet Witteveen on a regular base⁸¹⁵. In the meantime, new possibilities for housing were explored by the studios of Van Tijen & Maaskant, and Brinkman & Van den Broek, which was the continuation of Van Nelle’s Brinkman & Van der Vlucht (after the latter had died). The study was commissioned by the *N.V. Volkswoningbouw*. While Van der Leeuw was one of its shareholders, its director Plate happened to be a cousin of Van der Mandele. Since Van der Mandele’s Chamber of Commerce had moved to the new ‘Beurs’, the results of this study, together with photographs by Jan Kamman, were presented here in March and April 1941. Afterwards they were published as a book: *Woonmogelijkheden In Het Nieuwe Rotterdam*⁸¹⁶. The ideas would be applied in practice by the ‘Zuidpleinflat’ (1941-1947, Van Tijen, Groosman, Maaskant, Bakema)⁸¹⁷.

In October 1941, Mayor Oud was replaced by the Dutch national-socialist F.E. Müller⁸¹⁸. Since that time the Club Rotterdam needed to be especially careful, and therefore Van der Leeuw invited the members of the *Kleine Commissie* to meet, every week, at the rooftop pavilion of the Van Nelle factory⁸¹⁹. During these secret meetings, the group prepared its own reconstruction plans, which were elaborated by a study group of architects directed by Jo van den Broek⁸²⁰. Besides that, Van der Leeuw made a list of twelve required public facilities, including a commercial centre for maritime enterprises, a centre for the arts, a grand theatre in the city and another one in the south of Rotterdam, and a university of economics⁸²¹.

⁸¹⁴ Roelofs, 1989: 139.

⁸¹⁵ Wagenaar, 1992: 215.

⁸¹⁶ *Woonmogelijkheden in het Nieuwe Rotterdam* (“Housing Possibilities in the New Rotterdam”), 1941, Brinkman, Van den Broek, Maaskant, Van Tijen, published by W.L. & J. Brusse. Cf. De Klerk & Moscoviter, 1992: 200.

⁸¹⁷ In 1943, Plate asked Van Tijen and Maaskant to elaborate the results of their earlier study, now focused on the idea of de *Stedelijke Tuinwijk* (“Urban Garden Quarter”), as the new study was called (see: Bijhouwer e.a., 1983: 108-113).

⁸¹⁸ Oudenaarden, 2004: 13.

⁸¹⁹ Roelofs, 1989: 139; Wagenaar, 1992: 215; Dicke, 2003: 133; Van der Pauw, 2006: 422 – since October 1941.

⁸²⁰ Roelofs, 1989: 17.

⁸²¹ The list includes: 1. Centre Maritime (maritime enterprises); 2. Centre Artistique; 3. Extension to Museum Boymans; 4. Grand Theatre; 5. University of Economics (Handelshogeschool); 6. Exhibition Centre; 7. Theatre for Rotterdam-Zuid; 8. Country-Golf Hotel in Kralingen; 9. Maasbastion (a terrace over the river); 10. Park in Zestienhoven; 11. Park in De Esch (near Kralingen); 12. Water sports & Hippique Centre. Ref.: Roelofs, 1989: 17.

In 1942 and 1943 the Club Rotterdam expressed its viewpoints in two notes, and state planner Ringers considered this input indispensable⁸²². However, on the 1st of April 1943, Ringers was arrested by the German authorities, since he was secretly involved with the organisation of an intermediary government after the Germans would be defeated⁸²³. While he was imprisoned, Ringers was officially not dismissed; while being imprisoned he continued to work until he was brought to concentration camp Sachsenhausen in Germany (1944-04-24)⁸²⁴. In the meantime the relationship between the offices in The Hague and Rotterdam became complicated, and Van der Leeuw was appointed as “Delegate”, just before Ringers would be brought to Germany⁸²⁵. This invented, voluntary function, meant that Van der Leeuw became the director of ASRO, since Witteveen had to leave, officially because of illness⁸²⁶. Van der Leeuw accepted this function on his own terms, which meant that he was allowed to set commissions for the board of the ASRO, and to make the decisions and to approve the plans, instead of the state, although the “General Deputy” still needed to sign in the end⁸²⁷.

Van der Leeuw immediately reformed the ASRO⁸²⁸. Cornelis van Traa, a colleague of Witteveen, became the new city planner and started to modify Witteveen’s plan. In the meantime Van der Leeuw discussed the plans with members of Opbouw, which had officially been dissolved in 1943, but which continued under the flag of the Club Rotterdam, as *Opbouw Rotterdam* or OPRO (as the counterpart of ASRO). Besides the involvement of OPRO’s city planner Verhagen, Van der Leeuw privately asked Mart Stam to draw a completely new principle-plan (‘Plan OpRo’, 1944-1945), in which the ideas of the Club Rotterdam would be present from the onset⁸²⁹. Besides the fact that Stam had collaborated on the design of the Van Nelle factory, he had previously designed the masterplan for the industry city Magnitogorsk in the USSR. However, before Stam’s plan was elaborated, the Dutch state had already ratified parts of the plan that existed at that moment, without the approval of Van der Leeuw. He was upset.

Van der Leeuw called for urban planner Sam van Embden to become the vice-director of ASRO, and he approached also Cornelis van Eesteren, who had drawn the general extension plan of Amsterdam (‘AUP’, 1934)⁸³⁰. Already in 1942, Van Eesteren had made a proposal for the city of Rotterdam, and his idea, of disconnecting infrastructure and urban fabric, would come back in the eventual plan⁸³¹. Van der Leeuw engaged, furthermore, the *Nederlands Economisch Instituut*, headed by the renowned and socially engaged economist Jan Tinbergen⁸³². The institute was founded in 1929, to carry out applied business research, and to support new planning principles – one of its initiators had been Plate. It provided the plan of the Club Rotterdam with rational arguments.

The result was presented in March 1946 as the *Basisplan Herbouw Binnenstad Rotterdam* (“Basis Plan Reconstruction City Centre Rotterdam”). Architect Van Tijen explained it to the city

⁸²² De Klerk, 1998: 239.

⁸²³ Lichtenauer, 2008.

⁸²⁴ Ringers stayed first at the *strafgevangenis* ‘Oranjehotel’ in Scheveningen (1943-04-01 – 1943-11-24), at Kamp Vught (1943-11-24 – 1944-04-05), as a hostage at the *interneringskamp* St. Michielgestel (1944-04-05 – 1944-04-24) and finally at KL Sachsenhausen (1944-04-28 – 1945-04-21). After the war he became Minister of Reconstruction – ref.: www.parlement.com/9291000/biof/01855 ‘Dr. J.A. Ringers’ (website visited: 2008-11-29). While Ringers remained responsible for the most important decisions, J.C. Keller became the acting “General Deputy for the Reconstruction”, next to H.W. Mouton, chairman of the *Coördinatie Comité*, in The Hague.

⁸²⁵ Keller confirmed the appointment in a letter to Van der Leeuw, on 1944-04-19, see: De Klerk, 1998: 241, 334 n73.

⁸²⁶ Wagenaar, 1992: 176; cf. De Klerk, 1998: 240.

⁸²⁷ Roelofs, 1989: 139.

⁸²⁸ Dicke, 2003: 133.

⁸²⁹ De Klerk, 1998: 242.

⁸³⁰ Wagenaar, 1992: e.g. 26 [on Van Embden], e.g. 220 and 236 [on Van Eesteren]; Van de Laar, 2000: 420 [on Van Embden]; De Klerk, 1998: 244 [on Van Eesteren]. According to Wagenaar, however, there would be stronger structural resemblances between the AUP and the Plan Witteveen than between the AUP and the Basisplan.

⁸³¹ Vanstiphout, 2005: 148-151 (with a reference to Provoost, 1996: 47).

⁸³² Roelofs, 1989: 141. Cf. Wagenaar, 1992: 246-247, 253-254; Van de Laar, 2000: 420.

council in terms of social functions and the promise of a new urban society, with Rotterdam developing into the most modern and social city of the Netherlands by the year 2000. As such it received much appraisal⁸³³. The ‘Basisplan’ was a matter of models and indications, rather than a spatial design. Moreover, a cut was made between planning and architecture. Due to the emptiness, according to Crimson, ‘urban planning and even architecture were redefined as being primarily immaterial’⁸³⁴.

Crimson has argued (2002: 43) that the ‘Basisplan’ was a coincidental cross-section of the dismantling process of a previous plan⁸³⁵. ‘The programme is regarded as something with a fixed surface area but certainly no fixed form...’⁸³⁶. It appears that the ‘Basisplan’ used conventional terms and conditions, like building blocks, alignments and construction heights, in order to be comprehensible. However, while a building block was a ‘normative proto-object’ in Witteveen’s plan, it became an invitation for a deconstruction of the type in the plan by Van Traa (Crimson, 2002: 51)⁸³⁷. Following plans became more courageous, and less defined; some spots on the map were even left empty⁸³⁸. The ‘Basisplan’ had become an analytical model, instead of a forecast⁸³⁹. In this process, emptiness was not only a condition, but also a planning tool for a new kind of urbanism, which moved from structure to organisation to analysis – to take the use of space into consideration above all. In that development, ‘urbanism cannot do more than furnishing a city, or better, to equip a city, in such a way that it remains neutral in its spatiality, that it remains empty of spatial determinations. Hence an urbanism that enables things, and that remains doing so’⁸⁴⁰.

§ 3. information and publicity

The new Rotterdam needed to be sold, to its citizens, and the Netherlands as a whole. To that end, according to Cor Wagenaar (1992: 284), a broad propaganda campaign was set in motion. It is no coincidence that Wagenaar refers first and foremost to private contributions. Jan Backx established the organisation *Rotterdamsche Gemeenschap* (1944-1955), which envisioned a new society, based on community life and democratic values, to which the idea of the ‘neighbourhood unit’ (*wijkgedachte*) became emblematic. It aimed at generating public participation in the reconstruction process, and to stimulate debate about it. Film was one of the media used for that purpose⁸⁴¹. Next to that, the *Rotterdamsche Gemeenschap* also published a series of books,

⁸³³ Van de Laar, 2000: 463. Van Tijen published his vision in a series of the *Rotterdamsche Gemeenschap*, under the title *Rotterdam anno 2000. Werk- en woonstad* (1947) – see: Wagenaar, 1992: 286.

⁸³⁴ Crimson, 2002: 41 [Crimson, 1995b] ‘...stedebouw en architectuur werden hergedefinieerd als in de eerste plaats immateriële processen.’

⁸³⁵ One points at drawings of the elaborated, but less defined plan from 1953, which follows the scheme of functional zoning. Zones were identified by splotches to represent functions, without formal definition. ‘The pattern represented a random freeze-frame in a constantly fluent, thickening and diluting, mixing and curdling programmatic tub.’ English quote: Crimson, 2002: 44. Original quote (Crimson, 1995b): ‘Het patroon vertegenwoordigt een momentopname in een constant vloeiende, verdikkende en verdunnende, mengende en schiftende programmatische tobbe.’

⁸³⁶ English quote: Crimson, 2002: 44. Original quote (Crimson, 1995b): ‘Wat we hier zien is een krachtenveld; programma wordt gezien als iets met een bepaalde oppervlakte, maar zeker geen bepaalde vorm...’

⁸³⁷ Original Dutch quote (Crimson, 1995b): ‘Wat blijkt uit het Basisplan 1946, is dat de keurig weergegeven stedenbouwkundige randvoorwaarden zoals rooilijnen, bebouwingshoogten, bouwblokken, slechts tekens waren, wier enige rol was op een voor iedereen begrijpelijke wijze een toekomstig stedelijk programma aan te duiden. Op het plan van Van Traa krijgt een bouwblok een totaal andere betekenis dan op het plan van Witteveen, ook al is het verder identiek. Bij Witteveen is het een normerend proto-object, bij Van Traa een uitnodiging tot totale deconstructie van het type.’

⁸³⁸ In 1955, there are big empty spots without indicating a building, park or anything. Cf. Wagenaar, 1992: 16.

⁸³⁹ Crimson, 2002: 51.

⁸⁴⁰ Crimson, 1995b. Original quote: ‘Stedebouw kan dus niet meer doen dan een stad zo in te richten, of liever uit te rusten, dat zij in haar ruimtelijkheid neutraal blijft, dat zij leeg blijft van ruimtelijke bepalingen. Stedebouw dus die dingen mogelijk maakt, en mogelijk blijft maken.’

⁸⁴¹ The organisation also showed films. In October 1947, for example, it showed a programme with films about Rotterdam during the war and afterwards, see: www.cinemacontext.nl > Rotterdamsche Gemeenschap (2009-01-15). The

including Van Tijen's vision of Rotterdam in the year 2000⁸⁴², and a Dutch translation of Lewis Mumford's *The social foundations of post-war building* (1946 [1944]). The latter was an argument for an open and green city, of a regional character, and organised through smaller urban units that enabled a new community life. It was a premise of the 'Basisplan' too.

Wagenaar has also pointed to the architecture magazine *Bouw* (1946-08-10), which dedicated a special edition to the reconstruction of Rotterdam. Following the example of Great Britain, one gave expression to the motto 'it is their city, explain it to them' (*Het is hun stad, leg het hun uit*)⁸⁴³. The editors of *Bouw* considered it as a matter of taking the public into account, in order to let the people make up society. Information and publicity were therefore of crucial importance, to enable feedback, in order to improve the plan – and so on. Planning had become an act of democracy. However, as we will see in the next section, like the British films that were made to this end (Gold & Ward, 1997; Lebas, 2000 a.o), films on Rotterdam were also rhetorical statements to inform the public, rather than frames of reference to start a dialogue. According to Wagenaar (1992: 293), there was necessarily a split between reality and propaganda during the first years after the war, since not much was built until 1952; the information provided did not report on the actual conditions, but envisioned a possible reality. A democratic order, or the 'welfare city', could only become a matter of fact once its stipulations had been fulfilled.

One of the authors contributing to this edition of *Bouw* was Jo van den Broek, who articulated the social dimension of planning. He argued that 'comprehensive planning' was the most essential innovation that had come to the fore during the occupation. The city's accommodations were no longer seen as parts of a technical programme, but as instruments of the unity that is society⁸⁴⁴. Vanstiphout (2005: 169) has argued, however, that Van den Broek still kept his doubts concerning urban planning based on specific forms and a specific model (i.e. based on the neighbourhood unit'). Since he was not officially involved with the 'Basisplan', Vanstiphout argues, he had also no direct interest in building on the 'quicksands of the propaganda' (*drijfzand van de propaganda*) – with a reference to Wagenaar⁸⁴⁵. But the propaganda that Wagenaar refers to was hardly a matter of official institutions, or definite statements, but of views within a discussion heading towards a common attractor, which also affected Van den Broek. He actually played a major role in preparing what would become the 'Basisplan', as the secretary of OPRO and as an adviser to Van der Leeuw and the Club Rotterdam⁸⁴⁶. Besides that, Van den Broek, together with Bakema, would give shape to the outlines of the 'Basisplan' through various projects (a.o. 'Lijnbaan').

It is this circle of different professionals and the elite, this cross-disciplinary network, that propagated the plans in the first place, to which the municipality became the necessary vehicle to actualise the ideas. At last, Wagenaar refers also to the propaganda made by the municipality (p291), in particular the exhibitions that it organised. He quotes city architect Rein Fledderus, who addressed the problem of the communication, concerning architecture and planning, between the city and its citizens. He stated that the *democratic order* is the Maecenas of the municipality,

titles mentioned are: ALARM, ALS DE WINTER KOMT, HERINNERING, ROTTERDAM, WINTER, WINTERSPORT – these (16mm) films are unidentified (no further reference). Within the general view of the organisation, art and culture had to contribute to people's development (cf. Oudenaarden, 2004: 18).

⁸⁴² As articulated by Wagenaar, this publication followed the books *Woonmogelijkheden in het nieuwe Rotterdam* and *De stad der toekomst, de toekomst der stad*, on which he had collaborated too. See: Wagenaar, 1992: 284-287; cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 473.

⁸⁴³ Wagenaar, 1992: 287, reference to *Bouw*, 1946-08-10 (illustration nr. 107 in: Wagenaar, 1992: 292).

⁸⁴⁴ Van den Broek, quoted by Wagenaar (1992: 290-291). Original quote: '...eerst nu hebben wij die sectoren tezamen als een cirkel leren beschouwen, die op zichzelf een eenheid is en niet alleen een som van deze sectoren. Onze winst is dus, dat wij al die voorzieningen niet als een technisch programme voor diverse onderdelen, maar als apparaten van een eenheid zien, en deze eenheid is de sociaal-culture samenleving zelve.'

⁸⁴⁵ Cf. Wagenaar (1992: 316) has remarked that the *Basisplan* would bring fame to Rotterdam, but that it was, as it turned out later on, to no small degree built on the 'quicksands of the propaganda'.

⁸⁴⁶ Cf. Crimson, 2002: 49.

but that right after the war, there is, in Rotterdam, no *order* but chaos. The ‘Basisplan’, as a flexible plan that provided space for future developments, was therefore presented as the foundation of a democratic construction.

Paul van de Laar (2000: 463) has also addressed the importance of publicity, but in his turn he has focused on the municipality, and in particular its brochure *Het Nieuwe Hart van Rotterdam* (ASRO, 1946), which explained the ‘Basisplan’. According to Van de Laar, it was the beginning of an extensive series of promotional booklets and magazines. What neither he nor Wagenaar has mentioned is the fact that right after the presentation of the ‘Basisplan’, and in direct connection to it, the municipality opened the “Office for Information and Publicity” (*Bureau Voorlichting & Publiciteit*), on April the 1st 1946. Its director became the journalist Jan Nieuwenhuis, who distinguished seven major concerns⁸⁴⁷:

1. Maintaining systematic contact with the press;
2. Providing news (a.o. through press conferences);
3. Publishing articles, photographs, papers;
4. Archiving articles from press for internal use;
5. Hosting of guests, through excursions; and providing them with information;
6. Promoting the city by way of film (newsreels, reconstruction films), radio (assisting foreign reporters), own publications, exhibitions, city excursions;
7. Collaborating on propaganda for municipal services and companies.

This shows a comprehensive media approach, in which film was embedded in a larger field of information and communication practices. Most important was the concern with journalism, and as such we might pay special attention to Polygoon⁸⁴⁸. The municipality even commissioned newsreels, for example about the *tramdag* (“tram day”), to celebrate the reopening of the tramways, after they had been out of order during the last year of the war (Polygoon, 1946-06)⁸⁴⁹.

Although planners and architects were busy, little was still built. The port, moreover, got priority. An exception was the creation of a temporary cinema, ‘Lutusca’ (1946, arch. J. Hendriks e.a.), whose name was a contraction of Lumière, Tuschinski, and Scala, which had lost their theatres in the city and collaborated for the occasion. They also commissioned Polygoon-Profilitti to document the construction process, step-by-step: BOUW VAN HET LUTUSCA THEATER TE ROTTERDAM. It starts by saying that it has to be erected in a period of exactly one hundred days. It creates a narrative tension, and of course the builders succeed. This seemingly straight-forward report actually presents a heroic achievement, which is all the more symbolic since the building was made of recycled bricks from the ruins of the war.

and still...

The reconstruction of Rotterdam stemmed from a particular modernist vision. It was presented as objective and self-evident, which was a matter of rhetorics (cf. Wagenaar, 1992, 26; Crimson,

⁸⁴⁷ Hazewinkel: 1996: 35.

⁸⁴⁸ Many examples of (Polygoon) newsreels can be considered as results of the city’s information policy and publicity campaigns. Many of them concern anniversaries of municipal services, buildings etc., or certain achievements, e.g. reports on a news bus garage (Polygoon, 1947-wk18); the 75th anniversary of producing drinking water from the Meuse and another report (in the same news show, 1949-wk46) of the 10,000th ship arriving at the port after WWII; the 10th anniversary of the Maastunnel (1952-wk08), whose construction had been the subject of a Polygoon production commissioned by the municipality; a report on such a promotional event as ‘Lichthaven’ (1953-wk51); and, among many others, on something like the creation of a central city heating system (*stadsverwarming*, 1956-wk02).

⁸⁴⁹ Although it was presented as a newsreel, it is registered as a ‘commissioned film’ (see: B&G); it suggests that it was part of the film project EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM (1950, Polygoon), which was a common practice at Polygoon. Other commissioned newsreels are the reports on the farewell of Mayor Oud and on the inauguration of Mayor Van Walsum; see resp.: Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws 1952-wk05 and 1952-06. Concerning the operations of trams, Polygoon still reported early 1940 (wk03) the fact that women needed to work as conductors.

1995b; Provoost, 1996: 51). As I have addressed, it is somewhat comparable to the case of British films on city planning. In the case of Glasgow, Elizabeth Lebas (2007: 35) has accounted for its municipal films ‘in terms of the evolution they appear to chart of this modernising socio-political project; how as political instruments their imagery of the city and their implied audiences responded to shifts of power both within and without the Corporation, while the purposes they served and the message they conveyed were neither as simple nor as obvious as their departmental or individual sponsors in the Corporation claimed them to be.’ According to John Gold and Stephen Ward (1997: 66) planning in Britain was presented through film as the application of science, as social medicine, as revelation (vision), and as wizardry. This also applies to a range of promotional activities of the “Office for Information and Publicity”, and especially in the case of the film, EN TOCH...ROTTERDAM (“And still...”, 1950), which was made by Polygoon-Profilti⁸⁵⁰.

The subtitle of the film was a *filmsuite* of newsreels and documentaries from 1925-1950’. It suggested a loose, almost coincidental and entertaining collection of images. This increased the credibility of the film as a ‘document’. With a duration of 45 minutes, it was nevertheless carefully scripted, and much of the material had been especially made for it, since 1940 – although at the time of recording there was no idea yet what the result would look like. Immediately after the bombardment, Polygoon and Profilti made extensive recordings of the destructions and of the first reconstruction works⁸⁵¹. Certain images were used indeed for news reports, during and after the war⁸⁵². This, however, was concomitant, or at best a parallel track. Regarding the footage from before WWII, especially images from Von Barys’s THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS (1928), this was actively gathered by Jan Nieuwenhuis, the head of the *Bureau Voorlichting & Publiciteit*. The collected material, which had become especially valuable after the destruction of the city, was subsequently handed over to the *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam*, which marked the beginning of its film collection⁸⁵³. After all, the imagery of the film was not just ‘found footage’, but collected on purpose, to be able to (re)construct the identity of the city.

The introduction of the film is an overview of pre-war Rotterdam. It starts with the statue of Erasmus and a library with books on the history of the city. The film recalls the most important public spaces, including the squares Hofplein and Oostplein, the shopping street Hoogstraat, canals and the old houses along them. These images show a lively city, but the narrator emphasizes that it was not a beautiful city. It was just dedicated to labour. We then see how the city is attacked by the German Luftwaffe, which are images from the UFA propaganda film ANGRIFF AUF ROTTERDAM (1940). While this material has often been used in films on WWII, this film is one of the rare cases in which it is explicitly said that it was shot by the Germans and that no images have been made of the Dutch resistance. The Germans occupy the city and the Dutch capitulate. They clear the ruins and commemorate the victims. The film mentions the figures of the destruction and subsequently the plans that were made to rebuild the city. The film

⁸⁵⁰ Neither the director or scriptwriter, nor any other collaborator of the film is known. In 1965 a second version of this film was made, which was directed by Nol Bollongino, who worked already for Polygoon by 1950, but it is not clear if he was involved with this film at that time.

⁸⁵¹ In the archives of Beeld & Geluid, various reels are preserved that are part of this production, e.g. DE WEDEROPBOUW VAN ROTTERDAM (1949) – see ‘overige opmerkingen’ in the file of this film at B&G; see filmography: EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM). More material is related to it, like recordings of the construction of emergency dwellings in the districts IJsselmonde and Overschie (1941). In order to build these dwellings Rotterdam incorporated various villages, following an older plan. Ringers also proposed the annexation of the towns Schiedam and Vlaardingem, also according to existing drafts, but that plan was cancelled (Van de Laar, 2000: 415).

⁸⁵² As soon as the war was over, Polygoon showed images of the devastations in Rotterdams as part of reports on the situation in the Netherlands in general, see: Polygoon (1945-wk39), and VERWOESTINGEN (1947, Polygoon).

⁸⁵³ Letter (1958-11-25) by H.C. Hazewinkel (GAR) to mayor and alderman, and an internal letter (1959-01-29) of the *commissie voor het archief* in the Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, archive ‘Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam’ (archief van het archief), dossier ‘correspondentie filmcollectie’, toegangsnr. 297.01, inv. nr. 461 (1958-1962).

addresses the hidden role of the Club Rotterdam during the war, and mentions that it held secret meetings at Van der Leeuw's Van Nelle factory every week.

The film shows Ringers and his colleague Mouton at the factory's boardroom. In the next image they appear together with Van der Leeuw and Van Traa, studying the plans, which are subsequently discussed in a meeting of Van Traa and Mayor Oud. These recordings must have been taken shortly after WWII, presumably June 1945⁸⁵⁴. This was before the Office for Information had been established, at the time that Ringers had become Minister of Reconstruction. The sequence is thus of special interest, since it is a contemporary account of the interaction between Ringers, Mouton, Van der Leeuw and Van Traa, among others, which as such is also a key to understand the film itself. There is a convergence of content and conditions of the film.

The film continues by showing an empty city and, for the time being, only emergency shops are built. The citizens have to wait for the liberators to come, which is the moment that the city can be rebuilt. After they have come indeed, we see draughtsman and architects, directed by Van Traa, followed by images of the construction of the main buildings⁸⁵⁵. The film presents a modern city that matches contemporary values and demands, which is as attractive and living as the old city, it is said. This modernity is emphasised by the new business accommodations 'Groothandelsgebouw' (under construction), department store V&D, and the temporary theatre that is built from the ruins. At the end of the film, by way of conclusion, we see aerial shots from the empty city, followed by aerial shots in which the city is being rebuilt. The emptiness is the evidence for the new city, framed in a historical perspective. The city has resurrected and is alive again, day and night, just like its port, of which we see several images too.

EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM was an attempt to generate support for the reconstruction plans. It created a frame of reference for the city itself, in order to let people understand what had to be done, and to make them enthusiastic to partake in the new developments. The conducted strategy was convincing and successful⁸⁵⁶. This, however, has also obscured the actual decisions and visions at issue, and the efforts and achievements that were made.

The fact that the production of EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM had already started in 1940 raises the question who initiated it. As we have seen, the clearance of the destroyed city and its reconstruction became initially a state affair and the responsibility of the (anti-Nazi) state planner J.A. Ringers. The first project that was carried out according to Witteveen's plan was a housing complex (Goudsesingel, arch. Jan Wils, 1941-1943). Its first pole was rammed in April 1941, which thus marked the actual beginning of the reconstruction. At this occasion Ringers gave a daring speech, stressing that it would be *Dutch* housing for *Dutch* people. It was attended by representatives of the industry and the municipality. Polygoon documented the event, by way of a commission⁸⁵⁷, while Profilti made a newsreel out of the material (Profilti, 1941-16). In its files at the *Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid*, just like in a number of others related to EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM, it is said that the recordings were commissioned by the Ministry of Reconstruction. This ministry was established after the war, but it was the successor of the department of Ringers, and Ringers was its first minister. It therefore seems that Ringers took the initiative. This is suggested by the newsreel of his speech. It is also likely if we consider the reconstruction films that were made for his ministry immediately after the war, which he

⁸⁵⁴ It seems that these film recordings were made at the same time as the photographs made by Van der Leeuw, June 1945, which are reprinted in: Roelofs, 1989: 140.

⁸⁵⁵ Including: the *Groothandelsgebouw* (trade centre, 1949-1953, Maaskant, Van Tijen), *Warenhuis Termeulen/Wassen/Van Vorst* and *De Klerk* (department stores, 1948-1951, 1949-1956, Van den Broek & Bakema), *Bouwcentrum* (building centre, 1946-1948 J. Boks), and *Centraal Station* (1950-1957, Sybold van Ravesteyn).

⁸⁵⁶ Once this was a matter of fact, the "Office for Information and Publicity" commissioned Polygoon to make a new version of the film (1965). It emphasised the accomplishment of the reconstruction, while the rhetorical argument was left out; the plans had become reality, and the first film, as a tool to achieve that, had become obsolete (see: ch. 15. §2).

⁸⁵⁷ i.e. rushes called WEDEROPBOUW ROTTERDAM (1941, Polygoon).

explained by saying ‘that the Netherlands do not know the Netherlands anymore, and that the medium of film is taken to make the people aware of the task that is ahead of them’⁸⁵⁸.

There is, however, no evidence who was involved with the film production during the war. One should notice that although the ministry is mentioned in the records, the Rotterdam planning office, ASRO, was officially part of it. More specific records seem to be lacking. To note such things down was dangerous – which became a matter of fact when Ringers was arrested and imprisoned. One should also notice that after March 1943, the reconstruction process was even carried out behind closed doors, and that no publicity about it was allowed⁸⁵⁹.

Considering the communication between Ringers and Van der Leeuw, it seems that both of them had been involved with this production. If we follow De Klerk’s argument that there is a correspondence between the planning process of the Van Nelle factory and that of the new city, this seems to apply to the accompanying films as well. Moreover, Polygoon had made films for both Van Nelle and the municipality⁸⁶⁰. They were also ‘functionalist’ in their conception and use, to channel the visions and attitude of the public, and professionals too. Concerning the municipality and the ASRO, we may also recall Van Traa’s interest in film, who had been the secretary of the Filmliga Rotterdam before, where Van der Leeuw was involved too. After all, this film is a comprehensive record of the ‘scenius’ of the new Rotterdam, an audiovisual component of the ‘conspiracy’ that effected a common direction of urban development.

alive and kicking

Four years after the release of EN TOCH..., the office for information and publicity commissioned Polygoon to make THAT MOST LIVING CITY (1954, Walter Smith). Even though this film is also an instance of ‘positive feedback’, it is rather different from the former. The film also starts with the statue of Erasmus reading a book, and about to turn a page. It is watched by a small English boy, who is lost in the city. A policeman takes him around for a tour, and hence the audience. He briefly explains how Rotterdam used to be before. Its reconstruction started by re-using material of the ruins. To celebrate the revitalised port, we learn about the Ahoy’ exhibition. Next are the city’s new icons: the ‘Bouwcentrum’, ‘Lijnbaan’, ‘Groothandelsgebouw’, ‘Maastunnel’, ‘Heliport’, a theatre, and some of the spared landmarks, such as the town hall⁸⁶¹, Museum Boymans, St. Laurens church, *De Hef*, and the Van Nelle factory. Next are churches, shops, parks, new housing estates – with laundry hanging outside – allotment gardens and summerhouses. The city, in short, is alive and kicking. The old city is not there anymore, but there is hardly any reason to recall history, other than Erasmus, who turns another page⁸⁶². The city seems to be ready; THAT MOST LIVING CITY presented Rotterdam’s attractions, its modern style and comfort of accommodations, without mentioning anything of the trouble of a city under construction. Everything seems to work smoothly. It shows the city’s ideal image, and hence the aims to be achieved, which needed to be confirmed as soon as possible.

§ 4. continuing projections

The scenius that directed the reconstruction of Rotterdam manifested itself in different ways. Important has been the establishment of the *Bouwcentrum*. It started as a centre for

⁸⁵⁸ At that time, the official name of the ministry was still *Ministerie van Openbare Werken*. Ringers said this on the occasion of the premiere of (a.o.) ARNHEM (1945, Herman van der Horst & Paul Schuitema), which took place in The Hague, 4th of August 1945. Hogenkamp, 2003: 29; original quote: ‘dat Nederland Nederland niet meer kent, en dat het middel van de film wordt aangegrepen om het volk besef te geven van de opdracht waarvoor het staat.’

⁸⁵⁹ Wagenaar, 1992: 158.

⁸⁶⁰ For Van Nelle e.g.: ACHTER GLAS! (1931), and various commercials, e.g. EEN FILMSTUDIE (1933), RECLAME VAN NELLE (1936); for the municipality e.g. BOUW MAASTUNNEL (1937-1941).

⁸⁶¹ See also: Polygoon, 1948-wk31, about a new carillon for the town hall.

⁸⁶² Something similar is reflected by the book *De Stad van Erasmus* (1952, photography by Kees Molkenboer), which was compiled by Jan Lebbink of the “Office for Information and Publicity”. Several other photographic books on Rotterdam would follow its example (see: Bool, 2004; Suermondt, 1993).

documentation and information concerning building, which had been the idea of Kees van der Leeuw and other members of the Club Rotterdam⁸⁶³. Its own building (1946-1948, arch. Joost Boks), which is in itself a remarkable example of modernist architecture, characterised by its circular structure, would become one of the first landmarks of the reconstruction of Rotterdam, which was heralded by Polygoon (1949-01).

Elly Winkel became secretary of the *Bouwcentrum*⁸⁶⁴. She played an important role behind the scenes, especially by maintaining contacts. Her career shows already a part of the network under consideration; she was appointed secretary due to the efforts of grain trader Willebeek Le Maire (Club Rotterdam), for whom she worked before, while previously she had worked for housing developer Auguste Plate (as the chairman of the employers association SVZ), and the architecture office of Van Tijen & Maaskant.

Jan van Ettinger became director of the *Bouwcentrum*; he had been the general-secretary of the Dutch foundation for statistics during the war⁸⁶⁵. In 1943, Ringers asked him to collect statistical information in order to make plans for the post-war reconstruction⁸⁶⁶. As a result of it, Van Ettinger directed a reorganisation of the Dutch building industry, which was closely related to the promotion of innovative production methods, especially in the field of housing. To that end the *Stichting Ratiobouw* was founded (1943)⁸⁶⁷. The reorganisation and rationalisation of the building industry was intertwined with an ideological plea for welfare, especially by economist Jan Tinbergen. Based on economic, technological and organisational innovation, welfare would eventually become the main attractor for (urban) development⁸⁶⁸.

Information and documentation were preconditional to carry out the reorganisation⁸⁶⁹. The *Bouwcentrum*, growing from the various foundations that had already been established during the war, was a direct result of this⁸⁷⁰. Van Ettinger understood its functioning in terms of 'a system of feedback', which he would later articulate in his book *Towards a Habitable World* (1960: 221). Information fuels research, in order to design and produce prototypes. This needs analysis and feedback, in order to produce a series, which needs analysis and feedback again for further development. Regarding this cycle, Van Ettinger emphasised (ibid) that 'the development of an efficient system of transmission of knowledge is one of the most important basic problems of our time', which he elaborated in further detail. 'In its simplest form it is a problem of integration, which did not involve any particular difficulties when the world was still little differentiated and specialised and when knowledge, experience and production were practically in one and the same hand or practiced by people working in very close collaboration' (Van Ettinger, 1960: 223). In this way he saw – similar to the ideas of Julian Steward – the emergence of new modes of communication. He discussed, first of all, what he called 'unilateral methods' for a one way transmission of knowledge, in the context of which he explicitly mentions film and television (pp226-229). Besides that, he discussed 'multi-lateral methods' that enable a direct exchange of views. He provided a detailed list of all kinds of media, including film, which can be used for this purpose, but only when complementary forms of communication are devised together.

⁸⁶³ Cf. De Klerk, 1998: 248. The initiators were C.H. van der Leeuw, F.W.C. Blom and W.B. Willebeek Le Maire, who were all members of the *Kleine Commissie*, ibid: 237.

⁸⁶⁴ Mieke de Wit (1995) has paid special attention to her position, which immediately shows a broader network, while it also exemplifies the pattern of the role played by women, from the individual home to the higher ranks of administration, to enable organisations to operate.

⁸⁶⁵ i.e. NSS, related to the CBS, see: 'Geschiedenis van het CBS', Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, p2 www.cbs.nl/NR/rdonlyres/E56C3AB2-2B6E-450E-8E74-06EE67B76CD5/0/GeschiedenisCBS.pdf (2009-03-10).

⁸⁶⁶ Van Ettinger, 1960: 255.

⁸⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁶⁸ Wagenaar, 1992: 247. It might be considered as Wagenaar's main argument, which the title of his book indicates too: *The development of the Welfare City*.

⁸⁶⁹ Wagenaar, 1992: 246.

⁸⁷⁰ Van Ettinger, 1960: 255.

Indeed, the *Bouwcentrum* often used film to accompany lectures and exhibitions. There is a direct link here with the *Technisch Filmcentrum* (The Hague), which produced and distributed technical films; it was established through Marshall funding (i.e. MSA), in 1954, on the basis of the idea that film was an efficient medium to raise labour productivity⁸⁷¹. Besides the films that the centre showed, it was also shown itself in a large number of newsreels and documentaries⁸⁷². As a focus point of international housing developments the *Bouwcentrum* was shown, for example, in Jacques Brunius's documentary *SOMEWHERE TO LIVE* (1950), a British production for the series 'Changing Face of Europe'⁸⁷³. The film addresses the housing problem in Western-Europe, and the need to apply innovative construction methods.

Particularly interesting is the film *TWINTIG UUR PER DAG* (1952), which was especially made for the centre⁸⁷⁴. It was directed by the young filmmaker Albert Brosens, who used to work for Multifilm, and who was asked to make other films on the building industry as well. Besides screenings at the *Bouwcentrum* and elsewhere in the Netherlands, Van Ettinger showed this film, which was also made through Marshall funding (MSA), as part of presentations that he gave in the USA, in June 1952. The film addresses the role of architecture in daily life, and special accommodations that one needs during one's life stages, from birth till death. It emphasizes the concern with prefab building methods, but also the mediating role of the centre between architects and industry, which together took the initiative to establish the centre, as the film says.

In an article on the film, Van Ettinger divided the film into five parts: society and building industry; the functional basis of building; the choice of materials, installations and constructions; building location and its organisation; and international collaboration⁸⁷⁵. Whereas these issues structured the film, they were also foundational to the centre. Moreover, the three Rs that Hediger and Vonderau (2007: 22) have addressed in the case of industrial film production – those of Record, Rhetorics and Rationalization – actually apply to the *Bouwcentrum* as a whole. Alternatively the production of the film, and the ambitions of the centre, can be explained in terms of the theory of Niklas Luhmann (1997). Record serves a memory function, while rhetorics is a matter of oscillation, and, applying complexity theory, rationalisation can be seen as the principle attractor. In this way, the media practices of the *Bouwcentrum* helped to institutionalise modern architecture and planning, and that of the Netherlands and Rotterdam in particular.

The members of the Club Rotterdam established also the public-private *Rotterdamse Kunststichting* (RKS), to support the arts in general, in order to give expression to the new society. Kees van der Leeuw was its founding chairman, and also Jan Backx played an active role in this initiative, which largely corresponded to the aims of his *Rotterdamsche Gemeenschap*. The RKS operated independently, but it was sponsored by the government. It gave practical shape to the municipal policy concerning the arts – against the will of Alderman Van der Vlerk for education and social development⁸⁷⁶. Rather than a governmental institution, it was indeed an instrument of Rotterdam's elite to implement its own ideas for a new culture, but the values that it promoted were actually the same as those of the municipal *Bureau Voorlichting en Publiciteit*.

The RKS was concerned with virtually every artistic discipline, including cinema⁸⁷⁷. One of its first acts was to invite Jean Cocteau and to screen his film *LA BELLE ET LA BÊTE* (1946),

⁸⁷¹ Hogenkamp, 2003: 138; cf. Schuyt & Taverne, 2000: 74. Since the reorganisation of the building industry had its consequences for the labour conditions too, film was also used to accompany this process, e.g. *BOUW VOORT* (1948, Triofilm), which was commissioned by the *Algemene Bouwarbeidersbond* (the union closely collaborated with the authorities in the years after WWII).

⁸⁷² Among the first newsreels are: *Polygoon*, 1949-wk01; *Polygoon* 1949-wk20; in the case of *NTS JOURNAAL*, e.g. 1956-02-16, 1956-05-16, 1959-06-12 (a.o.).

⁸⁷³ Cf. Dingemans & Romme, 1997: 142.

⁸⁷⁴ Van Ettinger, 1952.

⁸⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷⁶ Van der Laar, 2000: 551.

⁸⁷⁷ Cf. 'Gemeentebestuur' in: *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1954: 18.

just after it was released⁸⁷⁸. The RKS thus made an attempt to reanimate the avant-garde film culture in the city, which it gave a more permanent shape through its film programme at Luxor, which had become municipal property in 1945⁸⁷⁹. It was also the place where a new Filmliga started⁸⁸⁰.

For the programming, the RKS contracted Piet Meerburg⁸⁸¹, who had just founded the cinema Kriterion, while he also became the director of avant-garde theatre De Uitkijk, both in Amsterdam. Besides art films, the programme at Luxor included also various (historical) films on Rotterdam⁸⁸². Moreover, Meerburg himself would even produce and direct, together with Alex de Haas, the film ROTTERDAMSE MIJMERINGEN (“Rotterdam Musings”, 1953, Alex de Haas, Piet Meerburg), which was released by the Luxor. This film recalls popular and well-known places of entertainment and modern urban life before WWII, such as the Hofplein, Hoogstraat, Bijenkorf, and the Feyenoord stadium, but it also presents new landmarks, such as the ‘Groothandelsgebouw’. It shows a mix of cosmopolitan and village life, even with cows in the streets. The film offered the city a history and an identity, not unlike EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM by Polygoon-Profiliti, which, in turn, heralded the new film in its news show (1953-wk04).

The RKS, the *Rotterdamsche Gemeenschap*, as well as the municipality, in the person of Mayor P.J. Oud, supported also a national congress on the theme of ‘relaxation, film and adolescent youth’, which took place at Luxor on the 14th and 15th of January 1949. It was organised by the *Instituut Film en Jeugd*, and attended by about five hundred people, among them many prominent Dutch scholars in the fields of sociology, health care and pedagogy, as well as film professionals, policy makers and representatives of various social organisations. The congress was opened by F. Rutten, professor of social-psychology and the Minister of Education, Arts and Science (OKW). He stated ‘that during the last decade we have become aware of the significance which cinema has been going to take up in the daily life of people’⁸⁸³. The general opinion expressed was that too many bad films were shown, with possibly a bad influence. One argued that more research had to be done in order to understand the actual influence of film, and that film exhibition needed better supervision⁸⁸⁴. Moreover, cinema in the Netherlands was challenged to provide alternatives in respect of social values, individual and public development. The ideas expressed supported a critical cinema, like that of the Filmliga before WWII. This was also reflected by the board of the organizing institute, which included the names of film critic

⁸⁷⁸ Screening on 1946-10-29 – see: *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1947. As such the RKS was important for the establishment of international connections regarding cinema.

⁸⁷⁹ It was first used as a stage for theatre plays, since there was no accommodation as such available anymore. After the opening of the new *Schouwburg* (1947, arch. Hendrik Sutterland), Luxor became a stage for cabaret, performances by the IvAO (a.o.), and cinema screenings, under supervision of the RKS, see: p9, policy note by the *SectieFilm*; ‘Advies voor de Sectie Film van de Commissie voor het Kunstbeleid’, February 1955: GAR, archive: ‘Secretarie afd. Kunstzaken’, toegangsnr. 487.01, bestanddeel 6.

⁸⁸⁰ The first screening of the Stichting Filmliga R45 took place on 1946-02-01, see: *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1947, p18. Next to that, on 1946-05-28, a film festival was organised here to celebrate 50 years of cinema, see *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1947, p59.

⁸⁸¹ Hendriks, 2006: 76. See also: Berg, 1996: 166.

⁸⁸² In 1948, for example, the Luxor showed a film called OUD ROTTERDAM (status unknown), see: www.cinemacontext.nl > films > ‘Oud Rotterdam’ (2008-08-29). On 1949-12-22, the *Historisch Genootschap Roterodamum* organised the ‘Rotterdamse Filmavond’ at Luxor, with films from WWII, a.o. ANGRIF AUF ROTTERDAM (1940, UFA), and UIT ROTTERDAM’S VERLEDEN (1941, Polygoon), see: *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1950: 114.

⁸⁸³ *Verslag van een Congres over Ontspanningsleven, Film en Rijpere Jeugd, gehouden 14 en 15 januari 1949 te Rotterdam*, Instituut Film en Jeugd, Den Haag [collection Universiteitsbibliotheek, Universiteit van Amsterdam]; original quote p6 ‘Spreker betoogt, dat wij ons in de laatste decennia bewust zijn geworden van de betekenis, welke de film is gaan innemen in het dagelijks leven van de mensen.’

⁸⁸⁴ *Ibid*, p13, conclusion by one of the organisers, David van Staveren.

Adrianus van Domburg, educational film pioneer David van Staveren (see: 5.§1. – Schoolbioscoop), and filmmaker Paul Schuitema⁸⁸⁵.

Two things are important here: cinema was understood to play an important role within society concerning social development and the spread of common values, and people had to see quality films, in close connection to reality. Documentary cinema was given priority, all the more so since possibilities for feature film production in the Netherlands were marginal during the first years after WWII. Whatever the impact of these ideas have been within the Netherlands as a whole, they resonated for many years in Rotterdam, and affected also the municipal film policy.

On the 18th of June 1954, the Mayor and Aldermen established a committee for the policy on the arts (*Commissie voor het Kunstbeleid*), chaired by the socialist Alderman A.J. de Vlerk. It consisted of various sections, including one for film⁸⁸⁶. David van Staveren was one of its members, among several other prominent names. In its report, the film section addressed that cinema was the most popular form of entertainment in modern life, but, as one said, the level of most commercial films was rather low and a matter of bad taste. There were worries about possible psychological and social effects, especially among youths. One considered it to be the responsibility of the municipality to act, and to use film to fulfil a progressive social-cultural agenda⁸⁸⁷. The concern with cinema was divided into four aspects: production, distribution, exhibition, and screen education (*vorming*).

The production of local films needed active support. The section proposed to appoint an expert institution, in particular the *Rotterdamse Kunststichting*, in order to guarantee the quality – in which aesthetic and social features were closely connected.

The municipality should give commissions, possibly to cineastes from Rotterdam, to make films of local interest, about, for example, municipal services and institutions, or on the history and the development of the city, next to films of a more general interest, concerning issues such as animal protection, traffic safety, hygiene, public responsibility, etcetera. In this way the municipality can make a valuable contribution to people's development and education, and offer a chance to cineastes from Rotterdam to develop themselves.⁸⁸⁸

⁸⁸⁵ One may note here that Paul Schuitema had been an active member of the Filmliga before WWII, while he was simultaneously a member of the board of Opbouw – two organisations that had also been supported by Kees van der Leeuw, which adds another link to the hub that he occupied in the social-cultural and economic network at stake.

⁸⁸⁶ There were, furthermore, sections for the visual arts, dance, film, literature, music, and theatre, besides two general sections for art and youth, and art and citizenry. Members of the film section included Willy Hofman, the director of the RKS; writer Wim Wagener; and C.A. 't Hart, secretary of the Rotterdam Philharmonic Orchestra (see: RJ 1948: 16 and 1969: 9), who were members of all sections. Next were Piet Meerburg; film scholar Jan Marie Peters (the later director of the Film Academy in Amsterdam, professor of film studies at the University of Amsterdam, and director of the *Nederlandse Onderwijsfilm*), David van Staveren; secretary of the Volksuniversiteit, Ida van Dugteren, who supported both avant-garde and educational cinema; the chairman of the district council Oud-Charlois, A.A. Sterman (who embodied the *wijkgedachte*, see also: RJ 1955: 9), and clergyman Gijsbert van Veldhuizen (see: RJ 1964: 229), who worked in the labour district Crooswijk and wrote various studies and novels on social questions, especially concerning youths. See the final report (Van der Vlerk e.a., 1957: 4-5). See also the preparatory policy note by the *Sectie Film*; 'Advies voor de Sectie Film van de Commissie voor het Kunstbeleid', February 1955: GAR, archive: 'Secretarie afd. Kunstzaken', toegangsnr. 487.01, bestanddeel 6.

⁸⁸⁷ The film section emphasised this responsibility since the municipality immediately profited from the popularity of the cinema, due to the high tax revenues on film screenings. This was 35% until 1954, and 25% afterwards. It is also mentioned (*ibid*, p3) that 5,300,000 people went to the cinema in Rotterdam in 1953 (on a population of 700,000).

⁸⁸⁸ Original quote: 'De Gemeente geve opdrachten, zo mogelijk aan Rotterdamse cineasten, tot het maken van films, die van lokaal belang zijn, waarbij gedacht moet worden aan films over gemeentelijke diensten en instellingen, over de historie en de ontwikkeling van de stad, maar ook aan films, die niet van uitsluitend plaatstelijk belang zijn, zoals films over dierenbescherming, verkeersveiligheid, hygiëne, burgerzin, etc. // Op deze wijze kan de Gemeente een waardevolle bijdrage leveren aan de volksontwikkeling en opvoeding, en daarbij de creatieve talenten van de Rotterdamse cineasten kans geven zich te ontplooiën.' Pp5-6 of the policy note by the *Sectie Film*; 'Advies voor de Sectie Film van de Commissie voor het Kunstbeleid', February 1955: GAR, archive 'Secretarie afd. Kunstzaken', toegangsnr. 487.01, bestanddeel 6.

The section remarked, however, that the production of films for general educational purposes was not the duty of the municipality. They were already made by the *Nederlandse Onderwijs Film*, and only its distribution needed support (which was hitherto often paid by parents).

Concerning film distribution, the section advocated to enable various cultural institutions to show quality films, by providing advice and equipment, and by the exemption or reduction of taxes. Next to that, an argument was made to establish neighbourhood centres where films could be screened to the youths in a 'responsible environment'. A link was made to institutions that possessed films themselves⁸⁸⁹. One argued that all the films related to Rotterdam, including certain 'neglected' films from state archives, should be collected, catalogued and preserved by one municipal film archive. This institution could also advise and assist other organisations that wanted to show films⁸⁹⁰. One may recognise here the voice of Piet Meerburg, also a member of the committee, who had previously taken the initiative to establish the *Nederlands Historisch Filmarchief* (1946), the precursor of the *Nederlands Filmmuseum*. With his film ROTTERDAMSE MIJMERINGEN, moreover, he had also shown the value of historical footage; this film was quite literally an example of the cinematic reconstruction of the city. The war had raised an awareness of the importance to preserve films.

Although the actualisation of most of the ideas of the committee took more than fifteen years to become a matter of fact, one of the first results was indeed the creation of a film archive. This achievement has also been addressed by Wilma van Giersbergen (2005), in a study on the historical-topographical atlas of the *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam*⁸⁹¹.

It is remarkable that as early as 1956, at the request of the Rotterdam Council, the archives took an interest in film documentation. In 1959 the archivist H.C. Hazewinkel (who had been in charge since 1935) was officially given the task of compiling a film archive. The council resolved that all municipal departments should give the archives a copy of any films they commissioned. In addition, newsreels and films made by the Nederlandse Televisiestichting (NTS) that had to do with Rotterdam were purchased.

By preserving contemporary productions, the archive compiled a new kind of city, a cinematic city for future generations (of which this text is a testimony)⁸⁹². In this way, the feedback loops of film productions were enlarged from months or years to decades, and even longer. Cinema got a collective memory function that enabled the cinematic reconstruction of the city.

§ 5. manifesting positions

On the 1st of October 1946, Van der Leeuw withdrew as the Delegate for the reconstruction of Rotterdam. The immediate reason was that the Dutch state, rather than Rotterdam, had the last word in the city's reconstruction, and the influence of Rotterdam's representatives was minimalised (which remained so until 1950)⁸⁹³. Ringers had preferred Van der Leeuw to continue

⁸⁸⁹ Among them the *Bureau Voorlichting en Publiciteit* and the *Gemeente Film Archief* (still related to the former and for the time being hosted by the GAR, which included a.o. material collected for EN TOCH ROTTERDAM..., 1950, Polygoon), and also the *commissie van de Raad voor Lichamelijke Opvoeding* ("Committee of the Council for Physical Education"), *ibid* p7.

⁸⁹⁰ *Ibid* pp7-8 and financial appendix – Concerning youth films, such a role was already played by the institute *Film en Jeugd* – and extra support would be desirable. In respect youth, the section paid also attention to screen education, such as lessons of film aesthetics at schools and neighbourhood centres.

⁸⁹¹ Van Giersbergen, 2005: 12; continuation of the quote: 'The inflammable nitrate films were transferred to acetate material, and the nitrate films were destroyed. A cabinet was bought specially for the conservation and storage of films, because the film safe on the roof of the second storeroom was not cool enough. (...) From 1962 they were conserved on 35 mm instead of 16 mm film. In 1966 the film negatives were moved to the air-conditioned vault of the Dutch Film Museum. They returned in 1970, by which time the archives also had an air-conditioned vault.'

⁸⁹² See also: Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, archive 'Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam' (archief van het archief), dossier 'correspondentie filmcollectie', toegangsnr. 297.01, inv. nr. 461 (1958-1962).

⁸⁹³ Van de Laar, 2000: 467.

his function, but after Van der Leeuw had left, Ringers himself withdrew too (30th of October), since he did not agree with the Dutch policy to stay in power in the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia)⁸⁹⁴. Van der Leeuw was then asked by Prime Minister Schermerhorn to become the curator of the Polytechnic University in Delft (*Technische Hogeschool Delft*, near Rotterdam), for which a new complex had to be created⁸⁹⁵. It seems likely that Ringers advised Schermerhorn to ask Van der Leeuw. It suited his personal itinerary. The masterplan of the university (1947-1950) became a template for modern planning, and the link with Rotterdam is a direct one, since Van der Leeuw asked several planners who were involved with the reconstruction of Rotterdam too, among them Sam van Embden, Cornelis van Eesteren, and Jo van den Broek⁸⁹⁶.

The function of curator also allowed Van der Leeuw to break the hegemony of traditionalism that dominated the influential faculty of architecture at the University of Delft⁸⁹⁷. Due to his efforts various new professors were appointed, first of all Van den Broek, as a professor of architecture⁸⁹⁸, and Van Eesteren and Van Lohuizen, as professors of urban planning⁸⁹⁹. Next was Elling, who had already carried out various projects in Rotterdam, among them buildings for Jan Backx, and later on also private projects for Van der Leeuw⁹⁰⁰. Another professor became Bakema, who had become associated with Van den Broek, in 1948, after Brinkman had died⁹⁰¹. Their studio was the continuation of Van Nelle's Brinkman & Van der Vlucht, and it created several of the university buildings, and complexes in Rotterdam as well. Among them was the terminal of the Holland America Line (1946-1949, Brinkman, Van den Broek & Bakema). Immediately after the bombardment in 1940, HAL director W.H. de Monchy chaired a committee for the architecture of the reconstruction, which, at that time, still envisioned a moderately modern city⁹⁰². De Monchy was also a member of the Club Rotterdam, and in this way the HAL terminal exemplifies the influence of Van der Leeuw.

Of special interest, in terms of (cross-)disciplinary networks is also an early project by Bakema, which was the rebuilding of the progressive cultural centre 'Ons Huis' (1909, arch. J. Verheul; 1948-1949, J. Bakema⁹⁰³). This centre, with the director of the municipal housing department, Alexander Bos, as its chairman, included also a cinema, 't Venster, which would be directed by Johan Huijts, the former chairman of the Filmliga⁹⁰⁴. It became a node between

⁸⁹⁴ Lichtenauer, 2008.

⁸⁹⁵ De Klerk, 1998: 232.

⁸⁹⁶ Also involved were Jules Froger and Kees Bremer (the latter had been engaged with the university since the late 1930s, for which he built the accommodation for Chemical Technology); Groenendijk & Vollaard, 1998: 214. Sam van Embden would later also design the master plans for the technical universities of Enschede and Eindhoven.

⁸⁹⁷ De Wagt, 2008: 155; Vanstiphout, 2005: 162.

⁸⁹⁸ Ibid, see also: Smit, 2008. Van den Broek was professor of architecture from 1947 till 1964. In 1948 he became also involved with the establishment of a new international organisation in Lausanne, which was called *Union Internationale des Architectes* (UIA), with Van den Broek as one of the members of the board, and organiser of the Dutch section, which in 1957 became the Union of Dutch Architects (*Bond Nederlandse Architecten*, BNA) – De Heer, 1983: 52.

⁸⁹⁹ Van Lohuizen had previously worked for the city of Rotterdam (1921-1928), before he moved to Amsterdam, to collaborate with Van Eesteren. They were professors at Delft University between 1948-1957 (vE) and 1948-1956 (vL), see: www.efl-stichting.nl/naamgevers/132.htm (2008-08-18).

⁹⁰⁰ Elling was professor in Delft in the period 1957-1965. For the role of Van der Leeuw in this case, see: De Wagt, 153-156 (private projects for Van der Leeuw, including an apartment at Carlton in Amsterdam (1949-1950), and Van der Leeuw's private house in Wassenaar (1953), see: De Wagt: 219/234. Projects in Rotterdam included: the 'Rijnhotel' (1949-1959), various buildings for Backx Thomsen's Havenbedrijf (between 1954 and 1962), and the 'Havenvakschool' (1955-1960), which was initiated by Backx too.

⁹⁰¹ In 1949, after Brinkman had died, the name was officially changed into 'Van den Broek & Bakema'.

⁹⁰² Wagenaar, 1992: 134/148.

⁹⁰³ Mulder & Schilt (1993, 20). Cf. www.lantaren-venster.nl/info/algemeen.htm Director of Ons Huis was K.F. Proost. Opening of its cinema 't Venster took place on 1949-01-27 by mayor Oud; *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1950.

⁹⁰⁴ Huijts joined 't Venster in 1954 (Smit, 2005: 36). Next to it was also a workshop for visual arts, and artists that frequented it became known as the *Venstergroep*, with Wally Elenbaas a.o.; see: Halbertsma & Van Uelzen, 2001: 82.

cinema and architecture, in terms of aesthetics and networks, with Bakema himself as a frequent visitor⁹⁰⁵.

The studio of Van den Broek & Bakema received also the commission to design Rotterdam's shopping centre 'De Lijnbaan' (1948-1953). This also included two department stores, as nodal points in the city's development strategy⁹⁰⁶. The construction of the shopping area, by building company Dura, was documented by the film *BOUW WINKELCENTRUM LIJNBAAN* (1953, B. Bollemeijer), which shows the building process and the inauguration, attended by Cornelis van Traa and others. Images of the construction works are also included in *STERK IN DE STORM* (1959, C. Niestadt), a film made for the insurance company *Nationale Levensverzekeringen Bank*, which financed this project, just like many other reconstruction projects in Rotterdam. Since 'De Lijnbaan' was exclusively an area for pedestrians, the plan received international recognition, for example by Lewis Mumford⁹⁰⁷. It would be frequently shown in films in the next two decades.

'De Lijnbaan' was part of a larger plan by Van Embden and Fledderus, which also included high-rise housing estates⁹⁰⁸, and, among others, various cinemas⁹⁰⁹. In the 1950s Polygoon often made film recordings in Rotterdam, and a direct connection is drawn here to its director Joop Landré, who came from Rotterdam. Polygoon's cameraman Joop Burcksen, born and raised in Rotterdam too, meticulously recorded the construction of the cinemas 'Thalia' and 'Lumière'⁹¹⁰. Besides that, 'Lumière' was also prominently present in his film *EEN WANDELING DOOR ROTTERDAM* (1955, Joop Burcksen) – made on the occasion of the E55. Especially 'Lumière' expressed the interest of 'De 8 & Opbouw' for cinema; due to its public character it became a reference in the oeuvre of its architect Alexander Bodon, who would design a range of other buildings in Rotterdam afterwards⁹¹¹.

Adjacent to 'De Lijnbaan' the new department store was built – 'De Bijenkorf'. It substituted Dudok's building, which had been partly destroyed by the war. For the sake of the city's new master plan, the remaining part was demolished. It raised criticism, but behind the façades something else was at stake. Due to the application of steel-and-glass as a consequence of the principles of functionalism, too much light entered the building, which negatively affected various products. Therefore, already by 1932, most of the windows were covered by blinds, which was noticed by various critics, among them Mumford (1957: 1198). Dudok himself came to realise that too⁹¹². During the war he made a design for a new building, which was the opposite of the former. He drew a closed box, which would be elaborated by Abraham Elzas, the chief architect of De Bijenkorf concern, in collaboration with the Hungarian-American architect Marcel Breuer. One might wonder why Dudok did not create the final design himself, but a well-known

⁹⁰⁵ This and following information is based on communication of the author (FP) with Fiona van Oostrom (2005-03-22). Bakema was part of a circle including: Jan van Oostrom, who was one of the organisers of the Ahoy!, E55, and Floriade (design by Bakema); Willy Hofman (director RKS); Piet Meerburg (Luxor e.a.); and Emiel Weier, who became director of 't Venster', providing his friends free seats at 'row 13'. Via Bakema several artists involved with 't Venster, like Wally Elenbaas and Louis van Roode, took part in Ahoy' (1950) – Van de Laar, 2000: 562.

⁹⁰⁶ 'Ter Meulen, Wassen, Van Vorst' (1948-1951) and 'De Klerk' (1949-1956), cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 469.

⁹⁰⁷ Mumford, 1957; 1968: 104 (reprint of Mumford's 'The Highway and the City', *Architectural Record*, April 1958).

⁹⁰⁸ 1954-1956, arch. Krijgsman, Bakker, Maaskant.

⁹⁰⁹ Particularly Thalia (1953-1955, Hendriks, v/d Sluys, v/d Bosch) and 'Lumière' (1954-1955, A. Bodon, A. Krijgsman). Krijgsman had also (re)built Lumière at the Coolsingel (1939), which was destroyed shortly afterwards. In the vicinity of the new Lumière other cinemas appeared too: 'Scala' / 'Cinerama' (1957), 'Corso' (1959, Carel Wirtz, Thomas Nix), see the film *BOUW CORSO THEATER* (1959-1961, anon., and 1961 Fox Movietone).

⁹¹⁰ *THALIA IS HERREZEN* (1953, Joop Burcksen); *LUMIÈRE THEATER TE ROTTERDAM* (1955, Joop Burcksen).

⁹¹¹ In Rotterdam Bodon had already built the factory of Van Melle's Confectionery Works (1949-1950, i.c.w. L.A. Cijssouw), which also commissioned a housing complex (1948-1952). Afterwards, Bodon built the 'Chemische Fabriek Nederlandse Dow Mij.' (1955-1957), 'Kantoorgebouw Nieuwe Eerste Ned. Verz. Mij.' (1957-1958), 'Passagebureau KLM' (1959), 'Loods Diepenveen' (1960), 'ENCI Factory' (Rozenburg, 1963), 'Museum Boijmans-Van Beuningen' (1963-1972). In Amsterdam he also built the 'Joop Geesink Filmstudio' (1964-1966) – Claassen, 2001.

⁹¹² Dudok in: Magnée, 1954: 74. The design was made between 1941 and 1944; cf. Wagenaar, 1992: 231.

foreign architect⁹¹³. Dudok's 'Bijenkorf' had been an icon of the modern ambitions of Rotterdam before WWII, but it was exactly this iconic building that revealed the shortcomings of functionalism as a wholesale principle. Moreover, Breuer, who was almost a generation younger, was a much more straight forward proponent of the international modern movement.

The new iconic image that had to be created, and the high expectations that accompanied it, were amplified by the media. Polygoon (1956-wk04) reported on the construction of the Bijenkorf, while it referred to the former one. Together with the brand new Cineac newsreel theatre located in the building, it was said, De Bijenkorf was about to occupy a special place in the new Rotterdam. One year later Polygoon brought the opening of the department store under the heading: 'the city approaches its completion' (1957-wk13). The report shows Mayor Van Walsum pressing a button to put the escalators in motion, watched by Breuer and Elzas, so that he and his wife can move upstairs to look around. The report finishes with contextual shots of the reconstruction. Polygoon made these reports as a part of a production of a promotion film, which rhetorically answered the expectations by giving it the title ROTTERDAM HEEFT 'T ('Rotterdam has it', 1957), which was also made by Joop Burcksen. In twenty minutes it shows the opening of the building and impressions of the store with its smooth interiors and fashionable products. The new store was a closed concrete cube, detached from all city life and fully directed towards the interior and its visitor, which the film emphasised. In front of the Bijenkorf, at the Coolingsingel, and part of the plan, a sculpture was made by the Russian-American constructivist artist Naum Gabo (see: JOURNAAL, NTS, 1957-05-23). He and Breuer embodied the international connections of 'De 8 & Opbouw'. The same applies to the Russian-French artist Ossip Zadkine, who made the later iconic 'monument for a destroyed city' (see: Polygoon, 1953-21)⁹¹⁴. It was (anonymously) commissioned by the general director of De Bijenkorf, G. van der Wal, and it would be shown in every film about the reconstruction of Rotterdam afterwards⁹¹⁵.

Besides 'De Lijnbaan' and its surroundings, a number of priority projects were built. First of all, Maaskant and Van Tijen received the commission for the 'Groothandelsgebouw' (Trade Centre, 1947-1953)⁹¹⁶. It offered space to more than two hundred wholesale companies. The building is to be seen in many films on the reconstruction of Rotterdam, while Multifilm and Polygoon-Profilti made also films just about the building itself⁹¹⁷. They showed it from various perspectives, exterior and interior, and through panorama and tracking shots. Especially the film by Polygoon showed its functioning. It showed all kinds of businesses, from cosmetics to agrarian vehicles, from hairdressing to exhibitions of modern furniture design, and from money exchange to an art gallery. The film applies an associative montage, for example by showing a women's bracelet followed by a chain of a ship, or shots of shop selling toys followed by shots of a garage where a businessman watches a brand new Cadillac. While customers drink a beer or buy flowers, trucks load and unload, making use of a forwarding street that runs through the building. It is an integration of architecture and infrastructure, which enables a modern and

⁹¹³ Dudok still worked in those years; one of his last buildings was the 'Havengebouw Amsterdam', 1957-1965.

⁹¹⁴ The connection with architecture, in the case of Zadkine, is also illustrated by his collaborations with, for example, Hugh Maaskant, i.e. on the Tomado buildings in Etten-Leur (1954-1955) and Dordrecht (1959-1962).

⁹¹⁵ For the history of this sculpture, see: De Man, 2002: 200.

⁹¹⁶ The initiative for this building was taken during WWII, cf. Van Traa, 1947.

⁹¹⁷ I.e. OPENING GROOT HANDELSGEBOUW TE ROTTERDAM (1953, Multifilm, for: NTS television); HET GROOTHANDELSGEBOUW (1955, Joop Burcksen/Polygoon), cf. Polygoon 1953-wk11 and 1953-wk23. The Polygoon production starts with busy traffic in front of the building. Businessmen enter the main hall, and, as described by B&G, 'report to the reception desk, where an attractive young secretary shows them the ropes by way of a wall board with the names of the companies established in the building'. Burcksen told (interview FP, 2007-05-22) that there was actually a man at the reception desk, but Burcksen asked if a young lady could play that role for the film. One looked through the building and someone was called, against the will of the receptionist, who got upset and immediately resigned. Catalogue B&G, original quote: '[zakenman en twee andere bezoekers] vervoegen zich bij informatiebalie waar aantrekkelijke jonge receptioniste hen middels muurbord met namen van in het gebouw gevestigde zaken wegwijs maakt....', see also: Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws, 1953-11.

efficient way of doing business, the film says. As a concrete structure, but also as an icon of the reconstruction, the building contributed to the redevelopment of the urban economy.

The 'Groothandelsgebouw' was built next to another cinematic icon of the reconstruction: the central railway station (1950-1957)⁹¹⁸. Because of his long experience with railway accommodations, Van Ravesteyn received this commission. It marked his return to functionalism, not unlike that of Oud, who built the functionalist office building 'The Utrecht' (1954-1961)⁹¹⁹. On the other side of the station appeared the district post office ('Stationspostkantoor', 1954-1959). This functionalist landmark was designed by the brothers Evert and Herman Kraaijvanger; the latter had been a member of OPRO, and collaborated with Van der Leeuw and Van Traa on the 'Basisplan'. The post office accommodated the mechanisation of postal traffic, which was heralded as such by television, once again as a matter of Record, Rhetorics, and Rationalization⁹²⁰.

⁹¹⁸ For the opening, see: JOURNAAL, NTS, 1957-05-21 and 1957-12-31

⁹¹⁹ Van Ravesteyn would also design the new "Grand Theatre" (*Groote Schouwburg*, later: *Theatre Zuidplein*; 1952-1954), which followed a composition of cubes according to a functionalist scheme. This new theatre was built in Rotterdam South as part of a strategy by Kees van der Leeuw to distribute culture outside the city centre, which was already mentioned on his list of the twelve required representative public functions in Rotterdam.

⁹²⁰ For the three R's, see: Hediger & Vonderau, 2007: 22. For television programmes, see: JOURNAAL (NTS, 1959-09-22; 1969-09-25); FLITS (Leo Akkermans / AVRO, 1960-05-14), and especially the youth programme ZIENDEROGEN (Neuman & Noordam, NCRV: 1968-02-03), which deals specifically with this building and its operations. The aesthetics of the three R's are also shown by the (exterior) artwork of Louis van Roode, and various interior pieces (a.o. by Dolf Henkes, Wally Elenbaas, Kees Timmer, Henk de Vos, Gust Romijn) – Groenendijk, 2004 > 'Stationspostkantoor'.

CHAPTER 8. A MODEL TO COMMUNICATE THE CITY

§ 1. cinematic models

The new city that emerged under the direction of city planner C. van Traa (1944- 1964), and under the supervision of the Mayors P.J. Oud (1945-1952) and G.E. van Walsum (1952-1965), became an international model of planning and urbanism⁹²¹. This was supported by film and television⁹²². An example is the CBS report THE STORY OF ROTTERDAM (1955, Walter Cronkite, Max de Haas), to highlight the results of the Marshall Plan aid⁹²³. Cronkite, standing in front of the St. Laurens church, starts to tell the ‘story of Rotterdam’. He visits the town hall where he meets city planner Cornelis van Traa, who explains the reconstruction plans. In the meantime, images of construction works are shown. The city seems to be a place of joy and happiness. It is proud of the new shops along the Coolingsingel, including the Bijenkorf by Breuer, the housing estates of the Lijnbaan, the new offices, and the St. Laurens church that is being reconstructed; in its port two tugboats tow the impressive ‘Nieuw Amsterdam’ ocean liner. The city is both a place of busy traffic and quietness; it is both a city without a heart, expressed by Zadkine’s sculpture, and a city of progressive human values, symbolised by the statue of Erasmus. After finishing the interview with Van Traa, Cronkite states that Rotterdam could serve as a model for city planners elsewhere in the world, and he ‘gives back’ to New York⁹²⁴. Rotterdam travelled the world in a nutshell, as a model, like a movie star.

Film and television became increasingly important to communicate ideas and to generate support about the new urban society that had to be built after the war⁹²⁵. In comparison to the pre-war period, ‘a shift in mode of address can be detected from that of engagement, to model and statement...’, as Elizabeth Lebas (2007: 36) has remarked in the case of Glasgow. This also applies to Rotterdam. Film offered a model *of* the city and a model *for* the city, on top of the city being a model in itself. This modelling through film happened in different ways.

The ‘modernity thesis’ suggests a correlation between between modernity and cinema in terms of perception⁹²⁶. As such we may pay attention to the fact that city planner Van Traa was a film enthusiast himself. Whereas he first explained his plan (1946) in terms of functionality, he also pointed to the way it is experienced, which is exemplified by the connection between north and south. According to historian Paul van de Laar (2000: 460), accessibility was one thing, but ‘[e]qually important was the feeling that a passenger to Rotterdam-South would have’. He quotes Van Traa describing his plan with the following words: one ‘passes twice the river, twice a harbour, and then goes along the heads of two of the largest and most vivid harbours of Europe, and all in a grand totality, so that one who experiences it becomes enthusiast once and again,

⁹²¹ See e.g. Mumford, 1957; Benevolo [1960] (in: Wagenaar, 1992: 13); Bacon, 1964: 6; Hillebrecht, 1964: 2; Johnson-Marshall, 1964: 5 e.a.

⁹²² An early example of a foreign report on Rotterdam after WWII is the British production IN ROTTERDAM (1946, Ronald Haines). It shows the city mainly from the river Maas, paying attention to the destroyed city, but above all to the historical heritage that is still saved, in particular the *jenever* (gin) distilleries. Other examples are the Yugoslavian report HAMBURG-HAG-ROTTERDAM (1955, Vladan Slijepcevic) and the Italian ROTTERDAM (1957, Igor Scherb), a.o.

⁹²³ Max de Haas frequently worked as a cameraman for CBS, and it had been him who had convinced Cronkite to come to Rotterdam (Bert Hogenkamp, personal communication FP, 2009-01-13).

⁹²⁴ See also www.geheugenvannederland.nl; the film is mentioned under the title: AMERIKAANSE BELANGSTELLING VOOR WEDEROPBOUW IN ROTTERDAM.

⁹²⁵ Municipalities promoting themselves by way of film had already a tradition before WWII (e.g. films by Willy Mullens since the 1910s). During the war Multifilm (i.c.w. VNF) made a series of films for different cities, a.o. Nijmegen, Schiedam, Dordrecht, Eindhoven, and Tilburg (see: NFDB > Multifilm and/or Allan Penning, dir.), as well as Filmfabriek Holland, e.g. Amsterdam, Arnhem, The Hague, Gouda (ref. NFDB). As a ‘genre’ the city film had its heydays in the 1950s, with titles such as NIJMEGEN, STAD AAN DE RIVIER (1951, Frans Dupont), OUVERTURE DEN HAAG (1954, Rudi Hornecker), HENGELO 1954 (1954, Polygoon), VLAARDINGEN KOERST OP MORGEN (1955, Jan Schaper), TILBURG, HARMONIE VAN EEN GEMEENSCHAP (1956, Otto van Neijenhoff), ZAANDAM, ONZE STAD (1956, Polygoon-Profiliti), AMSTERDAM, STAD VAN HET WATER (1957, Max de Haas), GOUDA ALBUM (1960, Walter Smith), a.o.

⁹²⁶ For this term, see: Bordwell, 1997: 140-147; cf. ch. 12.§1.

while it is most important for the identity formation of the entire city⁹²⁷. Van Traa's plan became a matter of 'scripted spaces' (to use the concept of Norman Klein, 1999).

In a similar way Van Traa designed 'the window on the river' (*het venster op de rivier*), which established a visual connection between city and port, with the port being a 'window on the world'. After an idea by Backx, Van Traa designed this (eventually unsuccessful) plan by enlarging the Coolsingel boulevard up to the river, which he explicitly explained in aesthetic and psychological terms⁹²⁸. In general, Van Traa paid attention to spatial contrasts, such as low-rise versus high-rise, housing versus leisure facilities, and high-density complexes versus open spaces such as parks and waters. Together with a refined transportation system this enabled an 'urban montage', with different places quickly succeeding each other⁹²⁹.

This links up with an important aspect of the modernity thesis, the correspondence between cinema and mobility. The 'Basisplan', and following plans, foresaw an elaborate circulation system, including a network of roads with crossings at different levels, tunnels and roundabouts, a periphery motorway with fly-overs, as well as tramways and railways, including terminals and stations, next to airports⁹³⁰. Moving through the city became a cinematic experience, which was exemplified by newsreels and other reports on infrastructural advances⁹³¹. Moreover, the car got integrated in the architectural project, by way of interior roads, car parks and car ports⁹³². Such an integration was continued at pedestrian level by applications such as elevators, escalators and revolving components⁹³³.

In addition to the movements that were enabled by all kinds of built structures, the act of building these structures endorsed the city already with a cinematic quality. It is exemplified by the *Rondrit Wederopbouw Rotterdam* (org.: Jan Lebbink). During the summer of 1946, the "Office for Information and Publicity" and the "Rotterdam Tourist Information Board" (VVV) organised a daily two-hour 'reconstruction excursion' by bus. It was a 'reality film' that played with the imagination – almost nothing was being built yet in 1946 – through the suggestion of what the city could become, as explained by a guide. Due to its success, the excursion became an annual event, which lasted until 1966⁹³⁴. Next to that, a special international tour got organised (by the VVV), with explanations in three languages. Over the course of the next decade, new suburbs were visited too, as well as the infrastructural projects just mentioned.

Since 1947, the information office also organised the *Opbouwdag* ('construction day'), which would take place every year on the 18th of May, under supervision of K.P. van der Mandele⁹³⁵. It was the day, in 1940, that city planner Witteveen had been commissioned to draw

⁹²⁷ Van Traa quoted by Van de Laar, 2000: 459-460; original quote: 'Minstens zo belangrijk was het gevoel dat de passant op weg naar Rotterdam-Zuid zou ervaren. Dan "passeert hij tweemaal een rivier, tweemaal een haven en komt dan [p459] langs de koppen van twee van de grootste en levendigste havens van Europa en dat alles is een grootsch geheel, dat iemand die dat beleeft, telkens weer stimuleert en dat van het grootste belang voor de karaktervorming voor de gehele stad is.'

⁹²⁸ see: Van de Laar, 2000: 460. The plan was partly fulfilled by a 14-storey housing block, the 'Maastorenflat' (1955-1956), designed by Herman Bakker, who had previously worked for the studio of Van Ravesteyn (cf. Groenendijk & Vollaard, 2004: 25). The idea was eventually unsuccessful, since the port gradually moved westward, out of the city.

⁹²⁹ The 'urban montage' would be further reinforced by the (partly underground) metro line, built since 1959. Once it was built, it was considered a tourist attraction for its great variety of views, see: Edzes, 1974: 1.

⁹³⁰ There are many examples to be found in Rotterdam for the kind of transition spaces mentioned; airports: Heliport Rotterdam, Airport Zestienhoven; train stations: e.g. Rotterdam Central Station; transportation: e.g. Rotterdam Metro; circulation system / crossing at different levels: e.g. Weena, 's Gravendijkwal; roundabout: e.g. Hofplein, Droog-Leavever Fortuynplein; periphery motorway with elevated junctions: i.e. the Ruit om Rotterdam with e.g. Kleinpolderplein, Knooppunt Ridderkerk; tunnels: e.g. Maastunnel, Beneluxtunnel.

⁹³¹ One of the earliest reports as such was on the opening of a new tramway, *Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws*, 1946-wk06.

⁹³² e.g. Groothandelsgebouw

⁹³³ e.g. restaurant of Euromast

⁹³⁴ See the article: 'D.C. Zuur: in de ene hand de microfoon...in de andere het stuur', p24 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 2/1, 1963. As explained by D.C. Zuur, one of the bus drivers, he got his text from the office, but was also able to add information himself.

⁹³⁵ Groenendijk, 2004 > Karel Paul van der Mandele (www.wonen.rotterdam.nl/smartsite2043748.dws)

the reconstruction plan, and it was rhetorically applied here. It would become an annual event, which became a way to attract attention from the media, among them Polygoon⁹³⁶. The act of building was turned into a show, which eventually would be recorded on film too.

These cases, next to the fact that various architects and planners were interested in cinema⁹³⁷, seem to be confirmations of the modernity thesis, if they would not just tell one part of the story. The city, as argued by Bernhard Tschumi (1994 [1983]: 140), can only be understood when space is perceived in relation to acts that take place in space, that empower space, and that make certain spatial structures important. Media should be considered here too. They make it possible to express complex urban life and to provide frames for urban development. This goes beyond perception, in aesthetic terms. The connection between cinema and modernity, and the modern city in particular, is multifold and not limited to a particular cinematic mode.

Architectural and planning projects have traditionally been presented by technical and perspective drawings, maps and three-dimensional models. Film became another medium to present plans, and quite literally regarding the films of the department of “Public Works” (Gemeentewerken), made by its own ‘phototechnical service’. In addition to the classical media, film could show developments and processes, because of movement and sequences; it could show a project growing. Through framing and montage it could visualise relationships, between different spaces, people, and activities. Film could also suggest certain developments taking place, by showing existing spaces and projects under construction, and subsequently empty lots, in order to imagine similar things happening there too.

If one still takes into account that Van Traa used to be a film enthusiast, one might eventually see the ‘Basisplan’ as a kind of film script⁹³⁸. What remains of the post-war city today, in its various facets, is its image on film. Different from set design serving the story of a film, the set here is the subject itself. In its turn, the subject of this architecture and planning is modern life – its organisation, its becoming, its actualisation, and its reflection. The city of Rotterdam followed a strategy in which architecture and planning became a *mise-en-scene* that enabled the city to act; the development of society was the purpose of design. Films articulated this, which includes films that do not concern planning in a direct sense. Whereas Gold and Ward (1997) have addressed the need for commissioners to propagate planning ‘beyond housing’, in the case of Great Britain, one may extend this argument and consider films ‘beyond planning’. Films that promoted the modern city and its institutions, and the architecture that gave shape to it, had the same purpose, which creates an ontological complex in which architecture and cinema are mutually supportive.

2008-12-30). Van der Mandele organised the financial support for this event (like many others), cf. *Rotterdam Jaarboekje*, 1976: 107.

⁹³⁶ E.g. ROTTERDAM STRAKS, OPBOUWDAG IN DE MAASSTAD (Polygoon, 1947-23), including images of the exhibition ‘Rotterdam Straks’ (Museum Boymans); OPBOUWDAG (Polygoon, 1948-22), showing the area where the new airport will be built, housing plans for Mathenesse, the first church to be built after WWII, and reconstruction work on the harbour; KONINKLIJK BEZOEK (Polygoon, 1949-22) shows festivities and a tour through the city and the port by Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard – the royal couple also visits the emergency houses of Wielewaal (district Charlois), and the ‘Bouwcentrum’ (Building Centre), where C. van Traa informs them about the plans. Such reports are continued in later years, e.g. ROTTERDAM VIERT ELFDE OPBOUWDAG (1957, Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws), OPBOUWDAG 1963 (1963, Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws), STADSNIEUWS 1971 (1971, Soek). It became also a habit to finish the *Opbouwdag* with a film programme. In 1957, for example, it showed in Ahoy’ a film on the reconstruction of the old city of Warsaw – a historical reconstruction that was quite a different from Rotterdam (*Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1958: 88); in 1959, films were shown at the Schouwburg, on reconstruction works in France and England, next to the film DOKBOUW AAN DE NIEUWE MAAS (1959, Ytzen Brusse), on the building of docks for Wilton-Feyenoord – organised by the ‘Comité Rotterdam 1960’, ‘Havenvereniging Rotterdam’, RKS and ‘Genootschap Roterodamum’ – *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1960: 94.

⁹³⁷ See e.g. ch. 2.§1.

⁹³⁸ This applies even quite literally in the case of his slides-lecture (*Het Nieuwe Stadsplan*) that he presented at the *Rotterdamsche Kunstkring* (1946-05-10). *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, ‘Dagelijkse Kroniek 1946’, jrg. 5, 1947: p51 [GAR].

The function of films dealing with city planning and reconstruction can thus be understood in terms of plan, model, and support, in which the notion of model links the other two. A model, in order to be implemented, needs both a plan and support.

§ 2. news reports and television

Important for the reconstruction of Rotterdam was the way it was subject to news reports, which went beyond monitoring, and took on the role of what I have previously called 'projective reflexivity': envisioning development. After WWII, Polygoon continued its weekly news reports, now called 'Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws', which was shown in 110 cinemas all over the Netherlands. In 1946, Philip Bloemendal started to work for the company as a commentator. The typical sound of his voice became well-known in the country: the voice of reconstruction.

The 1950s were the glorious years of the Polygoon news, to which Rotterdam has much to owe. A particular name to be mentioned here is that of Joop Burcksen. He was born and raised in Rotterdam, where he spent much time in the cinemas. He wanted to work as a filmmaker, but after the war there was no film production left in Rotterdam⁹³⁹. Therefore, in 1951, at the age of twenty-two, he joined Polygoon in Haarlem, while still living in Rotterdam for the next few years. After a while he began to work as a sound technician, and later on he joined the editorial board of Polygoon's news. As a cameraman he became responsible for various reports and documentary shorts. He reported on achievements like the 'Groothandelsgebouw', the 'Heliport', the reconstruction of the St. Laurens church and the construction of 'De Bijenkorf', the installation of a radar chain for navigation in the port, as well as the creation of the 'Euromast', among others⁹⁴⁰.

At the same time, television broadcasting emerged⁹⁴¹. It was organised by the *Nederlandse Televisie Stichting* (NTS) in Bussum, which united the main broadcasting associations that had been concerned with radio⁹⁴². The NTS collaborated with Multifilm in Haarlem, and since 1952 they made domestic news reports. During the first years this did not happen on a regular basis yet, and the numbers were still limited. In 1952, Amsterdam was shown in seven reports, and Rotterdam in just one, on housing shortage and a makeshift village of old trams and train wagons. During the next year, Amsterdam was shown another seven times, and Rotterdam three times, including two reports on the new 'Heliport'⁹⁴³.

⁹³⁹ Personal communication of the author with Joop Burcksen, 2007-05-22.

⁹⁴⁰ The Polygoon reports mentioned are: 'Groothandelsgebouw': 1953-23; 'Heliport': 1953-21 and 1953-32, St.Laurens: 1954-25, 'De Bijenkorf': 1956-04, radar chain: 1956-50, 'Euromast': 1959-14. Source: personal communication (FP) with Burcksen. In the well-made report on the radar chain, characterised by various carefully lit scenes, there are also images of a ship dealing with fog. This is the reason why the radar is built, as sight is limited. However, according to Burcksen, the day that it was put to use it was a clear sky. Eventually he took a transparent plastic bag in which he kept his bread for lunch, creased it, and put it in front of the lens. It perfectly looked like a foggy day, in which the radar made sense indeed, and so the boatmen acted alike.

⁹⁴¹ Television had been introduced in the Netherlands by John Logie Baird in 1928, at the Nenijs. The Dutch electronics company of Philips, which had been present there too, began to develop television equipment. One of the Philips pioneers was Erik de Vries, who started to do experiments for the firm in 1931 when he was 19 years old. Throughout the 1930s he would be involved with experiments, like the tv-shows on the trade fair (*voorjaarbeurs*) in Utrecht in 1938. In 1938-1939 he made a tour through Europe to demonstrate the medium (see: http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geschiedenis_van_de_televisie 'geschiedenis van de televisie', 2007-05-27). During the 'Philips Experimental Period' (PET, 1948-03-18 – 1951-07-10), De Vries was in charge of 264 tv-shows for a small number of people in Eindhoven. Afterwards the first national television broadcasting took place on the 2nd of October 1951, from 'Studio Irene' in Bussum (see: www.nos.nl/assets/service/nosnl_overdenos.html 'NOS: ontstaansgeschiedenis', 2007-05-27). De Vries would still play a role as an instructor of tv-directors and tv-cameramen (see: www.beeldengeluid.nl 'Erik de Vries, uitgebreide biografie', 2004-03-25).

⁹⁴² These associations were divided along the lines of what in Dutch has been called the *verzuiling*, an overall social division in different 'columns' (= *zuilen*), which dominated public life. The NTS encompassed representatives of the broadcasting stations KRO (Catholic), NCRV (protestant Christian), VARA (socialist) and AVRO (liberal), and later also VPRO (progressive Christian, soon 'critical').

⁹⁴³ JOURNAAL [housing shortage] NTS, 1952-02-29; JOURNAAL [Heliport], NTS, 1953-05-19, 1953-10-09, 1956-12-04.

An important step was the decision of Multifilm to open a laboratory in Hilversum, near the television studios in Bussum. It is one of the reasons that in 1955 the number of reports rapidly increased, and on the 5th of January 1956 the NTS began its regular JOURNAAL, which was broadcast three times a week⁹⁴⁴. The presence of Multifilm in Hilversum finally led to the joint-venture ‘Cinecentrum’, in which Multifilm collaborated with Polygoon, Profilti and Interfilm⁹⁴⁵. According to Hogenkamp, Multifilm argued that cinema news and television news were different things, and subject to different aesthetic principles, and that therefore no competition existed between them. But Polygoon certainly felt the competition⁹⁴⁶. The JOURNAAL became soon the most popular television programme, while television rapidly spread. In 1955, less than one percent of the Dutch households had a television set. Six years later it was already one third⁹⁴⁷. The time of broadcasting also increased, from twelve hours a week in 1958, to eighteen in 1960⁹⁴⁸. Since television in general became also more important for entertainment, the number of cinema spectators dropped from 64.2 million in 1958 to 38.7 million in 1964⁹⁴⁹.

The NTS reports on Rotterdam concerned mainly the port and the reconstruction. Exemplary is a report on a ‘masonry match’ (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1956-07-12): bricklayers could win the ‘silver trowel’, which was handed over by A.C. De Bruijn, Minister for *productiviteitsbevordering* (‘productivity promotion’). The state heralded the workers as the heroes of the reconstruction, and television amplified it. Most newsreels like this one have remained anonymous, but illustrative is the fact that among the cameramen frequenting Rotterdam were Charles Breijer and Peter Alsemgeest (for the latter, see chapter 12).

Breijer started as a photographer, and was part of the resistance during WWII, together with Cas Oorthuys (a.o.). The two of them also contributed to the brochure *Het Nieuwe Hart van Rotterdam* (1946, ASRO), which accompanied the ‘Basisplan’. Oorthuys would make several photographic series in Rotterdam afterwards, which resulted in the photographic paperback *Dit is Onze Havenstad Rotterdam* (1952) and eventually in his monumental book *Rotterdam, Dynamische Stad* (1959), with photographs of both the city and its port⁹⁵⁰. Breijer, who concentrated on the moving image, made various reports in Rotterdam too, for example about the ‘SS Rotterdam’ (1958), the new flag ship of the HAL built by the RDM (which Oorthuys recorded too)⁹⁵¹. Their recordings remained comparable, in terms of content and style, characterised by sophisticated compositions and perspectives, but always at the service of the

⁹⁴⁴ Since 1958-05-01 this became four times a week, and since 1960-10-03 six times; Scheepmaker, 1981: 152.

⁹⁴⁵ The collaboration started in 1956 and Cinecentrum, with three hundred employees, was officially opened on the 27th of April 1959. Hogenkamp, 2003: 79.

⁹⁴⁶ Scheepmaker, 1981: 19-20.

⁹⁴⁷ In 1955, out of 2,850,000 Dutch households, 25,000 had television sets, and 100,000 in 1957, which was reported by the JOURNAAL (NTS, 1957-01-03). After another two, on the 24th of July 1959, the ‘PTT’ registered number 500,000 and this growth would go on. By 1961 there were one million registrations. Van de Laar (2000: 573) has estimated that there were about 3,000 television sets in Rotterdam in 1955.

25,000 televisions in 1955, in: ‘Na 1960: het tijdperk van de televisie en de auto’, website ‘Vergeten Verleden’, by W8 Onderzoek, 2003 www.w8.nl/tv.htm visited: 2006-02-08. 500,000 in 1959: www.verkeerenwaterstaat.nl/?lc=nl&page=364

Home > Over VenW > Actuele onderwerpen > Historisch overzicht VenW > Overzicht 1957-1966 / 1967-1976 / Overzicht 1977-1986 (Website visited: 2006-03-21). One million by 1961; Van Driel, 1999.

⁹⁴⁸ In: ‘Na 1960: het tijdperk van de televisie en de auto’.

⁹⁴⁹ Hogenkamp, 2003: 80. Over the course of the 1960s, this change was also noticeable regarding sports events as well as visits paid to community centres, a.o. For Rotterdam, see: Van de Laar, 2000: 574.

⁹⁵⁰ On the occasion of the Ahoy’ (1950) Cas Oorthuys had already made a series of photographs on the port. He frequently visited Rotterdam in the following years, broadening his field to the city as a whole, which is also reflected by his photographs for the book *De Steden* (“The Cities”, 1951), in the series *De Schoonheid van Ons Land*.

⁹⁵¹ e.g. JOURNAAL (NTS, 1955-10-06, Belgian ambassador visiting RDM); see also reports on the construction of the ‘SS Rotterdam’ at the RDM: JOURNAAL (NTS, 1958-08-13); FILMREPORTAGE (NTS, 1958-09-13); JOURNAAL (NTS, 1958-09-17); JOURNAAL, 1959-08-21; 1959-09-03; 1959-09-11. Oorthuys included the images of the ‘SS Rotterdam’ in *Rotterdam, Dynamische Stad*.

human concern. This, in general, applied to the television JOURNAAL, which it shared with the photographic association GKI⁹⁵².

Already in 1956, the reports concerning Amsterdam outnumbered those of Polygoon. Concerning Rotterdam, Polygoon remained the most productive until 1959. After that year, for all major cities, Polygoon became second in terms of frequency and numbers of spectators. If we look at the reports of both Polygoon and the NTS JOURNAAL made in the 1950s, Amsterdam was by far the most frequently shown (table 1). Its figure is about the same as that of the four other cities together. This is not only because Amsterdam is the Dutch capital, but its proximity to Haarlem and Bussum/Hilversum also played a role. According to Carel Enkelaar, editor in chief of the NTS JOURNAAL, it was easier to acquire daily news from Paris, Rome or London [and New York] than from the different provinces of the Netherlands⁹⁵³. Rotterdam took a position in between.

Rotterdam was shown through reports on the launching of ships, revealing monuments, and openings of buildings. Reports like these, quite similar to those of Polygoon (table 2), show the attractors of increasing welfare, economic growth and progress. In a survey on television spectatorship, from 1957, respondents made clear, however, that they did not appreciate just reports on formal events⁹⁵⁴. In the next years the JOURNAAL began to change, and to develop its own approach. With more time to broadcast, it started to cover more and different subjects⁹⁵⁵.

Table 1: The City in News Reports, 1950-1959

approximate numbers of reports dealing explicitly with the main Dutch cities⁹⁵⁶

black = NTS Journaal (TV); blue = Polygoon (cinema)

	Amsterdam		Rotterdam		The Hague		Utrecht		Eindhoven	
1950		94		30		42		12		2
1951		68		28		34		17		6
1952	7	91	1	25	3	42	1	13	1	1
1953	7	53	3	32	2	29	1	11	0	5
1954	-	54	-	20	-	36	-	14	-	5
1955	36	76	9	27	11	26	5	16	4	1
1956	77	71	33	33	24	43	18	15	6	2
1957	80	61	22	34	26	26	9	11	9	9
1958	90	52	23	26	34	21	11	10	4	4
1959	112	86	48	37	51	34	28	17	4	5

⁹⁵² Both Oorthuys and Breijer were members of the Gkf, just like Aart Klein, who published the photobook *Amsterdam Rotterdam, twee steden Rapsodie* (1959); for the latter, cf. Suermondt, 1993.

⁹⁵³ As addressed by Carel Enkelaar in 1961 on the occasion of receiving the national television award (*Prins Bernhard Fonds Televisieprijs*). Already in its first years, the NTS made an agreement with CBS in New York for news exchange. It then initiated, in 1958, the European News Exchange, in: Scheepmaker, 1981: 31; note on CBS: p28.

⁹⁵⁴ Hoekstra, 2001.

⁹⁵⁵ Gradually the JOURNAAL began to pay attention to events such as accidents, first of all in the port, which would become a frequent subject over the course of time. Early examples are: a report on the explosion at a tug-boat (1957-04-16), and a fire at a cargo ship (1957-06-27).

⁹⁵⁶ Figures are based on the collections 'NOS Journaal' and 'Polygoon' of B&G, May 2007 ('old catalogue'). Counted are reports in which the name of the city is explicitly mentioned in the descriptions within the database of B&G (see: www.beeldengeluid.nl); in this way certain reports have been omitted that, for example, just mention 'Botlek' (harbour area) or 'Schiphol' (airport). Note that some reports might not have been preserved and are therefore not counted. Some reports, on the other hand, have double registrations due to different versions, like the 'jaaroverzicht journaal' (year reports). There are no data available for domestic television news reports in 1954. Note that the numbers of Polygoon also include commissioned films; this however might actually give a more realistic image since they counterbalance certain inevitable omissions.

Table 2: Subjects of Polygoon Reports on Rotterdam, 1945-1959⁹⁵⁷

1945-1949		
port issues (excl. navy)	43	29%
sports games	29	19%
navy	16	11%
reconstruction (building)	14	9%
military (excl. navy)	12	8%
politics	10	7%
other	25	17%
total reports	149	100%
1950-1959		
sports games	73	25%
port issues (excl. navy)	49	17%
reconstruction (building)	44	15%
navy	32	11%
politics	27	9%
arts & culture	25	9%
zoo	11	4%
military (excl. navy)	7	2%
other	24	8%
total reports	292	100%

§ 3. steady spirit

In the 1940s, film production was at a minimum in the Netherlands. Illustrative for the conditions of Dutch cinema at that time is the conception of the feature film *DUTCH IN SEVEN LESSONS* (1948). The British film organisation Rank commissioned Hein Josephson and Charles Huguenot van der Linden to make a series of documentary shorts on the Netherlands. However, during the production Rank got a new board of directors who cancelled the project⁹⁵⁸. The recordings made so far, including aerial shots of Amsterdam and Rotterdam, were dressed into a fictional story, of an English cameraman that visits the Netherlands for seven days. In this way the film is an odd reflection upon itself. Audrey Hepburn plays a Stewardess explaining things about the country. Various sketches on Dutch particularities make up the body of the film, which the directors called a 'documentary comedy'⁹⁵⁹. The film presents a cheerful image of a country that has left the hardships of the war behind, which appears as a feature length promotion film for the Netherlands. It neatly links up with Huguenot van der Lindens' later industrial films that got

⁹⁵⁷ The figures are based on the descriptions of Polygoon week reports by B&G (Polygoon collectie), May 2007 ('old catalogue'). Included are reports since 1945 May 5. This overview provides merely a general indication. Reports are classified based on the dominant subject, as determined by the description or title of the report. For example, the first arrival of bananas in the port after WWII, has been classified as 'port'. 'Port', in such reports, is the common denominator, whereas bananas is incidental, but the main 'issue'. Comparable reports, however, might lack the descriptive key used for the classifications here, e.g. arrival of Canadian horses (1945-09-26), which is described by the keys: 'horses' (*paarden*) and 'reconstruction' (*wederopbouw*). Although the arrival of horses helped the reconstruction of the country, I have not considered it as a part of building the city, and, since 'port' is not a key here, I have classified it as 'other'.

⁹⁵⁸ Albers e.a., 2004: 244.

⁹⁵⁹ <http://cultura.nps.nl/page/tv-gids/162614> 2008-08-14.

wrapped into fiction (e.g. *BLOEM DER NATIE*, 1956). It blurred the line between promotion, art and entertainment, which were subject to a common attractor of economic development.

Only by 1950 a major Dutch feature film was produced again: *DE DIJK IS DICHT* (“The Dike is Closed”), directed by Anton Koolhaas. He had previously worked as a (film) critic for the newspaper *NRC* in Rotterdam. After the war Koolhaas was invited to become a member of an editorial committee to supervise *Polygoon*, since it had continued its work during the German occupation. Instead of supervising, however, the committee became an editorial board that became actively involved with other productions too. Due to Koolhaas’s connection with Rotterdam, the city also plays a role in *DE DIJK IS DICHT*, although the main setting is the province of Zeeland. The film tells the story of a man, played by Kees Brusse (trained by the *Rotterdams Toneel*⁹⁶⁰), who comes from the island Walcheren, but stays in Rotterdam for work reasons. When Walcheren suffers a bombardment in 1944, his wife is killed, as she drowns due to a broken dyke. He visits her grave and is taken over by a depression, but he finally understands that the only way out is to get in contact with the villagers, and to join them in their attempt to reconstruct the country.

The dyke, which is broken and repaired again, symbolizes the Dutch nation. This is emblematic for the spirit after WWII, which can also be recognised in various documentaries. Exemplary is *MODERNE ARCHITECTUUR IN NEDERLAND* (1954, Rudi Hornecker), which was commissioned by the Ministry of Education, Art and Science. The film was made to promote the country’s contemporary architecture, which had become the main vehicle for Dutch culture after WWII. Rotterdam was prominently present in this film, with housing, service and industry complexes, including buildings that would remain relatively unknown afterwards⁹⁶¹. A striking feature of this film, besides its expressive framing, was a montage sequence with interchanging portraits of workers and shots of buildings. ‘The Netherlands has adapted itself to the rhythm of this time’, the narrator said⁹⁶². This film, however, was not made before a number of other films had been made that dealt more explicitly with the reconstruction.

Of particular importance are the films by Herman van der Horst, especially *ROTTERDAM AAN DEN SLAG* (“Rotterdam Gets to Work”, 1946), and *STEADY! (HOUEN ZO!, 1952)*. The latter is a film of twenty minutes, commissioned and financed by the ‘Mutual Security Agency’ (MSA) of the Marshall Plan program⁹⁶³. Its aim was to generate support for the reconstruction, and for the American case. However, the movement that Van der Horst was a part of was historically affiliated with the political left – not unlike Dutch Prime Minister Drees that had received the aid and used the film to make propaganda for the PvdA⁹⁶⁴. The reconstruction had different sides that merged into a common aim.

Van der Horst did not use a voice-over or any other kind of commentary. The film, starting at the damaged St. Laurens, and subsequently showing the work being done in the port

⁹⁶⁰ Van de Laar (2000: 556) mentions Brusse and the role of the *Rotterdams Toneel* for the cultural development of Rotterdam after WWII. Kees was the brother of filmmaker Ytzen Brusse, and the son of writer / journalist M.J. Brusse.

⁹⁶¹ Special attention was paid to, a.o. the Groothandelsgebouw, Lijnbaan, department store Wassen/Ter Meulen, and HBU. Examples of relatively unknown buildings shown in the film are: a villa by J. Boks (1951) and housing estates by J. Pot and J. Pot-Keegstra (1950), and H. Hupkes and C. van Asperen (1954). Within less than half-an hour, more than seventy buildings were presented in total. In this way the achievements of the reconstruction became known to the Dutch, and to foreigners, since the film travelled abroad as well. The film, made with Prof. G. Holt as its consultant, had its premiere at 21-08-1954 in The Hague for a large number of architects, and one week later it was shown at the Triennale of Milan (Schelling, 1954).

⁹⁶² Original quote: ‘Nederland heeft zich aangepast aan het ritme van deze tijd.’

⁹⁶³ The premiere of the film took place in the Luxor theatre on 1952-07-2. An introduction to the film was given by Clarence E. Hunter, head of the MSA in the Netherlands – *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1953: 43.

⁹⁶⁴ See: *EEN VERKIEZINGSFILMPJE VAN DE PVD A* (1956, Carel Borgers, see: ‘filmography outside Rotterdam’); this propaganda film was made for the 1956 elections and it was probably broadcast on television. Drees emphasises the achievements of the reconstruction, and refers to *STEADY!*; since a break follows it seems likely that (a fragment of) this film was shown as part of the propaganda film.

and the city, is characterised by a rhythmic editing, expressive cinematography, and an articulated sound design. Simone Brouwers has described it as follows:

In *STEADY!* (1952) the changing appearance of the city of Rotterdam is shown through the eyes of, among others, a pigeon fancier, a war invalid, two boys, an engine-driver and construction workers. All of them look from a different point of view at the city; sitting driving, relaxing, working, high on a scaffolding, low on the water. Via them, Van der Horst tells his story about the city.⁹⁶⁵

The city becomes a rhythmic composition of machines and people. And to refresh the spirit and to make the work even more joyful, the navy band inspires the city with their music. In the description of Hans Keller:

STEADY! deals with the successful continuation of the Reconstruction of Rotterdam. New is the perfection of the displayed technique of image and sound recordings, as well as the editing. The *zoomar*-lens made its entry. It is less light sensitive than the usual fixed lenses, but the *zoomar* – a visual trombone, as W.F. Hermans would call it – is extraordinary action-eager. In this film, which is rightly characterised as dynamical, Herman van der Horst uses virtually all its possibilities. The *pile-driver-sequence*, which he shot with a new lens and which gave him new ideas for the use of sound, has become legendary.⁹⁶⁶

With every bang of the pile-driving machine, by way of quick editing, and a camera tilting rapidly up the façade each time, a new building is shown. The city seems to be built in no-time.

STEADY! was made for a national and an international audience, to show the spirit of the Dutch, and what the country was able to do. The city is presented as a model of reconstruction achievements, and of Dutch modernity. By focusing on the creation of a new city, and leaving out old parts of the city, it reinforces the plans of the city's architects and planners whose starting point was a tabula rasa, or as Van der Horst might have considered it, bare land that has to be appropriated by man. Van der Horst thematised the emptiness of Rotterdam by accommodating the imagery and contents (or the spirit) of a new city. By doing so, the film is an attempt to generate the enthusiasm for the plans.

The British filmmaker Lindsay Anderson, accused this high modernist cinema of having 'too hygienic effectiveness' and advocated the 'injection of dirt'. According to Bert Hogenkamp, there was no place for tensions and conflicts, or for objecting individuals; the people in the work by Van der Horst not as real, but as metaphorical. The films are characterised by harmony and a common aim⁹⁶⁷. The film was nevertheless very successful. The *Rotterdamse Kunststichting*, for example, honoured Van der Horst with the *Penning van de Rotte*⁹⁶⁸.

⁹⁶⁵ Brouwers, 1994: 49; original quote: 'In *HOUEN ZO!* (1952) wordt de veranderende aanblik van de stad Rotterdam getoond door de ogen van onder anderen een duivenmelker, een oorlogsinvalid, twee jongetjes, een machinist en enkele bouwvakkers. Zij kijken allen vanuit een ander standpunt naar de stad; rijdend zittend, luiierend, werkend, hoog op een stelling, laag op het water. Via hen vertelt Van der Horst zijn verhaal over de stad.'

⁹⁶⁶ Hans Keller, 1994: 18; original quote: '*HOUEN ZO!* gaat over de voortzetting van de geslaagde wederopbouw van Rotterdam. Nieuw is de vervolmaking van de aan de dag gelegde techniek waarmee de film is opgenomen, van geluid voorzien en gemonteerd. De *zoomar*-lens heeft zijn intrede gedaan. Het ding is minder lichtgevoelig dan de gebruikelijke vaste lenzen, maar de *zoomar* – een visuele schuiftrompet, zoals W.F. Hermans later zegt – is buitengewoon actie-belust. // Herman van der Horst benut er in deze niet ten onrechte alom als dynamisch gekenschetste film ongeveer alle mogelijkheden van. De *heiblok*-sequence, die hij met behulp van de nieuwe lens realiseert en die hem ook in het gebruik van het geluid op nieuwe ideeën bracht, is legendarisch geworden.'

⁹⁶⁷ Hogenkamp, 2003: 101. Cf. Lebas, 2007: 40, who observes, in the case of Glasgow, a shift from the pre-war period, in which the kinds of people in the films were similar to those who watched them, to the post-war period in which the films reached 'out beyond reality of the lives of a local working-class towards an imagined mass, and thus implicitly classless, audience beyond Glasgow, beyond Scotland itself.'

⁹⁶⁸ On 1953-04-13 – *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1954: 33.

Considering its importance, we might briefly look how its production had been propelled. The NWF, which produced Van der Horst's first film on Rotterdam in 1946, participated in the political strategy of the reconstruction, while it also lay the foundations for the 'Dutch documentary school'. It stemmed from the pre-war avant-garde movement, with Schuitema as a central figure, which created a network between filmmakers and commissioners.

Since its films for the Ministry of Reconstruction had proven to be valuable, other ministries became interested too, especially the ministries of Economic Affairs, of Agriculture, and of Education, Art and Science⁹⁶⁹. The "Government Information Service" (*Regeeringsvoorlichtingsdienst*), in the person of Gijs van der Wiel, became an intermediary between different governmental bodies and filmmakers. That also applies to 'T SCHOT IS TE BOORD (1951, Van der Horst), about the herring fishery and international collaboration, which was also funded by the Marshall Plan programme. In 1952 this film won the first prize for non-fiction shorts at the Cannes Film Festival. It meant international recognition for Van der Horst, and more commissions to come, like STEADY.

The NWF had been both the funnel and the jumping board for Van der Horst, who was seen as a leader of the 'Dutch documentary school'. 'Van der Horst, in a good-natured manner, took it as his due to be called like that. Him, a leader of a school, a movement? No filmmaker in the Netherlands operated in such a solitary way as he did'⁹⁷⁰, wrote Hans Keller, who made a documentary about the work of Van der Horst⁹⁷¹. Does it mean that he, after having been a member of the NWF, was actually operating as much as possible outside professional networks?

Two ends of a spectre of relations, one 'formal public', the other 'informal private', might give a clue of the underlying mechanisms. At the formal end is the Cannes Film Festival, and its director Robert Favre le Bret. Dutch documentaries were successful in Cannes in the 1950s and 1960s, with Golden Palms for films by Haanstra, Van der Horst, and John Fernhout. According to film critic Bob Bertina, the personal fascination of Favre le Bret had been decisive in this respect (in: De Wit, 1994). Van der Horst, in his Rembrandt-like appearance, embodied Dutch culture. Whereas the characters in his films are metaphorical, Van der Horst himself was treated as such as well. However, Favre le Bret recognised a genuine, Dutch style of filmmaking, that of the Dutch documentary school, which has been described by Keller as follows.

The soberness of framing, the movements of the natural light, the attention to air and clouds, the almost devotional attention to the existing relationship between people, nature and the natural forces – one for another visual characteristics that seem to have been directly taken from the iconography of the Dutch Golden Age.⁹⁷²

This description applies especially to 'T SCHOT IS TE BOORD (1951). Slightly different, however, is STEADY!, for which Van der Horst won again the first prize for non-fiction short at the Cannes festival, in 1953. It does not deal with nature, but it still deals with human strength, and harmony between people and their environment; notwithstanding the dynamism of the activities going on,

⁹⁶⁹ Brouwers, 1994: 47

⁹⁷⁰ Keller, 1994: 21; original quote: 'Van der Horst liet zich die benoeming goedmoedig aanleunen. Hij en voorman van een school, een beweging? Geen filmmaker in Nederland opereerde zo solitair als hij.'

⁹⁷¹ This film is called VOETNOTEN BIJ EEN OEUVRE (1994), which was commissioned by the Netherlands Film Festival, Utrecht, on the occasion of a retrospective of the films by Van der Horst. The publication from which I quote was published at the same time.

⁹⁷² Keller, 1994: 21; original quote: 'De soberheid van de kadrering, de bewegingen van het natuurlijke licht, die aandacht voor lucht en wolken, de bijna devote aandacht voor de gegeven verstandhouding tussen mens, natuur en de natuurlijke krachten – stuk voor stuk visuele karakteristieken, die rechtstreeks ontleend leken aan de beeldtaal uit de Hollandse Gouden Eeuw.'

a quietness characterizes the film. Because of the successes in Cannes, Van der Horst became part of the global film festival network and became a real hit⁹⁷³.

At the ‘informal private’ end we may consider a quote by Simone Brouwers. She first sticks to the image of Van der Horst as a solitary artist, who prefers to do everything himself: research and preparations, direction, camera, sound, and editing – although he actually worked with a number of people that frequently collaborated with him⁹⁷⁴. ‘However’, she remarks, ‘the only constantly present colleague is his spouse Margreet. She was his ‘sound-board’ during the editing and collaborated on the sound recording for his last five films.’ She quotes Van der Horst:

We made our films together. On average, I need six hands. She has four of them. What she does is listen to my displeasure about the conditions, to my criticism when everything goes wrong again. She is my target to discharge, she records sound, she takes care that my things are there, always and everywhere, she knows how to manage people, clear the streets, and she automatically listens if everything functions well during recordings, and she hands out cigars. Awful.⁹⁷⁵

Such roles, largely unaccredited on the films and by historians, are of decisive importance for the success of the films, for a career and the development of a style. What does it mean that the man who is considered to be the solitary artist said: ‘We made our films together’? He even said *our films*. In other words, Margaretha Van der Horst-Admiraal was at the same time producer, manager, and adviser.

§ 4. film production in and about the city

In the first years after WWII, there were only a few professional filmmakers working in Rotterdam, next to a growing number of dedicated amateurs⁹⁷⁶. Among the amateur films are various historically unique recordings, which were often made as documents for future generations. An example is the outstanding documentary EILANDEN EXPRESSE (1954, A. den Besten), about the tram connection between Rotterdam and the Delta area south of the city (i.e. the island Voorne Putten)⁹⁷⁷. Anthropologically speaking, these films were instances of appropriating the urban conditions. Film became an individual tool to perceive and to frame the city. This can be understood as a matter of stigmergy, as a process of communication that happens within and that affects a particular environment, by using, marking and changing it accordingly.

A committed amateur filmmaker was Ed Millecam, who made, for example, DE SYMPHONIE VAN EEN GROTE STAD (1948). It was an echo of the pre-war avant-garde that showed a day in the life of Rotterdam: a woman opens the curtains, the market begins, barges bring sand for the reconstruction works, and the film ends with the evening rush hour. There are several other (well-made) films, of either unknown professional or amateur filmmakers, such as WEDEROPBOUW (1955, anon.). The opening scene shows the city by a pan from a high perspective; there are subsequently construction activities in some new streets⁹⁷⁸, and there is a

⁹⁷³ It won also prizes in Edinburgh, New York, Dublin, Bombay, Montevideo, Locarno, Strasbourg, Vienna, Oberhausen and Berlin.

⁹⁷⁴ Sound engineer Ate de Vries; composer Jan Mul; commentators Evert Gerretsen, Ger Lugtenburg; technician Wim Huender.

⁹⁷⁵ Van der Horst in: Brouwers, 1994: 47-48; original quote: ‘De enige constant aanwezige collega is echter echtgenote Margreet. Zij is zijn klankbord bij de montage en werkt mee aan de geluidopnames voor de laatste vijf films. Van der Horst: “Wij maakten samen onze films. Gemiddeld heb ik zes handen nodig. Zij heeft er vier. Wat zij doet is luisteren naar mijn misnoegen over de toestanden, naar mijn kritiek als alles weer eens verkeerd gaat. Mikpunt om op af te reageren, geluid opnemen, zorgen dat overal en altijd de spullen er zijn, met mensen omspringen, straten schoonvegen, automatisch luisteren of alles functioneert bij opnamen en sigaren uitdelen. Verschrikkelijk.”

⁹⁷⁶ Smits, 2002: 18-28.

⁹⁷⁷ Smits, 2002: 28; A. den Besten had previously worked for the Army Film Service.

⁹⁷⁸ E.g. Gerdesiaweg, Vredenoordlaan, Goudsesingel, Blaak.

general image of the empty city with the remaining St. Laurens church. The middle part consists of digging works and the construction of important buildings in the city centre⁹⁷⁹. The end of the film consists of general street images⁹⁸⁰, and long shots taken from the tower of the town hall show the appearance of the new skyline.

Rather similar are recordings by W.G. de Jong, called HERBOUW ROTTERDAM (1946-1959), and those by N.J. Polak, who made already films before WWII, of important events in the city, like the construction and launching of the ocean liner 'Nieuw Amsterdam' (1937). He might have used some of his recordings for semi-public presentations, which is similarly a matter of communicating through the environment. Another amateur filmmaker to be mentioned here was Rien Peeters, who made a commissioned (colour) film about the work of harbour clerks, which he called EUROPOORT (1951) – as such he coined the name for the extension of the port that started at the end of the decade. Peeters sometimes assisted his friend Carel Borgers, who was one of the few professional filmmakers in Rotterdam.

Before Borgers started to work as a cameraman for television, he and his firm *NV Filmproductie Rotterdam* made various promotional and industrial films⁹⁸¹. An example is a film for Van Berkel (1950), which produced measuring equipment, and had already made itself a name for its modern publicity campaigns before WWII. This film shows the production process of precision instruments, like scales and slicers, and subsequently the way they are used. To that end, shots were made at a number of places in the city, such as the port, Heineken's beer brewery, a hospital, and a paper factory. This implies a particular take on urban development, in which Van Berkel relates different (industrial) services. However, a vision upon the city in a broader perspective would only gradually develop, in the wake of the Dutch documentary school.

the case of Jan Schaper

A particular person that reinforced the link between Rotterdam as *Tatort* and Rotterdam as *Standort* was Jan Schaper (•1921-†2008). In 1950, when he worked as a journalist for the newspaper *Het Vrije Volk*, he submitted a film script for a national competition organised by the Ministry of OK&W (culture). He won first prize. As a consequence, he was recommended for a grant of the Rockefeller foundation, a three months traineeship in Hollywood⁹⁸². On the 6th of September, Schaper left with the 'SS Volendam' to New York in the footsteps of the musician Jurriaan Andriessen, who had received such a grant the year before. At his departure Schaper expressed his wish to look for possibilities to make *cine poèmes*. Once in Hollywood he became an assistant to director Robert Siodmak for the production of the docudrama *THE WHISTLE AT EATON FALLS* (1951, USA)⁹⁸³. It was the period in which 'method acting' emerged, which prescribes the actor to identify with the character by making use of his own emotions⁹⁸⁴. Its main exponent was Marlon Brando, who had just made his film debut in *THE MEN* (1950, USA, Fred Zinnemann) and became famous through his role in *A STREETCAR NAMED DESIRE* (1951, USA, Elia Kazan). It would have a lasting effect on Schaper. However, because of the Korea crisis, he decided to return to the Netherlands. Back home, early 1951, he sent his winning script and a letter to B.D. Ochse, the director of Polygoon. Besides the proposal to make the film, Schaper offered his skills to write scripts for commercials and propaganda films. Ochse invited Schaper at

⁹⁷⁹ E.g. Groothandelsgebouw, Schouwburg, Bouwcentrum, as well as warehouses along the Wijnhaven.

⁹⁸⁰ E.g. Coolsingel, Goudsesingel, Oostzeedijk.

⁹⁸¹ For examples, see filmography (Rotterdam and outside Rotterdam) > Borgers, Carel.

⁹⁸² For this and following information: Jansen, Pierre; 'Good Luck, Jan', *Nieuwe Schiedamsche Courant*, 1950-09-07.

⁹⁸³ '...een paar weken assistant-regie bij Robert Siodmak bij een speelfilm-productie van de Rochemont.' Jan Schaper in a letter to VARA-radio, 1954-05-31, personal archive Jan Schaper.

⁹⁸⁴ See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Method_acting >> 'Method Acting' (visited: 2007-05-09).

his home⁹⁸⁵. However, Schaper and his wife Leen Verheij decided to emigrate to Australia, to stay away from the Cold War battlefield that Europe was about to become, as Schaper supposed. After doing all kinds of jobs, including radio broadcasting, Schaper wrote an application letter to Stanley Hawes of the Australian National Film Board, but soon afterwards he changed his mind and wanted to emigrate to Canada, as he concluded that Australia did not have the opportunities he was looking for⁹⁸⁶. In the end he changed his mind again and with his wife he returned to the Netherlands, in 1953.

After Schaper saw STEADY!, he wrote a letter to Van der Horst. He expressed his admiration for the cinematography, and asked if he could write scripts for him, since that could be improved in his opinion⁹⁸⁷. He mentioned that during his stay in America he met Robert Flaherty, to stress his concern with documentary cinema. It did not result in a direct collaboration, but it may have helped him to establish contacts⁹⁸⁸. He was asked to write scripts for the 'Instituut Film & Jeugd'⁹⁸⁹, where Schuitema was active, who knew Van der Horst. In a similar way, Schaper established contacts with Walter Smith, who made THAT MOST LIVING CITY (1954). Smith asked him to write the script for his Caltex film LAND BELOW THE SEA (1954). At the same time Schaper made his first own film, called ROKA-FILM (1954), to promote an association of grocers. Shot by himself, it helped him to be contracted as a cameraman for the television experiment at the E55 manifestation the next year, which meant the introduction to the world of television.

Meanwhile, the Ministry of OK&W came into action to make a film out of his script. Piet van Moock of Forumfilm, who had previously produced Bert Haanstra's successful MIRROR OF HOLLAND (1950), was asked to produce the film, which would be called TROS ("Hawser", 1956). The young filmmaker Wim van der Velde, who had collaborated with Van Moock before, was asked to be its director. At that time, Van der Velde worked at the *Centro Sperimentale di Cinematografia* in Rome, also through a grant from OK&W, just like cameraman Eduard van der Enden⁹⁹⁰. Van der Velde accepted the invitation and came back to the Netherlands, together with Van der Enden who was asked to do the cinematography. Affected by the Italian *neorealismo*, working with actors taken 'from the street', Van der Velde and Schaper went into the streets to look for suitable candidates. In a park in Vlaardingen, Schaper spotted a seventeen year old girl, whom he asked to play the main character. In this way Christine van Roon played Hannie, a young woman who left her boyfriend when she emigrated with her parents to Canada a few years before. After her father dies, she goes back to arrange some things, and meets unexpectedly her ex-boyfriend Rinus (Ger de Jong), who has become the captain of a tugboat. Although she had promised to return and to stay with him, she is now married and has a three year old child. They try to understand their situation and have a coffee (in a jazz-bar that symbolizes cosmopolitan Rotterdam). But the two of them do not resolve their situation. Characteristic for Rotterdam, the drama is intertwined with the scale and power of its port: at the end the tugboat of Rinus tows the ocean liner 'Nieuw Amsterdam', with Hannie on board in order to return to Canada. He does not know that she did not embark and that she is watching both the tugboat and the ship going away.

The narrative of the film contains several flashbacks, first of all with a big ship packed with people to seek a better future. There are also flashbacks of places in the city where they had enjoyed being together. Now and then are mixed. The city, besides its port, is represented by the

⁹⁸⁵ Schaper wrote a letter on the 15th of February 1951 to Ochse. The film script is called 'De Andere Oever'; letter by Schaper and reply by Ochse are in the personal archive of Jan Schaper.

⁹⁸⁶ Letter of Stanley Hawes 1952-12-02, personal archive Jan Schaper.

⁹⁸⁷ Letter: 13th of August 1953; personal archive Jan Schaper.

⁹⁸⁸ A year later, in 1954 (letters in the personal archive of Schaper), he wrote a script for a film about the historical background of the Dutch St. Nicholas celebration (SINTERKLAAS KOMT NAAR HOLLAND, 1955), commissioned by Gijs van der Wiel (RVD), who was a good relation of Van der Horst. Schaper directed the film together with Hattum Hoving, while it was produced by Multifilm, where Van der Horst knew several people too.

⁹⁸⁹ It is not clear if these scripts have been made into films – probably with different titles.

⁹⁹⁰ For Van der Velde, see Hogenkamp, 2003: 102; for Van der Enden, see: Hendriks, 2006: 114. In Rome they had already made a short film together.

'Beurs', the new 'Bijenkorf' and 'De Hef' (the bridge from Ivens's film). This bridge is also to be seen in the opening shot, which is a long take that shows a train passing it. One of the most dramatic and powerful images of the film, is a shot from an extreme high angle, in which Rinus walks across a square, sad and disappointed, while she follows him at a distance.

After the film was finished, OK&W requested certain adaptations, and another version was made, including some extra facts to articulate the port. Afterwards Schaper and Van der Velde thought of producing more fiction films. For four years, according to Van der Velde, they were looking for suitable actors to make the films they envisioned⁹⁹¹. In this perspective we should also consider the activities that Schaper started to undertake as a photographer, almost like a casting practice. In 1957 he roamed around the city with his Kalloflex camera, photographing youngsters, especially at the Lijnbaan shopping centre.

The pictures of these 'street models' were published, together with essays by Cornelis Bastiaan Vaandrager, as a series in the newspaper *Algemeen Dagblad*, in 1957⁹⁹². They were also exhibited in the *Fotocentrum Rotterdam* of Kees Molkenboer, which attracted the attention of several newspapers. The interest was raised because of the phenomenon of the teddy boys and girls (*nozems* in Dutch), which in Rotterdam was called *Lijnbaanjeugd*. They 'appropriated' the brand new shopping-centre and surroundings, which Schaper recorded in a realist way⁹⁹³. Art critic Dolf Welling, editor of the *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, opened his review by saying that 'the photos ... seem to be cut from the feature film that he [Schaper] desperately would like to make'⁹⁹⁴. He characterised the photos by saying: 'This photography strives for a neo-realism, which prefers the usual human element above the "official" event'⁹⁹⁵. This is especially clear when the pictures are compared to a news report on the Lijnbaan that was shot at the same time (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1956-11-29), which showed the installation of decorative illumination on the occasion of the St. Nicholas celebration.

Most critics were positive about Schaper's work, except for a critic of *De Rotterdammer*.

[P]hotography – like every other representational medium – has a task, namely this: to see, to record, en to transmit with the mark of the maker. Exactly that mark of the maker, his vision, his conception, his interpretation and his colouring give photography its legitimacy as a visual medium. Schaper considers the famous Cartier Bresson as his guide. But Schaper does not understand much of him; Cartier, after all, let the world tremble in astonishment, because of the poverty he photographed. (...) And what does Schaper do with "his" youth? He photographs it and knows how to make perfect enlargements of his negatives – but he has no vision, not on Cartier Bresson and not on "his" youth. He just transmits and, when you ask him, explains: "I don't say anything, I just let you watch through the lens of my camera.." – and hence he definitively condemns his photography.⁹⁹⁶

⁹⁹¹ This and following information is based on the newspaper article: 'Twintig Jonge Mensen Dromen van de Film', 1959-12-07. Source unknown; personal archive Jan Schaper.

⁹⁹² As a result, the AD also asked Schaper to shoot portraits of a new generation of authors, a.o. Vestdijk and Lucebert.

⁹⁹³ Meeting places were *Café De Turk* and *Ijssalon Capri*. Cf. Andriessen, 1957.

⁹⁹⁴ Welling, 1957. Original quote: 'De foto's ... zijn als geknipt uit de speelfilm, die hij zo graag zou willen maken.'

⁹⁹⁵ Welling, 1957. Original quote: 'Deze fotografie streeft een neo-realisme na, dat het gewone menselijke element verkiest boven de "officiële" gebeurtenis.'

⁹⁹⁶ 'Jan Schaper in Fotocentrum; Foto's zonder visie van dito Jeugd', *De Rotterdammer*, 1957-09-05, author is G.H. Original quote: 'Want fotografie – als elk ander weergave-middel – heeft een taak, en wel deze: te zien, vast te leggen, en met het stempel van de maker door te geven. Juist dat stempel van de maker, zijn visie, zijn opvatting, zijn interpretatie en zijn kleuring geven de fotografie haar bestaansrecht als beeldend medium. Schaper haalt de beroemde Cartier Bresson aan als leidraad, door hem gebruikt. Schaper snapt dan ook van Cartier Bresson niet veel; immers, Cartier liet de wereld verschrikt huiveren van armoede, door hem gefotografeerd. (...) En wat doen Schaper met "zijn" jeugd? Hij fotografeert ze en weet van zijn negatieven perfecte vergrotingen te maken – maar hij heeft geen visie, op Cartier Bresson niet en op "zijn" jeugd niet. Hij geeft alleen maar door en verklaart je desgevraagd: "Ik zeg niets, ik laat je alleen maar door de lens van mijn camera kijken.." – en veroordeelt daarmee definitief zijn fotografie.'

Other critics wrote exactly the opposite: ‘The photos are good, with vision, there is directness, of moment; they are telling in an honest and unposed manner; they ask questions and confront us with a strange mentality’⁹⁹⁷. Notwithstanding a conflict between Schaper and Molkenboer, the pictures were subsequently shown at the women’s fair ‘Femina’, where they found a large public⁹⁹⁸. Finally they were also shown at photo gallery *La Cave Internationale* in Amsterdam⁹⁹⁹.

The photographic career of Schaper took its own course, which affected his filmmaking. It drew him further into non-fiction cinema, including promotional filmmaking¹⁰⁰⁰. The interaction between photography and film would especially come to the fore in his work for the municipality of Vlaardingen (see next chapter). However, Schaper and Van der Velde still developed ideas for fiction films. They established the ‘Productiegroep Trosfilm’, and rented a studio in Rotterdam, above the office of the newly established *Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij*¹⁰⁰¹. In early 1959, Schaper and Van der Velde placed advertisements in the national newspapers to recruit people that aspired to become actors. From 300 applications they invited one hundred to the ‘Riche-bar’ for auditions, from which they selected twenty people. In the weekends they came together, while during the week they exercised. The idea was to begin immediately with a film production, in the autumn of 1959, but tensions arose between Schaper and Van der Velde. Whereas the latter was affected by Italian cinema, and wanted to start filming, Schaper preferred to educate the group first of all, in order to develop the acting skills. Rather than drawing people from the street and start shooting he thought of the Actors Studio of Lee Strasberg in New York¹⁰⁰². Yet another reason for the tension was of a private nature. Christine van Roon, who played the main character in TROS, via Schaper, married Van der Velde. Complications emerged as Schaper and Van der Velde had affairs with each other’s lovers¹⁰⁰³.

Van der Velde decided to leave and started to work as a documentary filmmaker for VPRO-television¹⁰⁰⁴. Schaper, who got divorced from his wife Leen, eventually married Christine, and set himself to documentaries as well¹⁰⁰⁵. Schaper continued the actors group, which he renamed ‘Open Studio’, but for him, acting like a guru, it became merely a platform to propagate life lessons. No fiction films would be made, except for a number of tests and other unfinished attempts (e.g. 60 MINUTEN CS and HEEN EN WEER). Instead, a large number of non-fiction films were produced, in which the city became the main character, a model ‘playing itself’.

⁹⁹⁷ ‘Fotocentrum Rotterdam – geslaagd experiment; Jan Schaper fotografeerde jeugd tussen Lijnbaan en Binnenweg’, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 1957-09-06. Original quote: ‘De foto’s zijn goed, van visie, directheid, van moment; zij vertellen eerlijk en ongeposeerd en stellen vragen en confronteren ons met een vreemde mentaliteit.’ See for a comparable comment: Nieman, 1957.

⁹⁹⁸ E.g. ‘Schapers foto-expositie voortijdig gesloten’, *Algemeen Dagblad*, September 1957 [date unknown; personal archive Schaper].

⁹⁹⁹ Nieman (1958) reviewed this show, in *Elsevier*, as a ‘a good and even a little sensational photo collection’. Original quote: ‘Een goede en zelfs een tikje sensationele fotocollectie’.

¹⁰⁰⁰ e.g. UNILEVER KINDERLAND (1957, Jan Schaper); SAMENWERKEN (1957, Jan Schaper & Albert Brosens) for NV De Bataafsche Petroleum Mij; NUTRICIAFILM (1958, Jan Schaper); OPBOUWFILM NV HOOGENBOOM (1958, Jan Schaper).

¹⁰⁰¹ i.e. Eendrachtsweg 10. An immediate connection between the two enterprises is established by NFM ‘court’ cameraman Eduard van der Enden, who did already the cinematography for TROS, and also for HARMONIE IN INDUSTRIE, for which Schaper wrote the scripts, while he simultaneously worked on several films by Van der Velde.

¹⁰⁰² It was founded in 1949, see: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lee_Strasberg >> ‘Lee Strasberg’ (visited: 2007-05-09).

¹⁰⁰³ Personal communication FP with Jan Schaper, Christine van Roon, Wim van der Velde, Trudy Mulder (2004-2007).

¹⁰⁰⁴ Verhagen, Hans; ‘Jan Schaper, gesproken zelfportret, van gids naar nieuwe toneeltoppen’, *Algemeen Dagblad*, 1961-08-05. (Photographs by Egbert Munks.)

¹⁰⁰⁵ While Schaper worked on his own films, he also wrote scripts for other documentaries, e.g. HARMONIE IN INDUSTRIE (1959, Piet van Moock). It was made partly with the same crew from TROS, which strengthened his position.

CHAPTER 9. EXTENDED CITY

§ 1. multiple extensions

In the 1940s and 1950s, urban development was framed in terms of progress, which literally meant ‘growth’. Along with the growth of the port, the city needed new residential quarters, which was already foreseen by the ‘Basisplan’ (1946). Extending the city was a matter of building suburbs, which relied on a social programme. Cor Wagenaar (1992: 298) has argued that urban planning even said farewell to design, replacing it by scientific studies and policymaking. According to Wagenaar it was the onset of the ‘welfare city’, and the new Rotterdam became a prototype for the Dutch welfare state.

An ideal community life was envisioned. This, however, could not be achieved without an idea of how to ban antisocial behaviour and delinquency. Although planners and architects have hardly touched upon such issues, it became a concrete challenge for the institutions of the welfare state. In order to let the people believe in (social) progress, one also had to show them an appropriate treatment of delicate issues¹⁰⁰⁶. In this perspective we might consider a film like *DE BAJES IS ZO GROOT* (1950, Charles Huguenot van der Linden), which shows various kinds of detention in the Netherlands. The film addresses the responsibility of the state towards both society and its prisoners, within a humane, new social order. Various prisons are shown, including a women’s prison in Rotterdam. Women care for their babies inside the prison, while others work in factories. It shows nevertheless the antipode of the house and family life on which urban planning visions were based, and hence their latent problematic character.

The issue of the relationship between urban planning and social organisation might be approached through De Certeau’s model of place based on an ‘ethnography of communication’ (1997: 109). It is the way people use the environment as a way to communicate. The city, as a social system, manifests itself through its environment. The local is the starting point, the focus and place where interactions crystallise, and a major factor within the construction of social networks, including those connecting architects, filmmakers and commissioners. I will reflect upon different positions within such networks, what effects they had on the city’s organisation, its image, and the way this was communicated or mediated by film. Whereas the city extended itself physically, it simultaneously extended in terms of networks and media practices. These were multiple extensions that reinforced one another, radiating from the city’s culture core.

§ 2. living innovations

During the first years of the war, a few projects were carried out to counter housing shortage. For that purpose, under German administration, several villages were incorporated by Rotterdam: IJsselmonde, Overschie, Schiebroek, and Hillegersberg, in order to provide building ground. The emergency villages built in IJsselmonde and Overschie were documented by Polygoon¹⁰⁰⁷. Soon after the first projects were carried out, the Germans declared a construction stop (*bouwstop*, 1942-07-02)¹⁰⁰⁸. The Germans needed the material and human resources for military purposes.

During the war, new possibilities for housing were explored by the *NV Volkswoningbouw*, first in 1941¹⁰⁰⁹. In 1943 the results of this study were elaborated by Van Tijen and Maaskant, now focused on the idea of *de Stedelijke Tuinwijk* (“Urban Garden Quarter”). One

¹⁰⁰⁶ Luhr & Lehman (2006: 176-177) have made a similar observation regarding *noir* feature films based on police procedurals. ‘Procedurals were often curious combinations of both utopian and dystopian modernist strains, utopian in that they showed benign state organisations using advanced technology to root out criminals, but dystopian in their emphasis upon the pervasive, ongoing, and expanding world of contemporary crime.’

¹⁰⁰⁷ *BOUW NOODWONINGEN IN OVERSCHIE / WEDEROPBOUW OVERSCHIE* (1941, Polygoon). *BOUW VAN NOODWONINGEN IN IJSSELMONDE* (1941, Polygoon).

¹⁰⁰⁸ Since Germany fought on two fronts, in the east and the west. Oudenaarden, 2004: 16; Van de Laar, 2000: 435.

¹⁰⁰⁹ In 1941, Plate commissioned Maaskant, Van Tijen, Brinkman & Van den Broek to carry out a study for new housing possibilities, which resulted in the book *Woonmogelijkheden In Het Nieuwe Rotterdam*.

year later, Van Tijen became involved with the *Rotterdamsche Gemeenschap*, which propagated the *wijkgedachte* (the idea of the 'neighbourhood unit'). This, in turn, informed another study, by a group of ten members, including Van Tijen, and headed by Alexander Bos, director of the "Municipal Department for Social Housing". This study resulted in the influential book *De Stad der Toekomst, De Toekomst der Stad* ("The City of the Future, The Future of the City", Bos e.a., 1946). Wagenaar has called it 'a film in the form of a book', since it was highly affected by the film *DIE STADT VON MORGEN* (1930, Svend Noldan)¹⁰¹⁰. As the title already suggests, it was an ambitious study, to set an agenda for urban development in general, far beyond the disciplinary conventions of urban planning. Rather exceptional was the fact that the group included also three female representatives, from the fields of education, social care-taking, and religion¹⁰¹¹.

The book propelled the *wijkgedachte* and envisioned the city as a social system of various levels providing particular functions. Neighbourhoods would have about 2000 to 4000 inhabitants, living in 500 to 1000 dwellings, which in turn would be part of a *wijk* (district), with about 20,000 inhabitants, and subsequently of a *stadsdeel* (quarter) of about 100,000 people¹⁰¹². These figures were thought to be ideal numbers to enable basic social-cultural and health care facilities. Moreover, districts would have their own council, which was later institutionalised indeed as the *deeltgemeenteraad*. Largely comparable to the ideas of Lewis Mumford, a neighbourhood unit would be based on life-cycle differentiation, with old and young living together.

Within its broad idea of urban development, the group did not forget to mention the role of film, for which it asked 'great attention' in respect of 'social-cultural building-up'¹⁰¹³. Following explicitly the ideas of the Filmliga, it addressed the dominance of commercial cinema, and the difficulty to raise its level, especially in the Dutch situation. In order to break that monopoly, the group proposed, following people like Schuitema and others, to invest in cultural and 'development' films. Addressing the *wijkgedachte* once more, the group added that such films had to be shown in halls in the neighbourhoods, in special programmes and through well-prepared screenings. They stated (p258) that it could have an important impact on the general public. However, it was noticed too that costs were high, and the government was called to its responsibility. Various films would indeed be commissioned by the (municipal) government. Next to that, in the sphere of community work, youth clubs produced their own 8mm and 16mm films and frequently organised film screenings¹⁰¹⁴.

Ideas on social-cultural development were closely linked to economic considerations, in such a way that architectural and planning concepts favoured the application of industrial building methods, and more studies were conducted in this respect. In 1947, the Ministry of Reconstruction established a group to study 'efficient housing', headed by Jo van den Broek¹⁰¹⁵. Its results were applied in 'Zuidwijk' (1946-1953, H. Maaskant, W. van Tijen), which was based on the experimental RBM pre-fabricated construction system.

¹⁰¹⁰ Wagenaar, 1992: 214 and 266. Bos's introduction to the film (1936-11-25) had also been called 'De Stad der Toekomst', which was at the same time the Dutch title of the film. A summary of the book was also read by Bos as a lecture for VARA-radio, 1947-01-25: 16h10-16h25. Archive 'A. Bos' NAI: BOSA g11.

¹⁰¹¹ Resp. J.J. van Dulleman, L. Havelaar, L.M. Mispelblom Beyer-van den Berg van Eysinga. This study had a major impact, see e.g. Bijhouwer e.a. (1983: 108-113), Wagenaar (1992: 266), Van de Laar (2000: 472).

¹⁰¹² Bos e.a., 1946: 315-319.

¹⁰¹³ 'Grote aandacht zal bij de sociaal-culturele opbouw moeten worden gegeven aan de film', Bos e.a., 1946: 257. To that end, it is said, a role could be played by the new Filmliga, just like the association 'Vrienden van de Film' (for the establishment and aims of the latter, see: *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1947, p31).

¹⁰¹⁴ An example is *Arend en De Zeemeeuw*; for general information on this youth organisation: Van de Laar, 2000: 572. An example of an 8mm film: *GEZINSKAMP* (1958, Arend en de Zeemeeuw); more titles to be found in: GAR. Another example is the Christian community centre *De Brandaris* (see: filmography > 1960s & 1970s > Riet, J.M. van; more titles to be found in: GAR), while the nationally operating Christelijke Film Actie / CEFA organised three film screenings per week at Atrium – *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1961: p19.

¹⁰¹⁵ I.e. *Studiegroep Efficiënte Woningbouw*, see: Bijhouwer e.a., 1983: 108-113.

The problems of housing shortage were addressed by several films¹⁰¹⁶. One of them is EEN HUIS (1948, Henry James & Rob Out) which propagates industrialisation of the building branch, following the example of automobile manufacturing. The film propagates above all the working ethos. It is an appeal to produce, especially for the international market. In this way, the film explains, the country is able to buy, in return, building materials abroad. It was a general view, of both the government and commercial enterprises, which was promoted by various means¹⁰¹⁷.

Around 1948, prices for building material rapidly increased internationally, while the Dutch state had serious financial problems, which grew because of its military operations in the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia)¹⁰¹⁸. Therefore one needed to increase the country's production, which was rhetorically addressed by EEN HUIS. It emphasizes the importance of the home for family life and to raise children. Building and working go together with harmonious living, and every citizen contributes to it, men and women.

Besides the fact that wives enabled their husbands to work, to carry out the urban plans, they also contributed to the development through various organisations and initiatives, such as the "Women Advice Committee for Housing Development" (*Vrouwenadviescommissie voor de Woningbouw*, see: De Wit, 1995: 5). This organisation, which was established in Rotterdam in 1946, claimed a role in the reconstruction process. Through practical experience one drew guidelines for the organisation of dwellings, while one became actively involved, and trained, in design processes¹⁰¹⁹. As such they also contributed to the modernisation of the building industry.

Pre-fabrication allowed on-site mounting of buildings, which accelerated construction processes, as well as physically enlarging the building sphere, since the building was made at several places, from where the components were carried to the construction site. These new production methods demanded elaborate building scenarios and competent directors. Architects researched the different possibilities of industrially manufactured, pre-fabricated concrete shells, with modular wall and floor panels. Because of standard measures and elements, different parts could be combined.

The new construction techniques not only enabled one to build fast. Architects who created large industrial complexes and housing estates, among them Van den Broek & Bakema, Maaskant and Groosman, also built villas that were related in style and technique, but more expressive¹⁰²⁰. They were bright, open and spacious, and applied new kinds of floor plans and interior designs, as shown by the 'Bouwcentrum' (and Polygoon, 1956-wk15). Such templates

¹⁰¹⁶ E.g. WONINGNOOD (1950, Max de Haas) and BOUWEND NEDERLAND (1952, Polygoon-Profilti). The latter was commissioned by the "Ministry of Reconstruction and Housing" and showed building projects in various Dutch towns that had been devastated by the war. In the case of Rotterdam it also showed a model of the future city, including the ambitious idea of a large roundabout and two suspension bridges across the Nieuwe Maas, which would not be constructed in the end. The immediate occasion for the film was the celebration of the fact that since the end of the war 50,000 new dwellings had been made. In order to increase the production, the film addressed the first steps that were made in respect of industrial production of houses.

¹⁰¹⁷ Zoetmulder made the photographs for a promotional folder (app. 1948) with the slogan: 'It may be a better policy to spend your money, rather than to lend it... Buy Holland's outstanding merchandise through The American West Coast Import and Export Company – San Francisco, California; Rotterdam, Holland.' Additional quote: 'Let us make a serious attempt to do business with each other, to know each other's countries and peoples better. Everything we do in this connection will be instrumental to building a better world imperative out of the disorder and chaos of today' (Siegfried M. Hymans, managing director).

¹⁰¹⁸ Cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 467.

¹⁰¹⁹ See the interviews by De Wit (1995) with Adri Dooremans-Lans and Nel van der Pol-van den Dorpel, who were members of the managing board of the *Vrouwenadviescommissie voor de Woningbouw*.

¹⁰²⁰ Cf. Van Hoogstraten, 2000: 14. Major examples of functionalist housing projects in Rotterdam after WWII are: 'Zuidpleinflat' (1941-1947, Groosman, Van Tijen, Bakema, Maaskant), 'Parkflat' (Groosman, 1949-1958), 'Lijnbaanflats' (1954-1956, Maaskant); 'Pendrechtflats' (1949-1953, Beese, Bakema); main examples of private villas in Rotterdam after WWII: 'House Ypenhof' (1948-1952, Van den Broek), 'Own House' (1951, Haan), 'House Uitenbroek' (1954-1956, Haan), 'House van Stokkum' (1956, Groosman), 'Villa Veder' (1957-1960), Maaskant), 'House Van Buchem' (1960-1961, Van den Broek & Bakema), among many others.

promised new perspectives for mass housing too, also in terms of ‘social engineering’, although it had to resolve quantitative problems first of all.

The municipality occupied an important position within these developments. Since it was under tremendous pressure to build large amounts of dwellings, new people were contracted. Among them was, since September 1946, the German architect and planner Lotte Beese (see: Damen & Devolder, 1993). Beese had studied at the Bauhaus in Dessau. After a complicated love relationship with its director Hannes Meyer she had to leave the school, in early 1929. At the end of the next year she visited Meyer briefly in Moscow. She got pregnant and stayed in the USSR, where she met Mart Stam. They married and worked on housing projects for new Soviet cities, the so-called *sotsgorod*¹⁰²¹. At the end of 1934, they left the USSR and went to the Netherlands. With Mart Stam she had another child and they also started a studio together¹⁰²². In 1943 they got divorced again.

Whereas Mart’s tabula-rasa plan for Rotterdam did not come through, Lotte took his place instead and was appointed as chief architect within the municipal housing department. The ideas for the *sotsgorod* that they had implemented in the USSR were further elaborated and projected onto the map of Rotterdam. Her first important project was *Kleinpolder* (1946-1947), located at the edge of the city, which was partly built with recycled materials from the destroyed city centre. Like the housing projects in the USSR, it made use of the possibilities of industrial construction. Based on CIAM principles, it became an open quarter, with greenery in between the housing blocks, with collective gardens, and separation of traffic modes. Corresponding to the *wijkgedachte* it provided differentiation of dwellings, for people of different ages, while the quarter also included various public facilities. This was further elaborated in ‘Pendrecht’ (1949-1953), which she designed with ‘Opbouw’, in particular with Jaap Bakema. Together with ‘Zuidwijk’ and ‘Lombardijen’ (arch. P. van Drimmelen), it was part of the southern garden cities¹⁰²³. These were, however, not intended as ‘satellite cities’, but as parts of the city.

Pendrecht encompassed 6300 dwellings. The idea of spatial units was conceptualised as an ascending series: dwelling, block, neighbourhood, district, town¹⁰²⁴. In order to let the project function socially, applicants were screened, regarding social status, and household inspection was subsequently carried out (by female civil servants)¹⁰²⁵. Next to that, community centres and associations were set up. The plans, with considerable variation of dwellings, were discussed at the CIAM congresses¹⁰²⁶. Pendrecht served as a model for ‘Alexanderpolder’ (1952-1953) that Beese, Bakema and other members of ‘Opbouw’ presented also at CIAM (IX).

¹⁰²¹ See the film *Sotsgorod, Cities for Utopia* (1995, Anna Abrahams).

¹⁰²² One of the projects they carried out in this way, in collaboration with Maaskant and Van Tijen, was that of the now famous ‘drive-in-dwellings’ in Amsterdam (1937). At the same time Beese produced graphic designs, like covers for the magazine of ‘De 8 & Opbouw’, of which she had become a member, and for example a photographic mural for the office of the shipping company Burger & Zn in Rotterdam. Lotte and Mart also designed the pavilion for the Dutch Railway exhibition De Trein 1839-1939 in Amsterdam, which was accompanied by the film NA 100 JAAR (1939, Max de Haas) – for more information about this film, see: Hogenkamp, 1988: 93-95. In 1939, they won the competition for the Dutch pavilion for the World Exhibition in New York, which was, however, not made in the end.

¹⁰²³ See, e.g. Van de Laar, 2000: 474-475.

¹⁰²⁴ ‘The district configures four neighbourhoods around a traffic-free square. Rather than the usual system of (perimeter) blocks or series of free-standing buildings the fundamental unit chosen for these neighbourhoods was the so-called ‘wooneenheid’ (cluster), which can be considered a spatial and social link between house and neighbourhood. Each cluster consists of a variety of buildings serving differing categories of tenant. This social diversity is reflected in their spatial layout, free-standing blocks of differing height together surrounding a communal green space. The later, more common name for the cluster, ‘stempel’ or stamp, derives from the way in which clusters are organized in a strict orthogonal system’ (Groenendijk & Vollaard, 1998: 304).

¹⁰²⁵ See: Van de Laar, 2000: 477. He also remarks that socially problematic families were largely concentrated in the emergency dwellings that had been built in and after WWII. The most problematic families and individuals, about 500 altogether, were deported to resocialisation camps in the province of Drenthe. This resocialisation failed and the attempts were cancelled already in the 1950s.

¹⁰²⁶ In Bergamo (1949) and in Hoddesdon (1951), see: De Heer, 1983: 51.

At the same time, Beese became involved with the design of the new village 'Nagele' (1947-1957) in the 'Noordoostpolder', which was part of the reclamation of the Zuiderzee¹⁰²⁷. Nagele is known as one of the most elaborate Dutch modernist planning experiments in which most prominent Dutch architects were involved. In collaboration with Ernest Groosman, Beese created thirty-two dwellings for agricultural workers (Karweihof, 1955). Conceptually, Nagele and Pendrecht (as well as Alexanderpolder) are related. Moreover, since the Zuiderzee-project was above all a national concern, it attracted settlers from all provinces, among them farmers who had to move from the Rotterdam region, due to the Botlek port development.

The Amsterdam based filmmaker Louis van Gasteren, who was in touch with people like Mart Stam, Jaap Bakema and Ernest Groosman, proposed to make a film about the design process and the construction of Nagele, which became EEN NIEUW DORP OP NIEUW LAND ("A New Village on New Land", 1960). When Van Gasteren started this documentary, in 1955, several crucial discussions had taken place already. He therefore staged new meetings with all of them in the Cinetone Studios in Duivendrecht, near Amsterdam. There he also brought large models that were especially made for the film, built at Van Gasteren's own studio. In this way, Van Gasteren actively participated in the development process by creating conditions to reflect upon the project. Besides that, Van Gasteren gave his own views upon the project¹⁰²⁸

This film resulted in another one, called ALLE VOGELS HEBBEN NESTEN ("All Birds Have Nests", 1961), to promote the Dura-Coignet pre-fabricated system. The connection was established by Ernest Groosman. He had previously worked on the appropriation of the 'Welschen' system for the company Muijs & De Winter. It was introduced as MUWI, and Groosman applied it first of all in Vlaardingen and Schiedam¹⁰²⁹. Whereas the MUWI components were still produced at different places, the French system of Coignet was a new, fully industrial and standardised construction system, with all elements made at one site: houses being made in a factory. In order to introduce this system to the Netherlands, Dura had to build its own factory, which required a critical mass of at least 6,000 housing units. Minister H.B.J. Witte of "Reconstruction and Social Housing" (1952-1959), stimulated and forced different municipalities to collaborate: Rotterdam, Schiedam, Vlaardingen, Spijkenisse, Ridderkerk, and Maassluis, all near the factory, in order to minimise transportation costs (Hellinga, 2001: 36). Transportation also became an integrated part of the production and the standardisation of the construction process, not least since the size of tunnels and Dutch traffic regulations became factors in the final measurements of the houses. Dura built its housing factory in the Eemhaven in Rotterdam, after a design by Ernest Groosman. In 1959 it was ready to produce two types of apartments designed by Groosman. In the next years, the system would be applied in other municipalities near Rotterdam as well¹⁰³⁰. In this case the Rijnmond area, as the agglomeration of Rotterdam became known, functioned as one planning area.

The film shows the work at the Dura factory in Rotterdam, and the construction of the houses in the district Lombardijen¹⁰³¹. Critic Jan Blokker of the *Algemeen Handelsblad* ('Louis van Gasteren builds houses') recognised that Van Gasteren applied features of classic Soviet

¹⁰²⁷ Groenendijk & Vollaard, 1998: 52.

¹⁰²⁸ Van Gasteren (in a conversation with the author FP, 2003-10-07) has illustrated it as follows. 'There is an image of a footpath, which had emerged because of people taking the shortest route by cutting the corner. I said to Bakema: "Can't you design a route plan in which roads emerge themselves?" Original quote: 'Daar is een beeld van een paadje, ontstaan doordat mensen de snelste weg nemen door de hoek af te snijden. Ik zei tegen Bakema: 'kunnen jullie niet een wegenplan ontwerpen waarin wegen vanzelf ontstaan?''

¹⁰²⁹ Since 1950 in Vlaardingen, where MUWI had its factory, and since 1952 in Schiedam (Nieuwlandpolder). At the same time Groosman made the shopping corridor 'Van Hogendorp' in Vlaardingen (1951-1952). See: Hellinga, 2001: 28-29/34.

¹⁰³⁰ Among other: Rozenburg, Zalmplaat, Slikkerveer and Capelle aan den IJssel – Hellinga, 2001: 37-39.

¹⁰³¹ 'Lombardijen' is exemplary for its pre-fab construction, see also: De Heer, 1983: 91; Nycolaas, 1983: 183.

cinema¹⁰³². As such, the film became a rhetorical plea for industrialisation and progress that is explicitly socially motivated. This is already clear from the film's introduction, which even appeals to the UN Declaration of Human Rights. It is the cinematic counterpart of Van Ettinger's book *Towards a Habitable World* (1960). While he discussed the problem of the transmission of knowledge, especially regarding a resistance to change, he remarked (p230) that people in the building trade read little, but like to watch pictures. Whereas the film was made for the general public, it was also an argument to convince constructors, architects, planners and policymakers¹⁰³³. Many of them attended the premiere at the Arena Theater in Rotterdam (1961-10-26), where the film was introduced by the President-Commissioner of Dura-Coignet, W.H. de Monchy¹⁰³⁴, who had been concerned with the reconstruction of Rotterdam before.

The *NRC* called the film 'an aggressive plea', 'which will not fail to stimulate or to continue the discussion on the problem of housing'¹⁰³⁵. The film received various other enthusiastic reviews, for example in the *Algemeen Dagblad*: 'The film fills the spectator with awe, amazement, admiration, and fascinates like only a few industrial films can do'¹⁰³⁶. What follows is Van Gasteren's own story of the film production, which provides an informal and lively account of its undertaking.

In England they were busy with industrial building, such as the airy-system. Here [in Amsterdam] in the Populierenweg, next to the Linnaeusstraat, they applied it too. I found it quite interesting, and went to a factory in Leiden, where they made concrete building blocks. I started to talk about it with Groosman, who passed by here, just after he returned from a visit to Moscow. Groosman was a kind of dandy, and liked the idea of a film. He took me to Dura. They're willing to do things, and they don't make problems about money – I just tell you. They were rather busy with things like hunting and searching for plover's eggs. They showed me how you have to eat them, like this, slap, you smash it. And with Wim Dam, of the Ministry of Social Housing, we went to the factories of Coignet in France. That was a big party.

But at Dura's factories it was deadly boring. With the shootings we had also trouble with lighting – it was just too dark inside. And the labour was not related to anything. They just made the components, plain and dry. I looked for a bit of life, some human action. But it wasn't there, although there is still something in the film, someone with a cigarette, which he passes to a colleague by a transportation belt. The rest of it was a sober and matter-of-fact reporting, almost a commissioned film [*bijna een opdrachtfilm*]. We had to survive too.

Dura went to the Mayor and Aldermen of Rotterdam. The municipality had to build dwellings, so they were willing to collaborate. They only thought in cubic meters. And the architects could nicely sell it. How handy it was to walk this and that way, how good the rooms were, and with an additional storage. But for myself it still contained a promise. I was always rummaging around with cables. I wished to put all of that in the sheet piling, slabs to it, and then to plug in. But the way they did it, you won't believe it! They just got away with it. And I had to make it into a film... There is a ballad, written by Jan Vrijman, on music by Hans van Sweeden, which comes across quite well. That ballad has it¹⁰³⁷.

¹⁰³² Cf. "'Alle Vogels hebben Nesten"; Krachtige film over de woningbouw', *De Volkskrant*, 1961-10-20. Van Gasteren himself has addressed that he had a marxist education – and that he was raised with the monthly *USSR im Bau* (1930s). Next to that he has mentioned the influence of Joris Ivens and Hanns Eisler (*NIEUWE GRONDEN*, 1933), ref.: 'Alle vogels hebben nesten', interview with Van Gasteren, 1978, pp15-16, Archief Louis van Gasteren, NFM.

¹⁰³³ As illustrated by a review in the building magazine *Misset's Bouwwereld* (1961-11-10, 'Alle Vogels hebben nesten...').

¹⁰³⁴ 'Woningprobleem onoplosbaar zonder industriële bouw; bij de film van Dura-Coignet', *NRC*, 1961-10-27.

¹⁰³⁵ Original quote: '...een aggressief betoog in filmbeelden over een actueel vraagstuk dat niet na zal laten de discussie over het woningprobleem te stimuleren of op gang te houden.' Pleidooi voor oplossing van woningprobleem; Film van Louis van Gasteren "Alle vogels hebben nesten", *NRC*, 1961-10-21.

¹⁰³⁶ Original quote: 'De film wekt ontzag, verbazing, bewondering en boeit zoals weinig industriële films dat kunnen doen.' Bosman, Antony; 'Goede industriële film van Louis van Gasteren', *Algemeen Dagblad*, 1961-10-27.

¹⁰³⁷ Louis van Gasteren in conversation with the author (FP), 2003-10-07. Original quote: 'Wat systeembouw betreft, in Engeland waren ze bezig met industrieel bouwen, volgens het airey-systeem. Hier in de populierenweg bij de

This account reveals various connections between different people and places (with Dura being based in Rotterdam, and Van Gasteren in Amsterdam). Hannerz's idea (1996: 149) of cities as 'switchboards' again applies here. Products, ideas and values enter the city, and in a modified form they are exported again. This is an interplay between the environment and 'historical factors', which take place through local appropriation: the French Coignet system that is adapted by Dura to be applied in Rotterdam, which is shown by Van Gasteren.

The story explains not only how the film production was initiated, but also the ambiguities that it implied. Although Van Gasteren believed in the social promise of industrial construction, reality was harsh. 'It is hard to compose a symphony out of it'¹⁰³⁸, a critic of *De Telegraaf* remarked, in the only 'dissonant' review of the film, who also said that the industrial production of houses results in dead districts that bring happiness only to the homeless¹⁰³⁹. Van Gasteren had to resolve other difficulties too, especially in respect of the government, which was concerned with the application of Dura's pre-fabricated system, and wanted to have a say in the film, but without actually supporting it¹⁰⁴⁰. In the next years industrial building methods were nevertheless applied all over the Netherlands.

§ 3. the Rijnmond region and the case of Vlaardingen

Since the 19th century, Rotterdam has incorporated several villages, among them Charlois, Delfshaven, IJsselmonde, and Kralingen¹⁰⁴¹. In 1927, Rotterdam launched a plan to incorporate a large number of municipalities, including Vlaardingen and Schiedam, Capelle aan den IJssel, Ridderkerk, and Barendrecht, but the province of Zuid-Holland cancelled the plan¹⁰⁴². The small dyke village of Hoogvliet, however, was nevertheless incorporated, in 1934. After the war it became a satellite city of 60,000 inhabitants, which offered housing to the workers of the rapidly

Linnaeusstraat hadden ze dat ook toegepast. Ik vond dat wel interessant. Daarna ben ik uit eigener beweging naar een fabriek in Leiden gegaan, waar ze bouwblokken van beton maakten. Groosman kwam toen net terug uit Moskou. Ik had het er met hem over. Hij kwam hier langs. Hij was een beetje ijdel, zo met een vlinderdas om. Hij wilde een soort kunstenaar zijn. Groosman bracht me naar Dura. Via hem ging dat. Daar willen ze wel, en doen niet moeilijk over geld. Ik zeg het je maar. Via hem bij Dura, ja, tjonge, daar waren ze bezig, eigenlijk vooral met jagen en kievitseieren zoeken, dat lieten ze me zien, hoe je kievitseieren moest eten, zo pats, dan sloeg je een ei plat, want die waren anders veel te hard. En met Wim Dam van het ministerie van Volkshuisvesting gingen we naar Frankrijk, naar de fabrieken van Coignet. Dat was een groot feest. Daar werd tekeer gegaan. Maar de fabrieken zelf, van Dura, dat was maar een dooie boel. We hadden er bij de opnamen ook moeite met de belichting. Er gebeurde ook niets. De arbeid daar was aan niets gerelateerd. Daar werden gewoon die onderdelen droog gemaakt. Ik zocht naar wat leven, naar menselijk handelen. Maar dat was er bijna niet. Ja, ik heb in de film nog wel iets, iemand met een sigaret, die hij via een soort transportband naar een collega liet gaan, zoiets. Het was meer nuchtere verslaglegging, bijna een opdrachtfilm. Ja, we moesten hier ook rondkomen, dus dat deden we. Die van Dura gingen wel naar de gemeente, naar de Burgemeester en wethouders. In Rotterdam was dat allemaal. De gemeente die moest woningen bouwen, dus daar wilden ze wel. Ze dachten alleen in kubieke meters. En de architect die mocht het mooi verkopen. Hoe handig het wel niet was om zus en zo te lopen, en hoe goed de kamers waren, en met een extra berging. Ik zag er zelf trouwens wel wat in. Ik liep altijd maar met draden te klooiën. Het leek me handig om dat allemaal in de bekisting op te nemen, platen er voor, en stekkerdozen erin. Was je daar tenminste vanaf. Maar verder, jongens. Dat ging er toch aan toe. Ja, om daar een film van te maken... Er zit een ballade in, geschreven door Jan Vrijman, en muziek van Kees van Zweden, dat komt goed over. Die ballade heeft het wel.'

¹⁰³⁸ Original quote: 'Een gegeven waaruit moeilijk een symfonie kan worden gecomponeerd...', in: 'Nieuwe film van Louis A. van Gasteren', *De Telegraaf*, 1961-10-19 (signed by G.A.B.).

¹⁰³⁹ Original quote: '... [huizenfabrieken] die aan de lopende band onderdelen van mensennesten produceren, welke samengevoegd en aaneengerijd, doodse stadsdelen doen ontstaan, maar daklozen gelukkig maken.' – *ibid.*

¹⁰⁴⁰ ref.: 'Alle vogels hebben nesten', interview with Van Gasteren, 1978, pp15-16, Archief Louis van Gasteren, Nederlands Filmmuseum; cf. Hogenkamp, 2003: 238.

¹⁰⁴¹ Oudenaarden, 2004: 19.

¹⁰⁴² This decision was made in 1929 (Oudenaarden, 2004: 19). In the preceding years, plans for satellite cities were developed by a.o. Van Lohuizen (see: Wagenaar, 1992: 56).

extending harbours and industry (i.e. the Botlek development)¹⁰⁴³. The first plans were made by Lotte Beese, who elaborated also particular quarters of it (a.o. 'Westpunt', 1955-1957).

Although the neighbouring municipalities of Rotterdam remained independent, socially and economically they became ever more part of the agglomeration, due to industrial expansion and suburbanisation. Like the British New Towns, various other satellites cities were planned, including Spijkenisse, Capelle aan den IJssel and Ridderkerk, which had all been villages for centuries. Besides them, the historical towns Schiedam and Vlaardingen had to grow too.

Rotterdam developed into a network of towns and suburbs. It corresponds to the ideas of the American urban theorist Lewis Mumford, whose book *The social foundations of post-war building* was translated into Dutch and published by the *Rotterdamsche Gemeenschap* (1946). Mumford argued that there is a maximum number and size in respect of social relationships, exchange, and recognition. Moreover, districts need to have their own identity and governance, for the city to be a meeting place. Whatever the effect of his ideas might have been, in the essay 'Social Complexity and Urban design' (1963), Mumford mentions Rotterdam, Coventry and Vällingby as cities where such principles are carried out¹⁰⁴⁴.

Whereas the New Towns in Britain, to which Mumford refers too, were new suburbs around large historical centres, Rotterdam became the newly planned centre, surrounded by historical settlements. Among them are the towns of Schiedam and Vlaardingen, which are part of the port region. Both towns grew rapidly after WWII, with old parts being redeveloped and new areas being built, for housing and industry. Vlaardingen will be taken as a case for further reflection upon the image and position of an independent town within the agglomeration of Rotterdam. I will do so by considering its masterplan, by architect Willem van Tijen, which became 'a model to communicate the city', supported by the film OLD TOWN GROWING YOUNGER (1955/1958, Jan Schaper) which is the English version of VLAARDINGEN KOERST OP MORGEN. The film was the first important documentary by Jan Schaper, who, just like Louis van Gasteren, said that he was largely influenced by the ideas of Lewis Mumford¹⁰⁴⁵. However, neither Louis van Gasteren nor Jan Schaper have explicitly addressed the idea of satellite cities, even though Van Gasteren's film ALLE VOGELS HEBBEN NESTEN (1961) dealt with a project that concerned all of the Rijnmond region, whereas Schaper's film is a 'close-up' of one of its towns. Yet, Van Gasteren's film rather views the possibilities of industrial construction within a perspective of global housing conditions, while Schaper's film is, in correspondence with the ideas of Mumford, an attempt to understand Vlaardingen as a 'complete' town, as an urban unit with demographic diversity and its own identity, as a part of the Rijnmond region.

In 1947, Jan Heusdens became the Mayor of Vlaardingen and leader of a progressive municipal government that changed the town radically. In November of the same year he commissioned architect Willem van Tijen to draw a 'structure plan' for Vlaardingen (*Structuurplan Vlaardingen, 1947-1949*), and to elaborate it with plans for the housing quarters 'Babberspolder' and 'Westwijk', which belong to his most important contributions to post-war planning in the Netherlands, according to Idsinga and Schilt in the book *Architect W. van Tijen* (1988)¹⁰⁴⁶.

The *Nederlands Economisch Instituut* and the *Economisch Technologisch Instituut voor Zuid-Holland* were asked to make prognoses for the growth of Vlaardingen. Due to the expansion of the port of Rotterdam, Vlaardingen was thought to have a rapid increase of its industry and housing requirements. It was estimated in 1947 that the town would grow from its present 42,000 inhabitants to 130,000 in the 1970s. In 1949, a structure plan was presented, which included a sanitation plan for the existing city that had to become a home for 60,000 people. The next step

¹⁰⁴³ Damen & Devolder, 1993: 69; cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 476.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Mumford, 1968; the article was first published in *Architectural Record*, 1963-2. For Rotterdam, cf. Mumford, 1957.

¹⁰⁴⁵ Van Gasteren mentioned it in a conversation with the author (2003-10-07) as well as Schaper (2003-11-14).

¹⁰⁴⁶ Idsinga & Schilt, 1988: 349 (project explanation: 349-356).

was the creation of new quarters for another 70,000 people, with the industry being concentrated along the Nieuwe Maas. After the plans had been presented they were carried out immediately, starting with the sanitation and ‘completion’ of the existing city. In 1950, Van Tijen started to elaborate the plan for ‘Babberspolder’, which was executed between 1951 and 1953.

In the autumn of 1954, the municipality of Vlaardingen commissioned Jan Schaper to make a film about its growth, from a herring fishing town to an industrial centre. A film was thought to be an appropriate way to show the town’s totality and consistency, for reasons of information and explanation, promotion and documentation of the rapid growth of the town. At first Mayor Heusdens wanted to present the film at a meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio, later that year. In the early 1950s, Heusdens had convinced Cincinnati Millacron to open a factory in Vlaardingen (1952-1954, arch. Hugh Maaskant)¹⁰⁴⁷. The film would be a way to show the success, and to open up new perspectives. However, its production became an extensive communication process between Schaper, who lived in Vlaardingen himself at that time, and the municipality, as well as architect Van Tijen¹⁰⁴⁸. It soon turned out that the production of this film needed much more time. The final result, of half an hour, was ready one year later than initially planned¹⁰⁴⁹.

The municipality did not object the delay, since it allowed one to include various projects that were just getting ready. The Alderman for Education, H.K. van Minnen (a direct link to the educational function of the film), wrote Schaper a letter (1955-06-10)¹⁰⁵⁰ to make additional recordings of churches, homes for the elderly, a swimming pool (*Kolpa bad*), schools and the new equipment of the “Cleaning and Disinfection Service” (*Gemeente Reinigings- en ontsmettingsdienst*), in order to present values of social care, health, and hygiene.

The film, which begins with atmospheric images of historical Vlaardingen and activities in the port, gradually moves towards plans to sanitise old parts of the town. Hence, corporeal health and hygiene is presented in immediate connection with a sane, modern environment. One of the landmarks of this renewed town is the brand new Delta-Hotel by architect Joost Boks, for ‘industrial tourism’ as it is said, due to its superb location along the river Nieuwe Maas and its expressive composition of cubes hanging over the water. Its location, near a park and the industry of the port, also shows the position of the city as being both a healthy environment and economically prosperous. The future of the city is guaranteed by the river that runs along it, the film says. The port offered indeed new perspectives to Vlaardingen, which can also be seen in one of the next films by Schaper, ERTSHAVEN H.V.O. (1960).

OLD TOWN GROWING YOUNGER is a promotional account of the reconstruction spirit, and a plea for progress. Yet there is an ongoing tension between past and future, city and countryside, housing and industry. We see polders and meadows versus construction, the historical town and traditional fishermen versus industrial activities. The film includes archaic images with impressionist light effects, interchanged by images that make use of high contrasts of light, as well as shots with high and low angles, next to a montage of oppositions.

In 1957, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs showed interest in the film. They found it exemplary for the reconstruction and the future perspectives of the Netherlands, and ordered twenty copies for screenings abroad. Schaper took the opportunity to write a letter to the municipality (7 May 1957) to propose new shots, since the developments in Vlaardingen went so fast that certain architectural models shown at the end of the film had become reality already, and

¹⁰⁴⁷ Nieuwenhuizen, Bert van; ‘Kort Politiek Nieuws; Monumenten’, D66 Vlaardingen,

www.d66vlaardingen.nl/nieuws/archives/000241.html 10 February 2003 and Provoost: 2003: 135.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Personal communication with Jan Schaper, 2005-02-11. (Schaper: ‘Van Tijen visited me at home’.)

¹⁰⁴⁹ Information from the newspaper article ‘Jan Schaper maakt een film over Vlaardingen’, *Het Vrije Volk*, 1954-10-02.

¹⁰⁵⁰ Personal archive Jan Schaper. The information is confirmed in a letter by Schaper in which he explained the declaration of extra costs (because of the requests by Van Minnen), 1955-10-22.

several new buildings and complexes were not yet part of the film¹⁰⁵¹. The municipality approved Schaper's proposal, and a new version was made.

While Schaper worked on the new version, he was also asked to make a series of photographs, due to the success of his film. Schaper made a series of hundred photographs (1957-1958), for exhibition in public buildings and schools¹⁰⁵². They were also part of a submission, by the municipality of Vlaardingen, to the international architecture and planning exhibition Interbau in Berlin (1957) – with contributions of architects like Le Corbusier, Gropius, Niemeyer, Aalto and others. Schaper's series became part of the Dutch contribution to show Vlaardingen as a model case of town planning in the Netherlands. It accompanied the built demonstration of Van den Broek & Bakema, who created one of the so-called *Punkthäuser*¹⁰⁵³.

The new film was ready in January 1958. It received even more enthusiastic reviews than the former. A critic of 'Het Vrije Volk' even considered it to be one of the best city films in Europe¹⁰⁵⁴. With one hundred and four new images, the film exemplified the dynamics of the stormy urban developments, according to the critic. 'In the new version, the variation of acts has become more playful and surprising; the quality of the shots has been perfected in many cases, and the dynamics of what is happening in Vlaardingen is fully shown'¹⁰⁵⁵. The critic also saw 'fascinating new images' of the port enterprise of Vlaardingen, and immediately drew the connection with the film ERTSHAVEN H.V.O. that Schaper made at the same time (1957-1960).

In early 1958, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs received twenty copies of the film for screenings abroad¹⁰⁵⁶. Later that year, the film was broadcast on Dutch television (1958-05-06), while the Government Information Service (RVD) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs selected it for the Dutch film programme at the world exhibition in Brussels, EXPO 1958. Besides the general theme of life and work in the Netherlands, the Dutch contribution paid special attention to Dutch 'port cities'. Due to the work Schaper and his wife Leen had done for the Femina, they were also asked to curate the photography presentation of the Dutch pavilion¹⁰⁵⁷.

After EXPO 1958, Schaper was asked to make more photographs for the municipality, which had taken the initiative to publish a book, including an English edition¹⁰⁵⁸. It received a lot of attention in the newspapers, and some, like *Het Vrije Volk*, even published previews.

For many years, armed with a photcamera, Schaper roamed Vlaardingen, which he knows like few others. He snapped here; made a shot there. (...) Schaper photographed Vlaardingen as it was. Slum dwellings, old alleys, fishermen and lugger. He also photographed the metamorphosis of the years after the war. Houses and modern quarters arose, industries emerged. Drifting Vlaardingen threw history overboard in order to steam toward a vivid future. // Surprising are the effects that Schaper knows to achieve in his book. Past and future are mixed into one story that is presented to the reader.¹⁰⁵⁹

¹⁰⁵¹ E.g. the school 'Groen van Prinstererlyceum', Police Office (*politiebureau*), Town Hall (*Raadhuis*), Station Vlaardingen-East, a tunnel, Van Heutzflat, and the housing quarter Westwijk, the latter being designed between 1951 and 1956, and constructed between 1956 and 1961

¹⁰⁵² From correspondence between Schaper and the municipality in the personal archive of Jan Schaper.

¹⁰⁵³ <http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berlin-Hansaviertel> (visited 2007-05-10).

¹⁰⁵⁴ 'Nieuwe versie van Vlaardingen-film; goed werk van Jan A. Schaper', in: *Het Vrije Volk*, 16 January 1958.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Ibid. Original quote: 'In de nieuwe versie is de variatie in handelingen speelser en overwachter geworden, is de kwaliteit van de opnemingen in vele gevallen 'volmaakt' en is de dynamiek van wat in Vlaardingen gebeurt ten volle weergegeven.'

¹⁰⁵⁶ Copy of a letter by Schaper to the municipality of Vlaardingen, 6 January 1958; personal archive Jan Schaper.

¹⁰⁵⁷ The exhibition encompassed five photographic presentations of two cities each: Rotterdam and Dordrecht, Amsterdam and Zaandam, Vlaardingen and Schiedam, Den Helder and Delfzijl. Each presentation was accompanied by a booklet. Besides this, the show included two other presentations of the ports of Rotterdam and Amsterdam by prints of 7 by 1.5 meter (23 x 5 feet). For information on Vlaardingen and the work of Schaper at EXPO 1958, see: 'Op Expo is ook Vlaardingen vertegenwoordigd', *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad, editie Vlaardingen*, April 12, 1958.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Its production was carried out by bookseller Aart Pontier and N.V. Van Dooren press.

¹⁰⁵⁹ 'Vlaardingen onderwerp van bijzonder boekwerk; foto's (130) en tekst van cineast Schaper', in: *Het Vrije Volk*, edition Vlaardingen, 1959-10-10. Original quote: 'Veel jaren zwierf Schaper gewapend met fototoestel door

The book can be considered as a still version of the film, as well as a contextualisation of it and a document with additional and profound information. It not only shows the direct connection between film, photography and writing as it is practiced by one and the same person, but it also illustrates the union between the different media in terms of publicity and informative purposes.

The article in *Het Vrije Volk* is accompanied by a picture from the book. A signpost that shows the direction to Rotterdam stresses the connection with the city on which its future depended. Its position in the Rijnmond was also addressed by the preliminary title of the book: “Vlaardingen, Corner-stone of Europoort” (*Vlaardingen, Hoeksteen van Europoort*). The newspaper, however, prefers a previous suggestion by Schaper: “Vlaardingen, Revenge on the Past” (*Vlaardingen, Revanche op het Verleden*). The book was finally published, in 1959, with the title ‘Vlaardingen in turning tide’ (*Vlaardingen in kerend tij...*). One of the most enthusiastic reviews was published by Dr. A.W. Schippers Jzn in *De Nederlandse Courant voor Canada*, a paper for the Dutch community in Canada, with detailed comments and background information on the text and photographs¹⁰⁶⁰. The review starts mentioning the fast growth of the town that is made possible by Mayor Heusdens. In his period of office, from 1947 until 1959, the town had almost doubled its population, up to 70,000 people, with a prospect, at that time, of a total number of 160,000 in the next twenty years (which would not happen in the end). The critic compares the story of the book with the developments he observes himself in the town Scarborough, as a part of metropolitan Toronto. The developments go equally fast over there, but in their planning, according to Schippers, they are less harmonious and less diverse in their possibilities for the citizens. Hence Vlaardingen might be taken as a successful model. From today’s perspective this may be questionable, but it shows all the more the convincing power that Schaper’s work had at that time.

Vlaardingen dat hij kent als weinig anderen. Hij knipte hier; hij maakte daar een shot. (...) Schaper fotografeerde Vlaardingen zoals het was. Krotwoningen, oude straatjes, vissers en loggerschepen. Hij fotografeerde ook de gedaanteverwisseling van de jaren na de oorlog. Huizen, moderne wijken verzezen, industriën ontstonden. Driftig gooide Vlaardingen het verleden overboord om op een levendige toekomst aan te stomen. // Verrassend zijn de effecten, die schaper in zijn boek weet te bereiken. Verleden en heden worden in één verhaal gemengd aan de lezer voorgelegd.’

¹⁰⁶⁰ Schipper Jzn, A.W.; ‘Een boek met een stuk interessante historie en tastbare realiteit’, in: *De Nederlandsche Courant voor Canada*, 15 July 1961.

CHAPTER 10. TO ANIMATE THE CITY

§ 1. city – event

Whereas the culture of the city used to be rooted in the port, after WWII it became intertwined with the programme of the reconstruction. Rotterdam became a city of labour, as a way of life. The cultural achievements concerned the ever growing and highly dynamic port, the rationalist planning and modern architecture, and the social institutions in the newly established suburbs (cf. Van Ulzen, 2007: 149). It does not mean, however, that the city was devoid of special facilities for ‘the arts’.

Immediately after the war, a new, temporary theatre was built (1947, arch. Hendrik Sutterland), while in Rotterdam-Zuid a new grand theatre was erected (1957, arch. Sybold van Ravesteyn). Theatre plays were also performed at, for example, the newsreel theatre Cineac¹⁰⁶¹. An important stage for different artistic disciplines, including film, became ‘t Venster’ (1948-1949, J. Bakema)¹⁰⁶². One of the theatre groups that played here was the socially engaged *Rotterdamse Comedie*, with Anna Blaman and Kees Brusse, among others, but it should be emphasised here that they also played in factories¹⁰⁶³. Several new cinemas opened¹⁰⁶⁴. The Luxor cinema was also used for theatre plays. At the new ‘Bijenkorf’, special events were organised such as a book fair, with well-known writers as guests¹⁰⁶⁵. In the ‘Rivièrahal’ of the Blijdorp zoo, events took place such as fashion shows, lectures, concerts, and games¹⁰⁶⁶. The same counts for the Ahoy’ hall, as well as the Feyenoord stadium, where various performances were organised besides football matches¹⁰⁶⁷. Next to that, all kinds of sports events took place, such as cycling tours and, of special importance, the annual *Concours Hippique International Officiel* at the Kralingse Bos from 1948. The experience of such events was a matter of ‘double exposure’, since they were recreated through film, to be seen in the Cineac theatre, among others¹⁰⁶⁸.

Some temporal centres for the arts were established in existing buildings, such as the former district water control office ‘Schielandshuis’ (1662-1665, J. Lois & P. Post). It served the RKS as an exhibition centre (1950-1953), and when the RKS got a gallery at the ‘Lijnbaan’, it became the city’s historical museum¹⁰⁶⁹. Surrounded by modern, functionalist architecture, the museum looked like the ambiguous ‘Ancient House’ in Yevgeny Zamyatin’s science-fiction novel *We* (1921), as a reminder of history in the ‘timeless present of modernity’. Just outside the city centre, a concert hall was established in the former ‘Koninginnekerk’ (1904-1907, B. Hooykaas, M. Brinkman). In the meantime, plans were made for new facilities, such as an extension to Museum Boymans.

These institutions, and the events they organised, were an integral part of the project to reanimate the city. During the war, Museum Boymans had already organised exhibitions (in 1941 and 1942) to present plans for the reconstruction of the city. In 1947, the museum also organised the exhibition *Rotterdam Straks* (“Rotterdam Later”), as part of the first *Opbouwdag*, which was

¹⁰⁶¹ Edzes, 1973: 2.

¹⁰⁶² It was also the place where the association *Vrienden van de film* was established, by a.o. Lichtveld (Albert Helman) and M.T. Brusse, on 1946-03-09; *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1947, p31.

¹⁰⁶³ Hendriks, 2006: 141.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Lutusca (temporary), ‘t Venster, Lumière, Corso, Thalia, and Scala/Cinerama (a.o.).

¹⁰⁶⁵ JOURNAAL, NTS, 1957-04-09.

¹⁰⁶⁶ Such events had already taken place since the creation of the zoo. An example is a show by German fashion houses, see: Polygoon, 1941-wk21. For general information on this accommodation, see: www.rotterdamers.nl/gebouwen/riviera.htm (website visited: 2006-04-04).

¹⁰⁶⁷ An example of a performance at the Feyenoord stadium was the play ‘Golfslag der Eeuwen’ by the Cultuurdienst der KAB, see the KAB propaganda film *JA, ZO WAS ‘T* (1951, Polygoon-Profiliti); see also, for example, the speech by Billy Graham at the stadium (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1955-07-04 and 1956-10-05).

¹⁰⁶⁸ An example of (a report of) a cycling tour is: *WIELERONDE ROTTERDAM* (1953, Polygoon), shown at Cineac. Concerning the *concours hippique*, it was largely covered by the media, (almost always) by Polygoon e.g. 1950-wk37; 1951-wk37, etc.

¹⁰⁶⁹ See: *WIE WAT BEWAART* (Leen Timp / AVRO, 1961-10-06).

also reported by Polygoon¹⁰⁷⁰. It showed the exhibition with its 3D models of the future city, the reconstruction of the St. Laurens church (through an excursion of Mayor P.J. Oud and a delegation), and new housing projects. More exhibitions followed, including shows that travelled abroad¹⁰⁷¹.

All of this resulted eventually in a series of mass events which animated the new city. These large ‘markets’ (at a time that the city centre actually lacked an ordinary market, until 1958¹⁰⁷²), turned the apparently fixed city into an event itself, a temporal reality, a developing, growing complex, to which different disciplines contributed. Strategies from mass communication were applied, while mass media were used too, as part of a *Medienverbund*, as Thomas Elsaesser would have it (2005b: 391). But rather than adding ‘culture’ to the emerging physical structure, these events became intrinsically part of the emerging urban fabric. According to Peter de Winter (1988), they presented the current state of the reconstruction and its ideas, and as such they tested the plans (in this perspective it is also important to note that several architects that collaborated on the events would be involved with Rotterdam’s reconstruction too); they promoted a modern way of living, tried to generate enthusiasm among the citizens, and to stimulate participation in the development of the city and the country.

§ 2. Ahoy’

A force behind the reconstruction of Rotterdam, in terms of organisation and finances, was the banker and chairman of the ‘Chamber of Commerce’, Karel Paul van der Mandele (•1880-†1975). He was the initiator of the annual *Opbouwdag*, and subsequently of the Ahoy’¹⁰⁷³. The Ahoy’ was the first large event to take place in ‘Het Park’, during the summer of 1950 (15th of June – 31st of August). It celebrated, first of all, the successful reconstruction of the port, as the precondition for the reconstruction of the city. It lasted two weeks more than initially planned, due to its overwhelming success. Within two and a half months it attracted 1,657,000 visitors¹⁰⁷⁴.

In a special edition of the architecture magazine *Forum*, dedicated to the Ahoy’, the architects Van den Broek and Bakema, who designed its masterplan, explained that the plan had initially been to connect the port and the city, hence an event that encompassed a large part of the city centre, but ‘this plan proved to be too vast and then [it] was limited to the area of the Rotterdam Park’¹⁰⁷⁵. It kept nevertheless the ambition to give expression to urban culture at large. Organiser Jacques Kleiboer, who had previously organised the visit of the Zeppelin (1932), made the event into a joint-venture of architecture, visual arts and media. The event provided a common framework and a common agenda, which allowed for various different kinds of approaches and styles, ranging from functionalist architecture to symbolic murals (e.g. by Dolf Henkes) and abstract expressive sculptures (e.g. Karel Appel)¹⁰⁷⁶, next to documentary photography (e.g. Cas Oorthuys) and all kinds of commercial presentations. The cross-disciplinary character of the event raised an enormous enthusiasm among its participants.

¹⁰⁷⁰ ROTTERDAM STRAKS, OPBOUWDAG IN DE MAASSTAD (Polygoon, 1947-23).

¹⁰⁷¹ Exhibitions that took place in the next year were *Rotterdam Bouwt* (1948) and *De Maasstad in de Steiger* (1949). Within the perspective of international exchange, the Dutch Ministry of Reconstruction and Housing also organised a series of exhibitions abroad, in which Rotterdam was prominently present. The first one was a show, designed by Opbouw architect W.F. van Gelderen, on emergency dwelling, which took place in Brussels, 1946. Two years later Van Gelderen was also responsible for a travelling exhibition that was to be seen in Belgium, France and Germany. NAI, archive Van Gelderen – GELX.

¹⁰⁷² See: JOURNAAL, NTS, 1958-08-26.

¹⁰⁷³ see: Halbertsma & Van Ulzen, 2001: 156; see also: Oudenaarden, 2004: 13-14.

¹⁰⁷⁴ GAR: archive ‘Tentoonstellingen Ahoy’ 1950, E55, Floriade 1960’, toegangsnr. 315, inventarisnr. 14: ‘kranteknipsels en documentatie’, green-grey cover includes a booklet by J. van Tilburg [= alderman for finances]; *Verslag van de tentoonstelling “Rotterdam Ahoy”*, Gemeente Rotterdam/Stichting Tentoonstelling 1950, October 1952. Page 8.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Van den Broek & Bakema, 1950: 60.

¹⁰⁷⁶ See: De Winter, 1988: 29-31.

Architect Aldo van Eyck, for example, wrote an article for *Forum* about the spatial ‘sign’ that he had designed, in which he thought of the Ahoy’ as something that was part of ‘a new renaissance, not of the human being in respect of oneself this time, but of all things in space’¹⁰⁷⁷.

The central hall of the Ahoy’ was from the Neniĳto, from 1928, which had been relocated to ‘Het Park’. An extension to it was built by Van den Broek & Bakema, who also built the pavilion of Rotterdam. Inside the Neniĳto hall, now called the Ahoy’ hall, all kinds of enterprises presented themselves. Stands were designed by various architects and designers, like Gerrit Rietveld, Herman Haan, Rein Fledderus and Paul Schuitema. The latter, for example, designed a constructivist-like pavilion for *Betonfabriek De Metoor*, with a small office room and a model of the port, to show the so-called Stelcon industrial floor panels that were used for the reconstruction of the port¹⁰⁷⁸. It might be no coincidence that Multifilm, the company that Schuitema was related to as a filmmaker, made the short documentary ROTTERDAM AHOY’ (1950). Media were used to promote and document it, and this material was used afterwards as well, for example in the Polygoon production THAT MOST LIVING CITY (1954, Walter Smith), which was commissioned by the municipality. Film functioned as an extension of the event, both in space and time.

Polygoon had already reported on the Ahoy’ two months before the opening. The report shows images of the port and mentions that its reconstruction is complete, and that it now functions at full capacity¹⁰⁷⁹. To celebrate it, the Ahoy’ is organised, and images are shown of the construction of the pavilions. Inside the Ahoy’ hall just stands a model of Rotterdam and the port, with prominent people watching it, among them Mayor P.J. Oud and Minister D.G.W. Spitzen (Traffic & Water). Polygoon also reported on the opening, with general shots of the port and the exhibition¹⁰⁸⁰.

While the exhibition was going on, several events took place that were related to it. A particular instance was the visit of the British Royal Navy, with its cruiser ‘Cleopatra’, torpedo-boat destroyers, submarines and a storage ship, which was also reported on by Polygoon¹⁰⁸¹. The reconstruction of the port was not only of crucial importance for the economy, but also in military terms, and the Dutch Royal Navy actively participated in the event. In the central hall it had its own stand, while in ‘Het Park’ its submarine service gave another presentation. It also organised a demonstration of its submarines in the Nieuwe Maas, which attracted a lot of attention¹⁰⁸². It also showed a film, produced by Polygoon-Profilti (1949), on its new aircraft carrier ‘Karel Doorman’, which had previously been in use by the British Royal Navy.

In order to show such films, the Ahoy’ had its own cinema¹⁰⁸³. Concurrently, special film screenings were organised in the nearby Institute for ‘Navigation and Aviation’ (*Instituut voor Scheepvaart en Luchtvaart*), which informed the spectators and motivated them to visit the exhibition itself as well¹⁰⁸⁴. In the evaluation of Ahoy’, the chairman of the organising committee, Alderman Van Tilburg, mentioned the film screenings explicitly for their contribution to the success of the event.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Van Eyck, 1950: 15. Original quote: ‘een nieuwe Renaissance, niet van de mens ten opzichte van zichzelf deze keer, maar van alle dingen in de ruimte’.

¹⁰⁷⁸ De Winter, 1988: 23 and 35.

¹⁰⁷⁹ ROTTERDAMSE HAVEN GEHEEL HERSTELD (Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws, 1950-17).

¹⁰⁸⁰ TENTOONSTELLING ROTTERDAM AHOY (Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws, 1950 – 50-26).

¹⁰⁸¹ BRITS VLOOTBEZOEK (Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws, rec.: 1950-07-13, 50-29).

¹⁰⁸² GAR: archive ‘Tentoonstellingen Ahoy’ 1950, E55, Floriade 1960’, toegangsnr. 315, inventarisnr. 14: ‘kranteknipsels en documentatie’, *knipselalbum* p86: ‘De 024 schudde zich als ’n natte poedel’ (1950-07-27) [unknown newspaper].

¹⁰⁸³ De Winter, 1988: 23; number 30 on the list of attractions.

¹⁰⁸⁴ GAR: archive ‘Tentoonstellingen Ahoy’ 1950, E55, Floriade 1960’, toegangsnr. 315, inventarisnr. 14: ‘kranteknipsels en documentatie’, green-grey cover includes a booklet by J. van Tilburg [= alderman for finances]; *Verslag van de tentoonstelling “Rotterdam Ahoy”*, Gemeente Rotterdam/Stichting Tentoonstelling 1950, October 1952. Page 7.

Although there seem to be no records left that mention the film programming related to Ahoy', a number of films could be considered here. First of all are the films made by the municipal *Fototechnische Dienst* of the department of Public Works. It was directly involved with the reconstruction of the port, which it documented at length through films such as ROTTERDAM HERSTELT ZIJN KADEMUREN ("Rotterdam reconstructs its embankments", 1947) and PALEN ("Poles", 1950). An indication of their screening at the Ahoy' is the fact that the latter was submitted to the national censor just before the opening (it was approved on 1950-06-10). It also seems likely that the municipal office for information and publicity took this occasion to show EN TOCH...ROTTERDAM (1950, Polygoon-Profilti), since it was an outstanding opportunity to inform the public about the reconstruction and to motivate them to participate in it. For similar reasons, and also because of the presence of the Marshall Plan agency ECA at the Ahoy', one can also think of other reconstruction films that dealt with the Netherlands in general¹⁰⁸⁵. Next to that, a link can be made with the various firms that presented themselves at the exhibition, like KLM and Philips, as well as locally oriented firms. Spido, for example, organised popular boat-trips through the port¹⁰⁸⁶, and for this purpose it commissioned the film TOCHT MET SPIDO ("Trip with Spido", 1950, Klaas van der Knoop).

In short, we might distinguish different kinds of films related to the Ahoy'. Firstly, there were the 'extensions of the event', as I call them, which promoted the event, including news reports and documentaries. Secondly, there were films that promoted the participating enterprises, which might be called 'intentions of the event'. They do not necessarily concern Rotterdam as such, but due to the interest in Rotterdam of most of the enterprises present there is nevertheless a direct connection with the city. Finally, we might add another kind of film: those of amateurs. Although 8mm film and equipment had already been a mass-consumption product since 1932, when Eastman Kodak had introduced the format, it only became widely popular after WWII. In fact, the Ahoy' is one of the first large events in Rotterdam that became subject of such recordings¹⁰⁸⁷. In one sense, these films were also 'extensions' of the event, as people took the images home, but they stayed in the private realm for decades¹⁰⁸⁸. Rather than calling them 'extensions', it would be better to call them 'retentions'. They were the hidden dimension of the spectator. They point to another end of the spectrum of media usage and the way the presented ideas were internalised through the active involvement with media.

An example of this is ROTTERDAM AHOY' (1950), by amateur filmmaker Ed Millecam. It shows diving demonstrations by the navy, demonstrations of technical schools, a model of the ship Willem Ruys that enters and leaves the port, and further illustrates performances by bands, and all kinds of entertainment, including rides in Ahoy's Lunapark at night. Since Millecam was a committed amateur, it is a well-made report, but that does not count for many others. In AHOY (1950, anon.), we see port models, the entrance, pavilions, a hand written sign saying 'trip' (*uitje*), a church and a bridge that are part of the exhibition, ships, games, visitors who relax at the terrace of a café, an ostrich, sails and a windmill. The images have no clear order, which gives an idea how visitors actually experienced the exhibition, with a strong focus on ordinary things, instead of the new landmarks and future plans of architecture, planning, commerce and industry.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Possibly the films EEN HUIS (1948, Henry James & Rob Out), WONINGNOOD (1950, Max de Haas), and SOMEWHERE TO LIVE (1950, Jacques Brunius).

¹⁰⁸⁶ 159,560 people made a boat-trip by Spido, see: GAR, archive 'Tentoonstellingen Ahoy' 1950, E55, Floriade 1960', toegangsnr. 315, inventarisnr. 14: 'kranteknipsels en documentatie', green-grey cover includes a booklet by J. van Tilburg [= alderman for finances]; Verslag van de tentoonstelling "Rotterdam Ahoy", Gemeente Rotterdam/Stichting Tentoonstelling 1950, October 1952. Page 8. See also in this archive: knipselalbum p100: 'Havenrondvaart zeer in trek' (1950-08-12), article from an unknown newspaper.

¹⁰⁸⁷ E.g. AHOY (a.o.) (1950, P. v/d Bosch); ROTTERDAM AHOY' (1950, E.F. Millecam), AHOY' (1950, anonymous).

¹⁰⁸⁸ It is only since the 1990s or so that such recordings have become publicly available, as historic documents within the city archive.

After the Ahoy' had taken place, the Ahoy' hall kept its function and more events took place, as different as an exhibition on the architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright (1951, with J.J.P. Oud as its curator), a 'technishow' (1951), a table-tennis tournament (1953) and a 'hobby fair' (1954), which were all considered highly important. The opening of the hobby fair, for example, was even attended by Prime Minister Drees, Queen Juliana and Mayor Van Walsum – and many of these events were reported by Polygoon's news¹⁰⁸⁹. Besides that, annual fairs were organised, like the 'Femina' and the grocer's trade fair ROKA (*Rotterdamse Kruideniersbeurs*)¹⁰⁹⁰. In 1954, filmmaker Jan Schaper made a documentary about that fair (i.e. ROKA-FILM¹⁰⁹¹), which was his very first film. It was shown at different meetings of grocers' organisations, and it was highly appreciated by them. In half an hour, it shows the preparations and setting up of 170 stands, the activities that took place and the people involved.

Through the various events that were accommodated at the Ahoy', it had not only a lasting effect on the city's development, in terms of spin-off, but also in an immediate way, for its heritage as a concrete accommodation for the urban culture at large. This would culminate in two other big manifestations, using the same halls, modifying them, and adding several new ones, which was the case with the E55 and the Floriade (1960).

§ 3. E55

The next major event was the *Nationale Energie Manifestatie* or *Energie 1955*, which was simply called 'E55'. It took place from the 18th of May, when it was opened by the Queen, until the 3rd of September 1955. During this period of exactly one hundred days, more than three million people visited the exhibition. As summarised in an official *communiqué* that was held afterwards¹⁰⁹², the aim of the exhibition had been to show the nation and the world the results of the energy of the Dutch people since 1945. The E55 exhibited the achievements of commerce, industry, scientific research, and education, to set an inspiring example for the youth.

The E55, organised by Jacques Kleiboer, was the largest exhibition ever organised in the Netherlands. On a lot of 37 hectares, situated between the city centre and the Nieuwe Maas, including 'Het Park', forty large steel-and-glass pavilions were built, next to various other constructions and installations, under supervision of the architects Van den Broek & Bakema. The design of the exhibition was based on two premises: the organic coherence of distinguished spatial elements together with the human activity taking place in it¹⁰⁹³. Moreover, various pavilions were especially dedicated to social issues, like public health, the protection of workers, and social welfare. The pavilion of the latter was called "Social Flashes" (*Sociale Flitsen*, design: Strijbosch & Crouwel)¹⁰⁹⁴.

The E55 was documented in detail, on the request of Kleiboer, through a one-hour (silent) colour film, called E55¹⁰⁹⁵. It was made by architect Herman Haan, who had also been involved with the Ahoy'¹⁰⁹⁶, and his wife Hansje Haan-Fischer. It is a lively and virtually complete tour through the exhibition, characterised by outstanding cinematography. Rather than summing up all the presentations, the film shows how the exhibition was organised and

¹⁰⁸⁹ But not on Frank Lloyd Wright. For information on this exhibition, with J.J.P. Oud as its curator, see: Taverne e.a., 2001: 471.

¹⁰⁹⁰ An example of a report on the latter is JOURNAAL, NTS, 1959-09-25.

¹⁰⁹¹ Information is based upon the newspaper article 'Premiere Roka-Film een groot succes; vele tevreden gezichten op de jaarlijkse standhoudersvergadering', from an unknown source (probably a grocer's magazine), April 1954, personal archive Jan Schaper.

¹⁰⁹² What follows is based upon the official *communiqué* given by the organisational board after the event was finished.

¹⁰⁹³ De Winter, 1988: 43.

¹⁰⁹⁴ It included telephone booths with sound recordings of Prime Minister Willem Drees (De Winter, 1988: 47).

¹⁰⁹⁵ After the event was finished, the film was handed over to the city archive (GAR) by Jacques Kleiboer himself.

¹⁰⁹⁶ For the Ahoy' he designed various stands, of which he even used materials afterwards to build his own house at the Kralingseweg – De Winter, 1988: 35 (60).

experienced, while it also introduces some of the key figures behind the scenes¹⁰⁹⁷. In fact, Haan and Haan-Fischer were in close connection to many of the architects, designers and artists involved (a.o. Bakema, Bakema-Van Borssum Waalkes, Rietveld, Niegeman-Brand, Appel and Constant).

In his book on events in Rotterdam, Peter de Winter (1988: 11) has emphasised the aim of the E55 (like that of the Ahoy'), to 'integrate as many sectors of human activity as possible', and to facilitate cross-disciplinary collaborations. The E55 was another test-case for new approaches within design and architecture, and as such it played a role, especially through the work of Bakema (as a member of Team X), to set a new agenda for the modern movement¹⁰⁹⁸. Bakema himself designed the entrance of the E55, which encompassed a long steel construction with a large canvas roof. In front of it, the artist Constant Nieuwenhuys built the spatial 'energy logo'. More than six meters high, made of steel, it consisted of three vertical triangles, with spheres inside, which symbolised cosmos, science and trade. Constant had a large share in the event, for which he also made a (temporary) monument for the reconstruction that was called 'Symbol for Dutch Will and Work', which consisted of large rectangular shapes, and another monument, to symbolise the last century of the Netherlands¹⁰⁹⁹.

The central part of the exhibition was a complex of halls. The main one was the 'Energiehal' (arch. Van den Broek & Bakema), with an exhibition about 'water as friend and enemy of the Netherlands'. Attention was paid to the Dutch ports and their connections with the hinterland, shipbuilding and the fight against floods, with presentations of models of the Zuiderzeewerken and the Deltaplan. Next to the Energiehal were the 'National Pavilion' (arch. Rietveld), and the former Ahoy' hall (1950), which was dedicated to the theme of 'building and living'. It showed the results of the previous ten years of reconstruction and how planners imagined the 'city of the future', through renewal and city extensions. Located behind the halls was one of the landmarks of the manifestation, the Aeolusmast by artist Arie Jansma; with a height of about 40 metres, it moved quietly in the wind, to symbolise natural energy and the way people make use of it¹¹⁰⁰. The E55 also included working sites, with the actual construction of a ship, the construction of a house, a working oil-installation, and the loading and unloading of ships in the port, as well as simulations of several industrial processes and manipulations.

The entrance was connected to Het Park through 'the bridge of knowledge', designed by Paul Schuitema, and a chair lift. Located in 'Het Park' were pavilions of the different Dutch provinces, as well as presentations on agriculture and food production, which showed traditional farmhouses next to modern, fully industrialised ones. In Het Park one could also find the 'entertainment city' *Unifesti*, with daily performances of music, dance and cabaret, the E55 television studio, which was a major attraction that will be elaborated on shortly, and the 'Pavilion of Space Travel', showing the future possibilities of aerospace and 'interplanetary traffic'. This science-fiction complex was designed by the architect Jaap Bakema in collaboration with the artist Karel Appel. Next to it was a gigantic turning crane with two arms, each holding a capsule to lift visitors high into the air. In front of the pavilion, in the middle of a lunar landscape, was another sculpture by Constant, which consisted of curved steel strips. As a whole this 'artificial moon' did not only have a futuristic appearance, but it was also a playful and fantastic environment. Along the Nieuwe Maas, were presentations related to the port and themes such as maritime commerce, emigration and the navy.

¹⁰⁹⁷ A.o. J.A.C. Tillema, director of Gemeentewerken; architect Jaap Bakema; organiser Jacques Kleiboer; K.P. van der Mandele, one of the initiators; the artist Karel Appel a.o.

¹⁰⁹⁸ Team X prepared the influential tenth CIAM congress (1956), which eventually resulted in dissolving CIAM in Otterloo in 1959, where Herman Haan was present as well (presenting the results of an expedition to Africa and advocated an architecture based on the 'human habitat'). Besides contributions to the E55 by members of CIAM (through De 8 & Opbouw), there was also a special presentation by Opbouw (De Winter, 1988: 46).

¹⁰⁹⁹ 'Symbool voor Neerlands Wil en Werk', De Winter, 1988: 52, nr. 107.

¹¹⁰⁰ Cf. Van der Struijs, 2006: 1.

Whereas the film by Haan and Haan-Fischer exemplifies the memory function of cinema, the experiment with commercial television exemplifies that of oscillation. It had been the intention of the E55, and Philips, which had initiated the associated foundation TV55, to get the Dutch people acquainted with the new medium¹¹⁰¹. The E55 brought television to the attention of a broad public¹¹⁰². About three hundred television monitors were installed at the exhibition area, which were provided by Philips and its Rotterdam based subsidiary Erres, while people could also visit the TV55 television studio. Those in Rotterdam who had already their own television set could receive the programmes at home too. In this way, a shop like ‘Radio Modern’ (Schiedamseweg) had a television set in its shop window that showed the programmes of TV55¹¹⁰³.

The presentation of television at the E55 was initially welcomed by the national public broadcasting station NTS, until they learnt about the plans for commercial broadcasting, because NTS-secretary Wim Rengelink feared ‘American situations’¹¹⁰⁴. In the end, however, the E55 got its permission. Philips just wanted to establish the position of television as a medium, with no further plans for commercial broadcasting, and the NTS would eventually profit from it too. The NTS collaborated only marginally, and TV55 became responsible instead. Jo Brandel became its managing director and Erik de Vries its programme director; both of them had been employees of Philips in the past. Brandel, who then worked as a film and television producer in Paris, had previously been the president of Philips in France. Since the early 1930s, De Vries had worked for Philips on the development of television, and he had also been involved with the first stage of national broadcasting, in Bussum¹¹⁰⁵.

De Vries was assisted by Ansje Swinkels, who had previously worked for Marten Toonder’s film studio. Every ‘matinee’ began with a test image, a clock, programme announcements, a fanfare, and presenter Mies Bouwman introducing the performances of different artists¹¹⁰⁶. It marked the beginning of Bouwman’s long career as a television presenter. Together they made twelve programmes per day, and each of them was concluded by a block of commercials and a ‘television news service’ (*televisie nieuwsdienst*), regarding activities related to the E55, which was provided by the newspapers *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* and the *Algemeen Dagblad* – while *Het Vrije Volk* issued a daily E55-paper¹¹⁰⁷. This is in itself an instance of oscillation between different media, and a remarkable instance of *Medienverbund*; at the end the NRC even awarded De Vries a special ‘medal of honour’ for his work at the E55¹¹⁰⁸.

The chief operator of TV55 was filmmaker Theo van Haren Noman, who worked together with a group of cameramen, including Ruud Herblot and Jan Schaper¹¹⁰⁹. Recording and

¹¹⁰¹ The first television programme in the Netherlands (DE TOVERSPIEGEL, NTS), was broadcast on 1951-10-02. At that time, about 400 television sets existed in the Netherlands. Two weeks later (1951-10-16), KRO television showed its first programme, presented by Mies Bouwman, which was shown in Rotterdam on three television monitors that were installed on a van in front of the Schouwburg, for an audience of a hundreds of people. The presentation of television in Rotterdam was reported by KRO-radio ‘Eerste televisieuitzending KRO’ (1951-10-16, Leo Pagano, Paul de Waart), B&G: id 18814, 9’59”, ¼ inch tape nr. HA313. It was a direct promotion for the new medium (Pagano: “We kunnen concluderen dat de publieke belangstelling steeds groter wordt – Nog niet in actieve koopkracht omgezet. Nederlanders kijken eerst de kat uit de boom – Maar u kunt beter thuis kijken dan op deze parkeerplaats met koude voeten staan te kijken”).

¹¹⁰² See: Akkermans, 1998: 100.

¹¹⁰³ Van der Struijs, 2006: 1.

¹¹⁰⁴ According to Akkermans, 1998: 97.

¹¹⁰⁵ See: ‘Erik de Vries, uitgebreide biografie’, 2004-03-25; www.beeldengeluid.nl

¹¹⁰⁶ E.g. Piet Muyselaar, Cees de Lange, Wim Kan, Jan de Cler, Joop Geesink.

¹¹⁰⁷ Willem Duys was one of its journalists. He would later become a well-known television presenter (De Winter, 1988: 44).

¹¹⁰⁸ Akkermans, 1998: 99.

¹¹⁰⁹ Van Haren Noman is mentioned by Akkermans (1998: 98); Herblot is mentioned by Burcksen (personal communication, 2007-05-22) and Schaper is mentioned in a letter of Stichting Televisie ‘55 to Jan Schaper (1955-04-06); personal archive Jan Schaper.

broadcasting took place in a special studio (1014m²), which was designed for this purpose by the architects Van den Broek & Bakema. It was open to the public. The technical equipment of the studio was provided by Philips, except for the three cameras that were made by RCA. Part of the television programming were quizzes and games, like the PHILIPS ELECTRONISCHE TIENKAMP (“Philips Electronic Decathlon”)¹¹¹⁰, presented by Mies Bouwman, which were combined with commercials (e.g. PHILIPS SUPER M, PHILIPS RADIO, PHILIPS KOFFIEMOLEN)¹¹¹¹. They neatly combined with the exhibitions in the pavilions (i.e. another instance of ‘oscillation’). Next to the studio recordings, one also made reports of the activities across the E55 exhibition. For that purpose, the crew members drove around with a mobile studio unit – an especially furnished Citroën HY bus.

Among the films shown were informative films, documentaries and commercials. Several shorts were made by Louis van Gasteren, including a commercial and six informative films about ‘electro acid’, for which he founded the company ‘Telespot’ that existed only for the E55¹¹¹². One of the major film companies that contributed to the programme was Polygoon, whose director, Joop Landré, was both a member of the TV55 programming committee and a member of the E55 publicity committee¹¹¹³. First of all, Polygoon paid attention to the manifestation through newsreels, shot by cameraman Joop Burcksen¹¹¹⁴. The first of three reports shows the construction of the exhibition and other preparations. It was followed by a report of the opening and of activities that took place a few weeks later¹¹¹⁵.

Besides news reports, Polygoon took part in the production of various films, shows and commercials. Most of them were made by Burcksen too¹¹¹⁶. One of the most striking films presented at the E55, according to various reviews, was his short EEN WANDELING DOOR ROTTERDAM (“A walk through Rotterdam”), which promoted the city and its businesses. A couple in love, played by Mies Bouwman and Kees Brusse, makes an excursion through the utterly modern, shining and attractive city, to end up at cinema Lumière. In the darkness the cinema’s name lights up in neon, emphasizing visually what it says: Lumière. It becomes an abstract play of light and graphics in a film referring to the origins of film. The narrator says:

And then it was time to go to Lumière, which is a credit to its name at night, when Lumière is indeed a fairy-tale of light. The most beautiful films from the world are shown here. You can now have a look yourself at which film runs this week.¹¹¹⁷

The film embodies the encounter between television (TV55) and film (Polygoon), while it addressed the importance of cinema (Lumière), as an attraction to visit and to experience the city, which the film itself reflects as well. For the E55 Burcksen also made separate promotional films for the cinemas ‘Lumière’ and ‘Thalia’, as well as the ‘Groothandelsgebouw’.

For Philips the event was a success: the E55 caused a boom in the sales of television sets. Spectators, however, wanted a continuation of commercial television, according to a NIPO-

¹¹¹⁰ De Winter, 1988: 77.

¹¹¹¹ These commercials are part of the Philips collection of the Nederlands Film Museum (see: ‘Philips’ in filmography). Another film that might have been shown here too is PHILIPS IN NEDERLAND (1955), produced by Polygram Films.

¹¹¹² Afterwards he did not continue the productions of commercials. It makes them unique in his oeuvre, but unfortunately they have been lost – information by Van Gasteren in a conversation with the author, 2003-10-07.

¹¹¹³ Pp93/98, *Catalogus E55*, Rotterdam: Drukkerij Trio-Hillegersberg, 1955.

¹¹¹⁴ Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws, 1955 (55-07) ‘De Opbouw van De E55’; (55-21) ‘HM Koningin Juliana Opent E55’; (55-27) ‘E55 Manifestatie van Nederlands Energie’.

¹¹¹⁵ Resp. Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws 1955-07, 1955-21, 1955-27.

¹¹¹⁶ For example, a commercial for the Dutch paper industry.

¹¹¹⁷ Original quote: Toen was ’t tijd om naar Lumière te gaan, dat zijn naam ’s avonds wel eer aandoet. Want Lumière is dan inderdaad een sprookje van licht. De mooiste films uit de wereldproductie worden hier getoond. U kunt trouwens nu zelf zien welke er deze week draait.

survey¹¹¹⁸. As television director and historian Leo Akkermans (1998) has pointed out, journalists were critical of this claim. Although the experiment of commercial television had no direct follow up, a few years later, TV55 director Jo Brandel became the director of the commercial television pirate TV Noordzee of the *Reclame Exploitatie Maatschappij*. Polygoon director Joop Landré would be its programme adviser, and subsequently the director of television station TROS that emerged out of it. In this way TV55 exercised its influence on the course of Dutch television, alongside its impact on film production in Rotterdam and the image of the modern city.

§ 4. events in perspective

The events in Rotterdam offered frames for an urban culture at large, since they dealt with aspects of daily life – both public and private, work and leisure, as well as commerce and industry, through design, architecture, art, media, performances and games. According to De Winter, ‘young designers and artists like Karel Appel, Wim Crowel and Constant Nieuwenhuys got a chance to explore new ways to experiment with a new visual language, which would resonate for a long time in many fields after the different events had taken place’¹¹¹⁹. Appel, for example, produced a large art work of glass and concrete at the Hofplein Theatre in the ‘Technikon’ building (1955-1970, Hugh Maaskant)¹¹²⁰. Crowel would create various projects, such as a design for the Femina fair¹¹²¹. Constant elaborated on the E55 through his utopian project New Babylon (1956-1974), which is of special interest here.

New Babylon became an important reference within the history of Dutch architecture and urbanism¹¹²². His plan consisted of one large urban network, in the form of connected sectors built over existing cities, including Amsterdam and Rotterdam, as well as cities abroad. This overall ‘city’ was based on automation and information technologies that enabled leisure, play, mobility and adventure, which created a dynamic and temporal environment. Sectors could be modified accordingly, because of industrially fabricated building elements, not unlike those of the E55¹¹²³. In order to express the dynamic character, Constant made moving models, which Hy Hirsh used for the film *GYROMORPHOSIS* (1958)¹¹²⁴. Its movement was still ‘mechanical’, but this was a first step. Electronic machines would do the work humans used to do, for people to concentrate on challenging activities. Work and leisure would be no longer separated, but interwoven – not ‘alienating’, but ‘liberating’, as a matter of self-development. Constant spoke of the *homo ludens* – the playing human, after Johan Huizinga. The inhabitants of New Babylon would live like nomads, being commuters and tourists at the same time. It promised a new human interaction and experience; the environment and society would be one, through a kind of utopian *Medienverbund*. Constant called this ‘unitary urbanism’, as explained in a VPRO television

¹¹¹⁸ Akkermans, 1998: 99.

¹¹¹⁹ Original quote (De Winter, 1988: 11): ‘Jonge ontwerpers en kunstenaars als Karel Appel, Wim Crowel en Constant Nieuwenhuys, kregen een kans om nieuwe wegen in te slaan en te experimenteren met een andere beedtaal, die nog lang na afloop van de verschillende festivals op vele gebieden zou doorklinken.’

¹¹²⁰ Appel got involved with the project around 1962, see: Emous, 1970: 13.

¹¹²¹ Nicolai-Chaillet, 1960.

¹¹²² See: Taverne, 1983: 30/40-43; Groenendijk & Vollaard, 1998: 26; Wigley, 1998; Heynen, 1999: 151.

¹¹²³ Standardised elements were applied through the concept of ‘core elements’, to which smaller elements were attached (cf. De Winter, 1988: 43).

¹¹²⁴ Different sources provide different dates. I follow Wigley, 1998: 238. About this film Hirsh wrote: ‘*Gyromorphosis* strives to bring into actuality the inherent kinetic qualities seen in the construction-sculpture of Constant Nieuwenhuys of Amsterdam. To realise this aim I have put into motion, one by one, pieces of this sculpture and, with colored lighting, filmed them in various detail, overlaying the images on the film as they appear and disappear. In this way I have hoped to produce sensations of acceleration and suspension which are suggested to me by the sculpture itself.’ Hy Hirsh, from ‘Articulated Light programme notes’, www.iotacenter.org/Hirsh/

program¹¹²⁵. ‘The project radicalizes and idealizes the transitory aspects of the experience of modernity’, as Heynen has said (1999: 151-152).

New Babylon is actually an amplification of the E55, regarding its premises and concept, the connections it established, and its design. Constant’s models are akin to Bakema’s plan and designs for the entrance composition, the complex of connected halls, and the pavilion of space travel, among others¹¹²⁶. In terms of networks, the E55 resulted from a series of events, including travelling exhibitions that showed the reconstruction plans for Rotterdam in various European cities. Alternatively, Bakema contributed to various other manifestations that created a ‘network of events’; in 1957 he produced the Dutch part of the architecture exhibition ‘Interbau’ in Berlin (1957), and with Boks and Rietveld he designed the Dutch pavilion at the World Exhibition in Brussels (1958)¹¹²⁷. A similar observation can be made, for example, of Philips, which was present at many large events. It is of particular interest since it was largely involved with electronic automation, which it promoted through electronic means, such as the television game PHILIPS ELECTRONIC DECATHLON. This followed a tradition, including the annual Femina fair, since 1948, which presented also household innovations¹¹²⁸.

During the war the *Nederlandsche Vrouwen Electriciteits Vereniging* (“Dutch Women Electricity Association”) had already commissioned the promotional film ELECTRO BLIJSPEL (“Electro Comedy”, 1942, J.S. van de Nieuwendijk). Six years later, the same director made HET ELECTRISCH HUIS (“The Electric House”). Its futuristic message contradicts the medium: a silent film with intertitles. The first titles say: ‘Your grandmother, 50 years ago, did not cycle, did not practice sports, moved with a horse-boat, and used petrol light. Many things that your grandchild will find indispensable in the future [i.e. 2000] already exist now’¹¹²⁹. There is a map of a modern bungalow, and subsequently the bright façade of the house, recorded at night. Two young ladies approach it and ring the electric door bell. The hostess picks up a phone and opens the door by a remote control. The ladies get a tour through the house, and so does the spectator. It is a show of all kinds of electronic equipment: a fridge, boilers, lamps under the beds that are ‘practical when taking care of children and ill people’, and heated cabinets for warm clothes. The women suddenly get a glimpse of a man shaving himself, and move quickly on to a greenhouse, as part of the living, which ‘brings atmosphere’. At the end they walk around like photographers, measuring the light with ‘luxmeters’, to adjust the light in order to read.

Films with a similar message would also be made afterwards. An example is the Polygoon production VOLG DIE VROUW (“Follow that woman”, 1959), which was commissioned by the “Association of Operators of Electricity Companies in the Netherlands” and directed by Kees Brusse. As an actor Brusse had been present at the E55, for his role in the Polygoon film EEN WANDELING DOOR ROTTERDAM. In ‘Follow that Woman’ he played the role of a man who does not trust his wife (played by Brusse’s wife Mieke Verstraete), since she is only doing pleasant things (like going to the movies). Therefore he asks a detective (played by Bueno de Mesquita), to follow her. The film opens in film-noir style, full of suspense, but soon it develops into slapstick. The detective must hide himself in the most unlikely places, in the fridge, which opportunity he uses to have a lunch, and in a centrifuge, where he gets laundry on his head and is centrifuged. The man makes a sound of bubbles and when he gets out, he still tolls around, which

¹¹²⁵ ATELIERBEZOEK; MET SIMON VINKENOOG NAAR HET NIEUW BABYLON VAN CONSTANT (Simon Vinkenoog, VPRO television 1962-04-02); cf. OPENBAAR KUNSTBEZIT; CONSTANT, EEN KUNSTENAAR VAN ONZE TIJD (Jan Venema, NTS 1965-07-12).

¹¹²⁶ His models resemble also the sculptures of the Russian constructivist Naum Gabo, who drew at that time one of his major works, ‘Het Ding’ (1954-1957), for the Bijenkorf departmentstore in Rotterdam, see: Brinkman, 2002: 138-139.

¹¹²⁷ The Dutch pavilion was 25,000m²; together with those of France, USA and USSR it was one of the largest.

¹¹²⁸ Newsreels on this fair, which would take place at Ahoy’ after 1950, were made on a regular basis since 1959: NTS JOURNAAL, 1959-09-25 (on the 12th Femina); following edition were consequently reported by the NTS as well.

¹¹²⁹ Intertitles; original quote: ‘Uw grootmoeder 50 jaar geleden fietste niet, deed niet aan sport, zat in de trekschuit en had petroleumlicht. Toch gebruikte men de vélocipède, werd reeds getennist, bestond de stoommachine en kende men gaslicht. Veel van wat Uw kleindochter te zijner tijd als onmisbaar zal beschouwen, bestaat ook thans.’

is accompanied by fast jazz music. He understands finally that the woman has so much spare time because she has furnished her modern apartment – in a modern high-rise housing block – with all kinds of electric household equipment. The housewife became the *homo ludens par excellence*.

The reconstruction era is generally considered as a no-nonsense period. Things had to be useful, functional and sober. At the same time one was concerned with leisure, which made up the complementary factor. In this way we can also understand other examples of fictionalised promotional films, such as *DRIE DAGEN MET MONICA* (1956, Wil van Es), which was initially conceived for the E55. The practical purposes of such films allowed for cinematic play, which suggested a promising future that provided a reason for today's tasks. It was reinforced by other media, like television, and also amateur film, like recordings of one's visit to the E55.

By 1960, the reconstruction had entered its last stage. Hence the character of the large events also changed. The next one, which was the Floriade (1960), was devoted to floriculture and horticulture. Although it was all about enjoying natural beauty, this show of growth and blossoming had its economic reasons too, to give an impulse to the important and proud Dutch industry of horticulture. Moreover, Dutch agriculture needed to be modernised, which was stimulated by showing the possible results of it.

The Floriade was the last event out of three held in Het Park, and from this event to permanent verdure in this park was a small step. The Floriade became institutionalised within the national context as a quintannual event, to be organised in different places in the Netherlands. In 1967 the Ahoy' hall was finally removed from 'Het Park' and relocated to the Heliport terrain where it was used, among others, for a flower exhibition called 'Lentiade' (*lente* = spring)¹¹³⁰. The so-called 'Energiehal' was relocated to an area close to the original Nenijs location. It stayed there for about forty years, until it had to make space for an extension of Blijdorp Zoo. The urban culture had spread and enlarged itself; the city had gradually incorporated the complementary dimension of leisure and entertainment, in order to animate the city.

¹¹³⁰ The event was opened by Mayor Thomassen on the 15th of March 1967; impressions of the exhibition are to be seen in the film report *LENTIADE* (1967, Henk Vrijmoet).

RECAPITULATION OF PART II – THE CINEMATIC RECONSTRUCTION OF A CITY

After the bombardment of May 1940, Rotterdam had to reinvent itself. It strengthened the commitment of its citizens with their city, as reflected by amateur recordings, which I have addressed in terms of stigmergy. The subsequent reconstruction of the city took place over about two decades, which had to go beyond the achievements of seven centuries. Therefore it has been possible to observe, in accordance with the theory of cultural ecology, the culture core and its radiation. The reconstruction of the port got priority, which was shown by the short film *ROTTERDAM AAN DEN SLAG* (1946, Penning & Van der Horst). Under the heading of ‘stretching the liquid’, I have traced links between the port, planning and film practices.

The growth of the port required appropriate infrastructure, industrial facilities, and housing for its workers. Commissioned films supported this development, by channelling visions and directions. In a broader view there has been a double move: while shipping and industry fed the local culture and the city’s development, they became also engaged with a world system of trade, emigration, and defence. These issues were subject to the rise of higher levels of sociocultural integration. This rise has similarly been mediated and recorded by films, which in turn were also affected by it.

The development of the port enabled the reconstruction of the city, which was mainly carried out in the 1950s, but largely prepared in the preceding decade. Because of the destruction of the city, and the void that was the result of it, I have raised the question, following Crimson (2002), what a city is like when it has no longer a material form. I have articulated here the issue of urban identity and the collective cognitive domain (cf. Conti, 2005). In this perspective media became important. They were applied, as a part of development strategies, to communicate values and views that motivated and promoted modern urbanism and the reconstruction plans in particular. The void became a screen on which memories and possible futures were projected. Plans and films were both spatial *and* temporal indicators. In accordance with the ideas of Luhmann (1997), I have addressed this as a matter of ‘memory’ and ‘oscillation’ that draw a difference between past and future and, along with it, a temporal horizon. Through building, one could simply read progress, while achievements were communicated by way of film, which offered (positive) feedback. Moreover, films presented a concentrated image of what was happening, which emphasised the new. They were ‘oscillators’ that provided a model, according to a general attractor of social-economic welfare (cf. Wagenaar, 1992).

This attractor rose through an interplay between developments in the world and the city’s own urge for development. While the bombardment had been an external intervention, which has been underscored by the UFA film *ANGRIFF AUF ROTTERDAM*, the question of how to recover had been answered by state planner Ringers, and subsequently by Van der Leeuw as well as city planner Van Traa, and the ‘scenius’ of the Club Rotterdam. In this perspective I have discussed the film *EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM* (1950, Polygoon-Profilti). Being the first major reconstruction film on Rotterdam after *ROTTERDAM AAN DEN SLAG*, it drew a history that rhetorically presented the new plan as self-evident.

Various other reconstruction films provided feedback to the city, in different ways. In some cases film was a monitoring device at the end of a process, to document the results, and to provide input to new projects; sometimes it was a matter of promotion, of achievements like the ‘Lijnbaan’ and the ‘Groothandelsgebouw’, which provided positive feedback, while film was also used (e.g. by Gemeentewerken) as a research tool, as a model to communicate or channel urban plans, or for reasons of analysis and evaluation, education and information. To address, alternatively, the creative and directive forces of film, I have occasionally spoken of ‘projective reflexivity’. It is a kind of monitoring according to a certain assumption or idea of what will or should happen.

The imaginative aspect of film also appeared in the trend to present information through fiction, which added entertainment to the functionality of the city. Imaginative power was, furthermore, part of films like *STEADY!* (1952, Herman van der Horst), which explored cinematographic possibilities that appealed to the senses, although the objective was still to promote the reconstruction plans. Whereas Rotterdam was already a city of labour for its dockworkers, as shown by the film, this was reinforced by the construction workers. The port had given Rotterdam the image of industry and modernity; construction strengthened it through the idea of progress and building the future. This image would be cultivated through cinema.

Many films about Rotterdam (i.e. *Tatort*) were produced elsewhere (i.e. *Standort*). The clustering of film production companies in Haarlem, and Hilversum later on, points to a higher level of socio-cultural integration. By drawing networks, it has nevertheless become clear that most films about Rotterdam were still related to the city's institutions, its reflexivity and identity. This counts also for newsreels and documentaries that monitored Rotterdam as an index for national economic growth and the Dutch spirit to reconstruct the country. The production company Polygoon has been a case in point, since it made, next to newsreels, various films for the municipality and companies in Rotterdam. It has shown that the three As of Elsaesser even apply when there is no direct commissioner. Agents move into common directions due to larger structures and their attractors.

The institutions of Rotterdam were linked to national and international ones. Institutions that integrated developments at higher levels of social organisation were, among others, the Ministry of Reconstruction and the Mutual Security Agency (i.e. Marshall Plan), which became manifest in the films by Van der Horst (*ROTTERDAM AAN DEN SLAG*, 1946; *STEADY!*, 1952). Something similar applies to foreign reports that showed Rotterdam as a model of reconstruction, within a general European history. With socio-cultural integration taking place at an international level, differentiation and even opposition occurred at lower levels. Certain films and buildings that were enabled through the Mutual Security Agency (i.e. against the Eastern bloc), were actually produced by people engaged with the political left.

Different agents were directed by the attractor of social welfare, to be achieved through modernisation and rationalisation. Rotterdam linked it to its image of a 'city of labour', which empowered its development up until the 1960s. It preceded, according to Paul van de Laar (2000), the emergence of 'a city of culture'. However, 'culture' is seen here in a narrow way, which is common to the humanities (cf. the paradigms of *auteur* and art cinema) and that resonates in the social sciences, for example when economic geographers speak of 'cultural industries'. Most fundamentally, culture implies all human expressions; 'cultural industries' is a tautology. Similarly, the culture of Rotterdam is not 'additional' to its economy (cf. Van Ulzen, 2007: 149). At last, Van de Laar acknowledges this too when he refers to a lecture by the writer Wim Wagener at Museum Boymans in 1948. 'The culture of the city ought not to be, in his eyes, "her Sunday coat, which one can take off her, and hang on a nail to look at it"; one had to realise "that culture makes its way till the plate you eat from, and till the chair on which you sit"¹¹³¹. In a similar way, architecture and cinema, among other forms of modern culture, actively framed Rotterdam as a city of labour. The *Bouwcentrum* is a case in point, which I have addressed, with a reference to Hediger and Vonderau, in terms of record, rhetorics and rationalisation.

As mentioned in the introduction, Van de Laar has finally said that Rotterdam is hardly able to do away with its image of a city of labour. Its culture is simply rooted in this 'culture core'. It is, in terms of Luhmann (2000 [1995]: 158), 'a self-generated nucleus of autopoietic autonomy, which is recognised and utilised only in retrospect.' The city's appearance does not

¹¹³¹ Van de Laar, 2000: 589, quoting W.A. Wagener (from *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1949). Original quote (from Van de Laar): 'De cultuur van de stad mocht in zijn ogen niet zijn "haar Zondagse jasje, hetwelk men haar uit kan trekken en aan een spijker te kijk kan hangen"; men moest zich realiseren "dat cultuur dóórwerkt tot op het bord waarvan u eet, tot aan de stoel waarop u zit."

necessarily stay the same, which is maybe the actual concern of Van de Laar¹¹³². As Luhmann has it (ibid): ‘If evolution suggests a gradual process that occasionally makes a leap forward, the question is always how much complexity may still be compatible with the autopoietic autonomy of a system whose irritability by the environment increases accordingly.’

The development of the port has thus been preconditional for urban development that has subsequently been channelled by plans and media as ‘multiple extensions’ of the culture core. This has been recognised, quite literally, in the extension of the city by building new suburbs and enlarging neighbouring towns such as Schiedam and Vlaardingen. Cinema, in its turn, extended planning, which has been exemplified by the film *VLAARDINGEN KOERST OP MORGEN* (1955/1958, Jan Schaper).

Partly inspired by Mumford, one advocated the *wijkgedachte*. It was combined with industrial production methods to fight housing shortage and to explore possibilities of spatial design. Since industrial production needed a critical mass, various films were made to explain the urgency. At the same time they stressed the need for international exchange, since construction materials had to be imported. It was paralleled by the appropriation of foreign construction methods, like that of Coignet, which was promoted by the film *ALLE VOGELS HEBBEN NESTEN* (1961, Louis van Gasteren); sponsored by Dura, with additional support of the ministry of planning, it embodies the joined forces of avant-garde and industry, of social engagement and business, and, eventually, it exemplifies the convergence between culture and economy.

Beyond the rhetorics of labour, the *act* of building became an experience in itself, a ‘reality film’ (which I have illustrated by the *Rondrit Wederopbouw*). Various other events have exemplified the convergence between economy and culture, among them exhibitions that took place during WWII and a series of large manifestations that were organised afterwards, with the Ahoy’ being the first one (1950). This event, to celebrate the reconstruction and the port, was characterised by a collaboration between the arts (i.e. *Medienverbund*). It was a factor in the animation of the new city. Regarding the Ahoy’ I have distinguished three kinds of media practices: films shown here did not necessarily refer to the event, nor to Rotterdam, but promoted its values or ‘intensions’; reports about the event were its ‘extensions’; and amateur films, which became increasingly important, were its ‘retentions’, since they remained hidden serving private memories. Such practices were intensified by the E55. With the help of Philips, commercial television was introduced, which showed productions like *EEN WANDELING DOOR ROTTERDAM* (1955, Joop Burcksen), next to various advertisements. Within the overall theme of ‘energy’ the products and the modes of presentation reinforced one another.

Whereas *Medienverbund* applies to *different media* propelling a common agenda, I have also observed that *different events* propelled a common agenda, which implies a *Medienverbund* at yet another level. I have illustrated it through links between the E55, Interbau (Berlin, 1957), and EXPO ’58 (Brussels), with the architect Bakema and the filmmaker Schaper as the connecting agents. I have also pointed to Constant’s work at the E55, and his project New Babylon that would visualise such a ‘union of events’. Due to different alliances and cross-connections, I have hopefully provided an idea of a self-reflexive cultural ecology that applies to the city and beyond.

¹¹³² Cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 8 (i.e. mission statement).

PART III.

THE CINEMATIC PROLIFERATION OF A CITY ROTTERDAM IN THE 1960s & 1970s

PROLOGUE TO PART III

modernism moreover, final destination

The rise of television in the 1950s caused a process of ‘cinematic bifurcation’: the splitting of cinema as a system, and the resulting proliferation of audiovisual productions¹¹³³. This happened in terms of formats, numbers and kinds of productions, which corresponds to an observation by Niklas Luhmann regarding the arts and media in general.

In the evolution of artistic genres, the development of types bifurcates in the wake of the differentiation of perceptual media for seeing and hearing and along with the differentiation of space and time. Any further development becomes a matter of additional bifurcations (text-art, painting, sculpture) or of combining seeing and hearing (film, theater). Under these frame conditions, a differentiation of genres occurs, which is culturally and historically important but unstable (Luhmann, 2000 [1995]: 231).

Television offered a range of programmes that had developed from cinema newsreels and documentaries¹¹³⁴. Due to the relatively low production costs of television, it allowed for approaches different from those of cinema, including critical reflections.

Until the 1970s, feature films were mostly left to cinema, since they required large investments and much production time, which television could not yet afford. Private commissions for promotional films were left to cinema too. Most film production companies, however, worked in both fields simultaneously¹¹³⁵.

Along with cinematic bifurcation, large numbers of (television) documentaries, newsreels, promotion films and some features appeared, as ‘extensions’ of public events and city life, or they communicated the ‘intentions’ of social-cultural, commercial and political bodies. As such I will consider both cinema and television and take their particularities and connections into account. However, as Luhmann remarks, the differentiation of genres is generally unstable, unlike the urban identity and the motivations to make films, which are subject to ‘path dependency’¹¹³⁶. The increasing complexity of the media landscape caused nevertheless a change.

Due to the bifurcation of cinema, the mediated perception of the city became more personalised. It can be illustrated by the flourishing practice of amateur film production¹¹³⁷. The *Rotterdamse Smalfilm Liga* was particularly successful¹¹³⁸. Its films, such as the personal documentary short ROTTERDAM, MY HOME PORT (1965, J. Harmsma), won many prizes within

¹¹³³ Based on the notion of bifurcation from complexity theory, see: CALResCo, 2008: §6.5.

¹¹³⁴ Besides news programmes, one can mention many kinds of television ‘magazines’ and genres here. In respect of productions that have also featured Rotterdam, one can consider youth programmes such as VERREKIJKER (NTS, 1960s) and TOEKOMSTMUZIEK (1963, Jan Schaper / NCRV); consumer information programmes such as KONING KLANT and OMBUDSMAN (i.e. Frits Bom, see: VARA), sports programmes, such as SPORT IN BEELD (NTS) etcetera. Occasionally, due to low production costs, television also allowed for productions that had previously been the realm of avant-garde cinema, such as the short ‘city symphony’ RITME (“Rhythm”, 1960, Ruud Keers/NCRV), which combines images of the construction works with images of the port.

¹¹³⁵ Till the end of the 1970s, television programmes were still often shot on film, and although it was 16mm rather than 35mm, the same techniques and infrastructure were used (many promotion films were shot on 16mm too).

¹¹³⁶ The (economic) theory of ‘path dependency’ became paradigmatic in the 1980s by the work of the economists Paul David and Brian Arthur (a.o.), to explain issues of ‘lock-in’. Ever since, it has had an important influence on (economic) geography too, where it has often been seen as a positive force (e.g. for the process of industrial clustering), cf: Scott, 2000 & 2005, Conti, 2005: 25; Britton, 2007.

¹¹³⁷ Besides film clubs there have also been youth houses (e.g. Arend en de Zeemeeuw; De Jeugdhaven, i.e. Bouke Ottow; De Brandaris, i.e. J.M. van Riet), various social-cultural organisations (e.g. Ons Rotterdam, i.e. Wessel Vermeulen; Stella Maris, i.e. W.B. Waardenburg), or enterprises with employees that made film recordings (e.g. the Blijdorp Zoo, i.e. H. Rueb; GEB, i.e. J. Lucas, see the film: GEB HULPCENTRALE, 1970) – for examples of titles, see: filmography and furthermore the collection of GAR.

¹¹³⁸ Smits (2002: 46) mentions all kinds of film groups emerging within the RSL, and also outside it.

the nationally and internationally well-organised amateur film circuit¹¹³⁹. In the late 1970s, the RSL also organised public screenings of its films, at the so-called ‘Film-In’ (Hofplein theatre)¹¹⁴⁰. Moreover, many citizens started to make private 8mm recordings: ‘retentions’ of happenings in public space, of everyday situations and domestic life, and often in combination¹¹⁴¹. Such films can be seen as a way to ‘appropriate’ the city; they appear as cinematic markers of that environment, in which one acts and communicates, and helps to develop. What these recordings show, above all, is that the city is not perceived or used as a homogeneous place; instead of a limited number of commonly known sites, they show a range of individual references, in and outside the city.

All these audiovisual productions together presented the new city in as many ways, different from the previous period. Until the early 1960s, films on the reconstruction of Rotterdam highlighted its premises and achievements. They put cognitive accents in the urban fabric and created focus points, such as the saved town hall, the reconstructed St. Laurens church, the banks that were early milestones of the reconstruction, and projects such as the ‘Central Station’, the ‘Lijnbaan’ and the ‘Groothandelsgebouw’. In the next decades, however, such buildings were no longer principal references in the daily lives of most citizens. Various services of the town hall became decentralised; while the St. Laurens Church was reconstructed, other churches were demolished, like the once praised ‘Koninginnekerk’ (1904-1907, B. Hooykaas, M. Brinkman), which had a direct impact on the skyline and soundscape of Rotterdam¹¹⁴²; banks in the city lost their primacy as they were incorporated by larger banking chains; the railway station had to fight the emerging hegemony of the car, and although the ‘Lijnbaan’ and the ‘Groothandelsgebouw’ remained important, various other commercial centres were built.

The ‘Groothandelsgebouw’ (1945-1952, Maaskant & Van Tijen), however, is a particular case. While this trade centre became an icon of the city’s progress, the building had various faces and functions, and it was open to different kinds of users. As such it set a trend. Maaskant explored this as well with ‘Technikon’ (1955-1970), a complex with eight technical schools, gyms, a theatre, and a swimming bath, among other. A fine, but relatively unknown example of a

¹¹³⁹ This film won the first prize of the Dutch NOVA-festival and the golden medal at the festival of the *Union Internationale du Cinéma* (UNICA, 1966) – www.rvsl.nl/de_staat_van_dienst.htm (2007-08-17), i.e. Rotterdamse Video and Smalfilm Liga (overview of titles), see also this website for other titles of films within all kinds of genres.

¹¹⁴⁰ Smits, 2002: 58.

¹¹⁴¹ Exemplary are the films by Jan Soek, who made, next to family recordings, ‘city walks’, such as *IMPRESSIES VAN ROTTERDAM* (1955-1979, Soek), with images as different as the demolition of houses on the Noordplein, the river Rotte, the construction of the Shell building, as well as a protest demonstration at the Schouwburgplein against nuclear weapons. He also filmed strictly personal references, including shops and people, see e.g. *WANDELING DOOR ROTTERDAM* (1978-1982). Soek also made his own ‘city news’ (*CAPITOL STADSNIUWS*). It included all kinds of subjects, among them many constructions works and events in the city. Among the projects that he meticulously ‘appropriated’ was the reconstruction of the St. Laurens church (1952-1968). Soek asked filmmaker Ron Corbet to edit the material into the film *RECONSTRUCTIE LAURENSKERK*, for public screening, most likely at Soek’s café-restaurant Capitol (Nieuwe Binnenweg 345) – ref.: ‘Caféhouder maakt Laurenskerk-film’, p9 in: *De Tijd/De Maasbode*, 1970-04-30. Another example is the collection of 8mm recordings made by J.A. Visser, including *ROTTERDAM IN DE ZEVENTIGER JAREN* (1968-1975, J.A. Visser); it starts with domestic activities, while it also includes, for example, the opening of ‘Scholencomplex Technikon’ (1970) by Queen Juliana and Mayor Thomassen. Many other examples of such recordings can be found in the film collection of the GAR, see e.g. Lensink-Bosman, B. Broersen, J.C. de Geus, Heynsius, J.W. van Loon, J. Nauta, M.G. v/d Rovaart, W. Vermeulen, J. Verseveld e.a.

¹¹⁴² The Koninginnekerk was demolished in 1972. Some other examples of churches that were demolished are ‘H. Ignatius’ (1892, arch. P. Cuypers, demolished 1968); ‘St. Franciscuskerk’ (1912-1913, arch. J. Magry, demolished 1975), see the amateur film: *SLUITING VAN DE KERK* (1975, P. v./d. Bosch); ‘H. Theresiakerk’ (1928, arch. P. Buskens – dem. 1972), St. Josephkerk (1881/1928-dem. 1974) – this church was closed in 1969 and used again for various other activities in the next years, which could not prevent, however, its eventual demolition (see: Polygoon, 1969-wk35). For a number of churches that were demolished, see: Wagenaar, 1995-1996: 330, 332; Van de Laar, 2000: 578. All of this was a very quick change within about ten years, if one considers just the fact that still shortly before various new churches had been built, which were also heralded by television, e.g. *HET HUIS VOOR GOD EN ONS* (1960, Manus van de Kamp, KRO); *MORGEN IS HET ZONDAG* (NCRV, 1962-11-03); *PAROCHIE IN EEN GROTE STAD* (KRO, 1966-09-06); *KERKBOUW* (NCRV, 1969-09-29) a.o.

multifunctional building that applied such ideas as well, albeit at a much smaller scale, is the 'Ecumenical Centre' (1961-1968, Rietveld, Van Dillen, Van Tricht). In its religious approach the centre unites different views, and so does its spatial design. It houses a multitude of functions, including a meeting hall, a sports hall, a library, lodgings, and workrooms, in a cubic volume¹¹⁴³. One can wonder why this building, a late work by Gerrit Rietveld, was not shown by films, not even by a NCRV television report on an international ecumenical youth congress that took place in Rotterdam at the time of its construction¹¹⁴⁴. The fact that the congress was reported, however, seems most important here. Architecture and media complemented one another. Although there were still films on the production of major buildings, the programmatic side of the built environment, and its actual use, received more attention.

A parallel can be observed between the emerging complexity of perspectives upon the urban environment and a growing spatial complexity. Built structures became larger, while the industrialisation of construction methods took command¹¹⁴⁵. New suburbs appeared, such as 'Alexanderpolder' (1952-1967, Beese, Bakema e.a.)¹¹⁴⁶. One of its main sectors was the quarter 'Ommoord' (1962-1977, Beese), which became emblematic as a modernist project, for its scale and height, up to fifteen floors¹¹⁴⁷. Besides suburbs, infrastructure was created too: a metro, a ring road (*De Ruit*), an airport, the Europoort, and container terminals, which have all been the subject of numerous newsreels and promotional films.

Service accommodations were built, like offices, banks, and hotels, such as the 'Rijnhotel' (1949-1959, Merkelbach & Elling¹¹⁴⁸), to be seen in the promotion film ROTTERDAM (1962, Eimert Kruidhof), and the 'Hilton Hotel' (1956-1964, H. Maaskant, F.W. de Vlaming), which mainly served business interests. It was also an architectural statement, for its interior design and its abstract composition that corresponded to the 'International Style'. The identity of Rotterdam relied upon an image of efficiency and rationality, and linked up to that of 'a city of labour'. This, however, was as much a matter of culture as it was an economic concern. Culture was not the 'icing on the cake', it was the cake. Along with its architecture, and in congruence with the city's social-economic institutions, the new city became also a showroom of modern art, with famous sculptures by Ossip Zadkine, Naum Gabo, Wessel Couzijn, Henry Moore and many others, which were, in turn, highlighted by television¹¹⁴⁹. In Rotterdam in the 1960s, the arts in general became increasingly the subject of television programmes¹¹⁵⁰. Next to that, various institutions for the arts were established that also expressed the modern values of Rotterdam, as an integral part of its development strategies.

¹¹⁴³ Cf. 'Ammanstichting' (1959-1962, H.V. Gerretsen), i.e. a combination of housing and education for deaf children.

¹¹⁴⁴ At 'De Doelen': ONDERWEG (NCRV, 1967-03-04), a report made by Jan Schaper and Christine van Roon.

¹¹⁴⁵ Nycolaas, 1983: 201. Pre-fabricated building largely contributed to the record of 6,000 new houses built in Rotterdam in 1962, and another 6,000 or so in the rest of the agglomeration.

¹¹⁴⁶ This major project, which was initially called 'Alexanderstad', is shown in e.g. BOUW PRINS ALEXANDERPOLDER (1967, Henk Vrijmoet), cf. ALEXANDERPOLDER (1962, Jan Soek).

¹¹⁴⁷ See also: OMMOORD (1972, Tonko Tomei).

¹¹⁴⁸ The initiator of the project, the youth organisation AMVJ (YMCA), began with it around 1949 and Piet Elling got soon involved with the development of the building, which was completed in 1957-1959, see: De Wagt, 2008: 372.

¹¹⁴⁹ I.e. OPENBAAR KUNSTBEZIT (NTS, 1964-11-02), see also, e.g. OPENBAAR KUNSTBEZIT (on Zadkine, NTS, 1968-06-19 and 1970-01-25), a.o. The art works mentioned here were all the results of commissions by private corporations: De Bijenkorf (Ossip Zadkine, Naum Gabo), Unilever (Wessel Couzijn), Vereniging Nederlandse Baksteenindustrie (Henry Moore), see: Van Adrichem e.a., 2002.

¹¹⁵⁰ For literature, see e.g.: SIGNALEMENT: ANNA BLAMAN (VARA, 1963-10-06); LITERAIRE ONTMOETINGEN; ALFRED KOSSMANN (AVRO, 1967-10-18); VERNISSAGE (VPRO, 1962-04-19, Cornelis Bastiaan Vaandrager opens painting exhibition by Niels Hamel); for the graphic arts (including a retrospective empowering of Rotterdam): SIGNALEMENT; WILLEM DE KOONING (VARA, 1968-09-15); SIGNALEMENT: DICK ELFFERS (VARA, 1973-11-04); HET MUSEUM VAN DE STRAAT (AVRO, 1966-09-06 on poster exhibition at 'De Nieuwe Doelen' and RKS) – many other examples could be given, also in respect of the performance arts. About 'Nieuw Rotterdams Toneel': OPEN OOG (NTS, 1968-08-30); NAMEN DIE JE NOOI VERGEET; KOOS SPEENHOFF [popular singer] (Fred Rombouts / KRO 1968-01-05); EEN MENS LEEFT NIET BIJ BROOD ALLEEN (Milo Anstadt / VARA, 1961-04-30), among others.

During the war, Museum Boymans was already predestined to grow. Its new wing, designed by Alexander Bodon (1963-1972), became an abstract, rectangular construction of glass and grey bricks¹¹⁵¹. It contrasted to the main building that was built in the style of Scandinavian traditionalism (1928-1935, A. van der Steur)¹¹⁵². It was a ‘vengeance’ of the modernists, after forty years¹¹⁵³. Next to that a plan was made for ‘De Doelen’, by the Kraaijvanger brothers. It took more than a decade before this concert hall would be finished, in 1966. It became a milestone of the new city, to which the media contributed significantly¹¹⁵⁴. Even before its official opening on *Opbouwdag* (1966-05-18¹¹⁵⁵), Polygoon reported: ‘Rotterdam has reached its *goals*’ (i.e. *doelen*), to say that with this building marked the reconstruction was completed.

New educational facilities were also planned by Van Traa, like the polytechnical school ‘Technikon’ (1955-1970, Maaskant e.a.), and the ‘Erasmus Universiteit’ (1963-1970, Elffers e.a.), which was already foreseen by the Club Rotterdam during WWII. The university building would become another instance of the International Style, a ‘non-place’ that embodied the ‘generic city’ or *Tatville*¹¹⁵⁶. The building could be anything and anywhere, which is exemplified by Paul Verhoeven’s feature *TURKISH DELIGHT* (1973) that presents it as a hospital¹¹⁵⁷. The complex got highly criticised¹¹⁵⁸. That also counts for the ‘Medical Faculty’ (1965-1968, OD 205), which was located on the other side of the city, next to the Dijkzigt hospital. With its 114 metres of height, and its ‘space age’ aesthetics, it became another landmark¹¹⁵⁹. It included elevated public spaces and through a large car park, it integrated architecture and infrastructure. This too was critically observed¹¹⁶⁰. However, the city planner B. Fokkinga, who succeeded Van Traa in 1964, went on where the latter stopped.

Illustrative is the case of the plan for a central square in the south of Rotterdam. Van Traa had already drawn a plan that included the high-modernist ‘Industriegebouw Zuidplein’ (1954-1961, H. Maaskant). A new commercial centre next to it became a matter of ‘amplification’. It was designed by Herman Bakker (1967-1972), who had largely contributed to the reconstruction of the city centre, while he had also built the commercial centres of the satellite towns Hoogvliet and Groot-IJsselmonde. The brutalist megastructure of ‘Zuidplein’ combines a shopping mall with offices, housing and infrastructure: a metro station and a regional bus terminal. It channelled the flows of the consumer society, but it was constructed at a moment of growing critique on such projects, which Fokkinga replied by a film that showed how it came into being (*ZUIDPLEIN*, 1972,

¹¹⁵¹ Also the interior showed a different plan. Instead of small rooms, the new wing had large exhibition spaces, which could easily be rearranged for different shows.

¹¹⁵² Cf. Groenendijk & Vollaard, 1998: 268.

¹¹⁵³ The most ambitious plan to accommodate the arts was the idea of a ‘cultural beehive’, to be located at the Hofplein, for which the Rockefeller centre in New York served as an example. It was already conceived by Witteveen before the war, but it was too expensive (Van de Laar, 2000: 50).

¹¹⁵⁴ E.g. in *GALERIJ* (KRO, 1965-10-25) the last phase of its construction was shown. See also next footnotes.

¹¹⁵⁵ On that occasion an underground car park next to ‘De Doelen’ and below the ‘Schouwburgplein’ was opened too (cf. *TELEVIZIER*, AVRO, 1966-05-13). The *NTS JOURNAAL* showed Mayor Thomassen arriving there with his old Ford *JOURNAAL* (NTS, 1966-05-18). It then briefly showed exterior and interior shots of ‘De Doelen’. Polygoon showed it in further detail, and addressed the fact that it had the largest concert hall of Europe: *SCHOUWBURG ‘DE DOELEN’*, Polygoon, rec. 1966-05-18. In a similar way the *NTS (MONITOR)*, 1966-11-13) showed the building on the occasion of a performance by Dave Brubeck. Many reports like this would follow.

¹¹⁵⁶ Resp. Augé, 1992; (Koolhaas, 1995), Tati after the set of his film *PLAYTIME* (1967).

¹¹⁵⁷ In the film it is the ‘Vesalius Ziekenhuis’, cf. [http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Turks_Fruit_\(film\)#Trivia](http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Turks_Fruit_(film)#Trivia) (2007-05-11).

¹¹⁵⁸ Cf. Groenendijk & Vollaard, 1998: 293.

¹¹⁵⁹ Other large hospitals would be built: ‘St. Clara Ziekenhuis’ (1963-1968, arch.: H.A.D. Campman), see: *ST. CLARA ZIEKENHUIS ROTTERDAM-ZUID* (RKK, 1968-12-01) and the ‘St. Franciscusgasthuis’ (1970-1975, arch. H.A.D. Campman e.a.); the move from the old ‘St. Franciscusgasthuis’ in the city to the new one in the outskirts has been documented by way of the film *ADIEU OUDE GASTHUIS* (1975), made by cardiologist and filmmaker Ton Hooghoudt.

¹¹⁶⁰ Still under construction, it is shown from a critical point of view in *STAD ZONDER HART* (1966, Jan Schaper) and later also in ‘*T IS GEWOON NIET MOOI MEER*’ (1976, Hans de Ridder & Dick Rijneke).

Aad Griekspoor)¹¹⁶¹. While working on 'Zuidplein', Bakker also drew the masterplan for the C'70. This event turned the cool business district into a public attraction. Based on a small-scale approach, of pavilions, art projects and decorations, it marked the beginning of a period of differentiation and involution, which also affected Bakker's later work¹¹⁶².

Another example is of a more radical character. Fokkinga, together with the social-democratic Mayor Thomassen (PvdA) and port director Posthuma, developed the idea for a World Trade Centre, in the form of a skyscraper at the Leuvehaven¹¹⁶³. It was the site where Van Traa had spoken of the 'window on the river', a perspectival view from the city centre that maintained the contact with the port. The port, however, had gradually moved out of the city. The American office Skidmore Owings & Merrill (SOM) presented a design for the building in 1968. It raised much resistance, and finally it was not made. Instead, SOM received a commission to build the 'Europoint' office towers (1971-1975), outside the city centre, in Rotterdam-West¹¹⁶⁴. This was officially a project of the private Overbeek, which had previously constructed a steel-and-glass office tower, through an innovative construction by Aronsohn Engineers¹¹⁶⁵.

With twenty-two floors each (92 metres), the Europoint towers not only resembled the originally planned WTC, they were actually a triple copy of the '500 North Michigan' in Chicago (1968, SOM)¹¹⁶⁶. This went beyond the parody of *Tatville*. The Europoint was highly criticised, and it was subsequently kept outside the publicity. Moreover, it was completed after the new Labour government had come into power, which dismissed such projects altogether. It exemplifies a media strategy that is characterised by the *absence* of media. There is only an amateur film (a 'retention'), made by an insider¹¹⁶⁷. The film shows that municipal officials, rather than politicians, still kept an interest, and that Mayor Thomassen actually did the kick-off. The film shows him also at the following reception and 'old boys' dinner. At last, when the market for offices collapsed in the mid 1970s, the municipality bought it for 131 million guilders. Employees protested, handing in a petition to the Mayor, which was (finally) reported by the *JOURNAAL (NOS, 1976-04-29)*. The building became nonetheless the address of the departments of City Planning & Housing as well as Public Works, and of the Port Authorities later on¹¹⁶⁸.

The Europoint was the last bang of modernism. This Super Nova amplified its abstract imagination, based on rational *ideals*. However, in Rotterdam the modernist ideals were mostly framed as 'the real'. Similarly, in the 1960s the 'social ideal' was framed as the 'social real', by documentaries and informative films. It would be challenged though by a few daring films that

¹¹⁶¹ The film includes a fragment of the opening festivities: a public talk between television presenter Mies Bouwman and mayor Thomassen, who speaks of 'Zuidplein' in terms of 'attracting and radiating'. That also applies to this swinging construction film, with rhythmic sequences of machines and workers, of plaiting steel-wire and building concrete columns. At the end, aerial views are contrasted to interior shots of the mall. This film had its premiere at the *Hofplein Theater* within the Technikon building, which was attended by a large number of policy makers, planners and engineers. 'Zuidpleinfilm in première', p8 in: *NRC Handelsblad*, 1973-02-01; the premiere took place on the 31st of January. It was shown together with *EROP OF ERONDER* (1971, Joop Burcksen & Ruud Herblot).

¹¹⁶² Among them housing and office complexes, e.g. offices for Nedlloyd (1974-1978). Groenendijk, 2004: Architectuur > personen > Herman Bakker.

¹¹⁶³ See, for example, 'Plan Trade Center', pp22-23 in the magazine *Rotterdam*, vol. 6/1, 1968, Gemeentelijk Bureau Voorlichting en Publiciteit, Rotterdam; see also vol. 6/4 (1968), which is especially dedicated to the planned WTC.

¹¹⁶⁴ However, attempts had been made to change the plan of the WTC, for which a new architecture studio was contracted: Llewelyn-Davies, Weeks, Forestier-Walker & Bor (UK), which was developed next to the former plan that was executed in Rotterdam-West. The initiator of the latter was 'Overbeek & Co', which collaborated with an English developer. For the new plan and the Europoint project, see respectively p18-19 and p22 in: *Rotterdam, officieel tijdschrift van de gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 9/4, 1971. See also: '100 jaar architectuur in Rotterdam, 1975: Europoint'; www.xs4all.nl/~couvereur/ned/rdam/architectuur/100jaar/1975.htm (2006-05-03).

¹¹⁶⁵ The *Overbeekhuis* (1964-1965, arch. Verbruggen & Goldschmidt), was an office tower built around a monolithic core, with the first two floors left open. It was built top down by a downwards sliding floor; Szénássy, 1969: 139.

¹¹⁶⁶ Emporis Buildings, '500 North Michigan'; www.emporis.com/en/wm/bu/?id=117348 (2006-05-03). The only difference is that this counted 24 floors and 97 metres of height.

¹¹⁶⁷ i.e. *BOUW VAN EUROPOINT, 1971-1973*, anon.

¹¹⁶⁸ i.e. *Stedenbouw en Volkshuisvesting, Gemeentewerken*. In the 1980s the *Havenbedrijf* would be located here too.

balanced on the edge of fact and fiction. A major example is Ivens's EUROPOORT – ROTTERDAM (1966), produced by the *Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij* that also produced fiction films – to break through the imagined 'social real'¹¹⁶⁹. Another example is the documentary STAD ZONDER HART (1966, Jan Schaper), which triggered a strong discussion. These films paved the way for the 'social critique' as the 'social ubiquitous' of the 1970s.

While the forces of modernisation got amplified, various architects already developed new visions, but it took time to actualise their ideas. Many concepts from the 1950s were only carried out in the next decades. In the meantime, new developments had started. An urban environment and how it is used, is hence a combination of ideas of different eras (cf. Choay, 1976). Opposing forces coexisted and intertwined, which were highlighted by audiovisual media.

The transition of the 1960s to the 1970s was a 'phase change' in urbanism. 'In effect, Modernism *magnified* the processes and problems of evolution', argues Stephen Marshall (2009: 290). Modernism 'was a case of big trial and big error', and although trial and error is inherent in evolution, its scale and pace 'made any errors very tangible'. While it also brought well-adapted innovations, it became problematic 'where ripping up the older functional order of the traditional urban fabric' that resulted in 'discord and dysfunctionality'.

Rotterdam was no longer a model city, but one that was lived by real people. They broke into the model and demanded modifications, by strikes in the rapidly automatizing port, and by protests in the old quarters. They also showed their preferences by leaving the city. Within only ten years, the number of citizens dropped from 731,000 in 1965 to 616,000 in 1975¹¹⁷⁰. The actual numbers that left the city were even much higher, about *one third* of the total population; immigrants came in their stead. City planner Fokkinga needed to think small, and to think of people first. As a result he proposed the 'finger city' (*vingerstad*), like a hand with green zones between the suburbs to offer citizens fast access to greenery¹¹⁷¹. The idea of the 'finger city', however, was soon replaced again, in favour of the 'compact city'¹¹⁷². Most important became the redevelopment of the old quarters (*Beleidsnota 1973*). Plans were made for urban renewal, together with residents, which also implied different kinds of media practices.

Audiovisual media, next to print media, remained important all along to monitor and channel these developments. This has been related to the appearance of new media practices, and the institutions to support them. I will link this to what Allen J. Scott has called the 'geometry' of cultural production, which encompasses five main 'technological-organizational elements' (2000: 12). The first one is *human involvement*, which is especially relevant in the case of labour intensive technologies like media (as well as architecture). Secondly, labour is organised through *a dense network* of (small) establishments. It is characterised, thirdly, by *a variety of skills*, and rapidly changing work relations, which reduces risks. Agglomeration also gives rise to *multiple stimuli* at points of interaction, which triggers creativity. Finally, agglomeration establishes *institutional infrastructures* that provide overhead services. Although Scott has distinguished these elements in the case of major cultural industries, they might have been at work in Rotterdam too, since the city became gradually, next to *Tatort*, also *Standort*, where films are produced, which is Scott's concern. It implies shorter links, in terms of feedback, between the environment and media dealing with it, which links up with classic cybernetic views (e.g. Bateson, 1972). This, however, should not withhold one from considering networks that extend beyond the city, on the contrary¹¹⁷³. It seems actually productive to link external conditions with events in the city, which I will do in the next chapter.

¹¹⁶⁹ Illustrative is the premiere of the film ROTTERDAM (1962, Eimert Kruidhof), itself a promotion film based on a fictive story, which was shown together with NFM's feature fiction film RIFIFI IN AMSTERDAM (1962, John Korporaal), at Lumière, 1962-10-03 (ref. *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1963, p48).

¹¹⁷⁰ Van de Laar, 2000: 524.

¹¹⁷¹ I.e. *Structuurnota 1972*. It resembled Witteveen's plan with park ways and green belts (Van de Laar, 2000: 546).

¹¹⁷² I.e. *compacte stad* in the *Beleidsnota 1975*, see: Van de Laar, 2000: 547; cf. Rooijendijk, 2005: 155-156.

¹¹⁷³ cf. Riles, 2000: 62/184, elaborating on Bateson.

CHAPTER 11. DEVELOPING COMPOSITIONS

§ 1. a view from afar

‘Rotterdam is the most modern city of Europe’, proclaims the German documentary ICH WILL LEBEN (1960, Herbert Viktor/IFAG)¹¹⁷⁴. The film emphasizes the city’s efficiency, while it shows its new landmarks¹¹⁷⁵. Rotterdam is called a brave city, with references to Erasmus and the German sailors’ church; the new city gives hope for the future after the tragedy of the war, as represented by Zadkine’s sculpture. A similar image is drawn by the British production A CITY RESURRECTED (1964, Dody M. Cowan), which stresses furthermore the openness of Rotterdam. City planner Van Traa explains that only one third of the city centre is built area, instead of the two thirds from before the war.

‘God made the world, the Dutch made Rotterdam’, proclaims the BBC documentary LAND OF DEW (1961). Land is gained from the sea for the completion of the ‘Europoort’. Rotterdam tried hard to make its port the largest of the world. It attracted substantial attention from abroad. The German documentary ZUM TOR EUROPAS (1964, Renate von Ammon e.a.), made for the Bayerische Rundfunk, follows the river Rhine from Switzerland to the Netherlands, in order to emphasise the importance of Rotterdam for Germany¹¹⁷⁶. It praises its modern city and the new suburbs that offer a residence to the workers of the rapidly growing port. It is illustrated by images of Hoogvliet; although it is built near the industry, it is nevertheless surrounded by greenery, while the people enjoy the fresh smell of sea-air. ‘Here the future has started’, it is said.

Television offered a way ‘to communicate the city’ to foreign audiences. Such documentaries suited television programming, because of duration, content and costs¹¹⁷⁷. But many escaped the attention of film critics and historians. Innumerable foreign productions were made on Rotterdam¹¹⁷⁸; as a case, I will consider one of them in further detail. In 1964 the Austrian ÖRF made ROTTERDAM (dir. Walter Klapper). Whereas Dutch television focused merely on specific issues of the reconstruction, as the city in general was assumed to be known, foreign productions drew integral accounts of its post-war planning and architecture. They presented a functionalist city in *optima forma*, as a model case. A closer look at such ‘a view from afar’ shows how Rotterdam was turned into an international planning model. The cities of Europe that were destroyed during WWII shared a common fate. Rotterdam had unintentionally become part of an international ‘alliance’ of cities. Europe needed success stories, and Rotterdam offered one, under the motto *sterker door strijd* (“stronger through struggle”), which was even added to its coat of arms after WWII.

This ÖRF production accompanied an exhibition on Rotterdam that was organised at the town hall of Vienna, and which was part of a series of exhibitions on major European cities¹¹⁷⁹. In return, an Austrian week was organised in Rotterdam, with various presentations¹¹⁸⁰. Within this perspective of international exchange, of ‘friendly spying’ as it was called by the Viennese Mayor Franz Jonas, it is no coincidence that the ÖRF production was part of a Eurovision project – a series called ‘Town Building and Planning’¹¹⁸¹. The Eurovision (EBU) framework enabled the

¹¹⁷⁴ This television production was also shown at Luxor on *Opbouwdag*, 1960-05-18; *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1961: 31.

¹¹⁷⁵ Including the ‘Groothandelsgebouw’, ‘De Lijnbaan’, ‘De Bijenkorf’, ‘Maastunnel’, and the brand new ‘Euromast’.

¹¹⁷⁶ Special attention is paid to Duisburg, as the biggest inland harbour. Rotterdam, however, gets the most attention, with its docks, cranes and industry (e.g. Van Nelle). Next are shots of the city centre: ‘De Lijnbaan’, praised for its rest and comfort, the Euromast, Maastunnel and the metro, which is under construction.

¹¹⁷⁷ Television often used 16mm reversal film instead of the negative-positive printing of 35mm film for cinema.

¹¹⁷⁸ Various references to visits of foreign directors are made in the official magazine of the city of Rotterdam (*Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*).

¹¹⁷⁹ ‘Rotterdam op Tournee’, p20 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 2/4, 1964. The exhibition (‘Rotterdam in Kort Bestek’) travelled afterwards to various cities in Germany.

¹¹⁸⁰ May 1964, in a.o. Ahoj’, Rijnhotel, Museum Boijmans-Van Beuningen; see: p23 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 3/1, 1964

¹¹⁸¹ It also included films on London, Vienna, Copenhagen, and Venice, a.o.

ÖRF to collaborate with the Dutch NTS, which arranged soundman Géza Lászlóffy and cameraman Peter Alsemgeest. The latter was familiar with Rotterdam and a specialist in construction works. This is an instance of an institutional infrastructure at a higher level of integration, which provides overhead services. It enables flexible work relations, not through a local agglomeration economy, but through transnational networks that are locally anchored.

Besides institutional structures like Eurovision, this production was also created through intra-personal contacts – a double linking that is also addressed in the anthropological literature on networks across formal and informal realms (e.g. De Certeau, 1997; Riles, 2000 a.o.). This film had been an idea of Friedrich Hansen-Löve, who was the director of the ÖRF culture department. He was often in the Netherlands, as his wife was Dutch, so the choice to make this film was easily made. The script was written by his friend, the novelist, sociologist and visual artist Karl Bednarik (•1915-†2001). The two of them were among the pioneers of Austrian quality television. Since they were in a circle of friends of filmmakers, writers, artists and architects, the city planner of Vienna, Roland Rainer, got involved too, as a consultant and as a co-author of the screenplay – together with director Walter Klapper. Rainer (•1910-†2004), a major figure of Austrian modernism, considered Rotterdam as a model for his own work¹¹⁸². Through CIAM he knew architect Jaap Bakema and city planner Cornelis van Traa. The latter became a consultant to the production as well, next to port director Frans Posthuma.

Grete Bednarik, who collaborated with her husband from behind the scenes, has recalled that he visited Rotterdam for a week¹¹⁸³. Like usual, his script was structured through the way he encountered things himself. It began with his arrival by aeroplane. The film starts with aerial shots of the ‘Nieuwe Waterweg’, the gateway to the sea, and Pernis with its oil refineries. To shoot this one needed aerial-photography permission¹¹⁸⁴. For military reasons, it was not permitted to show the two banks at once, nor the transformer facilities. Director Klapper, however, followed neatly the script by Bednarik. Alsemgeest even used a wide-angle lens, so that they had an enormous overview. When they showed the material to the captain in charge, he was overwhelmed and Klapper could go on. In this way the opening scene presents the Netherlands as the cradle of modern planning and urbanism: land is taken from the sea, which is the ultimate artificial land. The title ‘Rotterdam’ appears in curly letters, it crumbles, and reappears in straight letters. This typographical wittiness already tells what Rotterdam is about. It was an idea of Hansen-Löve himself, who was a master of inventing titles, according to Grete Bednarik.

After flying over Rotterdam, the aeroplane lands at ‘intercontinental Airport Schiphol’. It might seem odd to begin a film on Rotterdam in Amsterdam, but it suited Bednarik to show a larger urban system. For regional traffic, the film tells us, Rotterdam has its own airport, while it also has a heliport that provides a direct connection to the city centre. In this way the film addresses the separation of functions and traffic flows, which is the principle of zoning.

Bednarik also drew the storyboard. He noted every place from where to shoot, and even indicated camera angles. Since he had made art works in large buildings, he knew how to look at architecture. The topic of this film was not only highly visual, the film could also be pre-arranged, since many (traffic) movements were predictable. The film was as planned as the city it showed. Cameraman Alsemgeest has mentioned that this project was probably the least free of all he did. He was just told where and what to shoot. Therefore he tried to get the most out of the compositions, to have the images really move, and if possible to get people in. According to him, everything was so well-organised that he and Lászlóffy made fun of director Walter Klapper. ‘He looked more like an administrator, noting down the recordings, and walking around with the clap’, so they called him ‘Herr Klapper der Klapper’. Grete Bednarik recalled that back home

¹¹⁸² Telephone conversation of the author (FP) with Roland Rainer, 2003-12-06; email reply of Roland Rainer, sent by Christian Kröpfl of Atelier Prof. Rainer, 2004-01-19; Rainer worked till the end of his life.

¹¹⁸³ Interview by the author (FP) with Grete Bednarik, Vienna, 2003-12-08.

¹¹⁸⁴ In an interview by the author (FP) with Peter Alsemgeest, Hilversum, 2003-11-27.

Klapper had the plan – inspired by the rationality of Rotterdam – to cut all shots in equal lengths, but Bednarik and the woman doing the editing resisted.

After the introduction, a large parking lot in front of the central station is shown from the air. A train moves over the bridge *De Hef* and the *Luchtspoor* (“Air Track”). Crowds of cyclists move through the Maastunnel at rush hour. Open and closed spaces are interchanged. Shots of small chaotic streets in the city centre are followed by shots of highways with separated lanes, as the solution to congestion. But it is not all about separation of functions; in the Leuvehaven port activities still take place in the city. City planning, it is said, is not just building houses, but the coordination of flows, of time, of the urban dynamics. The port emphasizes the need for that, since it requires the organisation of innumerable movements. This city at water needs ongoing supply and transshipment. It is illustrated by a ‘ballet of cranes’, by trucks transporting wood, and by endless oil pipes. Next to it are services to enable all this, from a victualling boat to supply food, to ship building. The latter is of special importance, since it is among the most complex engineering works. It is a discipline that knows how to use space efficiently, which has been a model for modern city planning and architecture. It is therefore no coincidence, the narrator says, that this came to full blossoming in Rotterdam.

The film has a spatial quality itself. Aerial shots are followed by street shots, which give a human touch. Deliberate compositions make old buildings look modern; a mill and the modernist Bergpolderflat are both portrayed in Rodchenko-style. Shots through corner windows make use of reflections. Tracking shots along buildings, like in Pendrecht, cause the architecture to ‘move’. Things suddenly move into the image, from behind still objects.

Rotterdam is presented as the radiant model of modern architecture and planning: dynamic, efficient, open, open, and human. The latter is illustrated by shots of laundry hanging at a Rhine barge, ‘De Lijnbaan’ shopping area for pedestrians, and housing quarter Pendrecht where kids play around and turn on their rollerskates, while grown-ups walk around to enjoy fresh air. It is, the narrator concludes, ‘the promise for the European youth’. This was addressed after CIAM had been dissolved. Instead of functions the human being had become central. This shift was also manifest in ‘De Lijnbaan’ and ‘Pendrecht’; Bakema emphasised the possibility for people to meet. Bednarik pointed in the same direction. In one of his writings he said that culture is not made by massive organisation, but by individual contacts, preferably in the vertical dimension, between people of uneven backgrounds¹¹⁸⁵. Yet, we can consider the film as the ultimate CIAM-vision, corresponding to its most elaborate ideas and concerns. The city is ‘more than real’.

The film is above all an attempt to explain modern urbanism. In 1953 Bednarik wrote the sociological essay *Der Junge Arbeiter von Heute, ein neuer Typ* – which was translated into several languages. He argues that we tend to perceive our environment as self-evident and natural; it is hard to realise the actual values and premises that preceded it and the complex mechanisms that make it function. Bednarik states that this awareness is even more difficult due to the acceleration of changes that had taken place. In the 1920s, for example, a young worker used to live with several family members in one room, while in the 1950s he got a room for himself¹¹⁸⁶. Here is a direct connection to ROTTERDAM. It displays the modern city, to know what has been done, so that it can be elaborated. In that respect the film is as open as the city it shows.

§ 2. Open Studio

On Dutch television, Rotterdam got frequently shown for the developments in the port and the advancements of its reconstruction, next to various events like congresses and sports games. This attention increased with the growing demand for television broadcasting, which required more programmes to be made. Yet, there was hardly any professional support locally available, which offered an opportunity to filmmaker Jan Schaper (•1921-†2008). Since 1955 he had already

¹¹⁸⁵ Bednarik, 1955 [1953]: 133-135.

¹¹⁸⁶ Bednarik, 1955 [1953]: 82-83.

worked as a television cameraman, but incidentally. To give it a structural base he turned his 'Open Studio' into a production unit, for camerawork, sound recording, lighting and editing. He was supported by his wife Christine van Roon, who often accompanied him, doing the sound recordings, while she took also care of the administration of the studio. Schaper contracted various talented collaborators, among them the cameramen Ferenc Kálmán Gáll and Mat van Hensbergen¹¹⁸⁷. As the Open Studio was initially established as an actor's group, its members could occasionally assist. This was an advantage in respect of the fluctuations within the field of television production. It might be seen, within Scott's geometry of cultural production, as a small-scale variant of a labour pool, with a variety of skills, that serves rapidly changing work relations.

The Open Studio was established in a building at the Schiekade in Rotterdam. It also used the historic *Zakkendragershuisje* in Schiedam, which Schaper had got at his disposal from the municipality, to establish 'a cultural platform'. For about ten years the Open Studio operated from Rotterdam, until it moved to an old farmhouse in the countryside. While working on the new accommodation, Schaper had a grave accident which actually ended his career¹¹⁸⁸.

In a decade or so, the studio collaborated on more than one thousand television productions, among them well-known programmes¹¹⁸⁹. The studio worked for all Dutch broadcasting stations, whether they were Protestant Christian, Catholic, liberal or socialist¹¹⁹⁰. This even included the commercial television 'pirate' TV Noordzee (REM), for which Schaper and his colleagues made the recordings of the infamous Rolling Stones concert in Scheveningen (1964-08-08)¹¹⁹¹. The fact that the Open Studio was established in Rotterdam has contributed to the frequency of recordings made in the city, like some exterior shots for JA ZUSTER, NEE ZUSTER and, for example, recordings for a series on professions, which Schaper directed himself, in collaboration with Jan van Hillo (TOEKOMSTMUZIEK, 'Future Melodies', NCRV, 1962-1964). For an episode on business (1963-01-04) Schaper and Kálmán Gáll made shots in the yards of Wilton-Fijenoord and Verolme, and in the city centre; for episodes on clergymen and mannequins some of the people came from Rotterdam. Of special interest are also staged documentary shorts on the port, which Schaper directed and produced for the youth programme VERREKIJKER (NTS). In the first one, DE PIER (1965), a boy called Tom visits the pier of Hook of Holland where he watches ships leaving the port, like the 'SS Rotterdam'. He forgets the tide: flood is coming, but he reaches the beach just in time. In another film (DE TROS, 1965), Tom observes a tugboat, and he is invited to come aboard. He watches a torn hawser and wants to know more about the way these ropes are made, so he comes to visit the old ropery in Vlaardingen, for which Schaper, not by coincidence, made already a (commissioned) documentary before (350 JAAR IN TOUW, 1961).

Although the Open Studio collaborated on various productions, the emphasis was on informative programmes. As such Schaper also made news reports and documentaries on events and issues in the city, like a taxi strike, a pastoral council at 'De Doelen', developments concerning shopping centre 'De Lijnbaan' and various reports on air pollution in the port area¹¹⁹². Among them is a number of critical documentaries by the NCRV. Whereas the VPRO had first shown POLDERS VOOR INDUSTRIE (1961, Wim van der Velde), with nature, farmhouses and villages being sacrificed for industry, the NCRV showed a specific case: the dramatic and

¹¹⁸⁷ As well as Hans Visser and Robert Collette a.o., and for sound Hans de Ridder, Martin van Dalen a.o.

¹¹⁸⁸ The farmhouse was located between Schoonhoven and Lopik, in the Green Heart. Schaper finally recovered from the accident, and started to work again, but this was limited to a few productions on which he collaborated, e.g. a script for IN GESPREK (1978, René van Nie), a PTT film on the social dimension of telephony (Amsterdam).

¹¹⁸⁹ E.g. MIES EN SCENE (Mies Bouwman), and (children) series such as PIPO DE CLOWN, DORUS and JA ZUSTER, NEE ZUSTER.

¹¹⁹⁰ It worked, however, most frequently for the following stations and directors (a.o.): VARA (Henk Barnard), NCRV (Jan van Hillo/Kees van Langeraad), KRO (Joop Reinboud), and the small IKOR (André Truymán).

¹¹⁹¹ Cf. www.mediapages.nl/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file=article&sid=1761 (2008-04-03)

¹¹⁹² Resp.: ATTENTIE [taxi strike], NCRV, 1965-04-01; KENMERK [pastoral council] IKOR, 1967-01-23; REGIOVIZIER [De Lijnbaan], AVRO, 1967-11-11; [Niet Bekend], Pier Tania/VARA, 1965-05-19; BRANDPUNT, KRO, 1966-02-24.

merciless vanishing of the village Nieuwesluis¹¹⁹³. Next to that, Schaper also collaborated with Ad Langebent, to report on air pollution in the harbour, especially in respect of the oil industries (BRANDPUNT, KRO, 1966-02-24) and with Jan van Hillo on a series about environmental issues, called WIJ STINKEN ERIN (1970)¹¹⁹⁴. The first episode deals with pollution in the Botlek area, including spectacular images of a fire at a Gulf refinery.

With the Open Studio, a certain convergence took place between *Standort* and *Tatort*. At the same time, however, the Open Studio made recordings all over the Netherlands. Moreover, the Open Studio was asked to make recordings across the globe¹¹⁹⁵. Schaper and his colleagues operated as ‘parachutist correspondents’, as Hannerz would have it (2004: 42). This was not at random though. ‘There is probably often an interaction between immediate personal experiences and general enduring orientations, on the one hand, and, on the other, the knowledge and sensibility built up by the news flow’ (Hannerz, 2004: 37). Hannerz speaks of ‘the embedding of foreign news’; there is a certain interest of the public that gets informed, which differs from others, including the way they understand it. ‘Foreign news, in other words, can be quite differently embedded in our overall background understanding of the world’ (Hannerz, 2004: 37). An example is the above mentioned documentary series WIJ STINKEN ERIN, which also included interviews in the USA with the renowned cellular biologist and environmentalist, Professor Barry Commoner, and science-fiction author Alvin Toffler. The issue at stake here, which had a direct link with the port of Rotterdam, was linked to international developments.

Schaper contributed substantially to the results of such reports. Although he was not the director, he used to have extensive conversations with the people to be interviewed before shooting. He brought the issues towards a certain level of interest and depth, and enabled them to react accordingly¹¹⁹⁶. However, Schaper’s name is often not even mentioned in the credits (including the archive files). A practical reason is the fact that the productions were shot on 16mm film and that the credits were added electronically during broadcasting. In this way names have not been documented whatsoever. Yet there is more to it. Except for Peter Scholten’s documentary JAN SCHAPER; THE CITY, THE LIGHT AND THE FILM (2005), the Open Studio has not been mentioned in any serious study whatsoever. This is partly due to the fact that it was based in Rotterdam, instead of Hilversum or Amsterdam. Moreover, little attention has been paid to the work of cameramen as compared to that of directors. Schaper’s work, however, might be compared to that of a press photographer. He made all kinds of ‘moving photographs’ of things he found interesting, especially in Rotterdam, whether or not he could use them later on.

Schaper also made commercials for cinema and promotion films (e.g. for Luxaflex, Kodak, NAM / Shell-Esso, Gasunie), which he directed and produced himself¹¹⁹⁷. They should not be framed in terms of *auteur* or art films. They have created access to the environment and supported its development, like films for the *Havenbedrijf Vlaardingen Oost* (1960, 1967) and for the *Havenvakschool*. The latter was the initiative of Jan Backx (director of *Thomsens Havenbedrijf*¹¹⁹⁸), to professionalise the labour in the port that faced increasing complexity. In 1960, Schaper collaborated with the NCRV television on a documentary about the school, and three years later Jan Schaper, Jan van Hillo and Ferenc Kálman Gáll, made another one for this

¹¹⁹³ i.e. NIEUWESLUIS VAN DE KAART, Leo Moen: NCRV, 1968-09-30.

¹¹⁹⁴ paraphrasing a proverb, meaning ‘We are Trapped’ while literally saying ‘We stink into it’)

¹¹⁹⁵ E.g. USA, Vietnam, Indonesia, Israel, Suriname, Venezuela, South-Africa, Kenya, Gambia, and European countries.

¹¹⁹⁶ As addressed by Christine van Roon, 2008-04-16; cf. JAN SCHAPER; THE CITY, THE LIGHT AND THE FILM (2005, Peter Scholten).

¹¹⁹⁷ Examples of commercials concerning Rotterdam: REISBUREAU BROERE (1969); VW-DEALER HOOGENBOOM (1966, Jan Schaper); the examples of promotional films mentioned here are: 4 DECEMBER 1964 – 12,5 JAAR N.J.F. [Luxaflex] (1964); AARDGAS WAT KOOP IK ERVOOR (1965), VREEMDE VOGELS OVER JE LAND (1971), MET KODAK IN ODIJK (1975).

¹¹⁹⁸ Cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 519. The school is currently called: ‘Scheepvaart en Transport College’.

broadcasting station, WEG NAAR DE WERELD, and more films on the school would follow¹¹⁹⁹. They show a network of different applications that served the same purpose: giving publicity to the school, to contribute to a well-organised harbour in the end.

Exemplary is also PORT OF GRAIN (MEER MANNEN MINDER, 1972), for the *Graan Elevator Maatschappij* (GEM). Schaper has called it one of his best films, which he made over a period of three years. It contains impressive shots of the handling of bulk and the labour it requires in order to feed the city, the country and its hinterland. There are similarly shots of the technical installations, and the efforts to keep the ‘port of grain’ running, with science-fiction like management systems and control chambers. Notwithstanding this functionalism, Schaper also plays with the symbolism of the subject. To show the enterprise, he follows a group of tourists on excursion through the port, particularly a young blonde woman, who wears oversized sunglasses, and who behaves like a movie star. While she sensually takes off her glasses, the installations suck and ejaculate all kinds of seeds from and into the body of the ships.

The film shows the classic elevators, which the narrator calls ‘insects’, and the transition that takes place to use mobile installations with more capacity. With five hoses each, these multipotent mastodons also look like insects. Such a view is similar to that of TOPSPORT ZONDER TRIBUNE (1970) for the *Havenvakschool*, in which Schaper called lifting trucks ‘the ants of the port’¹²⁰⁰. In an anthill, different agents have complementing tasks to do; the films by Schaper show similarly different tasks. Together they make up a cluster of films that reflect the links between agents in the port. It establishes a direct connection to the stigmergy in social insects, as a matter of social organisation mediated through signs (here: films) related to the environment.

Besides the port, there are other clusters within Schaper’s oeuvre, in particular concerning youth culture, and urban development, including his triptych on Vlaardingen, Rotterdam, and Schiedam – which were the places where he actually lived himself¹²⁰¹. Architecture and planning play an important role in it. The film on Schiedam, and its production history, is a case to put this into perspective. Moreover, it shows a transition in Schaper’s thinking, departing from the high-modernist view expressed in the film on Vlaardingen (1958).

Schaper in Schiedam

At the end of 1961, the city of Schiedam invited Schaper to make a film, due to the success of his film on Vlaardingen. Even before he presented his plan to the city council, it was reported by the newspaper *Het Vrije Volk* (1962-02-24), where Schaper had previously worked as a journalist. It had its effects. When Schaper gave his presentation, two other papers were present next to *Het Vrije Volk*, making it something important from the onset¹²⁰². They reported that Schaper turned the council chamber into a cinema to show VLAARDINGEN KOERST OP MORGEN (1958) and some draft images of Schiedam. Schaper based his plan on information from city archivist Piet Kuyer and the novella *Verbrande Erven* (1944) by Ferdinand Bordewijk¹²⁰³. His script began with *Zwart*

¹¹⁹⁹ The first one is HAVENARBEID: EEN VAK! (1960, Kees van Langeraad/NCRV). Schaper made additionally a commercial (1967), and in 1969 another documentary for NCRV (WEG VAN DE HAVEN, 1970-02-02). A ten minutes version of it was shown at the C’70, next to TOPSPORT ZONDER TRIBUNE (1970). It dealt with lifting trucks, emphasizing the skills of the drivers and stimulating the imagination of the (young) public. Cf. Polygoon, 1967-wk07

¹²⁰⁰ A similar analogy was made by the municipal office for information and publicity; it presented Rotterdam as a beehive (through graphics by designer Jeanette Kossmann). See the cover of the quarterly magazine *Rotterdam*, 1968, vol. 6/2, and e.g. of the promotional booklet *Rotterdam Europoort* (1971, Harry Edzes, ed.) – Gemeentelijk Bureau Voorlichting en Publiciteit, Rotterdam. The official logo of the municipality would later become a kind of honeycomb (see e.g. the municipal magazine *Rondvraag* 1973/1).

¹²⁰¹ As Schaper has emphasised himself in an interview by Jop Pannekoek (ROETS 14, 1989), and which is also an important issue in Peter Scholten’s documentary JAN SCHAPER – THE CITY, THE LIGHT AND THE FILM (2005).

¹²⁰² ‘Schapers film in Raadzaal: Wellicht opdracht voor documentaire’, *Het Vrije Volk*, 1962-03-24; ‘Schapers film zou en dramatisch beeld van Schiedam geven, een stad van felle historisch contrasten’, *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1962-03-24; ‘Jan Schaper begon al aan documentaire over Schiedam’, in: *Het Nieuwe Dagblad*, 1962-03-24.

¹²⁰³ As mentioned in the first report by *Het Vrije Volk*, 1962-03-24.

Schiedam where the smoke of 300 gin distilleries had made the city black. After the collapse of this industry, due to the steam engine, the city invested in its harbour. The script revolves around the encounter between tradition and modernity, which Schaper also showed in his drafts: excavations of a Celtic settlement, the old harbours, picturesque façades and smoking chimneys in the historic centre, versus pre-fabricated housing and the construction of a new railway station. There was appreciation for his work, although Mayor J.W. Peek remarked that the script paid still too much attention to draglines and cranes, and generic housing, instead of place-specific issues¹²⁰⁴.

A few days later the commission was confirmed¹²⁰⁵. There were four aims to it: documentation for next generations, a visiting card for tourists, a welcome to new residents, and a new image of this former gin city to generate ‘goodwill’ elsewhere. The idea was to release it in July 1963¹²⁰⁶. More than a year later, in October 1964, Schaper presented the film to the Mayor and Aldermen, but it was not released. Instigated by newspaper reports, *all the chairmen* of the political parties in the city council asked the Mayor and Aldermen questions about it¹²⁰⁷. What was at stake? Schaper had become critical of the plans to sanitise the historic centre. Moreover, he advocated to place people central. In June 1965, he showed it again to the Mayor and Aldermen, at the *Zakkendragershuisje*. Still there was no approval. In January 1966, Schaper invited new Mayor H. Roelfsema and his aldermen to his studio in Rotterdam¹²⁰⁸. The ‘opinions were divided’, which lead again to questions in the city council¹²⁰⁹. In the meantime Schaper’s film on Rotterdam was broadcast on television. Not much later the Mayor and Aldermen of Schiedam accepted *SCHIEDAM Kiest voor het Water* (“Schiedam chooses for the water”)¹²¹⁰. Yet, further commotion arose as its premiere took place in the small Monopole theatre, and no further screenings were planned. Newspaper *Het Vrije Volk* spent a long article on it, since the Mayor considered the film a ‘failure’. In defence of the film, the article said:

It particularly turned out that the Mayor and Aldermen did not share the opinions of Jan Schaper concerning the commentary. Because Jan Schaper is completely honest. He does not, happily, beat about the bush. His film shows the things uncovered, but he will also show the beautiful sides. His language is real; what he goes through as a human being in a city like Schiedam is shown on the screen and that will not always be favourable – how could it be otherwise in modern society with its hurried tensions, air pollution, commerce and mass housing. But that is, it seems, exactly the power of the film. There existed also aversion to the film on Rotterdam, as one does not want to recognize, in the *Maasstad*, that one completely surpasses the human being in this gigantic ‘desert of stones’. A fact is, however, that Jan Schaper, at the screening of the Rotterdam film, after a profound explanation to the public relations people, achieved a moral victory, as one finally recognised the value of the documentary. Considered in this way the film on Schiedam will also win the hearts of the citizens, although they hardly get a chance to see Schaper’s creation, and that is a great pity.¹²¹¹

¹²⁰⁴ As mentioned in the report by the *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1962-03-24.

¹²⁰⁵ It had to be a film of half an hour, for a budget of 36,000 guilders (ca. € 16,300, without corrections for inflation).

¹²⁰⁶ ‘Schaper filmde resten van “landelijke” Kethel’, *De Rotterdammer*, 1963-09-17.

¹²⁰⁷ ‘Raadsleden stelden vele vragen bij Begrotingsonderzoek; film van Jan Schaper voor wethouders vertoond’, *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1964-10-22. ‘En Schaper...? Hij filmde voort’, *Het Nieuwe Dagblad*, 1964-11-14; ‘Aan de Schie’, *De Rotterdammer*, 1964-11-25 – the report mentions that on 1964-10-13 the film was shown to Mayor and Aldermen.

¹²⁰⁸ ‘De film van Jan nog steeds niet voor Alleman...’, *Het Nieuwe Stadsblad*, 1966-01-12.

¹²⁰⁹ ‘Jan Schaper: “Over drie weken is de film klaar”’, *Het Vrije Volk*, 1966-02-22; ‘Vragen van Raadsleden; waar blijft film van Jan Schaper’, *De Schiedammer*, 1966-03-02.

¹²¹⁰ Various newspaper announcements in *Het Vrije Volk* (1966-06-30), *De Schiedammer* (1966-06-30), *De Rotterdammer* (1966-06-30), *Het Nieuwe Stadsblad* (1966-07-01).

¹²¹¹ ‘Valt documentaire over Schiedam nog vóór vertoning al in ongenade?’, *Het Vrije Volk*, 1966-07-01. Original quote: “Met name bleek het college de opvattingen van Jan Schaper over de begeleidende tekst niet te delen. Want Jan Schaper is volkomen eerlijk. Hij draait er, gelukkig, niet omheen. Zijn film geeft de dingen onverbloemd weer, maar zal ook de mooie kanten tonen. Zijn taal is echt; wat hij in een stad als Schiedam als mens ondergaat komt op het

On the 5th of July 1966, the premiere took place. Mayor Roelfsema introduced the film, while Schaper himself ‘could not attend the screening due to work on another production’¹²¹².

Critics were mainly positive. Except for the repetitions they appreciated the way Schaper framed the city’s history, from ‘fire water’ to ‘fare water’ (from gin to harbour), as an argument to exploit the city’s connection to the port of Rotterdam. A critic from *De Tijd* was very enthusiastic about Schaper’s cinematography, with contrasts between atmospheric dark foggy alleys and clear and bright new housing estates, ‘which connects it with the best Dutch documentary traditions’¹²¹³. Most positive was *Het Vrije Volk*, emphasizing Schaper’s criticism.

Through a series of exciting images, accompanied by splendid music, the filmmaker shows the urban breakthrough for which everything has to move. Centuries-old trees crack and collapse under the violence of ruthless axes. With muffled bangs of demolition hammers, a historic farmhouse is razed. ...A new housing quarter emerges, called after the farm: *Groenoord* [‘Green place’].¹²¹⁴

Quoting the film comments, the article also emphasised Schaper’s claim to give space to *people*.

“People are now better off than in the past, they are also more beautiful and healthier than before, also freer and they can allow themselves more. However, one is also more hurried, nervous and lonely than before. One is now mostly concerned with oneself.” That is the oppressive warning to a municipal government that has, according to Schaper, to build a city in which a human can be oneself. “A city needs to be a meeting place...”

Besides presenting a vision to the public, Schaper was a critic and an advisor to his commissioners, with film being the medium of communication and the object of reference. Schaper created frames for urban planning, by drawing the city’s historical development and extending it; he addressed continuity and change as preconditions for urban growth.

Schaper had listened to the comment of former Mayor Peek on his first draft, to pay more attention to place-specific and historical features. The film in turn affected the municipal policy¹²¹⁵. But there is more to it. Schaper mobilised the people of the Open Studio, the residents of the Brandersbuurt (the neighbourhood of the *Zakkendragershuisje*), and his contacts in

scherm en dat zal, hoe kan het anders in de moderne samenleving met zijn jachtige spanning, luchtverontreiniging, commercie en massahuizenbouw, niet altijd gunstig zijn. Maar dat is waarschijnlijk juist de kracht van de film. Ook tegen de film over Rotterdam bestond aversie, omdat men in de Maasstad nu eenmaal niet wil erkennen, dat men volkomen voorbij gaat aan de mens in de gigantische “steenwoestijn”. Een feit is echter, dat Jan Schaper bij de vertoning van de Rotterdam-film na een grondige uiteenzetting aan de “public relations”-mensen een morele overwinning behaalde, omdat men ten slotte de waarde van de documentaire erkende. Zo beschouwd zal ook de film over Schiedam de harten van de burgers winnen, maar deze krijgen helaas nauwelijks de kans om Schaper’s creatie te zien en dat is heel erg.’

¹²¹² Roelfsema said that it had been an extensive commission and that Schaper had put his whole soul into it. He also said that the film would be available for all kinds of associations, although he did not allow the directors of Monopole any further screening, even though they were willing to do so. In: ‘Onbehoorlijk’, *De Tijd/De Maasbode*, 1966-07-06.

¹²¹³ Willemsen, Harry; ‘Meer wit dan grijs; Jan Schaper steekt de loftrumpet over Schiedam’, *De Tijd/De Maasbode*, 1966-07-06.

¹²¹⁴ See: Snelleman, 1966. Original quotes: ‘Met een serie eneroverende beelden, begeleid door prachtige muziek, laat de cineast de doorbraak zien, waarvoor alles moet wijken. Krakend vallen eeuwenoude bomen onder het geweld van van nietsontziende bijlen om; met doffe klappen van slopershamers wordt een historische boerderij geslecht. ... Een nieuwe woonwijk ontstaat, genoemd naar de boerderij: Groenoord.’ Ibid: “De mensen hebben het thans beter dan vroeger, ze zijn ook mooier en gezonder dan vroeger, ook vrijer en ze kunnen zich meer permitteren. Maar men is ook gejaagder dan vroeger, nerveuzer en eenzamer dan vroeger. Men is meer met zichzelf bezig.” Dat is de beklemmende waarschuwing aan een gemeentebestuur, dat volgens Schaper een stad behoort te bouwen, waar een mens zichzelf kan zijn. ‘Een stad behoort een plaats van ontmoeting te zijn....’

¹²¹⁵ Schiedam has nowadays a well preserved historic centre. It cultivates it to such an extent that it hardly corresponds to the historic city anymore, which was dirty and hard to live in.

Hilversum; several protest actions in Schiedam were reported on television, which were shot by Schaper, except for one in which he is to be seen himself, explaining the situation¹²¹⁶. In this way even the Dutch Secretary of State C. Egas (culture & welfare) came to give a speech in favour of historic city centres. These reports became extensions of Schaper's film.

town without a heart

In 1964, Schaper started the production of *STAD ZONDER HART* (*TOWN WITHOUT A HEART*, 1966¹²¹⁷). This film, about Rotterdam, was his own initiative and financed by the Open Studio itself. The camerawork was carried out by Ferenc Kálman Gáll and Hans Visser, next to Schaper himself, while the sound recordings were done by his wife Christine van Roon and by Martin van Dalen. The film is about the reconstructed city centre. The main problem here, according to Schaper, is the limited number of dwellings. The city has become a clinical environment that is empty after rush-hour. In the morning people come in from the new suburbs, to return there again in the evening. Only on Saturdays the city is as lively as before WWII, which is illustrated by images of *EN TOCH ROTTERDAM...* (1950, Polygon-Profilti), which included shots of Von Barys's *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* (1928)¹²¹⁸. The old city was characterised by intimacy, chaotic movements, street musicians and salesmen, and all kinds of folks. The new one is straight and regulated, just like the Coolsingel and the Hofplein, which lack the human scale with their new high-rise offices. Schaper advocated a city in which the people are the main concern, instead of buildings. It should be an 'urban fabric' that allows for opposed movements, in which individuals can find their own ways to discover and to develop themselves. Schaper especially made a case for the youth, as they come to the city to meet each other. Therefore they need cafés, clubs, musical stages and cultural workshops, of which there are some, but not enough.

Like in the film on Schiedam, pluriformity is propagated, instead of one particular development. Oppositions, paradoxes and conflicts make a city. People do not know what they are looking for. People give always reasons that are not essential; one does not know the essential reasons. This could be Schaper's own explanation of his films¹²¹⁹. They report the clash as well as the co-existence between tradition and modernity. With his films Schaper searches for the undefined interstice, a creative force between different positions. From that perspective, city planning is observed and tested against the human norm. Development and growth are no fixed notions that can be applied unconditionally. Development and growth are processes that need to be lived. Schaper regards cities as organic entities that have interchangingly to do with periods of prosperity and decay, and which are, after all, the result of self-organisation.

Schaper has indicated that his view was largely based upon the ideas of the American critic Lewis Mumford. Mumford in his turn (1957) considered Bakema's 'De Lijnbaan' as an example of urban planning and design based on the 'human measure'. Being involved with the reconstruction of Rotterdam, Bakema gave expression to the modernism he attempted to reform. Schaper followed a similar track, and not by coincidence, since Schaper knew Bakema personally¹²²⁰. Schaper also departed from modernist ideas without losing them altogether. In *STAD ZONDER HART* there is a scene shot from the Euromast, showing a vast urban landscape, with the comment that at this point 'one realises that something great has arisen here'. However, entering the city again one understands that it still lacks a metropolitan climate. The city plan is criticised, but not in terms of architectural style. There is a scene in the film in which Schaper shows his appreciation for the Lijnbaanflats (arch. Maaskant), which are typical functionalist

¹²¹⁶ BRANDPUNT, KRO, 1967-04-20; VJOEW, AVRO, 1967-05-26; MONITOR, NTS, 1967-10-22 (Schaper explaining).

¹²¹⁷ There exists an English version of the film, but there is no information available on its status.

¹²¹⁸ See also the request by Jan Schaper (1965-11-23) to the GAR, to make use of historical footage: Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, archive 'Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam' (archief van het archief), dossier 'correspondentie filmcollectie', toegangsnr. 297.01, inv. nr. 461 (1958-1962).

¹²¹⁹ Based on personal communication with Jan Schaper, November 2003.

¹²²⁰ Ibid.

housing estates that are part of the overall Lijnbaan-plan. Schaper, like Bakema, favoured a renewed modernism in terms of a different programme.

In the case of Schaper's modernist *VLAARDINGEN KOERST OP MORGEN*, one can already recognise the style of his later films. It is on the one hand straight, with clear frames and some fast sequences, on the other hand it is quiet, poetic, impressionist and picturesque. *STAD ZONDER HART* and *SCHIEDAM KIEST VOOR HET WATER*, in turn, do not break with modernism. They are chronicles of the urban processes in the 1960s, but with their own style. We may explain them through the architectural theory of Hilde Heynen (1999: 224), in particular her idea of 'mimesis'. Things may appear to be normal, but the reflection suspends their continuity through small distortions. Heynen speaks of 'a moment of intensity that subverts what is self-evident' (p224) – a moment that I would call the moment of feedback that creates a 'noise'. The idea of mimesis applies first of all to architecture as 'shelter'. In the context of modernity as 'a state of homelessness', architecture cannot just recreate an existing notion of 'home'. Through mimesis, however, 'architecture can serve as a guide to this permanent quest for dwelling, not by embodying dwelling in any direct sense...but rather by framing it in modernity. This framing has, more than anything else, to do with the way architecture is offering a context for everyday life' (Heynen, 1999: 223). In the same way we can understand Schaper's work. Rather than showing everyday life *in* the modern city, his films show the modern city *as a matter of* everyday life.

Schaper had outspoken ideas about acting, and the desire to make fiction films, which he developed during his stay in Hollywood. According to him, a story fascinates when the audience does not yet know what will happen, but remains curious about it due to the play of the actor. It is best expressed by a figure that seems normal, but still has something enigmatic. In Scholten's documentary on Schaper, it is addressed that Schaper never made the feature film he had in mind¹²²¹. Although the conditions in the Netherlands were not favourable for feature film production, it is a fact that within Rotterdam the *Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij* was able to do so. *STAD ZONDER HART* and other films show that Schaper was not so much concerned with narration, but with observation. Rather than staging the enigmatic, Schaper searched for it in everyday life. What seems to be normal retains unknown layers. In Schaper's triptych, the cities have become the actors, as characters with a will of their own. They play the key roles, but above all they play themselves: the play of the city.

Although *STAD ZONDER HART* was made without a concrete plan for exhibition, it was finally broadcast twice by the NCRV, first on the 14th of May 1966. As the 14th of May 1940 was the date that Rotterdam was destroyed, it attracted much attention, and it immediately raised a discussion, above all within the municipality itself¹²²². Due to this success, the NCRV asked Jan Schaper, in collaboration with Leo Moen, to make a sequel. It included interviews with the officials to enable them to explain their plans. This production would be much shorter, eighteen minutes instead of forty-seven, and made within three months. Hans Visser did the camerawork. Rather different in style, it became also a critical evaluation of urban planning, with the telling title *DE TOEKOMST WORDT DICHTGEBOUWD* ("The Future is Built Full", 1967-04-03). Alderman Polak argues that the people want to live in a modern and healthy environment. It requires new suburbs and modern traffic facilities. An image shows a RET-bus stuck in a jam. Therefore a metro is built, as RET-director Van Leeuwen explains, to supplement the Maastunnel. City planner Fokkinga shows plans to construct new accommodations in the city centre, and plans to build modern quarters like Alexanderpolder and Ommoord. The film remarks that although the reconstruction has reached its completion, one simply continues building. Where will this end,

¹²²¹ Schaper has always kept the idea of making feature fiction films. Many drafts have been made with his actors group, but no one was completed. One of his latest was *MARINA* (1974), shot in the studio of the farmhouse in Lopik. It was a slightly erotic film (at a time that Paul Verhoeven had made the explicitly erotic *TURKISH DELIGHT*, 1973).

¹²²² See, for example, the reference to *STAD ZONDER HART* in 'Valt documentaire over Schiedam nog vóór vertoning al in ongenade?', *Het Vrije Volk*, 1966-07-01.

and to what degree should a city's density be increased? Moreover, the question is asked if the urban environment is actually the most appropriate human habitat at all.

After this production, Schaper started to make more 'sequels', which he never finished. Together with innumerable images that he made all over the city, these recordings built up an extensive collection of 'moving photographs' that read like footnotes and an 'epilogue' to STAD ZONDER HART¹²²³. Not unlike the case of Schiedam, this material leads directly to the activism of the urban renewal movement, particularly concerning Het Oude Westen¹²²⁴.

While Schaper made STAD ZONDER HART, he simultaneously made HET PROCES RENESSE (1966), for the NCRV. Renesse is a coastal village in the province of Zeeland, which by then became a holiday destination, especially among adolescents. The film addresses that most of them escape the city (Rotterdam in particular), where they cannot find what they want. We see boys and girls kissing and playing with each other on the beach and in the dunes, and dancing in clubs. The narrator says that 'many girls between 15 and 18 years old become adults in one summer', which made the film controversial, so that the NCRV decided not to broadcast it. Schaper advocated that youths should have the possibility to discover themselves and each other, for which the beautiful landscape of Zeeland is a suitable environment. However, Schaper also notices that it will be disturbed by the prospect of mass tourism, which demands large accommodations; because of this the possibility for spontaneous play will disappear and boredom will come instead. This film is the counterpart of STAD ZONDER HART, by drawing a vision on urbanism outside the municipal borders and into the domain of human needs and desires. It is a recurrent vision, since something similar was presented by the fiction film LENTELIED (1936, Simon Koster), which also deals with metropolitan life in Rotterdam and leisure in Zeeland, and which was also censored, for the suggestive 'naked knee' (of actress Ank van der Moer). After thirty years the Netherlands was still not ready for this, and it also had to wait before it could become manifest within urban planning. In order to change things, Schaper also made TEGENSPEL (1969), commissioned by welfare organisation Salco, which enabled youths in Rotterdam and elsewhere to express their experiences in connection to their environment.

I have indicated some 'clusters' within Schaper's oeuvre, concerning port, city and youth, but Schaper had many other interests¹²²⁵. In this light we may also frame his work for television, which brought him in contact with many people. The Open Studio, and hence Rotterdam, became a node in the network of Dutch television. As a result, a lot of names of people working for film and television that had previously collaborated with Schaper can be mentioned here¹²²⁶.

§ 3. television news

During the 1950s, television news followed the example of cinema newsreels. In their weekly news shows, Polygoon made a story out of each item, with a beginning and an end. The approach

¹²²³ Since 2006, this collection has been at the disposal of the *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam*. In 2007, the Gemeentearchief commissioned Bert Steeman (former editor of the Open Studio) to make an inventory of the Schaper collection = *Inventarisatie Archief Jan Schaper* (AJS). I have subsequently been asked to compile a filmography and to conduct a study concerning the work of Schaper = *Filmografie en Advies aangaande de collectie Jan Schaper* (juni/juli 2007).

¹²²⁴ Early in 1970, the Open Studio was commissioned by the VPRO to make a report, directed by Hans de Ridder, on the presentation of five plans for het Oude Westen and the public discussion following it. This material, however, has (most likely) never been broadcast (it is part of the Schaper collection at GAR, AJS p65 OUDE WESTEN 1 + 2; p71-72 THOMASSEN 1 + 2 + nr. 112). Instead, the VPRO broadcast a brief radio report later on, made by Bob Visser (VPRO-VRIJDAG, 1970-03-27, at: Beeld & Geluid, docid: 77744. De Ridder would later direct the urban renewal film 'T IS GEWOON NIET MOOI MEER' (1976).

¹²²⁵ See e.g. the documentary DE LAATSTE MAN (1970), which is about the legendary football keeper Jan van Beveren, who played for Sparta Rotterdam and the Dutch national team.

¹²²⁶ Christine van Roon and Martin van Dalen became successful sound technicians. The cameramen Ferenc Kálman Gáll, Mat van Hensbergen and Hans Visser collaborated on innumerable film and television productions afterwards. Hans de Ridder became an independent director. Many more names can be mentioned, e.g. Gerard van den Berg (presenter for NCRV), Bert Steeman (editor), Gijs Konings (cameraman) a.o.

of television changed as the frequency of its shows increased. Around 1959, Polygoon lost its leading position. A few years later it lost the competition altogether. It only survived due to the fact that the government granted Polygoon a structural subsidy, for its merits in the past. Polygoon then specialised in providing backgrounds to the news, either by framing the larger picture or, on the opposite, by focusing on particular aspects.

It might be no coincidence that in 1959, too, the main newspapers of Rotterdam, and the Netherlands in general, began to merge¹²²⁷. The media landscape changed, which was happening world-wide. Here I refer to Ulf Hannerz (2004: 31). 'The print media have had to come to terms with the limitation that, to attentive audiences, they can seldom be first with major hard news. So in part, at least, they have to deal with the news, perhaps even define the news, in some other manner.' As Hannerz has it (ibid), news refers to something that just happened, or something we have not come across before or that we find surprising. We might also remark that the very notion of 'news' is connected to 'modernism', with 'new' and 'modern' pointing to the same direction. Redefining the news might therefore also, imply redefining modern society.

For the next decades, reports on local issues remained predominantly a matter of the press¹²²⁸. Although arguments were made in favour of local broadcasting, for the time being the relationship between Rotterdam and television was based on national interests. Yet, this was also subject to change, both in form and content. With an increasing frequency of television news, reports became gradually sections of larger narratives. Television news was seen as the 'front-page', which linked up to various longer reports by (competing) television news magazines that provided background information, 'feature stories' or 'human interest'¹²²⁹. This was also institutionally arranged, since all broadcasting associations operated together in the overarching NTS. Reports thus referred to one another. Some people, like cameramen, worked for several programmes at the same time. Such cross-references extended to newspapers, which initially even published reviews of the JOURNAAL¹²³⁰.

At first, NTS reports were made by a small team of reporters based in Bussum and Hilversum. Cameramen and sound technicians of Cinecentrum carried out the recordings. Over the course of the 1960s, the numbers of reports increased, and the NTS JOURNAAL frequently got to use the services of (local) freelance correspondent-cameramen¹²³¹. This established a direct connection between *Standort* and *Tatort*, so that television news became firmly anchored in the city's cultural ecology. The correspondent-cameraman for Rotterdam became Pim Korver. He had worked for Cinecentrum before, from 1958 until 1963, when he established his own company in Rotterdam¹²³². As such he would make reports for the NTS, as well as other broadcasting stations, for more than forty years (for which the city gave him an honorary distinction in 2006, the *Wolfert van Borselenpenning*)¹²³³.

¹²²⁷ E.g. *De Tijd* and *De Maasbode*, as well as the *NRC* and *Algemeen Handelsblad*. Others spent extra attention to publicity, such as *Het Vrije Volk* (see the promotion film: HEET VAN DE NAALD, 1959, Herman Wassenaar). The latter eventually redirected itself; although *Het Vrije Volk* had been one of the most popular Dutch national newspapers, it became a local newspaper (1972), next to *Het Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*; Van de Laar, 2000: 580. Cf. JOURNAAL (1971-08-25, NOS).

¹²²⁸ In fact, the newspaper *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad* started to do experiments with local (cable) television. A. Daane, in: 'Stichtingsvorm voor regionale omroep in Rotterdam', p2 in: Elfferich, Edzes, Matthijsse, 1973.

¹²²⁹ I.e. KRO's BRANDPUNT; NCRV's HIER EN NU; IKOR's KENMERK, AVRO's TELEVIZIER, NTS' MONITOR.

¹²³⁰ In the case of Rotterdam, e.g. on a report about the test trip of the 'SS Statendam' (*De Tijd*, 1957-01-24, quoted by Scheepmaker, 1981: 23; he also refers to reports by the *Rotterdams Parool*, 1957-08-19).

¹²³¹ In February 1970, the personnel of the NOS Journaal counted fifty-five people, thirty-five of them being editors; the JOURNAAL made often use of freelance-journalists (Scheepmaker, 1981: 68). This certainly counted for cameramen. Most of the reports have been left uncredited, which makes it hard to trace things today.

¹²³² Information by Pim Korver, from a conversation with FP, 2008-12-05.

¹²³³ 'Rotterdamse onderscheiding voor filmer Pim Korver', in: *Algemeen Dagblad*, 2006-01-16.

<http://www.ad.nl/ad/nl/1002/Showbizz/article/detail/92386/2006/01/16/Rotterdamse-onderscheiding-voor-filmer-Pim-Korver.dhtml> (website visited: 2009-12-03).

An early production by Korver was a report for the AVRO, about maritime towing operations¹²³⁴. It included spectacular aerial shots of an oil-rig and of tugboats at sea. As a consequence of it, many such recordings would follow¹²³⁵. The Open Studio also employed him as a cameraman, for example for an NCRV documentary on the shipwreck of the ‘Ping An’ on the Dutch coast¹²³⁶. Under the name of the Open Studio, he also made some reports for the NTS JOURNAAL, about issues like a collapsed construction of a new car park, or the theft of a police car. As he became the regular local correspondent, he would report on a range of other events, such as mutiny at a carrier at sea with the navy intervening, explosions at refineries, strikes in the port, a fire in a Turkish boarding-house, and chaos in the Waalhaven harbour due to an accident with the Norwegian ship Tatra, to mention just a few examples¹²³⁷.

J. van Rhijn became another correspondent in Rotterdam. He was a well-experienced photographer, who worked for different newspapers, while he was also Rotterdam’s correspondent of the Associated Press¹²³⁸. Just like the photographer and filmmaker Charles Breijer, who already worked for the NTS in the 1950s, he had been part of the resistance group *De Ondergedoken Camera* during WWII¹²³⁹. In the early 1960s, Van Rhijn bought film equipment and started to make newsreels as well. An early report that he made for the NTS (1962-12-19), which was internationally transmitted by the European Broadcasting Union, was about drift ice on the river Hollandsche IJssel, which obstructed shipping near Rotterdam¹²⁴⁰. Van Rhijn reported on different issues, but probably the strongest impact was had by his spectacular and often alarming reports on various accidents and especially explosions and fires that occurred once in a while at the (petrochemical) industry in the Botlek area and the Europoort¹²⁴¹. Due to the growing numbers of issues covered, it occurred that on one day Van Rhijn, like Korver, might shoot three different reports across the city¹²⁴². These reports concerned the monitoring of ‘ecological parameters’, both biotic and abiotic (or social and material). The increasing complexity of their interdependency called for a structural local media engagement.

Something similar was said by Koos de Gast (1973: 9), journalist of the *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, but he expressed it as a critique at the NOS. ‘The current broadcasting associations and the NOS hardly follow the important issues that are going on in Rotterdam and its region. Rotterdam is only news when a ship is at fire, when there is an explosion at a refinery and when an alert has been announced’¹²⁴³. His conclusion was that Rotterdam hardly counted in Hilversum and Bussum, neither in respect of major issues for the city itself, nor in the case of more ordinary things such as fairs, unlike their counterparts in Amsterdam. The national news coverage showed indeed a bias, at least in numbers, which was addressed by others too (e.g. Van der Staay, 1973: 13), but things were changing in the early 1970s – probably under influence of this discussion.

¹²³⁴ TELEVIZIER: ZEESLEEPVAART, 1964-06-18, Pim Korver.

¹²³⁵ E.g. on a Belgian fishing ship near Hook of Holland, which caught a mine in its net; JOURNAAL, NTS, 1966-08-10.

¹²³⁶ I.e. PING AN, Leo Moen, NCRV, 1966-09-27 (the accident happened near Ter Heijde).

¹²³⁷ JOURNAAL (NTS/NOS): [car park] 1968-03-06; [theft police car] 1968-06-02; [mutiny at Liberian carrier ‘African Monarch’] 1967-12-24; [fire at Gulf refinery] 1969-11-15; [strike] 1969-01-03; [boarding house, together with Van Rhijn] 1971-01-01; [harbour, accident] 1971-08-28.

¹²³⁸ Colophon of the magazine *Rotterdam*, vol. 6/1, 1968, Gemeentelijk Bureau Voorlichting en Publiciteit, Rotterdam.

¹²³⁹ http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/De_Ondergedoken_Camera (2008-08-10). See also the photographic book *Rotterdam 1940-1946* by Van Rhijn (1947).

¹²⁴⁰ Shot near Capelle aan den IJssel (Rotterdam agglo.). The Hollandsche IJssel is a tributary of the Rhine / Maas.

¹²⁴¹ E.g. JOURNAAL, 1967-10-16, at Europoort; 1968-02-28 and 1971-10-13 and 1974-10-14 at Shell, Pernis; 1973-01-20, explosion at tanker Hallanger, Botlek; 1973-08-15, fire at factory Cindu-Key & Kramer, Maassluis; 1973-11-26, fire in a shed of chemicals at Waalhaven; 1974-05-29, fire at Oxirane, Botlek; among others.

¹²⁴² On the 29th of May 1974, for example, he reported on the (crucial) municipal elections, a fire at the chemical industry of Oxirane in the Botlek, and the arrival of fans of football club Tottenham at Airport Zestienhoven for the UEFA cup final against Feyenoord (won by the latter) (NOS JOURNAAL 1974-05-29).

¹²⁴³ Original quote: ‘De huidige omroepverenigingen en de NOS volgen nauwelijks de belangrijke zaken die zich in Rotterdam en zijn regio afspelen. Rotterdam is alleen nieuws als er een schip in brand staat, als er een ontploffing op een raffinaderij is en als alarmfase II wordt aangekondigd.’

Due to ever increasing numbers of news shows, and the involvement of well-informed local correspondents, a structural media engagement gradually emerged.

Although Korver made all kinds of news reports, he became particularly specialised in 'port affairs'¹²⁴⁴. A striking example is a report on the embarkation of a complete hospital assembly kit for the liberation front in Northern Vietnam (1974-11-04), which was designed by architect Carel Weeber and his students from the University of Delft¹²⁴⁵. Another one is on a drama with a ship called 'Eco Marino' that sank in the port of Rotterdam, with five casualties (1978-06-08)¹²⁴⁶. Next to his work for the JOURNAAL, Korver carried out various commissions, especially for companies in the port. It exemplifies the link between journalism and business¹²⁴⁷.

Van Rhijn, in turn, also made reports on shipping and the port at large, for example on the last trip of the legendary ship 'Nieuw Amsterdam' to New York (1971-11-08), and on the remarkable tragedy of a whale that visited the port, where it found its death¹²⁴⁸. However, Van Rhijn was especially committed to social and political issues. As such he shot in Rotterdam a demonstration against the war in Vietnam (1972-12-30), people occupying the Portuguese consulate (1974-01-23) and a demonstration against death-sentences in Spain (1975-09-26). Van Rhijn, who turned 65 in 1975, only occasionally made reports afterwards. In his stead, other correspondents frequently came to Rotterdam, among them Jacques de Gier, who was based in The Hague, and Hans Koekoek, who was based in Hilversum, but born and raised in Rotterdam, as the son of a cinema operator¹²⁴⁹.

The reports just mentioned do not only exemplify the local engagement with media, but they also show that international issues found their sediments in Rotterdam – the political situation in Chile would be another case¹²⁵⁰. Illustrative is also an attack of the Palestinian El Fatah movement, which was responsible for an explosion of an oil tank of the Gulf refinery in the Europoort (JOURNAAL, NOS, 1971-03-15)¹²⁵¹. The city's concerns were, in turn, transmitted abroad via the European Broadcasting Union, which included also recordings by foreign

¹²⁴⁴ As such he also shot a.o. the arrival of container ship *Nitron* (JOURNAAL, 1972-06-03), an international show of the port with all kinds of new ships (1972-10-06), and the demonstration of 'Docklift I', a floating dock to transport dredging mills and oil-rigs (1972-10-09), all shot on 16mm colour stock.

¹²⁴⁵ For more information on this project by the *Medisch Comité Nederland Vietnam*, see: Stokvis, 2005: 2.

¹²⁴⁶ Another example is: NOS JOURNAAL, 1978-09-26 (Pim Korver). It was a concentrated 'documentary' of four-and-a-half minutes on different aspects of the port, with departing vessels, dredging ships on the Nieuwe Waterweg, the Europoort development, next to such things like summer houses and allotments near the harbour.

¹²⁴⁷ A case in point is the AVRO-television documentary *SOMS WINT DE ZEE* (1979-01-08, Pim Korver), about the towing companies Wijsmuller and Smit, for which he also made promotion films. Korver also made films for other commissioners, e.g. the *Nederlands Maritiem Instituut* for which he registered the event ROTTERDAM MARITIEM 1978 (1979, Korver). The link between journalism and commissioned films is also exemplified by a film made for the police: *VAN UUR NUL TOT 24* (1968, Pim Korver).

¹²⁴⁸ JOURNAAL (NOS, 1972-05-07 and 1972-05-08).

¹²⁴⁹ Hans Koekoek started his career at Multifilm (Cinecentrum) in 1957, where he became a cameraman in 1960 (see the article: 'Hans Koekoek: "Vakmanschap in de film wordt duur betaald"', in: *Accent*, 1969-05-24, collection NFM > Koekoek). His father, Nathan Koekoek, worked as a cinema operator in Rotterdam since 1928; Hans Koekoek wrote a film script about his father's life (1988), see: GAR, archive: 'Collectie Tj. De Vries betreffende Rotterdamse bioscopen', toegangsnr. 1289, inventarisnr. 127. Koekoek also carried out various productions in Rotterdam, e.g. the promotional film *OP LEVEN EN DOOD* ('On Life and Death', 1971), with people at 'De Lijnbaan' being interviewed about big issues of life, made for *Bureau Voorlichting Levensverzekering* (publicity for life insurance).

¹²⁵⁰ Another important correspondent-cameraman in this respect is Drost, who reported from all over the Netherlands, including Rotterdam, where he made also various reports on political events, such as the international Chile Conference (1977-08-29). Rotterdam's Mayor André van der Louw played a prominent role in the Chili Comité (Chile Committee) of the Socialist International, in order to support the opposition against Pinochet. Two years before, the committee had already organised a conference in Rotterdam (1975-03-13), see: 'Bezoekers', p22 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 13/3, 1975. In those years, there were also frequently protest actions in Rotterdam against the Chilean regime, see e.g. *ACHTER HET NIEUWS* (VARA, 1975-03-27) and *KENMERK* (IKON, 1976-04-14 and 1977-03-23), about actions against the import of Chilean fruit in the port of Rotterdam.

¹²⁵¹ Cf. Van Nimwegen, 2007: 43.

television stations, especially Visnews (UK)¹²⁵². Besides that, various other foreign television crews came to Rotterdam, which made Rotterdam, in the words of Hannerz, part of the ‘global ecumene’.

ongoing news

A news report may be a little story in itself, but several together make a network, in which they are linked to other reports and documentaries, on the basis of correspondences in terms of content, form and productional features. The stories told in this way could be understood as ‘developing compositions’, which show resemblances to narrative structures from fiction film. One case would be the reports on a murdered taxi driver, in December 1970. The reports do not deal with the murder itself, but with its effects. Taxi drivers organise a one hour strike, with their cars parked at the Coolensingel (JOURNAAL, NOS, 1970-12-23). It is followed, three days later, by the cause: a man has been killed, which is illustrated by the funeral and the procession in which eight hundred taxis take part (1970-12-26). Finally the solution is shown: the first taxi in Rotterdam that is protected against criminal behaviour (1970-12-31). The story, with a running time of two minutes spread over nine days, is told from the perspective of the colleagues, and their anxiety is taken as the starting point. We might add here a seven minutes VPRO-report two weeks later (WAS ER NOG WAT, 1971-01-14), in which taxi drivers are interviewed on taking Surinamese clients, and if drivers need to be armed. Instead of the struggle of fellow taxi drivers, the identity of the murderer is the starting point, which is taken as a broad social issue.

From the network perspective we might also consider a Polygoon report made one year later, which was implicitly motivated by the murder of December 1970. It addressed that Rotterdam had got the biggest taxi centre of Europe¹²⁵³. Besides the service of operators to send a taxi to a client, the centre also undertakes action when a taxi driver calls for help. It is illustrated by a *staged* scene of an assault on a taxi driver. The driver pushes an emergency button, after which the centre asks the police and other taxi drivers to chase the criminal.

On the 3rd of April 1975, another taxi driver was killed, in Kralingseveer. This time it was a ‘crime thriller’, as the killer remained anonymous and still had to be found. Also in this case the reports became a *feuilleton*¹²⁵⁴. As the story went on, the viewer became involved with the news in order to know what would happen next. The connection with fiction film is also illustrated by a reconstruction of the taxi driver’s last rides (KRO’s BRANDPUNT (1975-05-03). The idea of a developing composition applies to many news reports. Another example is the case of the historic ‘Koninginnekerk’ (“Queen’s Church”). After it had already attracted substantial attention because of its possible demolition¹²⁵⁵, the JOURNAAL broadcast a ‘serial’ of four newsreels by Pim Korver. On the 3rd of January 1972, it reported on plans to demolish the church. Three days later, it showed a protest demonstration against these plans, which was followed one week later (1972-01-14) by a report on the demolition of the church. Two months later the serial’s (anti) climax took place, as the last tower was exploded (1972-03-22).

Being based in Rotterdam, Korver was also able to shoot another ‘serial’, on conflicts between Dutch citizens and Turkish *gastarbeiders*. The first report dealt with the fact that Dutch people entered a Turkish boarding house in the Afrikaanderwijk in order to throw out furniture

¹²⁵² Examples of transmissions by EBU, see: NTS JOURNAAL, 1967-07-24 on the opening by Luns of a BP refinery, Europoort], Korver’s report (NOS JOURNAAL, 1971-12-04) on the first Austrian ship since 1918; Van Rhijn’s report on the tanker Andromeda that got jammed under the railway bridge and obstructed train traffic (1976-02-12), or Korver’s general impression of the ready Europoort area (1978-09-26). For examples of reports by Visnews, see filmography.

¹²⁵³ GROOTSTE TAXICENTRALE VAN EUROPA, Polygoon, 1972-wk21.

¹²⁵⁴ Correspondent-cameraman Van Rhijn, for the JOURNAAL (1975-04-08), reported a funeral-procession of taxis behind the hearse of B. Hartmann. KRO’s BRANDPUNT (1975-04-16) showed the police investigating the location, checking passenger lists and taking finger prints; the taxi centre is shown and drivers are interviewed about protection. On 1975-04-29 the JOURNAAL showed the investigation procedure. KRO’s BRANDPUNT (1975-05-03) followed with a reconstruction of Hartmann’s last rides.

¹²⁵⁵ E.g. KENMERK, IKOR, 1971-10-20; HIER EN NU, NCRV, 1972-01-11.

(1972-08-10). Two days later he showed windows being smashed by Dutch people, and the police that had to intervene. The next day the *JOURNAAL* reported on riots. On the 14th of August, a report showed Mayor Thomassen and Aldermen Jettinghoff, Vos and Polak going to The Hague, where they discussed the riots with the central government; shots followed of the fights and police intervention. Finally, the damage was recovered. This ‘developing composition’ also included other programmes, as it became a major media event¹²⁵⁶. The *Turkenrellen* (“Turk Riots”) were a climax within a series of reports on foreigners in Rotterdam.

People from various Mediterranean countries came to Rotterdam to work in the port and ship yards like those of Verolme, Wilton-Fijenoord and RDM¹²⁵⁷. It attracted the attention of the media, which, at the same time, became also available to them to express their ideas. The NOS, for example, began the programme *PASPOORT*, for immigrants to make their own television programme, with editions in various languages (e.g. Turkish, Portuguese, Yugoslavian)¹²⁵⁸. Besides Mediterranean immigrants, an important influx came from the Dutch colony Suriname since its independence in 1975¹²⁵⁹. Television reported on this too, while it was also used to inform the Surinamese about matters like housing, as explained by Alderman Elizabeth Smith¹²⁶⁰. However, certain conflicts were inevitable, and Surinamese activists even occupied the Euromast to express their discontent on the municipal *Sociale Dienst* (social service). It was a way to attract media attention, which happened indeed, as the *JOURNAAL* reported on this protest (NOS, 1977-04-15). At the same time there were also initiatives to promote Surinamese culture by way of media¹²⁶¹.

Many more ‘developing compositions’ could be mentioned here, with the most important being those regarding the harbour strikes of the 1970s, which will be elaborated in Chapter 14.

§ 4. media and the municipality

The municipality supported the emergence of an audiovisual culture in different ways. In accordance with the ideas that had been expressed by the committee for the policy on the arts in 1957, the municipality established the *Gemeentelijke Educatieve Filmotheek*, as a film rental service to educational institutions in the city. Since 1966, until the late 1970s, it built an extensive collection. It included various titles related to Rotterdam, especially regarding its port, next to a substantial number of films that had been made for private companies¹²⁶². Except for this initiative, other developments were slightly different from those envisioned by the committee.

For the production of all sorts of films, including productions for municipal services, the committee had suggested a central role for the *Rotterdamse Kunststichting* (RKS). Until the 1970s, however, the RKS was only incidentally concerned with film. Nevertheless the art project ‘Corpocinema’ (1967, Theo Botschuyver, Jeffrey Shaw, Tjebbe van Tijen, Sean Wellesley-

¹²⁵⁶ See: *TELEVIZIER III/45*, AVRO, 1972-08-14; *BRANDPUNT*, KRO, 1972-08-11; *HIER EN NU*, NCRV, 1972-08-18.

¹²⁵⁷ See e.g. *KENMERK*, IKOR, 1974-03-13; cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 527.

¹²⁵⁸ It was a programme for immigrants all over the Netherlands, but several editions dealt with Rotterdam; e.g. İlhan Karacı spoke with Mayor Van der Louw on the problems with the Turkish ‘Grey Wolves’ (*PASPOORT: TURKS*, NOS: 1976-11-14) and *PASPOORT: JOEGOSLAVISCH* (NOS: 1977-10-06) reported on ‘Wijkcentrum Middelland’.

¹²⁵⁹ E.g. *BRANDPUNT*, KRO, 1974-09-28; *TELEVIZIER V/36*, AVRO, 1974-07-01 and *TELEVIZIER VII/48*, 1976-08-13).

¹²⁶⁰ *TV-INFORMATIE VOOR SURINAMERS*, NOS, 1976-02-09.

¹²⁶¹ E.g. a video registration by Van Heijningen of the theatre play *BA ANANSI WO! WO! WO!* (1977), in *De Lantaren*.

¹²⁶² Films about shipping and the port of Rotterdam included titles such as *WIJD EN ZIJD* (1964, Han van Gelder), which was a film made for shipping company Phs. Van Ommeren; *BAGGER* (1967, Tom Tholen), for Volker; *WATERWEG* (1970, Jan Wiegel), for the Nederlandse Particuliere Rijnvaartcentrale; *ZEESLEEPVAART* (1976, Pim Korver), for Smit, a.o. Films about the city included titles such as *HOUEN ZO!* (1952, Herman van der Horst) and *EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM* (1965, Polygoon). The majority of films, however, dealt with other subjects, and were produced by companies such as Unilever, Shell and Philips, besides Disney and other film companies, next to educational films made by the NOF/NIAM – see the brochure: *Gemeentelijke Filmotheek – Catalogus 1976*, GAR: ‘Collectie Bibliotheek’ P2815; see also: GAR: Archief ‘Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Kunstzaken’, toegangsnr. 487.01, ‘Stukken betreffende het aanschaffen van niet-commerciële educatieve films ten behoeve van de gemeentelijke Filmotheek, 1966-1972’.

The Filmotheek was located at Wijnhaven, 25.

Miller) became famous, which was commissioned by RKS chairman Ludo Pieters. It had its premiere at the Schouwburgplein, where a large transparent dome was set up, with dynamic projection surfaces inside (smoke, foam, paint, liquids e.a.). Various kinds of film images were projected on it from the outside, which were combined with light effects from within¹²⁶³.

In 1971 the RKS got its own film section. Its main task became the organisation of Film International (International Film Festival Rotterdam – see Chapter 15.§4). The RKS also supported De Lantaren, which established a film workshop, while it organised film courses too. In addition, the RKS had a modest budget to sponsor art films, from socially motivated documentaries (e.g. WIJK 20, 1974, Staal & Verheijen), to fiction shorts (e.g. AAN DE DEUR, 1979, Thys Ockersen). However, productions made for municipal services were still coordinated by the “Office for Information and Publicity” (*Bureau Voorlichting & Publiciteit*), which I will discuss now.

In 1961, Koos Bax succeeded Jan Nieuwenhuis as the chief information officer. Bax had previously worked for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and knew the power of media¹²⁶⁴. He immediately approached the *Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij* and commissioned two films, one dealing with the city, the other with the port, for which Jan Blokker wrote the scripts, while Eduard van der Enden became responsible for the cinematography of both films.

The first, fictionalised film is ROTTERDAM (1962, Eimert Kruidhof). An English family gets stuck in Rotterdam when their car breaks down¹²⁶⁵. When it is being repaired they go for a city tour and ‘discover’ sites like the St. Laurens church, De Lijnbaan, Hofplein, Beurs, Euromast, the airport, the port and the seaside, and finally the family stays the night at the Rijnhotel. We also see the city’s cosmopolitan life, with cafés and restaurants, people shopping, as well as Museum Boijmans-Van Beuningen and sculptures by De Keyser (‘Erasmus’, 1622), Gabo, and Zadkine. The other film is POORT VAN EUROPA (“Gateway to Europe”, 1962), directed by Ytzen Brusse, who previously made RHYTHM OF ROTTERDAM (1952). First is the Euromast, adding to its fame as the city’s new icon. Next is an overview of the city, the port and its logistics (e.g. radar signalling), its industries, the Botlek and the Maasvlakte that is ‘ideal for settling enterprises’. The industry, it is said, delivers social and urban benefits, regarding housing, shopping, education and recreation. Emblematic is an image of a woman hanging out laundry with industry in the background. In Haanstra-like fashion there is also a shot of boys playing with a toy ship, followed by shots of ship building.

Meanwhile, in 1962, the port of Rotterdam had become the largest in the world, leaving New York in second place. Whereas Rotterdam served already as an international model of urban planning, the success of the port reinforced the attention all the more. As a result, television stations from all over the world came to Rotterdam¹²⁶⁶. It was coordinated by the “Office for Information & Publicity”, particularly by Ivo Blom, since 1958¹²⁶⁷. He made special arrangements, such as interviews, access to firms and sites, facilities to be used for filming, such

¹²⁶³ Premiere on 1967-08-24. It was subsequently shown in Amsterdam (Museumplein). A re-enactment took place in 2005: <http://imaginarymuseum.org/AAAPublic/corpcinema.html> (visited: 2008-07-04); this website includes: ‘Verwarde Corpcinema; “Er is hierbij geen waarom”’, *Het Vrije Volk*, 1967-08-25; ‘Kleurenbol’, *De Courant Nieuws van de dag* (Amsterdam), 1967-09-21; “‘Corpcinema’ novum in Rotterdam’, *De Schiedammer*, 1967-08-26.

¹²⁶⁴ Bax in: Van der Schaaf & Hazewinkel, 1996: 53.

¹²⁶⁵ The family is actually played by Dutch actors, the Rotterdam based couple Steye and Ansjé van Brandenburg and their 12 year old son Peter, see: ‘Rotterdam in Kleur’, p22 in *Rotterdam, officieel tijdschrift van de gemeente Rotterdam*, vol 1/2, 1962.

¹²⁶⁶ This fact was presented early 1963. Reports on it included: WHERE WE STAND (1963, Alex Kendrick/CBS), mentioned (p22) in *Rotterdam, officieel tijdschrift van de gemeente Rotterdam*, vol 1/4, 1963; FLOURISHING EUROPE (1963, Japan), WHAT’S NEW (1963, GB), TODAY SHOW (1963, NBC, USA) [ibid, p21, vol 2/1, 1963]. In the next editions of the magazine more productions are mentioned, by television teams from Germany, USA, Brazil and France (vol. 2/2, 1963), Argentina, Italy, Australia, and again Japan and Germany (3/2, 1964), a.o. Since no further details are known, not all of these titles are included in the filmography.

¹²⁶⁷ Blom in: Van der Schaaf & Hazewinkel, 1996: 74.

as cranes, or boats to travel through the port, collaboration of the police and the fire brigade, or something like a performance of the navy band¹²⁶⁸. Some reports were made on the occasion of official visits of foreign guests, including presidents, business delegates, and planners, who wanted to learn about the achievements of Rotterdam and to establish collaborations, which subsequently reinforced the interest¹²⁶⁹. Striking is the great interest by the Japanese, among them businessmen, managers, scientists, governors, planners and along with them, people from Japanese film and television companies¹²⁷⁰. It resulted in a long lasting collaboration between the ports of Rotterdam and Kobe. This Japanese interest was even the subject of a special report by Desmond Hamill for the British Independent Television News¹²⁷¹. The media interest caused ever more interest. This was finally also reflected by a range of educational films on the world's largest port, for elementary and secondary schools in various countries¹²⁷².

Blom also became the executive for films commissioned by the municipality itself, like ROTTERDAM – EUROPOORT (1966, Joris Ivens) and TOUCH (1967, Tom Tholen). Besides special presentations of these films, whether or not as part of campaigns, the city started an information centre, in 1966, called *Open Boek*, with a small cinema that showed films on a regular basis¹²⁷³. Besides that, Blom collaborated, on behalf of the municipality, on feature film productions. Towards the end of the 1960s, an increasing number of fiction films were produced with images shot in Rotterdam, such as THE DELAY (1968, Nico Crama), TRAFIC (1971, Jacques Tati), L'ALPAGUEUR (1976, Philippe Labro), and SOLDAAT VAN ORANJE (1977, Paul Verhoeven)¹²⁷⁴. The French crime thriller L'ALPAGUEUR may serve as an example¹²⁷⁵. Its opening sequence takes place in Rotterdam, which has been described by Clarke Fountain (2006) as follows:

In this film, L'Alpagueur ['bounty hunter'] is Jean-Paul Belmondo, who does his work with a considerable sense of humor, great charm, and in as 'clean' a way as possible. First, he busts a drug-trafficking ring operating out of Rotterdam by observing that a certain 'pregnant' woman moves in an unusual fashion. Her 'baby' turns out to be a large, specially shaped package of heroin. The drug kingpins stung by his operation seek to find the man who thwarted them....

¹²⁶⁸ Navy band: in the case of WHERE WE STAND, 1963, Alex Kendrick/CBS.

¹²⁶⁹ An example is a report on the occasion of the visit of Edward S. Olcott, from the planning division of the port of New York; 'bezoek', p22 in *Rotterdam, officieel tijdschrift van de gemeente Rotterdam*, vol 2/2, 1963.

¹²⁷⁰ See, for example, the report 'Bezoekers', p22 in *Rotterdam, officieel tijdschrift van de gemeente Rotterdam*, vol 5/2, 1967. It mentions a Japanese production on Rotterdam and the Europoort (director: Kiyoshige Onishi; reporter: Masaaki Shibatsuji, cameraman: M. Koga), who came to Rotterdam in November 1966 and January 1967. On the same page is mentioned the initiative for collaboration between Rotterdam and Kobe. See also e.g. production by Banno, Marita, Koga / NHK (Japan) > on Europoort (Rotterdam, vol. 8/3, 1970, p21); Shimoura, Tomono, Hagiwara / Mainichi Television (Japan) > on Havenvakschool a.o. (vol. 9/2, 1971, p30); Kajima Productions Ltd, Tokyo > on city and port (vol. 9/3, 1971, p22), a.o.

¹²⁷¹ 'Bezoekers', p26 in: *Rotterdam, officieel tijdschrift van de gemeente Rotterdam*, vol 11/2, 1973.

¹²⁷² One of the first was a film by MacGrawHill (USA) – in: 'Bezoekers', p22 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 4/1, 1966. Other educational productions on Rotterdam (not mentioned in the filmography) were made by e.g.: Serge Vallin / French school television > on architecture; Ronnie Mutch & Graham Ironside / Yorkshire Television > city & port; Hans May & Mark Froideveau / Swiss school television > port's mouth Hoek van Holland; A. Walter / Canadian school television > city & port (ref.: vol. 7/3, 1969, p20). See also: ROTTERDAM-EUROPOORT, GATEWAY TO EUROPE (1971, Irv Rusinov), for: Encyclopaedia Britannica (USA); Beppe Wolgers for Swedish school television, (ref. vol. 11/2, 1973: p26); George van Puymbroeck, BRT (Belgium) > on European ports (ref. vol. 12/2, 1974: p25 and 12/3: p26) [= most likely: HAVENS VOOR EUROPA, 1975, STV] .

¹²⁷³ Bertus Schmidt (director of Open Boek), in: Van der Schaaf & Hazewinkel, 1996: 69. *Open Boek* was located in a wing of the *Bouwcentrum* (see also: Bax & Edzes, 1970: 16). In 1976 the *Open Boek* was transformed into H.I.C. (*Hulp- en Informatiecentrum*), located at the central post office, see: BINNENSTADSDAG (1976, J. Vrijhof).

¹²⁷⁴ Blom in: Van der Schaaf & Hazewinkel, 1996: 75. For various other (French, Belgian, German, Japanese a.o.) productions during these years, see e.g. *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 10/2, 1972 – p22, and vol. 11/1, 1973 – p26-27.

¹²⁷⁵ 'Belmondo in Rotterdam', p23 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 14/1, 1976.

The opening scene is shot at a waterfront location in Vlaardingen; it looks like a deteriorated neighbourhood, especially depressing because of the autumn weather¹²⁷⁶. The scene takes place in front of a modestly modern premises that houses an Indonesian restaurant. A shot from the inside shows a view over the river, with on the other side the petrochemical industry of the Botlek. In order to arrest the criminals, policemen are hidden in a typical Dutch three-wheeled *Spijkstaal* milk van, which was used to sell dairy products door-to-door. When the arrest has taken place, Belmondo steps on board of a boat and floats away.

We thus see Rotterdam's port and ships under a cloudy sky, heavy industry, a criminal network and drugs, with indexes of exotic food and domestic dairy, as well as run-down modernism. That seems to be the French image of Rotterdam in the 1970s. How the city and the port were presented was not much of an issue to the municipality; the moviegoer would understand that the conventions of the crime thriller were different from ordinary life. Most important was the concern of attracting attention, which itself had become a *raison d'être*¹²⁷⁷. This is also exemplified by other productions, like the television drama *LIEFDE EN LANGE VINGERS* (1975, Gerben Hellinga, NOS). It tells the story of a girl who has problems at home. She and her boyfriend escape to the big city, where they live from shoplifting. The image of the city seemed realistic¹²⁷⁸. The film was made in a documentary style, due to the cinematography by Mat van Hensbergen, while the actors Cina Timisela and Maarten Spanjer were not professionals yet and unknown until then. *Bureau Voorlichting*, together with the police and the RET (public transport), collaborated also on this film that showed a marginal and unpolished side of Rotterdam¹²⁷⁹. By providing facilitating services, the municipality actively participated in the way Rotterdam was framed¹²⁸⁰.

Historian Paul van de Laar (2000: 521) has pointed to the role of Alderman Hajo Viersen for port affairs, who argued, since 1973, that the development of Rotterdam and its port in the long run required high profile services to attract highly educated workers – the so-called *Viersen-doctrine*. To that end the quality of urban life had to improve, by making the city more attractive. Viersen initiated an office for Rotterdam promotion, to show another image of the city, instead of just the port and labour. As a result, Rotterdam became more frequently present in television reports on tourist attractions¹²⁸¹. It also affected foreign media reporting on Rotterdam. In 1973, the BBC was among the first, when its producer and director Peter Adam, together with the Dutch filmmaker Ed van der Elsken, made a programme on the arts in Rotterdam¹²⁸².

To reinforce this image, a one-minute television advertisement was made (*STERSPOT ROTTERDAM*, 1975, Toonder Studio's), which presented Rotterdam as a city of leisure. First is an aerial shot of the Euromast and the port, to make clear that it is Rotterdam. It then highlights its shopping centres, its exhibitions and events, and its architecture. It finally addresses the port in terms of leisure too, for boat trips¹²⁸³. In addition, films were made for a foreign public – tourists, clients and investors, which explicitly linked the port to the city's culture and services, while

¹²⁷⁶ At the corner of the Maasboulevard and the Westhavenkade. The recordings were actually taken in January.

¹²⁷⁷ Ivo Blom would later become a senior communication consultant for the Port Authorities.

¹²⁷⁸ Recordings were made a.o. near the Erasmus University, Oude Plantage, Spangen (Café 't Halve Vaatje), see: 'Opnamen NOS-speelfilm', p28 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 13/4, 1975.

¹²⁷⁹ Maas, Judith; 'Liefde & Lange Vingers, Lokatie Rotterdam', p7 in: *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*/'Stad', 1975-09-27.

¹²⁸⁰ Many other examples could be given here, including reports in which Blom appears in front of the camera himself (e.g. *HOLLAND ZE ZEGGEN*; RIJNMOND, EO, 1975-12-10), and also various foreign productions, such as a documentary on Zadkine (1973, Michel Fresnel) for which the GEB made cranes available to the filmmakers (for this and other references, see: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1, 1973 – p27).

¹²⁸¹ E.g. *ZO MAAR EEN ZOMERAVOND* [tourists at Euromast] (VARA, 1969-08-29); *JOURNAAL* [harbour round-trip] (NOS, 1974-04-14); *JOURNAAL* [Kralingse Plas, sea / Hoek van Holland, a.o.] (NOS, 1975-08-04 and 1975-08-05).

¹²⁸² Including subjects like the Rotterdam Philharmonic Orchestra, Museum Boijmans-Van Beuningen and various monuments; see: 'Bezoekers', p26 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/2, 1973.

¹²⁸³ Concerning shopping it shows 'De Lijnbaan' and 'Beursplein', the historical shopping street Binnenweg, and the modern shopping mall 'Zuidplein'. Concerning exhibitions and events it shows Museum Boijmans-Van Beuningen, the Ahoy'-hall, as well as Blijdorp Zoo. The city's architecture is highlighted by the 'Bouwcentrum'.

stressing Rotterdam's position as an international hub (e.g. CROSSROAD ROTTERDAM, 1979, Kees van Eijk, Werner Jansen).

However, as Van de Laar has said, to present such an image, there must be a correspondence with the facts, sooner or later. Different from the acts of city branding is a report like that of VARA-VISIE (1978-11-14), which explicitly called the Dutch government to pay attention to the declining economic position of Rotterdam, its housing shortage, and the situation of immigrants.

The core identity of a city, and its development path, cannot easily be changed by promoting an ideal model top down, just like the other way round is highly difficult too: to change an urban system through ideal images that come to the fore in the public debate. Such changes require a gradual transverse across different levels of the city's composition, which encompass respectively the system's features, structure and organisation¹²⁸⁴. Therefore various municipal departments communicated their work by way of film¹²⁸⁵. In order to show them the municipality established a cinema at its information centre *Open Boek*. In addition to the film, this centre also organised excursions, by bus, to various municipal enterprises¹²⁸⁶.

Over the course of the 1970s, the municipal departments of "Public Works" (Gemeentewerken) and public transport (RET) set up their own information services. The former even produced films itself, through its phototechnical service. Among its productions, directed by Henk Vrijmoet, was the ROTTERDAMS JOURNAAL (1967). It included succinct and clearly explained portraits, each of four minutes, of the construction of projects such as Alexanderpolder, the Maasvlakte, and the airport (a.o.). Next to that, both Gemeentewerken and the RET also commissioned films (see e.g. films by Peter Alsemgeest, Chapter 12. §2). In most other cases the "Office for Information & Publicity" coordinated the film productions¹²⁸⁷.

An example is a film for the municipal water company, called DE DORST VAN DE RIJMOND ("The thirst of the Rijnmond", 1974). This production, directed by Elvira Kleinen, is fast, fashionable and even funny, with outstanding cinematography and slightly experimental sound¹²⁸⁸. It was commissioned on the occasion of the centenary of the "Municipal Water Production Company", but it actually explains the reasons and motivations of three new complexes (arch. Wim Quist)¹²⁸⁹. Historical information was provided by a book instead¹²⁹⁰.

The film starts with extreme close-ups of men tasting cups of water. It is followed by ships at the Nieuwe Maas transporting barrels of drinking water, a metro in a washing street, and the cleaning of bottles, among others. There are also images of the old "Drinking Water Complex" at Honingerdijk (DWL, 1874, arch. Van der Tak) during its last years. The film addresses the need for an extension of the company and for modernisation, because of the pollution of the Nieuwe Maas and its increasing amount of salt, which makes it more difficult to gain clean drinking water from the river. Next to that a growing population within the

¹²⁸⁴ cf. Conti, 2005: 33; Rooijendijk, 2005: 444.

¹²⁸⁵ Many examples could be mentioned here, such as the 'construction films' VOOR MORGEN EN OVERMORGEN and CENTRALE MAASVLAKTE, BRON VOOR ENERGIE (1972, 1975, Peter Spronkers) for GEB [electricity works]; GAS (1975, Joop van Reede); ZUIDPLEIN (1972, Aad Griekspoor) for the Dienst Stadsontwikkeling; ROTTERDAMSE BRANDWEER (1975, A.C. Kroonenberg) for the fire brigade; RECONSTRUCTIE COOLSINGEL EN BINNENSTADSDAG (1976, Ary Groeneveld) for HIC; and the fiction short P.D. DE RECHERCHE-FILM (1978, Ruurd Fenenga) for the police department, among others. Next to such films, various television reports were made about municipal departments, e.g. about the water company: VAN GEWEST TOT GEWEST (NOS, 1979-03-28), the aliens' police department: 3 DAGEN BIJ DE VREEMDELINGENPOLITIE IN ROTTERDAM (Joost Tholens / KRO, 1979-01-15) a.o.

¹²⁸⁶ Bax & Edzes, 1970: 16

¹²⁸⁷ For comparison, see for example the municipal films made for the city of Groningen (Hajema, 2001: 213) and for the city of Utrecht, which had its own film production unit (1964-1988, directed by H.W. Gomersbach) www.hetutrechtsarchief.nl/onderzoek/onderwerpen/films (2008-11-13).

¹²⁸⁸ Cinematography: Pim Heytman, sound: Henk van Aggele.

¹²⁸⁹ I.e. "Water Purification Plant Berenplaat" (1959-1965), "Water Win Complex Petrusplaat" (1969-1974) and "Waterworks Schaarwijk" (1973-1977); Cf. Groenendijk, 2004 > architectuur > personen > Quist

¹²⁹⁰ Besides historical data it included also extra information on current trends – i.e. *De Watermakers* (Dijkstra, 1974).

agglomeration needs to be served. Therefore the decision was made to build the new purification plant Berenplaat, which is shown in detail. Next to that a reservoir and a water win complex ('Petrusplaat') have been made in the nature area of the Biesbosch, south-east of Rotterdam. The architecture has been adapted to its environment, which has been done, among others, by roof vegetation: the building and the reservoirs have become part of the landscape. From these reservoirs, water runs through tubes to Rotterdam. They emphasise that the city is a system and a network that links all kinds of places to one another. It is also illustrated by images as diverse as a private home with a woman having a shower, people drinking water, fountains at Hofplein and the pools at Schouwburgplein, as well as the accommodation of the polarbears in Blijdorp Zoo.

DE DORST VAN DE RIJNMOND was shown at the Cineac-NRC¹²⁹¹; the newspaper itself (NRC, 1975-11-4) announced that the film received the first prize at the international festival for industrial films in Montreux (France), while at home it was awarded the *Prix d'Amsterdam*¹²⁹². The film and its director have nevertheless been left unnoticed by historians. However, images like the opening scene of men tasting water, the female torso under a shower, but also the polar bears, for example, express what Thomas Elsaesser (2005: 204) has called 'the body as perceptual surface', which he coined in connection to the work of the Dutch documentary *auteur* Johan van der Keuken. Through the body the importance of the water company for the city is expressed, with water linking all citizens. In this way the city appears as one modern, collective body. It is comparable to Elizabeth Lebas's argument regarding Glasgow:

I have tried to suggest that [municipal] film sponsorship served several purposes, of which instruction and persuasion were no more important than an evolving representation of the body politic. As such, these representations whose political value is bound up with the modernity of their medium are useful to review our understanding of the imaginary of social democracy and the part which imagery of the city played in its construction. (Lebas, 2007: 50)

The 'social body' of the city, represented by the 'corporation', needed its constituents to realise their role and position within its development, based on a democratic order. In fact, such ideas came explicitly to the fore in discussions on local media practices.

discussions

In 1970, Alderman Van der Ploeg, for education and social work, was asked to prepare outlines for local broadcasting, and on the 18th of March 1971 the city council decided to establish the *Stichting Rotterdamse Regionale Omroep*, with Mayor Thomassen as its founding chairman¹²⁹³. It was 'hosted' by Van der Ploeg's department, but its board consisted of twenty-seven representatives of various organisations and groups in Rotterdam. Although it had been a straight forward decision, the actualisation of local broadcasting was still highly complicated. A discussion had nevertheless been started, to which the municipality dedicated an issue of the magazine *Rondvraag* (1973/1, Elfferich, Edzes, Matthijsse, eds.).

'The input of information has to come from the region and has to flow back into it', argued Adriaan van der Staay, the director of the Rotterdam Arts Council¹²⁹⁴. Local broadcasting, it was said, had a monitoring function, which, moreover, had to establish feedback loops, by repeated reports on particular issues¹²⁹⁵. Similarly, the head of the municipal office for

¹²⁹¹ 'De Dorst van de Rijnmond', p5 in: *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1974-10-25.

¹²⁹² I.e. best informational film addressed for a broad public, awarded by the *Stichting Audiovisuele Manifestaties* (Oss).

¹²⁹³ *Gemeentebld 1971*, nr. 88; code: 1.817.6/7 – radio en televisie; decision of the city council upon the proposal of the college of mayor and aldermen (*Verzameling gedrukte stukken 1971*, volgnr. 62, O.J.V. nr. 68.2883-02). www.bds.rotterdam.nl/content.jsp?objectid=138096 (2008-08-14).

¹²⁹⁴ v/d Staay, 1973: 14. Or. quote: 'De toevoer van informatie moet uit de regio komen en terugvloeien naar de regio.'

¹²⁹⁵ J.H. Dittmar, citizen of The Hague, about his participation in an experiment with neighbourhood television by the VPRO, in: 'Tekortkomingen signaleren en beleids mensen hinderlijk volgen', p16 in: Elfferich e.a., 1973.

information and publicity, Koos Bax (1973: 4), argued that the city needed local broadcasting first of all ‘for and by the locality’. This concerned mainly the production of news programmes, programmes with local information, and specific programmes that could ‘help to support the community’. Target groups would include minorities such as *gastarbeiders*, patients, action groups, residents of the old and the new districts, as well as industrial circles, which could use the opportunity to build community relations¹²⁹⁶.

Van der Staay (1973: 13), however, warned of decimating the NOS: one would lose its achievements, while getting pseudo-NOS programmes in return. Bax argued that local broadcasting should not be a competitor of national broadcasting. It would be better, he said (p5), to think of a new overall broadcasting system; rather than being additional, local broadcasting had to become an integral part of it. This would also allow for national transmission of local productions, through ‘hatches’ (*doorgeefluiken*), based on a refined network of correspondent-producers all over the country. In this way, cities and districts could also learn from each other’s experiences.

Notwithstanding the general support for local broadcasting in Rotterdam, it was still hard to make it, due to legal obstructions, organisational and financial complications, and the problematic role in this development of the national broadcasting foundation NOS. While these difficulties were discussed, another development was taking place, that of cable television, which even allowed for neighbourhood programming. Bax addressed this issue as well.

Those casually following the current reading on the ‘new media’, can easily get the impression that cable networks are now going to bring the solution of a tricky and harping question. They demand investment, time, but then they offer a range of possibilities, and they make all things that have been said and written so far ‘outmoded’. The impression is also advanced by people that follow the development of cable networks with more than idealist interest. It is a fact that the cable will play a major role; the ‘wired city’ is possibly closer than we think. Yet, the cable does not solve the problem of local broadcasting. It offers another possibility, nothing more.¹²⁹⁷

Although one expected local broadcasting to be a fact within a few years, and while Bax spoke of a ‘harping question’ after three years of discussion, it took many more years before it became reality (local radio in 1983, local television in 1989¹²⁹⁸). Notwithstanding this problematic development, the role of media within urban development had become an important topic.

The discussion affected also the *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam* (municipal archive). In 1961, when Rudolf Renting became its director, he ‘himself took charge of the film collection. He catalogued the films in two categories: newsreels and documentaries’ (Giersbergen, 2005: 12). On the 28th of October 1971, the archive opened a film theatre in its building, on the top floor of its newly built extension, and the screening of films became a recurrent event¹²⁹⁹. Besides

¹²⁹⁶ Bax, 1973: 4. Original quote: ‘Lokaal nieuws en lokale actualiteiten; lokale informatie dus en typische programma’s die “de gemeenschap helpen dragen” als we het zo eens zwaarwichtig zouden mogen uitdrukken: uitzendingen dus voor en over lokale groepen: minderheidsgroeperingen als gastarbeiders maar ook blinden, zieken, actiegroepen, bewoners van oude (en waarom niet van nieuwe) wijken, industriële kringen (een pracht gelegenheid om aan community relations te doen).’

¹²⁹⁷ Original quote: ‘Wie met een zekere argeloosheid [...] de recente lectuur over de ‘nieuwe media’ volgt, kan gemakkelijk onder de indruk komen dat kabelnetten nu de oplossing gaan brengen van een netelig en maar doorzeurend vraagstuk. Ze vergen investering, tijd, maar dan geven ze een scala van mogelijkheden dat alles wat er tot nu toe is gezegd en geschreven ‘uit de tijd’ maakt. De indruk wordt nog in de hand gewerkt door mensen die de ontwikkeling van kabelnetten uit meer dan ideële belangstelling volgen. Het staat vast dat de kabel een grote rol gaat spelen; de ‘wired city’ is wellicht dichterbij dan we denken. Alleen, de kabel lost het probleem van de lokale uitzendingen niet op. Ze geeft een andere mogelijkheid, meer niet.’

¹²⁹⁸ The television station was called Stads TV Rotterdam, which became TV Rijnmond in 1997.

¹²⁹⁹ The first show consisted of silent films from 1925-1940, with live music by Mrs. A.J. Spijkman-Visser, and the renewed reconstruction film EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM (1965, Polygoon). Mr. P. Ratsma (head of the *topografisch-historische atlas*, i.e. film collection GAR) introduced the programme. *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1972: 124. In 1973 a

preservation and presentation, Renting actively acquired films, and he commissioned filmmakers to document old parts of the city that were subject to change (e.g. HET OUDE NOORDEN, 1972, J. van Rhijn). Vrijmoet, who had made films for Gemeentewerken before, started to work for the archive as a photographer, and to manage the film collection. Since the archive already made photographic and sound recordings¹³⁰⁰, Renting argued for regular film recordings too. With information officer Koos Bax he developed the idea for a municipal film unit, and they sent a proposal to the Mayor and Aldermen (1973-06-28). 'For a long time, Rotterdam has already been in need of local newsreels and documentary shorts. If we want to give a realistic image of the city, at any moment, and to 'sell' it, the moving image is indispensable'¹³⁰¹. Another motivation was the frequent request of foreign television stations for footage.

The proposal was supported by the municipal committee for the archives, but the financial committee had its doubts¹³⁰². Mayor Thomassen made a plea in favour of the plan and asked the financial committee to reconsider it once more. The question, however, was not if film was needed – that was beyond dispute. The question was if the archive should run such a unit that would also carry out productions for other municipal departments, or if the city should work with independent filmmakers and freelancers as it used to do. The financial committee feared that the films would not be professional enough. Renting, in his turn, emphasised the importance of continuous documentation¹³⁰³. In the end the archive got the permission to employ a cameraman and a sound technician for film, but these vacancies would never be fulfilled, since no agreement was reached on investments in equipment¹³⁰⁴. As Thomassen ended his term as Mayor¹³⁰⁵, while Bax left the office for information too, the situation changed again¹³⁰⁶.

The archive concentrated itself on its primary function, to preserve documents, instead of producing them, although its photographic department would occasionally make some film recordings. What this history has made clear, after all, is a complicated ontological conception of film, as a medium to 'store' buildings and events, as 'manifests' of the city's history. This was a matter of recording, but also a matter of active participation in urban development, even to 'sell' the city. The different interests and motivations behind the plans were yet too difficult to let them converge, while the process of cinematic bifurcation complicated the issue.

programme was shown on 6, 8, 13 and 15 February – *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1974: 133 (i.e. VREEWIJK IN 'T GOUD (1966, Aad den Besten), and abbreviated versions of THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS (1928, Transfilma), TUSSCHEN AANKOMST EN VERTREK (1938, Andor von Barys), with additional sound (by GAR) – ref. GAR cat. Nr. GV 671 / GB 671). In 1974 a programme was shown on 21 and 28 of February and 7, 12 and 19 March, consisting of a film on 'Oranjefeestvieringen' (1910s), THE BRIDGE (1928, Joris Ivens), and ROTTERDAM – EUROPOORT (1966, Joris Ivens), – *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1975: 109. See also: *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1977: 134.

¹³⁰⁰ Cf. a television report on this sound archive: TELEVIZIER (1965-12-24, AVRO).

¹³⁰¹ Original quote: 'Reeds lang bestaat er te Rotterdam grote behoefte aan het beschikbaar hebben van locale filmjournaals en korte documentaires. Willen wij op elk moment een reële voorstelling van de stad kunnen geven en de stad kunnen "verkopen", dan is gebruikmaking van het bewegend beeld onmisbaar.' Proposal to Mayor and Aldermen, by Bax and Renting, 1973-06-28, coll. GAR: 'Archief van het Archief', toegangsnr. 297.01, inv. nr. 476.

¹³⁰² Letter (1973-11-19) of J. Riezenkamp, chairman of the *Commissie voor de Financiën*, to Mayor and Aldermen, coll. GAR: 'Archief van het Archief', toegangsnr. 297.01, inv. nr. 476.

¹³⁰³ Letter by Bax and Renting to the mayor (1973-12-17), GAR: 'Archief van het Archief', toegangsnr. 297.01, inv. nr. 476.

¹³⁰⁴ Letter by Renting (1975-03-19) to B&W, GAR: 'Archief van het Archief', toegangsnr. 297.01, inv. nr. 476.

¹³⁰⁵ The municipal commitment to film would be emphasised in a hilarious way by a farewell film that was presented to Thomassen (1974, Rien Peeters). All of his colleagues, aldermen and directors, had collaborated on it, playing fools causing trouble in a city that goes its own way.

¹³⁰⁶ The new head of the office for information, Koos Postema, proposed a continuous film production with freelancers that would be directed and supervised by his office (Letter of Postema, 1975-12-02, to Mayor and Aldermen; coll. GAR: 'Archief van het Archief', toegangsnr. 297.01, inv. nr. 476). This proposal also did not make it, since Postema soon left again, while in the meantime the *Videocentrum* got established (and Renting himself had played a role in its history too, as we will see). This centre would indeed become responsible for a continuous production of recordings in the city, albeit with a different agenda.

The era of Thomassen is characterised by an increasing importance of audiovisual media dealing with the city. Besides the fact that more films and television programmes were made than in the period before, these productions also fulfilled a different role. During the heydays of reconstruction, media provided mostly positive feedback, to reinforce the process set in motion. This gradually changed in the 1960s and 1970s. This is almost comparable to the distinction between ‘continuous stigmergy’ and ‘discrete stigmergy’ in entomology and artificial intelligence (Bonabeau, Dorigo, Theraulaz, 1999: 205). Continuous stigmergy is a matter of stimuli that generate more stimuli of the same kind. The latter is rather different; ‘because stimuli are quantitatively different, no positive feedback effect can amplify a stimulus to transform it into a more intense version of the same stimulus. A stimulus is transformed into another, qualitatively different, stimulus under the action of an [agent]’¹³⁰⁷. There is thus another kind of feedback at work with a different regulatory function. It implies a more diffuse effect of refined media practices providing local information, which I will illustrate here.

In Rotterdam, the municipal concern with media became more pervasive between 1974 and 1981, during the mayorship of André van der Louw (•1933-†2005)¹³⁰⁸. Van der Louw, who was a member of the social-democratic party PvdA, where he led the renewal movement *Nieuw Links* (“New Left”), had previously worked for the socialist broadcasting station VARA (1957-1971)¹³⁰⁹. With Van der Louw as the Mayor, the director of the “Information Office” (the word ‘publicity’ was left behind) would participate in the meetings of Mayor and Aldermen. The well-known VARA-presenter Koos Postema, who was born and raised in Rotterdam, was asked to perform that function. He considered it a challenge, but he withdrew after four months already as he understood that communication policy was of a different nature than television broadcasting¹³¹⁰. Postema returned to his former job, but a connection was made; as a presenter he would collaborate on various events and audiovisual productions related to citizen participation¹³¹¹.

Instead of Postema came Gerrit Schilder, who had worked for VARA-television too¹³¹²:

We came from a time of economic reconstruction, with a neglect of the citizens who lived in the existing bad and small pre-war houses and who did not take it any longer at a certain moment. That caused a break in political thinking, for which I can only oversee the *Partij van de Arbeid* [Labour Party], with strong quarrels between a group that actually wanted to go on as before:

¹³⁰⁷ Bonabeau, Dorigo, Theraulaz, 1999: 208; originally: ‘...under the action of an insect.’

¹³⁰⁸ Van der Louw became mayor on the 16th of November 1974, see the interviews: VRAAGGESPREK MET ANDRÉ VAN DER LOUW (NTS, 1974-11-21); ACHTER HET NIEUWS (VARA, 1974-11-02).

¹³⁰⁹ e.g. DE PAASHEUVEL, BIOGRAFIE VAN EEN 40-JARIGE (VARA-tv, 1963-07-04), on ‘De Paasheuvel’, where ‘Ruimte’/ AJC (socialist youth) celebrated its 40th anniversary. André van der Louw and Peter van Halm produced and directed it, Jan Schaper and Ferenc Kálman Gáll filmed it, and Martin van Dalen did the sound [GAR: ref. Open Studio, kaart 1]. He also collaborated on radio programmes, like UITLAAT, e.g. a report on the socialist approach towards housing shortage (1965-10-08). Next to that Van der Louw was chief editor of music magazine ‘Hitweek’ (since 1965). In 1971 Van der Louw became the chairman of the national party. For general information, see: http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Andr%C3%A9_van_der_Louw (January 2006)

¹³¹⁰ www.beeldengeluid.nl/template_subnav.jsp?navname=biografieen_p&category=collectie_informatie&artid=20607 (2006-04); see also: Van der Schaaf & Hazewinkel, 1996: 125.

¹³¹¹ Postema moderated, for example, a forum for citizens to ask question concerning the municipality at Binnenstadsdag (1976-05-22); on that occasion he also appeared as an interviewer in the RKS production HART VOOR DE STAD (Videocentrum, 1976), together with VARA-colleague Joop Daalmeijer (also from Rotterdam); cf. BINNENSTADSDAG 1978 (1978, F.P. Verheijen). The most important example (made for the Bureau Voorlichting) is EERST ZIEN, DAN GELOVEN (1978, Ton Dirkse); Postema presents the proceedings of the residents organisations in Het Oude Westen, ‘Cool’ and ‘Het Oude Noorden’, as they are collaborating with the municipality.

¹³¹² Among other for the programme KONING KLANT (1960s, VARA). As information officer, he initiated the municipal newspapers *Stadskrant* and *Rotterdam Post* for migrants, while he extended Koos Bax’ information centre *Open Boek* with personal assistance and consultancy (i.e. *Hulp & Informatie Centrum*). Occasionally the latter also commissioned films, e.g. RECONSTRUCTIE COOLSINGEL EN BINNENSTADSDAG (1976), which was made by Ary Groeneveld (who made photographs for various municipal publications as well, e.g. the magazine *Rotterdam*).

welfare first, and the rest comes along by itself, and the new generation that said: we give priority to the residents. To my mind that has put a very big and important mark on the practice of providing information¹³¹³.

The information service became an integral part of the bench of Mayor and Aldermen and its policy. It started to communicate its plans through folders, booklets, newspapers, exhibitions, forums, and indeed film and television¹³¹⁴. Moreover, following the new policy that emphasised interaction with the citizens, Rotterdam got its own *Videocentrum* (1976), above all for the production of ‘neighbourhood videos’, which was first of all intended to promote citizen participation (see: Chapter 16.§).

§ 5. emerging film practices and experimentation

Next to a number of film companies, various individuals came to the fore that started to experiment with film, of which I will mention a few examples. Among them were committed amateurs, particularly those of the *Rotterdamse Smalfilm Liga*. It resulted in celebrated titles such as *MEDDLE* (1973, Louis Smits), a surrealist experiment on memory that lives its own life, *DE SANTEKRAAM* (1974, Hans van Nierop), in which bizarre situations happen in an antique shop, and, for example, the puppet animation *DE SLEUTEL VAN DE PSYCHIATER* (1976, H. Schäfer)¹³¹⁵.

The borders between amateur filmmaking and professional practices were not so strict¹³¹⁶. Exemplary is the case of the ‘independent’ amateur filmmaker Rien Peeters (1925), who was the owner of ten cafés in the city, among them *Café De Schouw* in the Witte de Withstraat. This street was known for its newspaper offices, and Peeters’s café was the meeting place for journalists and artists. Peeters had made 8mm colour films since the early 1950s, including fiction shorts and *familiejournaals*. In the basement of his house he also started, in 1969, a small private film theatre, called ‘69’, where he showed, to invited guests, recently released features together with his own films. One of his was about the opening of his lunchroom ‘Pieterneel’ (1970), at the Lijnbaan. Not unlike many home movie makers, Peeters combined recordings of domestic and public activities, but consciously. For the opening he asked fashion designer Henk Wichers to do a show. Assisted by Philips, Wichers dressed girls in transparent plastic suits, virtually naked, but with special helmets through which they could call one another, as a precursor of mobile

¹³¹³ Gerrit Schilder, in: Van der Schaaf & Hazewinkel, 1996: 87. Original quote: ‘We kwamen uit de tijd van de economische wederopbouw, met toch veronachtzaming van de burgers die in de bestaande slechte en kleine vooroorlogse woningen woonden en die dat op een gegeven moment niet meer pikten. Dat veroorzaakte een behoorlijke breuk in het politieke denken, waarbij ik alleen de Partij van de Arbeid een beetje kan overzien, met fikse ruzies tussen een groepering die eigenlijk op de oude manier verder wilde: eerst de welvaart, dan komt de rest vanzelf wel, en de nieuwe generatie die zei: wij geven nu voorrang aan de bewoners. Dat heeft volgens mij een heel groot en belangrijk stempel gezet op de voorlichting.’

¹³¹⁴ Mathijssse in: Van der Schaaf & Hazewinkel, 1996: 82.

¹³¹⁵ See also the fiction film *DE LEUGEN OMTRENT WILLEM PEER* (1970, Filmgroep Flop) – ‘Filmgroep Flop eerste prijs op NOVA-festival’, in: *Het Vrije Volk*, 1970-11-11; for *MEDDLE* (1973, Louis Smits) and the documentary *BLIKSLAGER IN KUNST* (1973, Hans Ros) on artist Johan Verheij, see: ‘Bekroning voor Rotterdamse Films’, p21 in: *Het Vrije Volk*, 1973-11-23; for *DE SLEUTEL VAN DE PSYCHIATER* (1976, H. Schäfer), see: ‘Succes voor Smalfilmers’, in: *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1976-09-21. For other titles, see www.rvsl.nl > staat van dienst (2009-01-06).

¹³¹⁶ The RSL also invited various professional filmmakers to give presentations, a.o. Joris Ivens, Louis van Gasteren, Jan van Hillo, Herman van der Horst, Paul Verhoeven, Nico Crama, Pim Korver e.a., Smits, 2002: 42. The between amateur and professional practices also applies to what I would call ‘moving photographs’. Several photographers, among them Wim de Boek and Ary Groeneveld made recordings on film too, often without a clear purpose, and akin to still photography: a single shot of a particular movement or surrounding to ‘catch’ daily life, or a series of shots of a particular event. They often show something common as something special, by isolating it from its context, by showing it as an aesthetic feature, or as an emphasis of the spirit of the times. Although such recordings are the work of ‘professional observers’, in technique and method, and as ‘retentions’ without a public release they are akin to amateur recordings. For examples, see: Filmography > Boek, Wim de; Groeneveld, Ary – more recordings by them and others can be found at GAR.

telephony¹³¹⁷. This futuristic imagery oscillated, through double exposure, with most traditional and domestic imagery: of the family getting together to celebrate Christmas.

Not much later Wichers opened his boutique in the Witte de Withstraat (1971). Peeters recorded the opening, with a fashion show and other performances¹³¹⁸, and superimposed the images with shots of Wichers driving his Porsche. In his turn, Peeters himself opened an art gallery: 'Keerweer'. He made various short film portraits of newspaper illustrators and artists, to accompany their work shown at the gallery¹³¹⁹. In this way Peeters also made, together with Edward Luyken (camera), a graduate of the Academy of Visual Arts in Rotterdam, the experimental KUNST OP STRAAT (1979). It shows murals that had been painted across the city in the previous years, and the activities taking place in front of it. They were combined with shots of the city, again through double exposure – a technique that Luyken applied afterwards as well¹³²⁰. This cityscape was created through a train travel from north-west (station Schiedam) to south-east (Lombardijen). It resulted in contemplative sequences that were reinforced as such by ambient music, provided by Rob Maas, the director of the *Centrale Discotheek*. In his turn, Luyken made various other artistic films, such as the experimental 'construction film' INSIDE OUT (1979).

In the meantime, the Academy of Visual Arts had established a film studio – initiated by its director Pierre Jansen and television director Leen Timp in the late 1960s. It started with courses on Saturdays for everyone interested. In 1971, the academy asked the young filmmaker Thys Ockersen (•1946) to become a teacher, and he would eventually come to run the studio as well¹³²¹. It became a serious concern. Editor Bert Steeman, who had worked for Schaper's Open Studio before, became an assistant, and he would take over the role of Ockersen later on.

Besides working in the studio, Ockersen wanted students to acquire experience by participating in professional productions. He therefore proposed to make a documentary short about the Rotterdam based artist, and Academy teacher, Kees Franse, particularly about his monumental apples. After Ockersen received a grant of the RKS, without him knowing it, since the Academy (i.e. Piet Geurts) had applied for it, colleagues protested as they thought he just used the Academy for his own plans. The project was nevertheless carried out, but independent of the Academy, although one its students, the later well-known photographer Adriaan Monshouwer, still worked on it as an assistant cameraman. The film, 1000 KILO VURENHOUT (1975), which had its premiere at Film International, became a dynamic portrait of Franse, in his studio, in front of his apples at the Heemraadssingel in Rotterdam and at Schiphol¹³²².

Another project by Ockersen, which was also supported by the RKS, was a one-take fiction short AAN DE DEUR (1979), based on a story by Jules Deelder¹³²³. A man rings the doorbell, a lady opens, and the man asks if he can use the toilet. The woman does not trust him, and a play with suspense follows. The man goes to the toilet, but it takes long, and the door remains closed all the time. The lady picks up a knife and opens it, but the toilet is empty. At that the bell rings once more: there is the man again, who has lost his glasses in the bowl. For this surrealist film Ockersen casted actress and television personality Marjan Berk, and Piet Goedings. The latter was not an actor, but the hunchbacked owner of the art house and distribution company

¹³¹⁷ It was enabled through strips on the floor, to which the shoes of the girls got connected through metal parts in the soles, which were in turn linked to the helmets.

¹³¹⁸ E.g. by the musicians Herman van Veen and Harry Sacksioni, although the film recordings are mute.

¹³¹⁹ Among them are the cartoonists Teo Gootjes (*Het Vrije Volk*), and Adriaan Meijers (*Algemeen Dagblad*), 1980, see filmography > since 1980 > Peeters.

¹³²⁰ See e.g. DE HEFBRUG (1979, Edward Luyken).

¹³²¹ Ockersen remained a film teacher for about twelve years. At the studio he was assisted by Bert Steeman, who would run the studio later on. Thys Ockersen in an interview by FP, 2008-09-27.

¹³²² The film can be seen within a 'genre' of documentaries about art works, which also includes a BRONS IN BEWEGING (1964, Jaap Nieuwenhuis) about the sculpture 'Corporate Entity' (1963, Wessel Couzijn), made for Unilever.

¹³²³ The story was called 'Niks tegen Kees zeggen', which would later be published as a novella in *Schöne Welt* (Jules Deelder, Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij, 1982).

The Movies in Amsterdam, whose shadowy empire had various enemies, among them Huub Bals of the Rotterdam Film Festival. The film was therefore not to be seen at the festival, but at the City theatre in Amsterdam. For Ockersen, who came from Amsterdam himself, the film was an inside joke, which connected, just like his own practice, the two cities.

While the Academy opened its film studio, the youth organisation AMVJ, opened its cinema 'Calypso', in 1969¹³²⁴. Dick Rijnke, a student of the experimental filmmaker Frans Zwartjes at Psychopolis in The Hague, was asked to make a film programme, and he subsequently started a film workshop too¹³²⁵. Through the AMVJ he also made a 'discussion film' on drugs, *IK WEET NOG STEEDS NIET OF IK BETER BEN* (1971), which offers impressions of the consequences of both soft and hard drugs, with a number of interviews with youngsters, and impressions of their environment. It resulted subsequently in the film *I TAKE IT FOR GRANTED* (1973), which he made together with Hans de Ridder (who worked for Schaper's Open Studio).

Another film workshop was established by De Lantaren in 1972. While this studio was supported by the RKS, this fund also sponsored various productions made here¹³²⁶. Next to the workshop De Lantaren also organised film courses, which consisted of three meetings per week over two months, given by Floor Peeters (and guests like Frans Zwartjes)¹³²⁷. The results were presented at the art house theatre of De Lantaren, where Huub Bals did the programming.

Among the people using the facilities of De Lantaren was the young Noud Heerkens, who made in this way his experimental *RE-ACTION IN A* (1979). Someone else was Pieter Jan Smit, whose first films were *ZWAANSHALS*, made at Psychopolis too, and *BOTLEK BLUES* (1979), sponsored by the RKS. The former is a series of photographs of an old neighbourhood, recorded from the four corners of a crossing; the latter, is an expressive reflection, of half an hour, of Rotterdam in general. It includes music by punk rock formation Rondos and poetry by Cornelis Vaandrager, on *De Hef*, and as such the film refers also (explicitly) to Ivens's *THE BRIDGE* (1928), yet in an unpolished, underground style.

Another young filmmaker that frequented De Lantaren, but who had already made films before, was Ferri Ronteltap. His fiction shorts were subsequently selected by Huub Bals for Film International, the annual film festival for which De Lantaren became a home, which was organised by Bals as a representative of the RKS (see: Chapter 15.§ 4).

Besides Film International, various small festivals were organised at De Lantaren, which were actively supported by the RKS as well. An example is the *Ongelukkige Liefde Festival* ("Unhappy Love Festival", 1977), where the visual arts, theatre, and film came together. For that occasion the artists Hans Citroen and Bob van Persie made a series of cinematic one-liners – with Jacques van Heijningen as the cameraman. The shorts were made as a reaction, according to the makers, to the highly formalised and much too serious art criticism of that time. Instead, they presented acted cartoons that dealt with rather banal issues that varied from corny gags to witty pieces that played with perception. This was closely related to their performances and the art works that they showed at their 'smallest museum of the Netherlands', the *Keikdoos*, a showcase at central station (see also: Polygoon, 1977-wk16)¹³²⁸. On the occasion of the so-called 'Suggestival', the group made another series of about twenty one-minute 'suggestions': *THERE'S*

¹³²⁴ Calypso, which used to be a gym before, located at the complex of the 'Rijnhotel', opened on 1969-03-26.

Rotterdams Jaarboekje, 1970: p26.

¹³²⁵ One of Rijnke's own experimental shorts is *ESCALATING EGG* (1969).

¹³²⁶ Theatre De Lantaren and cinema 't Venster (run by Piet Meerburg), located in the same building, merged in 1976 to become Lantaren/Venster, under supervision of the RKS, until 1986 when it became independent again. See also: www.lantaren-venster.nl/22-Organisatie Lantaren/Venster > Het Gebouw > Geschiedenis (visited 2007-04-20).

¹³²⁷ Regarding workshops at De Lantaren, see: Willemsen, 1979: 13. Both of them made productions at the former water works area of DWL-Honingerdijk, respectively the experimental short *LANDSCAPES* (1982) and the feature film *PENTIMENTO* (1979), since that complex had turned into a redevelopment area and the artistic enclave 'Utopia'.

¹³²⁸ It was a new way to bring art to the public, while the art itself was a matter of play. On pets' day, for example, the artists put a big cheese in the showcase, together with about eighty mice.

NO BUSINESS LIKE NO BUSINESS (1979). Initially they were presented in between performances of magicians and the like, but due their success, the series was also shown at once.

One of the pieces of the series is WERK IN UITVOERING, which starts with the, for Rotterdam, emblematic traffic sign ‘under construction’. The figure in the sign suddenly moves and walks out of the frame, to have lunch in another room. When the man (played by Citroen) starts to eat his sandwich it (auditively) turns into a harmonica, which causes a surprise effect. Finally the man continues to work, without having eaten anything. The city of labour turns into one of culture: the reconstruction newsreel is replaced by an artistic film, which shows a worker becoming a musician. However, the man continues his construction work after all. While food turns into ‘food for the senses’, the question remains if it makes a living for Rotterdam¹³²⁹. It did, at least for Citroen and Van Persie.

Together with their companion Cor Kraat they also appear in KUNST, KOEK & KOFFIE (1980) by Dick Rijnke and Mildred van Leeuwaarden, which is the first part of the documentary trilogy GROETEN UIT ROTTERDAM about the cultural climate of Rotterdam (see: Chapter 16.§4). The artists organise an exhibition of pictures on a wall in a street, where they are left during the night, in order to see what will happen to them. Most important are not the pictures on the wall, but the event itself as a conceptual work of art. The film recording, and its broadcasting by VPRO television, is an integral part of this project. Although the experiment resulted in the deception that most of the works were taken by colleagues (rather than ‘the people’), the film is based on waiting and the tension that something may happen.

Part II of the trilogy starts with Cor Kraat having an important business meeting. It took place on a boat, which was a reception organised for the new director of the RKS, the filmmaker and former VPRO prominent Hans Keller, for him to be introduced to representatives of the main cultural and business circles of Rotterdam. This meeting of Kraat with the city’s elite was no coincidence, but a way, through the connections of the VPRO, to make a contrast with the punk movement in the second and last part, with special attention being paid to the Rondos.

While Rijnke and Van Leeuwaarden made GROETEN UIT ROTTERDAM, they established their own production company: ‘Rotterdam Films’ (1979). It would be the onset of a fruitful collaboration with an extensive track record. Other companies would follow soon.

Whereas the various initiatives had initially existed as islands, or parallel movements, connections were made and a network emerged. The RKS occupied a nodal place in it, by enabling an oscillation between different realms and categories. This appealed to the ideas of students and artists, which affected them to work with film, while it also attracted filmmakers from elsewhere to establish themselves in Rotterdam (e.g. Noud Heerkens). Film in Rotterdam, moreover, got embedded in the urban culture at large, if it were only for the different artistic sections that were united by the RKS. It established an institutional infrastructure with points of interaction that provided ‘multiple stimuli’ that triggered creativity, in the words of Scott (2000: 12). It exemplifies, on a small-scale, the effects of clustering, which, at the same time helped to frame its conditions, through critical reflection and experimentation.

¹³²⁹ It is telling that Cor Kraat and Bob van Persie, together with Willem van Drunen, established (1979) the artist formation ‘Kunst & Vaarwerk’, literally “Art and Sailing Work”, a punning of the saying *kunst en vliegwerk* [‘art and flying’ = managing something quickly by all possible means]. Most commissions concerned spatial art works, see: VERGETEN VERHALEN: KUNST EN VAARWERK (2005, Harm Korst). Rather than making use of subsidies, it operated like an office for architecture, based on commissions, especially from port enterprises.

CHAPTER 12. THE STRUCTURE OF MOTION

§ 1. film and mobility

Film scholars have often related cinema to the experience of modernity. Following Walter Benjamin (1936), many have considered cinema as a mode of perception that corresponds to the mobility of locomotives, metropolitan traffic flows, and the assembly line, as phenomena that called for new cognitive frames. The development of film montage, and cinematic time, as well as cinematic features such as the close-up or (non-diegetic) sound effects, have been analysed in such a perspective, for the assumed interrelationship with the acceleration of modern life, a simultaneity of events, and urban fragmentation. David Bordwell (1997: 140-147) has called it the ‘modernity thesis’, in order to criticise it. According to him, it brings difficulties to explain both the rise of certain stylistic conventions and alternative stylistic options that were explored at the same time. Instead he argues for a more refined historical account¹³³⁰. ‘How did very sweeping economic and social changes create different ways of seeing among various groups?’

The 1960s, like the 1890s or the 1920s, witnessed ‘very sweeping economic changes’, which were interdependent with increasing mobility. For the 1960s, the car was the revolutionary vehicle. In 1950, one out of sixty-eight (1:68) people in Rotterdam had a car, which became one out of eight (1:8) by 1966¹³³¹. Perceptual correspondences between automobility and screen media have been addressed by various scholars, mostly affirming the modernity thesis¹³³². To some extent, film and television have been models for the urban experience, as well as city programming, in terms of sequencing and montage. My concern, however, is to move beyond a generic conception of media screens and their aesthetics. Instead, I will consider certain particularities of media productions, and compare different audiovisual practices, to understand the dynamics between film and television, and how they relate to the environment.

In the 1960s, television heralded infrastructural projects as indicators of progress. The ‘developing compositions’ on television showed the gradual process of building infrastructure. Serial reports created ‘suspense’. It engaged the audience with the development of the projects, which turned them into public achievements. Eventually this enabled a critical discussion, which also affected cinema, especially in the production of promotion films. This brings different purposes and groups of people to the fore. It can be exemplified, first of all, through educational films.

The rapid increase of automobility affected the nature of public space, which brought new possibilities, but also threats. Therefore, already in 1932, the “Dutch Association for Traffic

¹³³⁰ Bordwell, 1997: 145: ‘If people can slip out of synchronization with the new mode of seeing or slide back to earlier modes, the history-of-vision account loses a good deal of its explanatory power. // Some vision-in-modernity theorists may nonetheless argue for plural and uneven development. But to accept this view we would need a more refined historical account than we have yet seen. How did very sweeping economic and social changes create different ways of seeing among various groups?’

¹³³¹ Van de Laar, 2000: 523.

¹³³² E.g. Friedberg (2002: 183-185) considers the film, television and computer screen as virtual windows that are component pieces of architecture, ‘which dramatically change the materialities (and – perhaps more radically – the temporalities) of built space.’ In this light she also frames the relationship between the spectatorial experience of cinema and travelling by car, through a case-study of Los Angeles (with references to experiments by the situationists in the 1960s, as well as ideas of Paul Virilio and Jean Baudrillard from the 1980s). ‘The post-war screens of Los Angeles – both the drive-in and the Cinerama Dome’, Friedberg argues (p200-2001), ‘negotiated the *materiality* and *mobility* of the driver – the need to *park* the vehicle – in order to reach the *immateriality* and *stasis* of the spectatorial experience’. They have had reciprocal effects, with the panoramic view being a common issue. That is also the case in the work of Verhoeff (2007: 3-4), who is similarly concerned with questions about the relationship between materiality and virtuality. She elaborates on studies by Kevin Lynch (1960s) concerning mobile perception of space and its implications for design, as well as studies on the car as a ‘mobile studio’. Verhoeff (p4) links them to ‘media archaeological studies about the development, theories and practices of screen media’, since ‘they both approach mobility as a perceptual and media shaped experience’ (with a reference to Wolfgang Schivelbush (1986) concerning the impact of train travel on the experience of time and space).

Safety” (VVN) was established¹³³³. It became especially active after WWII, and its activities were accompanied by various films to explain traffic rules to children. Through the moving image particular situations could be simulated and explained. In 1961, the VVN asked the newly established company Mundofilm from Hilversum to make the film SLECHTS EEN PAAR REGELS (“Only a few rules”, 1961, Joop Burcksen & Ruud Herblot). The film was a humorous, fictional adventure of a medieval knight, played by the well-known performer Bueno de Mesquita, who had suddenly landed in modern Rotterdam¹³³⁴. He did not understand the traffic rules, and fought against these beasts on wheels. The knight slammed cars in the streets – which was actually shot at a car dump. The filmmakers even got the Maastunnel at their disposal, where the traffic had to stop. In the film the knight forced the cars to move backwards – filmed in reverse with De Mesquito walking backwards¹³³⁵. In a hilarious way, the motion of traffic highlights the art of motion pictures: its capacity to reverse time and movement, which in turn, through its unlikeliness, shows children the actual nature of traffic flows.

Mundofilm made many other productions for VVN afterwards, among them TV spots¹³³⁶. Most of them were shot in Rotterdam too. Burcksen:

In Rotterdam we could often begin the next day, while in Amsterdam it took weeks. In Rotterdam we managed to do everything we wanted. When we asked for an extra zebra crossing, it was no problem, and the police, from the office Haagse Veer, was always willing to collaborate. On our request they did all kinds of little stunts, like sliding with a car on a square with cobbles, near the Veerhaven. Residents there got scared, since they did not see us, standing on the roofs with our cameras.¹³³⁷

It is no coincidence that such recordings took place in Rotterdam. Besides the fact that Burcksen came from Rotterdam, the city paid special attention to the development of traffic. In Rotterdam there has always been a strong interest in mobility and traffic, whether in a positive or negative way. This has, similarly, been reflected by the media, for example by television programmes on car races that were held in the city, and reports on measures to regulate traffic¹³³⁸.

Notwithstanding the measures taken to regulate traffic flows, and the infrastructural achievements of the 1960s, all kinds of traffic accidents occurred. However, it was only by the 1970s that it was regularly reported on television, after the frequency of newsreels increased, so that time became available for more ordinary subjects, which was news with a limited ‘use-by date’. Next to that (and probably related to it), a change of attitude towards automobility occurred, and criticism on the use of cars became stronger. Car accidents and related problems became a recurrent subject over the course of the 1970s; there were reports on multiple collisions, subsided tank trucks, flooded roads and tunnels, and attempts to solve traffic jams in the city centre. On the other hand, problems with trains were reported too, such as derailments or

¹³³³ = *Verbond voor Veilig Verkeer*, later *Veilig Verkeer Nederland* (VVN).

¹³³⁴ See also a review in: *Telegraaf* 1961-09-27, by Henk ten Berge.

¹³³⁵ Information by Joop Burcksen from an interview by the author (FP), 2007-05-22.

¹³³⁶ These spots have been brought together into one film: *VERKEER OP TELEVISIE* (1965); Mundofilm would make films for VVN for about 25 years, e.g. *BOTSENDE MENINGEN* (1975).

¹³³⁷ Information by Joop Burcksen from an interview by the author (FP), 2007-05-22. Concerning the comparison with Amsterdam, a similar remark was made by Peter Alsemgeest (in: *Post* e.a., 1976: 2). Original quote Burcksen: ‘In Rotterdam konden we vaak de volgende dag al aan de slag gaan, terwijl dat in Amsterdam weken duurde. We kregen in Rotterdam alles gedaan. Toen we een keer vroegen of er ergens een extra zebrapad geschilderd kon worden was dat geen probleem. Bovendien kregen we altijd de medewerking van de politie, vanuit het kantoor Haagse Veer. De politie deed op verzoek allerlei stuntjes, zoals slippen op een pleintje met keien, bij de Veerhaven. Omstanders schrokken zich rot, want men zag niet dat er gefilmd werd. Wij stonden met onze camera’s boven op een dak.’

¹³³⁸ See for example reports on the ‘Tulpenrally’, e.g. *JOURNAAL* (NTS, 1969-04-28); *TULPENRALLY* (Veronica, 1977-06-01), and respectively, a report on traffic thresholds in Charlois, *HIER EN NU* (NCRV, 1973-05-02), next to video production that addressed traffic problems (e.g. *VERKEER WALRAVENBUURT*, 1977, Bob Visser).

obstructions¹³³⁹. In this way the NOS JOURNAAL provided feedback on an important issue – traffic – for city planning, and an important feature of modernity in general. Rather than providing just positive feedback, of showing improvements, as it used to be done in the 1960s (like Polygoon), it began to show things that went wrong, so that measures could be taken.

Motion structured Rotterdam, and film and television helped to channel it. I will elaborate on this dynamic by way of three cases, regarding the main infrastructural projects carried out in the 1960s and 1970s in Rotterdam, which attracted substantial media attention: the metro, the *Ruit om Rotterdam* (ring road) and the airport – the Europoort gets attention in Chapter 13.§2. They are exemplary for what has become known as ‘non-places’ (Augé, 1992) and the ‘space of flows’ (Castells, 1996). That, however, is only one side to think of motion, in generic terms; the structure of motion has also another side, with particular coordinates and characters.

§ 2. metro

In 1959, the decision was made to build a metro¹³⁴⁰. It was a novelty for the Netherlands, which appealed to the imagination. When the project started, in 1960, the *Nederlandse Onderwijsfilm* (NOF) produced an educational report about it, which exemplifies the importance attributed to it¹³⁴¹. The metro symbolised progress, and the metropolitan ambitions of Rotterdam, which caused a pride and a historical awareness among its citizens. It is reflected in amateur films, like those by Jan Soek, who followed the development meticulously over various years, while he and others would also document the later extensions¹³⁴².

The department of Gemeentewerken, in charge of the project, took care of its documentation and promotion as well. Its phototechnical service made, for example, detailed recordings of the construction of 375 large concrete beams for the metro fly-over in Rotterdam-Zuid (METROVIADUCT ‘BALKENFABRICAGE, 1965, Henk Vrijmoet). It was followed by a film about the transportation of these beams by especially constructed vehicles, whose function was explained through animations. The total length of a truck with a beam counted 50 metres, which had to travel through the streets of Rotterdam, three times a day (ROTTERDAM METRO BALKENTRANSPORT, 1965, Henk Vrijmoet). The films were part of a larger campaign, which included various publications – similar to the promotion activities for the ‘Maastunnel’ about twenty-five years earlier¹³⁴³. Besides its own films, Gemeentewerken also asked Cinecentrum in Hilversum for a series of films. This joint-venture of Multifilm, Polygoon and Profilti was the most experienced Dutch film production enterprise, also in respect of films on construction works, including one on the Delta works¹³⁴⁴. Among its cameramen was Peter Alsemgeest (•1927-†2004), who was then asked to film the metro¹³⁴⁵.

¹³³⁹ The examples mentioned here are NOS JOURNAAL reports made by J. van Rhijn: [fog, multiple collision] 1973-11-11; [subsided truck with fenol], 1974-07-19; [subsided fuel truck, Spijkenisse], 1974-08-30; [traffic issues, parking] 1974-11-09; [flood in city], 1975-06-24; [flood in city], 1975-08-21; [derailment] 1974-08-29; [aftermath derailment, Rotterdam-Zuid] 1974-11-21; [hoisting crane collapsed onto railway, Berkel] 1975-01-02.

¹³⁴⁰ Van de Laar, 2000: 537.

¹³⁴¹ ROTTERDAM KRIJGT METRO explains that the city has serious traffic problems, and the metro offers a solution to that. The planned metro line is shown by way of an animated model and map.

¹³⁴² I.e. METRO ROTTERDAM DEEL I, 1961-1967, and METROBOUW, 1974-1983; STADSVERNIEWING, METROBOUW EN SPOORTUNNEL, 1975-1985; BOUW VAN DE METRO OOST/WESTLIJN, 1978. For other amateur recordings on the construction of the metro, see for example: AANLEG METRO, 1963, Wessel Vermeulen; KRIS-KRAS DOOR ROTTERDAM, 1960-1970, Wemelsfelder; LOCAAL JOURNAAL, 1963, anon. a.o.

¹³⁴³ As addressed by Paul van de Laar (2000: 538).

¹³⁴⁴ A few years before, the “Ministry of Traffic and Waterworks” had given Multifilm an important commission, to make a film on the *Deltawerken* in the province of Zeeland (1953-1986). The first episode was called DE SLUITING VAN HET VEERSE GAT, 1958-1961, directed by Hattum Hoving, cameramen: Peter Alsemgeest, Pim Heijtman, Charles Breijer. See also the films: DELTA YPSILON (1969) and SPUISLUIZEN IN HET HARINGVLIET (1974).

¹³⁴⁵ Interview by the author (FP) with Alsemgeest, 2003-11-27. While he worked on this project, he also collaborated on HET KORPS MARINIERS (1965, Paul Verhoeven). Alsemgeest was asked by Verhoeven since the latter was impressed by his camerawork for the short fiction film BIG CITY BLUES (1961, C. Huguenot van der Linden). Both films received

Two episodes were released (METRO, 1965, and ROTTERDAM METROPOLIS, 1966), of 22 minutes each, before an omnibus was made, all by Polygoon-Profil¹³⁴⁶. Next to this film various newsreels were made, probably from the same footage, for both Polygoon and NTS television. At that time, Cinecentrum, and first of all Multifilm, where Alsemgeest was actually employed, made also the recordings for the NTS JOURNAAL, more than twenty reports in total¹³⁴⁷. The JOURNAAL started by presenting models of the project (1960-10-28). Polygoon followed two weeks later with a report on the official ceremonies and impressions of the construction works, including works under the river Nieuwe Maas, and a model of an underground station that is tested¹³⁴⁸. Polygoon would make various other reports in the next years¹³⁴⁹. Besides that, various television stations paid attention to the metro works¹³⁵⁰. Even another construction film was made, by Eduard van der Enden, for the *Nederlandse Filmproductiemaatschappij*, which produced other films for the municipality at the same time¹³⁵¹.

For the first part, simply called METRO (1965), Alsemgeest recorded the construction of tunnel segments in a special dock at the Van Brienoord island. Spectacular is the moment when the pre-fabricated tunnel segments are transported. Tugboats pull a ninety metre long segment under the railway bridge. It is sunk in the river, and connected to the already installed parts.

After five years of construction, the metro stations got their shape. Through aerial shots, the course of the metro line was shown, still under construction, from Central Station, via Coolsingel to the river and further. What happened underground was recorded step by step, and illustrated by animations of the Toonder studio, as shown in ROTTERDAM METROPOLIS (1966, Peter Alsemgeest). Alsemgeest, who played with contrasts, through various cinematographic techniques like zooming and panning, showed the polished new underground stations as opposed to the 'battlefield' of the construction site above.

The construction of the metro was also to be seen in ROTTERDAM TOEN, ROTTERDAM NU (1966, Freddy Lievense), a general report on the new city. It was shown at the Cineac newsreel

much attention. For Verhoeven it was the beginning of his career that led him to Hollywood. Alsemgeest, in his turn, continued to make films about industrial production and engineering (e.g. for Hollands Signaal, the Netherlands Space and Aircraft Laboratory, Stork, and DAF/Volvo). Notwithstanding his broad interest in cinema, as well as social issues, Alsemgeest preferred technical films, which he could handle in a technical way himself.

¹³⁴⁶ At the time of writing this book, the film collection of *Gemeentewerken*, among them many titles by Alsemgeest, was transferred to the Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, and not yet ready for consultation, so that much of this is subject to further investigation. For the first part (1965), on the construction of tunnel elements, at the Van Brienoord island; see: 'Metro in Film', p24 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 3/3, 1965.

¹³⁴⁷ Cf. Post e.a., 1976: 2. For reports, see: NTS JOURNAAL: [model] 1960-10-28; [models of the stations, construction at Weena] 1961-02-24; [first part tunnel ready] 1962-01-04; [tree cut for metro a.o.] 1962-03-08; [model and construction of station Leuvehaven] 1962-06-10; [first element sunk] 1962-11-27; [excursion construction works] 1963-05-19; [fire] 1963-05-28; [relocation of market], 1964-02-15; [traffic rerouted] 1964-02-18; [last element to be sunk] 1964-10-17; [decision on type of wagon], 1964-12-05; [works] 1965-10-19; [roof construction of station] 1966-01-24; [metro wagon exhibited] 1966-05-17; [fly-over] 1966-11-11; [new ticket service] 1966-11-18; [interview with Plantema a.o.], 1967-05-16; [test ride] 1967-06-03; [construction of the railways] 1968-02-09; [opening metro to Slinge] 1970-11-25. See also: MONITOR by NTS [directors of the metro], 1967-03-26; MONITOR [experience by a disabled person] 1967-11-19.

¹³⁴⁸ Polygoon, 1960-11-14. General-secretary of "Traffic and Waterworks", Mr. Gieben, rams the first dam wall near Rotterdam Central Station, and Mayor Van Walsum reveals an information board. A scale model of the metro explains the plan. Next are impressions of the construction works (Weena, Coolsingel, Leuvehaven). As the metro line crosses underneath the river, dam walls are built in the water, while tunnel segments are made on the other side of the river.

¹³⁴⁹ I.e. more than seven, a.o. BOUW VAN DE METRO BEGONNEN (1960); ROTTERDAM BOUWT AAN ZIJN METRO (1961); ENGELSE STUDENTEN BEZICHTIGEN DE METRO (1962); ROTTERDAMSE METRO VORDERT (1963); BOUW METRO (1965); ROTTERDAMSE METRO VORDERT (1967); METRO OFFICIEEL IN GEBRUIK (1968).

¹³⁵⁰ E.g. MEMO (NCRV, 1960-11-14); ACHTER HET NIEUWS (VARA, 1961-07-28); ONDERGRONDS PERSONENVERVOER (1962, Rob Mariouw Smit, NCRV 1962-11-09); TELEVIZIER (AVRO, 1967-03-25); KLOKKE VIER (KRO, 1968-01-13); NEEM LIEVER DE... (KRO, 1967-01-20); KOMPAS (TROS, 1967-06-29); WAAR EEN WIL IS, IS EEN WEG (VARA, 1967-11-28). Since Cinecentrum made recordings for various stations, some may have been shot by Alsemgeest too.

¹³⁵¹ Personal communication FP with Eduard van der Enden. The status of this film is unknown.

theatre (October 1966), which was located at the Coolingsingel where the work was actually carried out. In this way the film was almost literally an extension of the construction work.

On Friday the 13th of October 1967, not hindered by a sense of superstition, the Coolingsingel was reopened by the popular television performer Tom Manders, who came to ‘test’ the ‘new’ Coolingsingel with an old-timer¹³⁵². Part of the celebration was the presentation of the station *Stadhuis* (Town Hall). It took a couple of months more before the metro line was officially opened (1968-02-09), which was the subject of a live report by the NTS¹³⁵³. Princess Beatrix and Prince Claus were the first to buy a ticket from the ticket machine, which was itself a novelty, to which the NTS had already spent a report before¹³⁵⁴. Together with Mayor Thomassen and the aldermen, the Princess and Prince travelled from Central Station to Zuidplein. About 400,000 people followed in the next days.

In 1968 Gemeentewerken released the film METRO, in different language versions, directed by Peter Alsemgeest, and shot in collaboration with Lajos Kalános (and sound by Nick Meijer). Like the preceding episodes, it starts with images of the harbour, and the need to have good connections across the river. The Maastunnel is not sufficient for efficient traffic flow, and hence in 1959, the films says, the city decided to build the metro. Many studies and reports followed, as the film illustrates, and the planned lines are shown. The Coolingsingel is temporarily a canal again, in order to transport especially pre-fabricated tunnel segments that are sunk in it. The line from Central Station to Coolingsingel and further on is shown from the air, which is followed by detailed shots of the construction process, including various animations. It shows the control chamber and the first (fast motion) test rides. The metro moves like a rollercoaster through the tunnels, and over the viaducts through the snow. The first passengers enter the trains.

Because of the metro, through its media coverage, Rotterdam received respect within the Netherlands. It strengthened its metropolitan image. As soon as the first line was opened, plans for extensions (to Slinge) were presented. In 1970 its actualisation was reported (NTS, 1970-11-25).

It motivated Amsterdam to build a metro too¹³⁵⁵. It literally ‘appropriated’ Rotterdam’s metro, which is illustrated by the feature film NO PANIC (1973, Ko Koedijk) that used shots of the metro in Rotterdam as if it existed in Amsterdam¹³⁵⁶. As a matter of ‘premediation’, Rotterdam was used to present the metropolitan ambitions of Amsterdam, but the tide rapidly turned. In 1975, riots took place in Amsterdam (i.e. *Nieuwmarktrellen*), when houses were demolished for the construction of the metro¹³⁵⁷. To avoid such situations, the Rotterdam municipality, regarding the planned extensions, wanted to collaborate with its residents, all the more so since there had already been fierce protests in the previous years concerning housing.

For the construction of the metro, the municipality tried to inform the population as well as possible, in order to generate understanding, support and appreciation. Therefore Gemeentewerken commissioned a film, to be shown twice a day in a neighbourhood centre, as part of a permanent exhibition on the construction of the metro¹³⁵⁸. The film was called BOUWEN TUSSEN DE MENSEN (1976), meaning ‘building amidst people’, but also ‘building between people’, hence connecting them. The credits at the beginning hold Peter Alsemgeest responsible

¹³⁵² Cf. Polygoon (1967-10-13). By then, Manders had just started ‘Cabaret Dorus’ in Rotterdam, Mauritsstraat 65 (building of chemics trade company v/h E. Schuddebeurs NV, until 1960). The studio, to record the television programme ‘Dorus’, existed for three years. http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tom_Manders

¹³⁵³ I.e. OPENING METRO ROTTERDAM (NTS, 1968-02-09).

¹³⁵⁴ JOURNAAL, NTS, 1966-11-18.

¹³⁵⁵ The earliest plans for a metro in Amsterdam were made in 1922, but only by 1966 concrete plans were made, and in 1968, when Rotterdam opened its metro, the Amsterdam city council decided to implement the plans. http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amsterdamse_metro (2008-07-11).

¹³⁵⁶ They were situated at Dam, Marnixstraat, and the Munt, where no stations were planned at all.

¹³⁵⁷ <http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nieuwmarktrellen> (website visited 2008-07-11).

¹³⁵⁸ The film was shown from November the 4th; the exhibition was shown in the neighbourhood centre Onésimus (Gashouderstraat). See: ‘Metrobouw Gefilmd’, p2 in: *Het Vrije Volk*, 1976-11-02. See also: Post e.a., 1976.

for 'design and direction' (*ontwerp en regie*); Alsemgeest operated like a 'cinematic constructor'. The film starts with a woman who wants to buy a piano and subtle differences are tested in a shop. When the camera moves outside one sees that this shop is located next to the construction site, and that sound annoyance is reduced to a minimum. Walls for pouring concrete are not rammed but 'trembled', and for the piles to be drilled into the ground, special coats are put around the rammers, in order to lower the noise. Alsemgeest used this opportunity to make his film an interplay between images and (electronic) music (by Nick Meijer). Inspired by *STEADY!* (1952, Herman van der Horst), it includes a montage-sequence directed by the sound of ramming.

The film pays attention to the social conditions, and even mentions protests against the metro. Kralingers do not understand that their quarter has to be sacrificed for a new one, the district Ommoord. Certain buildings have to be demolished indeed, but all efforts are made to save those that are in good condition, which required technical innovations. The film shows in detail how a housing block is maintained by constructing the tunnel under it¹³⁵⁹. Besides location shots, Alsemgeest uses models and animations to explain it. The ground is dugged away around the foundations of the building. A tunnel is built there, and the building then rests upon the tunnel roof. Once it is finished the old foundations are removed. Alsemgeest follows the process in the claustrophobic space in which the workers have to operate, and he too. His cinematography is characterised by mobile framing. The camera often starts from a fixed position, turning towards something else that is happening simultaneously. This neatly interacts with the montage.

At the end, the pianist plays her new instrument at home. This shot becomes part of a special effect. The image is scaled down, to be inserted as a small image in a housing estate, filling one apartment. Images of other people doing different things are inserted too. Under the building an animation of a metro is shown. It is suggested that no one notices the work being done. Film is needed to make this clear.

The workers boring a tunnel are literally the precursors of the metro train that will run through it. Their struggle to move forward, to create space and movement, is the indexical counterpart to the metropolitan experience of a fast underground ride. Something has to become animated before it moves, quite literally here, as the film shows an animation of the result that it helps to bring about. Once this is a matter of fact, the index disappears, except for the film, if it were not subject to the same logic.

While Alsemgeest made *BOUWEN TUSSEN DE MENSEN* he also worked on a parallel commission from the "Public Transport Authority" (RET). RET spokesman Ton Michielse was appointed to assist Alsemgeest for the film *SAMENSPEL* ("Interplay/Teamwork", 1975). It addresses that the Department of City Planning closely collaborates with the public transport authority to design new city plans (i.e. the title of the film). Newly built quarters are shown, which have important implications for transportation. The film shows the problems of car traffic in the city. Through animations and an attractive cinematography and editing style, it presents the solutions offered by the interplay of tram, bus and metro services within an extensive public transport network.

While the West-East metro line was constructed, the North-South line was extended, to connect the new suburbs to the city centre. The satellite town Hoogvliet became the terminal for the time being, and Gemeentewerken commissioned Peter Alsemgeest to make another film: *METRO HOOGVLIET* (1977)¹³⁶⁰. Alsemgeest was the 'court-filmmaker' of Gemeentewerken¹³⁶¹.

The fact that he was on very good terms with Gemeentewerken can be exemplified by the film *AFSCHEID DIRECTEUR GEMEENTEWERKEN PLANTEMA* ("Farewell to Plantema, director of Public Works", 1979, Alsemgeest). Alsemgeest initiated this film, of half an hour, as Plantema, who had been the driving force behind the metro works, turned sixty-five and retired. Alsemgeest

¹³⁵⁹ Housing estates at the Chris Bennekerslaan, Adamhofstraat.

¹³⁶⁰ See also: *OPENING VAN HET METROTRAJECT NAAR HOOGVLIET* (Polygoon, 1974-10-25).

¹³⁶¹ Post e.a., 1976.

made this film without budget, using 16mm colour stock that was available at *Cinecentrum*. This ‘slapstick’, as he called it, on which many colleagues of Plantema collaborated, was a playful tribute and presented to him as a surprise. The film is the materialisation of the close personal connection between Alsemgeest and Gemeentewerken. It is also a concise history of urban development and civil engineering in Rotterdam, especially in respect of the metro.

Alsemgeest continued to make films for Gemeentewerken until the early 1990s, among them METRO OOST-WEST (1982), to present the new east-west connection, and EEN GOED LOPENDE STAD (1989), on the role of Gemeentewerken in general. In the meanwhile Alsemgeest moved from Cinecentrum to Toonder Studios, taking his connections with him. On that occasion, his colleagues made a farewell film for him, just like he had done for Plantema.

§ 3. ‘De Ruit’

Since the late 1930s, ideas were elaborated for a ring road around Rotterdam, as part of a larger network of highways¹³⁶². In 1957, the decision was made to build a forty kilometre ring for automobiles, across five different municipalities¹³⁶³. The so-called *Ruit om Rotterdam* (“Diamond around Rotterdam”) was carried out by the “Dutch Directorate for Public Works and Water Management” (*Rijkswaterstaat*, dir. A.G. Quack e.a.¹³⁶⁴), in collaboration with the municipal departments of “Public Works” (Gemeentewerken, dir. J.A. Tillema) and “Urban Development” (*Stadsontwikkeling*, dir. C. van Traa)¹³⁶⁵. Part of the *Ruit* was the creation of two connections across the Nieuwe Maas, a bridge and a tunnel, besides a series of junctions, for connections to the main national roads¹³⁶⁶.

Through the ring, the city, the port and the new residential quarters and satellite towns became integrated. Wouter Vanstiphout and Michelle Provoost (Crimson Architecture Historians) have framed the *Ruit* in the perspective of the plans of Van Traa; for the new city he drew a grid of traffic roads, which served as an ‘irrigation network’ to the emptiness of the city¹³⁶⁷. As Provoost has argued (1996: 171), the ring is thus much more than a technical intervention, since it structures social-economic processes. ‘The 1955 road network clarifies what Van Traa had in mind. This map shows the Roads and Waterways Department’s [*Rijkswaterstaat*] tangential highway structure around Rotterdam’s central city. Rotterdam’s traffic network within this structure proves to be a refined version of a regional, national and even continental network of lines and points’¹³⁶⁸. As such we may consider similar projects that followed the example of Rotterdam. Belgium introduced a special coding system for urban ring roads (R0 = Brussels, R9 = Charleroi), while in Great Britain an elaborate system of orbital motorways was developed too, including the ‘London Orbital’ (M25)¹³⁶⁹. Famous is also the ‘Boulevard Périphérique’ of Paris, built between 1963 and 1973. It is 35 kilometres long, and constructed on the military *zone non-aedificandi* in front of the former city wall; most of the exits correspond to the old gates¹³⁷⁰.

¹³⁶² Cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 307, map of precursor of the ‘Ruit’, 1937; and Van de Laar, 2000: 306, *Streekplan*, 1938.

¹³⁶³ Stuvell, 1969: 2. Municipalities: i.e. Rotterdam, Ridderkerk, Barendrecht, Vlaardingen, Schiedam.

¹³⁶⁴ See also: Meurs & Verheijen, 2003: 34.

¹³⁶⁵ The *Ruit* was connected to the city centre through the Maasboulevard (from the east), the Westzeedijk (from the west), the *boezem tracé* form the north, and the Vaanplein/Zuidplein from the south. The slack ground required to reinforce its basis first – see: Edzes, 1973: 3.

¹³⁶⁶ Cf. Meurs & Verheijen, 2003: 34.

¹³⁶⁷ Crimson, 2002: 43.

¹³⁶⁸ English quote: Crimson, 2002: 50. Original Dutch quote 1995b: ‘Uit het wegenschema van 1955 wordt duidelijk wat Van Traa aan het doen was. Op deze kaart is Rijkswaterstaats ruit rond Rotterdam aangegeven; het verkeersnet van Rotterdam binnen de ruit blijkt een verfijning te zijn van een regionaal, nationaal en zelfs continentaal netwerk van lijnen en punten’ Vanstiphout, Wouter / Crimson Architectural Historians; ‘Leegte’, 1995:

www.crimsonweb.org/spip.php?article16. See also: Vanstiphout, Wouter / Crimson; *Too Blessed to be Depressed*; *Crimson, 1994-2002, Architectural Historians*; Rotterdam: 010 Publishers / Rotterdam Maaskant Foundation, 2002.

See also: Provoost, 1996: 63 (the *Ruit* as part of *Stad Nederland*).

¹³⁶⁹ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Beltway> (2007-11-02)

¹³⁷⁰ http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boulevard_P%C3%A9riph%C3%A9rique_%28Parijs%29 (2007-11-02)

Architecture historian Katherine Shonfield (2000: 111) has subjected the ‘Boulevard Périphérique’ to a cultural analysis, through an interpretation of Jean-Luc Godard’s film *DEUX OU TROIS CHOSES QUE JE SAIS D’ELLE* (1967). She has reached the challenging conclusion that ‘free circulation is free copulation’. Since the ‘boulevard’ cuts indifferently through existing quarters (exemplary for Rotterdam is the former village of IJsselmonde), it provides access to formerly hidden areas, and hence to people. It could be a way to understand the infrastructure as an instrument to recreate the city as a collective entity, socially, culturally and economically; it has transmitted modern values, giving an impetus to urban culture, which has been mediated by cinema and television.

The construction of the ring ran parallel to a major change in the media landscape. The way the ring came into the news exemplifies the changing relationship between cinema and television. The state subsidy that Polygoon received for its *bioscoopjournaal*, since 1964, shifted the relationship with the commissioners for which it used to make promotional films. Polygoon no longer enjoyed a favourable position. Television, in its turn, began to show in-depth documentaries too, such as *VOOR MILJARDEN WEG* (“For billions a way”, AVRO, 1968-04-01). Whereas its slightly critical title refers to the substantial expenses to build roads, it actually explains the reasons and the designs of projects accommodating automobility. Preparatory measures by *Rijkswaterstaat* are shown and the way designs come into being. The film includes aerial shots of the ‘Van Brienenoordbrug’, the ‘Beneluxtunnel’, and *De Ruit*. It was the first time that the bridge and the tunnel were shown as part of one overall project.

Television accelerated modernity through its speed and frequency, but also by the tendency of generalising ‘cases’ into ‘conditions’. A particular achievement became instantaneously representative for a broad development, beyond the merits of the specific object. Such reports caused positive feedback, which reinforced the ‘structure of motion’.

Van Brienenoordbrug and Beneluxtunnel

Already in 1929, plans were made for a bridge east of the city, but the money was finally used for the ‘Maastunnel’, near the city centre¹³⁷¹. Once it was finished, new plans were made for the bridge. In 1941 ground was bought for this purpose in the village of IJsselmonde¹³⁷². Only by 1959 had the plans become concrete, and in 1965 the bridge was ready, after a design by W. J. van der Eb¹³⁷³. It became part of the A16 motorway that connects the Randstad Holland conurbation with Belgium. With its characteristic bow, it became a national icon of urban expansion, increasing automobility and economic growth. Media contributed to this image, since *Rijkswaterstaat* made strategical use of them, by inviting journalists to witness key moments of the construction. Hence, the first reports on it were simultaneously provided by Polygoon and the NTS JOURNAAL.

Its first milestone was the installation of the bascules, the turning parts to let ships pass by. The Van Brienenoordbrug became the largest bascule bridge of the country¹³⁷⁴. Polygoon and

¹³⁷¹ Plan from 1929 according to a decision of the *Nationale Verkeerscommissie*, Van de Laar, 2000: 306. See also: http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Van_Brienenoordbrug, article ‘Van Brienenoordbrug’ (visited 2006-03-11).

¹³⁷² Walhout, R.; ‘Dossier A 16’, *Nederlandse autosnelwegen - Dutch motorways / freeways - Niederländische Autobahnen*, www.autosnelwegen.nl, 2004-11-13, www.r.walhout.freeler.nl/asw/dosA16.htm

¹³⁷³ http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Van_Brienenoordbrug ‘Van Brienenoordbrug’ (visited 2006-03-11); built: 1962-1965. For the construction of the bridge, see: BRIENENOORDBRUG (1962-1965, Cornelia Guikink-Visser). See also: Meurs & Verheijen, 2003: 142. The bridge measures 1320m, the main suspension 287m, with an elevation of 24m above the river.

¹³⁷⁴ www.bruggenstichting.nl/BruggenDB/nbs.asp?id=69&data1=&data2=&mode>ShowRecord ‘Van Brienenoordbrug’ (2006-03-20).

NTS heralded this achievement with impressive images of the machines, installations and constructions¹³⁷⁵. It supported the bridge as a model case for engineers and policy makers.

Polygoon (1963-wk22) framed the bridge explicitly in the perspective of connections between the Netherlands and Belgium, while at the same time it addressed its role within the ring around Rotterdam. While the reports by Polygoon were compact stories, those of the NTS built on common knowledge gathered through other media. It provided detailed reports on different aspects of the project, such as the mounting of the fixed part of the bridge, and the completion of its suspension¹³⁷⁶. Shortly before the opening, the NTS showed a truck transporting sixteen lighting towers with a length of thirty-five metres each¹³⁷⁷. Polygoon reported on it too, but in combination with shots of workers asphaltting the road, and an astonishing aerial view (exceptionally all in colour) of the entire bridge and its system of approaching roads, which the lighting towers would turn into a 'sea of light'. It created a contrast of scale with the images of the neighbouring village IJsselmonde through which the towers had just been moved.

Before the opening of the bridge (on 1965-02-01), *Rijkswaterstaat* decided to arrange a 'preview' for the general public. Polygoon reported on it in combination with shots of the official opening ceremony. The NTS, instead, covered the 'preview' and the opening as two separate events¹³⁷⁸. Yet, it was the NTS this time that offered more of a background. Besides the opening ceremony it showed the bridge in its entirety, and including the connecting roads as well, also through aerial shots, and as such it presented the first part of the ring road. Afterwards, the NTS also showed the first traffic jam at the bridge, within a week after the opening (NTS, 1965-02-07).

Once the 'Van Brienoordbrug' was ready, it was featured in several television programmes, such as an informative essay on design, called VORM EN FUNCTIE; BRUGGEN (VPRO, 1966-11-10)¹³⁷⁹. A man jumps over a ditch with a jumping-pole, which is followed by all kinds of images of bridges in the Netherlands and abroad. Movements of bridges are shown and also one that collapses. After impressions of old bridges in Amsterdam, the magnificence of the Van Brienoord is shown through aerial shots; historic Amsterdam is opposed to modern Rotterdam. The VPRO used this footage of the bridge also for a separate 'tv-poème', broadcast during a break between two programmes¹³⁸⁰. It promoted the bridge as an example of engineering ingenuity and as built poetry.

Another example of a television programme that paid attention to the bridge was OPENBAAR KUNSTBEZIT (NTS, 1969-04-06)¹³⁸¹. Engineers of *Rijkswaterstaat* are interviewed about the artistic value of their work; 'a bridge is beautiful when it expresses its function'. Parts of Ivens's film THE BRIDGE (1928) are shown as reference material. In the same way, the filmmakers argue, one should look at the Van Brienoordbrug, which is shown from different angles. This is an instance of self-referentiality that is inherent in any system, whether that of

¹³⁷⁵ e.g. Polygoon (1963-wk22); JOURNAAL (NTS, 1963-05-22). Both reports show how the second bascule is moved to its position by floating benches and installed by cranes. Polygoon, however, offers more of a background as it also shows the two existing connections across the river in Rotterdam ('Koningsbrug' and 'Maastunnel').

¹³⁷⁶ JOURNAAL, NTS, 1963-10-04; JOURNAAL, NTS, 1964-07-03.

¹³⁷⁷ JOURNAAL, NTS, 1964-12-01; BOUW VAN DE BRIENENOORDBRUG (Polygoon, 1964-week50). These towers were manufactured by Verolme, which also commissioned a promotion film about it, i.e. VEROLME VERLICHTING BIJ DE VAN BRIENENOORDBRUG (1964, Verolme United Shipyards).

¹³⁷⁸ DE VAN BRIENENOORDBRUG (Polygoon, 1965-06, rec. 1965-02-01) and JOURNAAL (NTS, 1965-01-30; 1965-02-06). Both of them showed speeches by Jan Klaasesz (Royal Commissioner of Zuid-Holland) and Jan van Aartsen (Minister of Public Works and Water Management), and the opening by Queen Juliana.

¹³⁷⁹ See also, for example, the educational programme BETON, LES 1. INLEIDING (Teleac, 1972-01-15).

¹³⁸⁰ NIET BEKEND (VPRO, 1967-10-16).

¹³⁸¹ It was shot by cameraman Jochgem van Dijk and directed by Ton Aarden and Joes Odufré. Odufré began his career as a cameraman of BRUIN GOUD (1954, Louis van Gasteren). He was among the first tv-cameramen (NTS), and became a director for VPRO, in 1955, for which he made art programmes. After being head of VPRO-television he started Gamma Films. 'Joes Odufré (1925 – 2004), cameraman/tv-regisseur en producer' (May 2004).

www.beeldengeluid.nl/template_subnav.jsp?navname=biografieen_o&category=collectie_informatie&artid=28193

media or engineering. The evolution of such a system ‘is a form of structural change that produces and reproduces its own preconditions’ (Luhmann, 2000 [1995]: 158). This can only happen through observations of former states of the system. ‘Today this is called “intertextuality,” which is another way of saying that the art system must have a memory’ (ibid: 245-246). Luhmann calls it the ‘self-programming of art’, which happens within the ‘autopoietic network of the art system’ (ibid).

Media and engineering subsystems are linked to each another within a broader system of social-cultural and economic development. In this perspective we should observe the way *De Hef* and the Van Brienoordbrug have been turned into icons of their time, *De Hef* as a railway bridge shown by film, as a new form of art, and the Van Brienoordbrug as a bridge for automobiles, covered by the mass medium of television.

As the general attitude changed in the 1970s, the bridge was no longer unproblematically presented, either as a work of art and technology or as an icon of modernity. Instead, it became subject to critical observations. At the end of 1973, the government took measures to decrease energy consumption, due to the oil crisis, combined with environmental reasons as addressed by the Club of Rome. The government announced the so-called *Autoloze Zondagen* (“Carfree Sundays”); the first one took place on the 4th of November 1973, and the last one on the 6th of January 1974¹³⁸². During these days the bridge remained empty, which was something unique in its history. This image was included in different television programmes¹³⁸³. The icon of progress was all of a sudden turned into its reverse. However, the numbers of cars crossing the bridge every day increased nevertheless, far beyond the estimated daily 144,000¹³⁸⁴. Small disturbances resulted in major traffic jams¹³⁸⁵. As a consequence, the bridge had to be broadened within fifteen years, which, finally, was also reported by the JOURNAAL (1979-08-23).

Besides the Van Brienoordbrug, *Rijkwaterstaat* made plans for the ‘Beneluxtunnel’ at the west side of the ring (A4)¹³⁸⁶. In 1963 an agreement was reached on the financial plan, which was reported by the NTS JOURNAAL (1963-06-09). It also showed a map of the area and the purpose of the tunnel. The JOURNAAL would closely monitor its further development. Since the tunnel connected the city of Vlaardingen to the larger agglomeration, its ambitious Mayor Heusdens, portrayed in the report too, became the president of the exploitation company Beneluxtunnel NV. It took time before the construction works started, but at the beginning of 1965, when the Van Brienoordbrug was finished, the construction rapidly progressed¹³⁸⁷.

At the opening ceremony, both Mayor Heusdens and Mayor Thomassen of Rotterdam were present, as the hosts of Queen Juliana (NTS, 1967-06-05). Driving through the tunnel offered another ‘cinematic experience’, which was shown as such by the NTS JOURNAAL (1967-06-05). The report also showed a close-up of the ticket machine, because of the toll to be paid. The Queen, seated in a special bus, was the first one to buy a ticket, as shown by Polygoon (1967-24), just like the audience watching it bought a ticket at the box office of the cinema. Polygoon mentioned furthermore that many drivers followed that day, anxious to enjoy this experience. It was actually the only report by Polygoon on the Beneluxtunnel, quite different from, say, the way it covered the construction of the Maastunnel about a quarter of a century before. It stresses the changed position of cinema newsreels in favour of television.

¹³⁸² http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Autoloze_zondag (website visited: 2006-04-05)

¹³⁸³ E.g. in a programme by Bob Holt for Yorkshire Television (ref. *Rotterdam*, vol. 11/4, 1973, p25), in ALLES OP ZIJN TIJD (NCRV, 1973-12-31), a film-essay on slowness, and briefly in a programme on environmentalism: DE KLEINE AARDE (IKOR, 1974-01-04).

¹³⁸⁴ De Bruin e.a.; 1998: 232.

¹³⁸⁵ E.g. when the bridge had to be closed because of falling pieces of ice, JOURNAAL, NTS, 1979-01-08.

¹³⁸⁶ <http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Beneluxtunnel>, article ‘Beneluxtunnel’ (visited 2006-03-11).

¹³⁸⁷ First came the work on the south bank, near Pernis (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1965-03-05), and then on the other side near Vlaardingen, which was shown by aerial and location shots (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1965-08-11). The next year the tunnel was opened by Heusdens (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1966-12-02), but it took another half a year before it was ready for use.

traffic junctions

While the Beneluxtunnel was being built, *Rijkswaterstaat* started similar projects elsewhere too, such as the Heinenoordtunnel (part of the A29), which strengthened the connection of Rotterdam with the south of the country¹³⁸⁸. On the north side a new road was built to improve the connection between Rotterdam and Amsterdam¹³⁸⁹. At the east side of the Ring, the road A15 was constructed to connect Rotterdam with the Ruhr area in Germany, according to plans made by the former ‘road planning director’ and main engineer Le Cosquine de Bussy, who also opened the new road in front of the NTS camera¹³⁹⁰ (1964-03-22).

The ring around Rotterdam, which has been called a large roundabout¹³⁹¹, needed good junctions to connect these roads in order to regulate the flows to and from Rotterdam. In VOOR MILJARDEN WEG images were shown of ‘Kethelplein’ (A4-A20), still under construction. It would actually never be finished entirely, due to environmentalist objections¹³⁹². As soon as ‘Kethelplein’ performed its minimum function, *Rijkswaterstaat* started to build the next one: ‘Kleinpolderplein’¹³⁹³. In contrast to the former, the proceedings were frequently reported by the media¹³⁹⁴. Journalists largely followed press releases and invitations by *Rijkswaterstaat*.

The construction of Kleinpolderplein had been envisioned from the onset, and prepared since 1959, when the first measuring of traffic intensity was carried out¹³⁹⁵. In 1967, *Rijkswaterstaat* commissioned Van Hattum & Blankevoort to build the project¹³⁹⁶. They were previously involved with complex projects like the ‘Beneluxtunnel’ and the ‘Zeelandbrug’ (part of the Delta Works). The construction of Kleinpolderplein was promoted by a booklet and a film, EROP OF ERONDER (1971)¹³⁹⁷, made by Joop Burcksen and Ruud Herblot, who had established their names in the field of engineering with their successful film ELEMENTS FACING ELEMENTS (1966) on the ‘Zeelandbrug’. The new film, which was commissioned by Van Hattum & Blankevoort, shows the construction step by step. It is a record of a project that is, at the same time, framed in rhetorical way to address rationalisation – once more an instance of the RRR, according to Hediger & Vonderau (2007).

Due to increasing automobility, the film explains, new infrastructure needs to be built, to solve traffic jams and to relieve ‘provoked drivers’ (*getergde automobilisten*). A map is presented of the *Ruit om Rotterdam*. The camera zooms in on Kleinpolderplein, with roads in four layers. Certain parts of the construction are prefabricated in Kats, a village near the Zeelandbrug, which establishes a direct link to the preceding construction and film project. Pre-fabrication, innovative

¹³⁸⁸ See e.g. JOURNAAL, NTS, 1968-07-10; INGEBRUIKSTELLING HEINENOORDTUNNEL, Polygoon, 1969-07-22.

¹³⁸⁹ See: Polygoon, 1958-wk, showing the opening of a part of the road A4 (Amsterdam – The Hague) by minister J. Algra (*Verkeer en Waterstaat*). In the early 1960s the road between The Hague and Rotterdam (A13) was widened and improved (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1964-03-18).

¹³⁹⁰ Opening of the part between Alblasterdam and Giessendam.

¹³⁹¹ Fred Heuer (*Rijkswaterstaat*), in the article ‘Nexus-partners gaan ‘pijn verdelen’ op Rotterdamse Ruit’ (2006-02-08), www.verkeerskunde.nl/moxie/actueel/nieuws/nexuspartners-gaan-pijn-v.shtml.

¹³⁹² nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Knooppunt_Kethelplein (website visited: 2006-03-22).

¹³⁹³ www.verkeerenwaterstaat.nl/?lc=nl&page=364 It started at 1967-08-01.

¹³⁹⁴ The first part of ‘Kleinpolderplein’ was already opened at the end of 1969 (JOURNAAL, NOS, 1969-11-11). Shortly afterwards it had already to deal with the problem of traffic jams, which was shown in a four minute film commissioned by the regional police service *Regiopolitie Rotterdam Rijnmond*. It also showed jams in the Europoort, at the Van Brienoordbrug and inside the city at Hofplein and near the Maastunnel (FILEVORMING, 1969, anon.). Film served the analysis of traffic movements. It was not meant for public screening. The authorities only addressed this issue indirectly (JOURNAAL, 1971-01-14). Later that year the official opening of the entire junction was shown, as a striking example of engineering, with four layers of roads, which offered a dazzling spectacle of compositions (JOURNAAL, NOS, 1971-06-23; Polygoon, 1971-wk30). Less favourable was a report on water abundance at the junction (JOURNAAL, 1971-07-21). For the construction, see also ROTTERDAM IN DE ZEVENTIGER JAREN (1968-1975, J.A. Visser).

¹³⁹⁵ Provoost, 1996: 79.

¹³⁹⁶ i.e. *Rijkswaterstaat Directie Bruggen*. For Van Hattum & Blankevoort, see www.vhb-vsce.nl/ (2006-03-23).

¹³⁹⁷ The booklet is called *Kleinpolderplein* (Stuvel e.a., 1969), issued by Van Hattum & Blankevoort / reprint from the magazine *Weg en Waterbouw*, nr. 1969/07. The film was already commissioned before, but it was finished in 1971.

building methods, new ways of organisation and logistics, like transportation by waterway, are all needed in order to let the traffic go on during construction, which was one of the main challenges for the constructors¹³⁹⁸. In the end the film shows aerial views of the finished junction. ‘Only a radical approach like that in Rotterdam is sufficient if one does not want to be confronted with complete traffic disorder on our roads in the future. There is no choice: one has to go up or down (*het is erop of eronder*)’¹³⁹⁹. The title EROP OF ERONDER literally says: above or below, referring to the different traffic lanes, while it is also a Dutch expression to say ‘win or lose’. An epilogue follows, which is an artistic impression of the new infrastructural ‘sculpture’.

In the 1970s, the construction of motorways rapidly increased. It also generated protests, due to changing public opinion. It can be illustrated by the television programme HIER EN NU (NCRV, 1972-03-21). It starts with impressions of Kleinpolderplein. The first protest concerns the planned ‘Rijksweg A3’ (freeway), from Amsterdam to Rotterdam across the so-called Green Heart of the Randstad. E.J. Hennink, representative of the *werkgroep* against the road, argues that a precious nature area is threatened. It is illustrated by a film impression of the area, and opposed to plans of H.D. Prins, chairman of the “Dutch Association of Road Constructors” (*Nederlandse Vereniging Wegenvoerders*). Next is an explanation of the *werkgroep* against the Leidsebaan, a road in The Hague. Last is an argument of a committee to save the old country-seat Twickel, near Hengelo, from plans to build the road S23. Tracking shots through the landscape articulate the argument. The report finishes with more images of constructions, as opposed to nature. Not long after the programme was broadcast, all the three projects were cancelled.

Kleinpolderplein was built when the media became a battleground. In this perspective we may also understand the promotional value of a film like EROP OF ERONDER. Besides its particular interests, it helped to pave the way for other projects in Rotterdam. The next junction to be made (1972) was ‘Beneluxplein’ (A4-A15), at the end of the Beneluxtunnel south of the river¹⁴⁰⁰. Notwithstanding its ingenious construction of three lanes on top of each other, it was left untouched by the media. The same applies to the turbine junction ‘Tebregseplein’ (opening 1973-06-21)¹⁴⁰¹, in the northeast of the ring (A20-A16), in spite of its separate lanes for private cars and trucks, and notwithstanding the fact that it provided an important connection with Utrecht.

About two years later, the JOURNAAL (1975-11-06) reported that the *Ruit* was ready, which was illustrated by tracking shots of ‘Kleinpolderplein’. For the next ten years, it was the last report on the infrastructural works around Rotterdam. Although one could indeed drive around the city by then, the *Ruit* was not yet finished. Only by 1979, the ring was truly completed, with the opening of the complicated star and clover-leaf junction ‘Ridderkerk’, which provided connections in the direction of Belgium and Germany¹⁴⁰². Four lanes pass on top of each other while at one side it counts sixteen lanes next to one another. Although it was a spectacular work of engineering, *Rijkswaterstaat* and the contractors refrained from further publicity.

By the end of the 1970s, infrastructural works were no longer presented as icons of progress, but as icons of environmental problems. An example is the programme AKTUA (TROS,

¹³⁹⁸ This is also explicitly addressed, as reasons to make the film, in a letter (1973-01-24) that accompanied a film copy that was presented by Van Hattum and Blankevoort to the Gemeente Rotterdam ‘as a token of appreciation for the good collaboration’. GAR, letter in film can BB-0780, the letter is marked with the code ‘D174’.

¹³⁹⁹ Original quote: ‘Alleen een radicale aanpak zoals die bij Rotterdam is afdoende wil men in de toekomst niet geconfronteerd worden met een complete verkeerschaos op onze wegen. Er is geen keus: het is erop of eronder.’ The film, which had already been shown at different occasions, was officially presented to mayor Thomassen by Van Hattum & Blankevoort on the 31st of January 1973, after the premiere of the film ZUIDPLEIN (1972, Aad Griekspoor); see: ‘Zuidplein film in première’, p8 in: *NRC Handelsblad*, 1973-02-01.

¹⁴⁰⁰ I.e. between Pernis and Hoogvliet – http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Knooppunt_Benelux (2006-03-21)

¹⁴⁰¹ <http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tebregseplein>. In 1977 was the opening of ‘Vaanplein’, in the east: <http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vaanplein> (2006-03-21); a ‘windmill’, later combined with a ‘star’ and ‘clover-leaf’.

¹⁴⁰² As a node of the A15 and A16, located in the south, where one finds connections to Nijmegen and Dordrecht http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Knooppunt_Ridderkerk, cf. : www.beeldbankvenw.nl (2006-03-21)

1979-09-29), on smog research by TNO, including images of oil tanks in the port of Rotterdam and of its motorways. Whatever critical opinions were demonstrated, the *Ruit* had become a matter of fact. Strategies changed, and communication processes along with them, in order to secure urban development in the end. The suburbs and the relocated port became connected and integral part of the city, which accommodated the increasing number of daily commuters. However, ideas for a second and larger ring around the whole agglomeration of Rotterdam, which was still discussed in 1969¹⁴⁰³, were soon left behind.

§ 4. Airport Zestienhoven

In May 1940, Airport Waalhaven was the stage of fights; the Dutch eventually destroyed it, and aeroplane factory Koolhoven, to prevent the Germans to use it. After the war the government did not want another airport close to Schiphol, but a location was nevertheless appointed in 1948¹⁴⁰⁴. A construction board along the A13 highway boldly mentioned that a new national airport was under construction. Politicians were surprised and wanted to stop it, but it continued. 'Airport Zestienhoven', with a 1300 metre runway and a few wooden buildings, was opened on the 1st of October 1956 by Mayor Van Walsum. It was reported one day later by the NTS JOURNAAL (1956-10-02), which showed the connection to Southend-on-Sea (UK), while Polygoon (1956-wk40) showed the work that had enabled it: the construction of the runway and the control tower.

Although the KLM had run the first airline in Rotterdam in the 1920s, it took time before it came back. The first KLM aircraft at Zestienhoven was welcomed by Mayor Van Walsum, as shown in a relatively long report (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1959-11-06) on the history of aviation in Rotterdam. In the next years the airport would be frequently subject of television reports, which meant direct promotion¹⁴⁰⁵. Due to the precarious development of the airport, its director Van der Hoeden maintained good relations with the media. Any kind of news was communicated, about subjects as different as a flight school, the hoisting up of a subsidised DC-9, or, for example, the transportation of small aircrafts to Tunisia for agricultural purposes¹⁴⁰⁶. The airport's management even arranged a special flight for journalists to shoot a lunar eclipse (JOURNAAL, 1964-06-28).

In 1965 the Sabena helicopter flights were taken over from the Heliport in the city, which had to close¹⁴⁰⁷. Due to the airport's success new companies came to Rotterdam, like Swissair, Lufthansa and Air France, and related businesses came along with them, so the airport had to renew its facilities. The plans were first presented by the JOURNAAL, by way of models (1964-02-23), which were accompanied by nice shots of the lit runway at night. When the construction works started, they were presented by a short film made by Gemeentewerken itself¹⁴⁰⁸. The JOURNAAL, in its turn, reported twice on the construction, of the traffic control tower and the new hall. It continued to monitor the development of the airport, after the plans were carried out, in 1970, and when half a million passengers were counted after the next six months¹⁴⁰⁹.

Besides regular flights the airport organised special events, such as tourist flights above Rotterdam, and air shows, which also attracted the attention of the media¹⁴¹⁰. Mayor Thomassen

¹⁴⁰³ See for example Nieuwenhuijze, 1969: 15.

¹⁴⁰⁴ For these and following facts: 'Geschiedenis Rotterdam Airport' (March 2006) www.rotterdam-airport.nl/generalmenu/Voor_kinderen/Schoolpakket/Terug_in_de_tijd/Geschiedenis_Rotterdam_Airport

¹⁴⁰⁵ E.g. ESPRESSO (VARA, 1961-08-19), about a memorial; EXTRA (VPRO, 1965-11-04), on the growth of the airport; Polygoon (1963-week25), on the introduction of a new aircraft, the Carvair, to carry automobiles to Great Britain (the cars are lifted by a special elevator and then driven into the nose of the aircraft).

¹⁴⁰⁶ JOURNAAL [school] NTS, 1968-01-04; JOURNAAL [DC-9] NTS, 1969-02-11; JOURNAAL [Tunisia] NTS, 1969-12-05.

¹⁴⁰⁷ Already before, helicopter flights took place from Zestienhoven, see e.g. JOURNAAL, NTS, 1958-11-04.

¹⁴⁰⁸ I.e. LUCHTHAVEN ROTTERDAM (1967, Henk Vrijmoet).

¹⁴⁰⁹ JOURNAAL [construction of tower] NTS, 1969-09-16; JOURNAAL [construction of the hall] NOS, 1970-04-28; JOURNAAL (NOS, 1971-03-08): Alderman Polak explains the official report on the development of Zestienhoven.

¹⁴¹⁰ See respectively: VRIJ UIT (NOS, 1970-07-17), JOURNAAL (NOS, 1970-09-26); cf. VLIEGFEEST OP ZESTIENHOVEN (Polygoon, 1965-10-02); VLIEGTUIGSHOW OP ZESTIENHOVEN (Polygoon, 1978-06-03).

thus promoted the airport in terms of ‘more welfare and pleasure’¹⁴¹¹. It generated support among the citizens, but the airport faced nevertheless a difficult period in the early 1970s. First of all there was the threat of terrorists hijacking aeroplanes¹⁴¹². There were also protests against its extension, which was transmitted by the JOURNAAL and by the VPRO that showed a meeting of the ‘anti-bulderbaan’ committee in Berkel & Rodenrijs¹⁴¹³. The JOURNAAL also reported on the results of a NIPO questionnaire that was held among the neighbouring residents, to ask for their experiences concerning noise and their opinion about the extension plans¹⁴¹⁴. The conclusion was that the airport could go on, when appropriate measures would be taken. But then the physical condition of the runway became problematic. After strong discussions, broadcast by the NOS, it was finally decided to renovate it¹⁴¹⁵. It was documented through the film RUNWAY 06-24 (1974), made by Werner Jansen and his Rotterdam based production company Capricornus¹⁴¹⁶. With Jansen himself being trained as an engineer, the film fits the genre of the ‘construction film’, which was commissioned by Royal Stevin, one of the constructors¹⁴¹⁷. As the airport had to be closed for two weeks, Jansen used the tight time schedule to create a tension: man versus time.

Zestienhoven became a node in an international network, and as such a site for all kinds of encounters, which offered possibilities, but also threats. It was, for example, the stage for a ‘television narrative’ on the IRA kidnapping AKZO-director Tiede Herrema, who was held hostage for thirty-six days¹⁴¹⁸. After people went to Ireland to negotiate, the NOS finally reported the reunion of Herrema with his family awaiting him¹⁴¹⁹. While life went on, the destination of the airport remained uncertain, as the discussion about the need of a second national airport was fuelled again. The city council, anticipating a negative outcome, thought of using the area for housing. Employees went to the town hall to protest against the closure, and felt themselves supported by the JOURNAAL reporting on it (1976-01-27). Alderman Mentink stuck to his idea, which he expressed once more in an interview for the JOURNAAL (1977-07-26). The airport, he argued, could not become a major economic force like the port, as Schiphol was destined to hold such a role. Mentink, however, did not have the last say, and different developments took place simultaneously. KLM’s daughter company NLM even decided to fly to more destinations from Zestienhoven¹⁴²⁰. In the end Zestienhoven was not closed, but continued to grow.

The development of Zestienhoven was the result of opposed forces; film and television played a moderating role in it. In respect of its size and importance to the country, the airport attracted a relatively large amount of attention. Besides the aeroplanes themselves, other discussions were ‘flying in the air’, concerning the connection between Rotterdam and Amsterdam, the position of Rotterdam in the Netherlands, the status of local versus national interests, the interaction between seaport and airport, and economic interests versus housing and environment. Media did not only give an image of the airport, its space, planning and logistics; they enabled a discourse on urbanism.

¹⁴¹¹ As mentioned by Van de Laar (‘meer welvaart en meer vertier’), 2000: 510.

¹⁴¹² See: TELEVIZIER III 37 (AVRO, 1972-06-19), JOURNAAL (NOS, 1972-06-23).

¹⁴¹³ I.e. BERICHTEN UIT DE SAMENLEVING: GELUIDSHINDER, VPRO, 1971-03-25; reports of the NOS JOURNAAL on this issue were broadcast on: 1970-04-28; 1971-06-04; 1971-09-14.

¹⁴¹⁴ See: JOURNAAL (NOS, 1971-11-30; 1972-06-14).

¹⁴¹⁵ See: JOURNAAL (NOS, 1974-04-19), DEN HAAG VANDAAG (NOS, 1974-04-24); and JOURNAAL (NOS, 1974-09-02), VAN GEWEST TOT GEWEST (NOS, 1974-09-11).

¹⁴¹⁶ Capricornus was, since 1974, the continuation of Studio Freddy Lievense, Rotterdam (see filmography > Lievense). Capricornus was directed by Werner Jansen himself; collaborators were Inge Overkleeft and Bertus van Dinter (for the latter, see e.g. RIJNVAART III, 1970). See: Happel, Frans; ‘Werner jansen, Bedrijfscineast: Gewoon, gewoon goed, gewoon filmgek’, in: *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1975-04-02.

¹⁴¹⁷ Stevin also commissioned other films, such as WERKEN OM WATER (1975, Joop Span).

¹⁴¹⁸ Cf. Van Nimwegen, 2007: 44.

¹⁴¹⁹ See: JOURNAAL, NOS, 1975-10-10; 1975-10-11; 1975-11-08; see also: Polygoon, 1975-wk46.

¹⁴²⁰ JOURNAAL (NOS, 1977-10-13).

§ 5. Rotterdam, De Randstad and the Netherlands

Throughout the 20th century, the biggest cities in the Netherlands were Amsterdam and Rotterdam. Over the course of the century, each of their agglomerations grew to over one million inhabitants, but the numbers of the core cities have remained relatively stable since the 1920s; with some fluctuations they have counted about 700,000 and 600,000 people respectively. These figures are modest compared to major cities abroad. In fact, the Netherlands is characterised by its large number of relatively small cities. Since the Middle Ages, these cities were already competing with each other, so that each of them managed to develop its own commercial, cultural and educational institutions. After the fast industrial-urban growth in the 19th century, a new cityscape emerged, made up by different but closely related cities. In 1938, the founder and president of the KLM, Albert Plesman, called it the 'Randstad' ("Rim city")¹⁴²¹. Flying over the country, the chain of cities looked like a rim, with a 'Green Heart' in the middle.

In 1959, the Randstad was, for the first time, the subject of a documentary: RUIMTE, RUMOER, RANDSTAD ("Space, Noise, Randstad", Arie de Ruyter, VARA, 1959-02-25). The Randstad was used as a name to address increasing congestion. Regarding Rotterdam, we do not only see the city centre and its port, but also the way it is related to other cities; a map of the Randstad is shown, which was a novelty. In about a quarter of an hour, images of different cities interchange: Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague, and several smaller ones, with all kinds of industries being related, from oil to horticulture. The congestion in the Randstad is opposed to other areas in the Netherlands, with lower population densities, and less employment. As such the film makes an argument for decentralisation, which, it is suggested, offers more possibilities for economic development within European perspectives.

The Randstad, as a planning concept, has never been clearly defined. However, the actual constellation, of an urban network with nodes that are complete cities with their own (historical) identities, comes close to the vision of Lewis Mumford. 'We can no longer think, in old-fashioned terms, of a "metropolis of three million people," for that no longer corresponds to the range of urban cooperation....'¹⁴²² For Mumford, human interaction is the basis for urban planning. 'We must rather seek a new over-all pattern for both the small-scale and the large-scale unit. The expression and linking together of these units is the task of modern urban design.' The key to do so Mumford found in landscape planning, in order to 'provide a permanent green matrix'. It would allow for a larger structure to include different urban clusters, separated from each other by green belts, but connected by infrastructure.

This larger structure, unlike the present clumsy magnification of the old Stone Age container, is rather an open network, comparable to the electric power grid, which utilizes both small and big units to form a greater interdependent system. // With a regional grid, the smallest urban unit will be able to make demands and draw on all the resources of the largest unit in a two-way system of intercourse and cooperation. But to create such a larger system, one must begin with a reorganization of small units, by introducing balance, self-government, organic growth, and a dynamic, self-renewing form into the neighborhood, the precinct, the city, and into all the institutional components of the city, which have become clumsy and disorganized through unregulated overexpansion.¹⁴²³

The situation of the Randstad corresponded to this vision, but also to the modernist ideal of a city with abundant air and space. Citizens could be outside the city in about fifteen minutes. Mumford elaborated on it in the article 'Landscape and Townscape' (1960).

¹⁴²¹ Wagenaar, 1992: 389 n97; cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 311. In the late 1930s, when a discussion took place in respect of the airports of Amsterdam and Rotterdam, Plesman proposed an airport for the Randstad Holland, near Leiderdorp.

¹⁴²² This and following quote: Mumford, 1968: 139.

¹⁴²³ Mumford, 1968: 140.

The most important public task, around every growing urban center, and far beyond, is to reserve permanent open areas, capable of being maintained for agriculture, horticulture, and related rural industries. These areas must be established in such a fashion as to prevent the coalescence of one urban unit with another. Within its metropolitan area, this has been the notable accomplishment of Stockholm, and in no small degree of the Netherlands as an ecological regional entity.¹⁴²⁴

Mumford included De Randstad in his series LEWIS MUMFORD ON THE CITY (1963, Ian MacNeill), which was produced by the National Film Board of Canada¹⁴²⁵. It was a project with many collaborators, among them the Dutch filmmaker Ytzen Brusse¹⁴²⁶. Based on Mumford's book *The City in History*, the first out of six parts, of half an hour each, starts with the rise and fall of cities, and the creative and destructive forces that shape them, with Rotterdam as an example. In the second part, the Randstad is introduced, shot by Bert Haanstra, as a model to solve problems of congestion. This view would be elaborated by others, among them the British planner Gerald Burke, who spoke of the *Greenheart Metropolis* (1966).

Contrary to the planning policies, however, the 'Green Heart' became a place for suburban living, since the late 1960s. According to Wagenaar (1992: 284), suburbanisation was an implication of the *wijkgedachte*, which, as an idea, developed parallel to that of the Randstad. Suburbanisation reinforced social-economic ties within the region, but it also demanded good infrastructure. Hence a network-like urban structure emerged. Critic Niek de Boer has stated (1996) that this is no big city, and that a policy vision upon a big city is altogether lacking in the Netherlands. *Rijkswaterstaat*, however, envisioned the so-called *Stad Nederland*, with the country being a network of interrelated and interdependent cities, with 'functional parks' in between (i.e. for agriculture)¹⁴²⁷. The regional planning authority of Zuid-Holland, in its turn, envisioned, for the end of the century, a megalopolis of 40 to 45 million inhabitants, including large parts of the Netherlands and Belgium, and the Ruhrgebiet, with Rotterdam as its main port¹⁴²⁸.

While planners attempted to elaborate the Randstad as a concept, it became a common notion among the Dutch to indicate the western part of the Netherlands, its congestion and its economic prosperity, which kept a promise for the future. In 1960, it even became the name of an employment agency, the now renowned Randstad Holding. In 1961, it also became the name of a literary magazine (1961-1969, published by De Bezige Bij). However common the notion had become, it was hardly reflected by motion pictures. One reason is that there existed no Randstad government, to commission films about it. Although it was often mentioned in reports, it was not before 1978 that another programme explicitly took it as its subject, DE RANDSTAD HOLLAND (1978, Teleac) as part of an educational series on Dutch history. It showed urbanisation patterns in the Netherlands and it addressed traffic problems. It seems that the notion of Randstad referred first of all to infrastructure and congestion, rather than functional relationships between the cities.

Filmmakers still relied upon the idea of the metropolis, and felt more affiliated with a particular town than with the Randstad. For Rotterdam, it was also less of an issue than other large-scale urban constellations¹⁴²⁹. More attention was paid to the Rijnmond, and the attempt to set up a Rijnmond administration (*Openbaar Lichaam Rijnmond*, 1964-1986)¹⁴³⁰. Alternatively,

¹⁴²⁴ Mumford, 1968: 83-84.

¹⁴²⁵ For more information on this film, see: www.nfb.ca.

¹⁴²⁶ He was responsible for fragments of Part 4: THE HEART OF THE CITY.

¹⁴²⁷ For further references, see: Provoost, 1996: 61-73.

¹⁴²⁸ Lange: 1964: 15.

¹⁴²⁹ For films on regional planning in the province of Zuid-Holland, see e.g.: ZUID-HOLLAND (1964, Otto van Neijenhoff), and AAN DE ORDE IS... (1979, Werner Jansen), made for consultancy office *Adviesbureau Stad en Landschap*, and *Vereniging Dorp, Stad en Land* (association for planning interests).

¹⁴³⁰ Van de Laar, 2000: 499-501.

connections were drawn with port cities abroad, such as London and those along the river Rhine, which come to the fore in many foreign films¹⁴³¹.

Although there is no substantial body of films from the 1960s and 1970s on the Randstad, some titles can still be mentioned, such as the ‘television-poème’ SHOPPING CENTRA (1962, Joop Reinboud). This (16mm colour) film shows the cities of Amsterdam, The Hague and Rotterdam. They are made into one cinematic composition through street shots and images of buildings, the people inside and the traffic around them. There are close-ups of posters, consumer goods and cars, and how people use them. Children ride a tricycle, a scooter and a cart, each in another city. By combining images of different places, a new place emerges on the screen. Something similar applies to a programme on playgrounds for children across the Randstad¹⁴³². Of a different order is a report on an exchange between Amsterdam and Rotterdam, with the Amsterdam city council and Mayor Samkalden visiting Rotterdam, hosted by Mayor Thomassen¹⁴³³.

There are, furthermore, reports dealing with the interdependence of Dutch cities as part of the Netherlands as a social-economic and environmental system. A returning theme is housing, especially in respect of a housing shortage¹⁴³⁴. It is exemplified by THE BUILDING GAME (1963, C. Huguenot van der Linden)¹⁴³⁵. It was commissioned by the “Joint Building Enterprises” (*Gezamenlijke Bouwbedrijven*), to celebrate the fact that one million dwellings were built in the Netherlands after WWII. The film won a Golden Bear at the 1963 Berlin Film Festival¹⁴³⁶, for its energetic and playful approach. Shots of buildings from various cities become one cinematic construction, through a sophisticated matching of colours and compositions. The result is a new, all-encompassing city. It corresponded to everyday experiences as far as people encountered similar buildings and styles in different cities, while within a city one could see many different styles and approaches. Particular building enterprises operated in different places at the same time, hence creating structural connections between them.

The film was made alongside Alsemgeest’s LEVEN IN DE BOUWERIJ (1963)¹⁴³⁷, while there was also the publication of the Bruna pocket *Wij Bouwen* (1963, Godfried Bomans, photographs by Kees Scherer e.a.). Like the films, this book hardly mentions any city by name, but addresses the energy and possibilities of building. With an almost utopian enthusiasm they express the modernist paradigms of placelessness and timelessness, or it must have been a concern with the space of the future. In addition, an exhibition was organised at the ‘Bouwcentrum’ in Rotterdam, which also collaborated with KRO-television on a series of television programmes on housing¹⁴³⁸.

The *Medienverbund* of the one-millionth dwelling promoted an industry, a modern way of living and thinking. The industry and the government shared the same agenda, which is illustrated by the film NOG NIET (“Not Yet”, 1970, Elvira Kleinen)¹⁴³⁹. Made for the Ministry of

¹⁴³¹ e.g. LA PAROLE EST AU FLEUVE (1960, Claude Lafaille, Marianne Oswald), ZUM TOR EUROPA (1964, Renate von Ammon), DE RIJN ZOEKT ZIJN WEG NAAR DE ZEE; DE RIJNDELTA (1977, Ion Bostan).

¹⁴³² cf. DAG NEDERLAND; KINDEREN IN VAKANTIETIJD (AVRO, 1972-07-22); impression of children in summer, playing in the Amsterdamse Bos, in the *Energiehal* and *Zuiderpark* in Rotterdam, and on a building lot in Utrecht.

¹⁴³³ i.e. MONITOR (NTS, 1967-10-29). Another example is the ‘police film’ VAN NUL TOT 24 (1968, Pim Korver), for the police forces in the main cities; all kinds of scenes are arranged in which the police has to come into action.

¹⁴³⁴ e.g. DE SOCIALE WONINGBOUW EIST EEN OMWENTELING (1971, Milo Anstadt); ANNO 1973 (Richard Hock).

¹⁴³⁵ Dutch title: BOUWSPELEMENT. It is a punning of words: *Bouw* + *Spel* + *Element* = Building Game Element.

¹⁴³⁶ Hogenkamp, 2003: 204; Hofstede, 2000: 109.

¹⁴³⁷ It is a punning of the saying ‘leven in de brouwerij’: life in the brewery = ‘something is going on’. The film is lost.

¹⁴³⁸ i.e. HUIS, THUIS, WONEN (1963-1964, Guus Kristel). Looking towards the future, the building enterprises anticipated the two-millionth dwelling in 1975. Therefore the exhibition showed the so-called *Woning 1975*, for which the ‘Bouwcentrum’ developed a prototype, designed by H. Eckardt, who also presented a full-scale model of it in the television programme. It was conceived upon notions like ‘elasticity’, with adjustable walls, together with ideas of industrial building, the use of new materials like plastics, and high-tech electronic applications (incl. in-built audiovisual equipment). Overall it followed some sort of structuralist lay-out, centred around patios and terraces.

¹⁴³⁹ Cf. BEWOONBAAR LAND (1968, Jan Wiegel), which is another film on planning that was also edited by Kleinen and commissioned by the Ministry of Housing and Planning.

Housing and Planning, this compilation film, including images of *THE BUILDING GAME*, gives an overview of housing production since 1945. It states that the targets have ‘not yet’ been achieved, which would require innovative approaches. While these films concerned a particular *subject*, other films (e.g. by Carillon), promoted the Netherlands *as a country*, to show foreign audiences its economic resources, in which perspective the port of Rotterdam was usually shown¹⁴⁴⁰. Still other films drew a more general impression of the country¹⁴⁴¹. Many of them concern the theme of water and landscape, and hence the way Rotterdam is structurally connected to other places.

An example is the Shell film *HOLD BACK THE SEA* (1961, George Sluizer)¹⁴⁴². It was made to introduce foreign relations to the country. Rotterdam is shown for its port, as a major hub within a network of waterways connecting different places, and as a part of an overall environmental system. That is also the case in Bert Haanstra’s independently made feature-length documentary *THE VOICE OF THE WATER* (1966)¹⁴⁴³. It shows the way the Dutch grow up with water, and how it is part of Dutch identity. In this perspective the port is shown as an impressive entourage and its dynamics are emphasised by fast-motion images. Giant ships seem even greater as they are filmed from below. In between them a boatman is busy with hawsers, which is a traditional job that is still needed in the modern harbour. All this is shown in contrast to the quietness of inland waters, with people fishing, and sailing on Frisian lakes. The Netherlands encompass a network of towns, but important too are the areas in between.

The assistant director of this film was Rolf Orthel. For British Petroleum (BP), concerned with mobility, he subsequently directed, with Haanstra as the producer and partly the same crew, *BRIDGES IN HOLLAND* (1968). According to a similar canvas, the film shows all sorts of bridges across the country, including Rotterdam. The connection between the bridges is the water that cuts through the landscape. Comparable is *SKY OVER HOLLAND* (1967, John Fernhout), which was a promotional film for the Netherlands, shot on 70mm, shown at the World Exhibition of Montreal (1967). The Dutch landscape is seen from the sky, which is closely related to masterpieces of Dutch painting, as the film shows. City and countryside, it is suggested, are part of one big composition. In all these films, Rotterdam is presented as part of a larger landscape. If it comes to identity, it is most of all a national one, and based on geography. The space of the Netherlands is shown, with its constructions, resources, and elements like water and air.

Whereas these films rarely dealt with urban culture as such, I should mention one more case. In 1975, the chief editor of AVRO’s *TELEVIZIER*, Jaap van Meekren, who generally spent the majority of his time on urban issues, made a documentary called “Searching for the world of tomorrow; the urbanisation of the Earth” (*OP ZOEK NAAR DE WERELD VAN MORGEN; DE VERSTEDELIJING VAN DE AARDE*, 1975-06-02). It deals with large scale urbanisation. Issues like criminality, pollution, conflicts, poverty and bad housing conditions are opposed to economic wealth and progress, and the human concern to direct the developments, to establish prosperous communities and unique cultures. The examples shown in the film, including Bombay, Tokyo, New York, Arcosanti, Brasilia, Reston, and Curitiba, serve as warnings, models, directions and opportunities for the cities of the Randstad, which are briefly shown at the end of the film.

¹⁴⁴⁰ e.g. Carillon productions such as *HOLLAND TODAY* (1962, Gerard Raucamp), *D’HORIZON À HORIZON* (1963, Gerard Raucamp), *...AND THEY CALLED IT HOLLAND* (1967), *MAN, SHIPS AND OIL* (1960s, Gerard Raucamp); other examples: *EFG-DOCUMENTAIRE* (1964, Harry Hagedoren); *BESTAANSBRONNEN VAN HET NEDERLANDSE VOLK* (1967, Max de Haas).

¹⁴⁴¹ Besides promotional films, this also included documentaries, educational and fiction films (e.g. the feature *GOING DUTCH*, 1973, Harry Booth).

¹⁴⁴² For this film, see also: Hogenkamp: 2003, 2009-211. Other examples are: *THE NETHERLANDS PAST AND PRESENT* (1960, anon.), in which the country’s architecture is highlighted (a.o. Groothandelsgebouw, Lijnbaan), while water is called the ‘key of life’, and: *WATER* (Fred Oster / AVRO, 1961-07-14).

¹⁴⁴³ The narrator (Simon Carmiggelt) comments e.g. that ‘the water is great, humans just small’ and thus, ‘in order to survive in this low country, we have to think big’. Original quote: ‘het water is groot, de mens is maar klein’, en dus ‘om in dit lage land te blijven bestaan moeten we in het groot denken’.

As Mumford wrote, the city's functions are not the four listed by Le Corbusier; the city is above all a meeting place¹⁴⁴⁴. Its social fabric and civic character define all other functions, which can be read from the list of media reports¹⁴⁴⁵. The world of television, in which Rotterdam stands next to other places, reflects also a polycentric urban culture. Moreover, television people themselves ran from one node to another. As such they also contributed to an emerging urban culture, but to frame it remained still something to be explored.

§ 6. moving on

Regarding audiovisual media and mobility in Rotterdam, various kinds of media productions have come to the fore: educational films for children, cinema and television newsreels and documentaries for a general audience, television programmes that enabled public discussion, informative films for residents of particular neighbourhoods, films that have served engineers and policy-makers, or investors and clients, archival recordings for future generations, and amateur films for private use, among others. Although their common denominator is the issue of mobility, they are different in terms of target groups and numbers of spectators, budgets, forms of presentation, possible effects, and also in their cinematic approaches, convictions and styles.

Some of the productions are characterised by mobile framing, from a camera mounted on the doorstep of a tram, tracking shots through tunnels, to aerial recordings; some films have shown fast movements, of vehicles that pass by from different directions; expressive forms of montage have combined different places into a new urban space, or contrasted movements of different modes of transport. Many other films, however, have had little dynamics within them.

Motion exists when there is also standstill, and it makes only sense when there are destinations. Similarly there are 'directions' when there are also 'junctions' with particular coordinates. Following the same logic, films may contain mobile frames of static objects, or static frames of mobile objects. Or the camera may stand still in a moving environment (e.g. an interview in a tram). Motion can, alternatively, be present in the processes shown, and movement may be only noticeable through gradual development. This applies to construction films, but also to 'developing compositions' of (television) reports.

The structure of motion is a matter of cinematic engineering, in order to show directions to move to, and to support particular urban models. It has involved filmmakers, constructors, commissioners, and various groups of citizens, for whom different values were at stake. Exchanges between them did not result in one set of cinematic conventions. Returning to Bordwell, there seems to be no direct relationship between mobility, as a modern phenomenon, and cinematic perception, but instead there has been a web of interconnections. Together they have generated the motion that is characteristic for the modern city.

Television, as a public realm (albeit through private viewing), served public interests, while cinema was used for corporate interests. Film and television, in dialogue with one another, have been 'markers' regarding the urban environment, by showing perspectives and articulating prospects. Here one may finally recognise the issue of stigmergy. Agents follow signs in the environment, which are related to previously established paths. Media reporting on the creation of infrastructural projects can literally be seen as, respectively, signs and paths, which have informed the public and mapped possible directions for development. It has initially been a matter of positive feedback, which reinforced the development, but eventually it triggered negative feedback, which required other paths to be explored. This is a matter of collective learning through feedback that is fundamental to the way human society appropriates the environment, as a matter of systemic self-organisation¹⁴⁴⁶. There is a parallel with other stigmergic systems to be found in nature. 'Negative feedback counterbalances positive feedback and helps to stabilize the

¹⁴⁴⁴ In 'Yesterday's City of Tomorrow', first published in *Architectural Record*, Nov. 1962, reprint: Mumford, 1968.

¹⁴⁴⁵ Like AVRO's TELEVIZIER, as well as NCRV's HIER EN NU, VARA's ACHTER HET NIEUWS, KRO's BRANDPUNT a.o.

¹⁴⁴⁶ cf. Salinger, 2005: 233.

collective pattern: it may take the form of saturation, exhaustion, or competition' (Bonabeau, Dorigo, Theraulaz, 1999: 10). Instances of saturation include traffic jams and overcrowded parts of the city (to which traffic safety films are informative too), exhaustion has been illustrated by problems related to energy and natural resources, and competition is exemplified by different views of (urban) development, while next to that we have seen the competition between different media, particularly film and television. Such dynamics will be further elaborated in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 13. ANCHORING FILM AND TELEVISION

§ 1. city and port, film and television

After 1956, the port became the direct concern of the Mayor himself, and it kept its priority position within the city's policy, irrespective of the political orientation of the mayor. The president of the Port Authorities (*Gemeentelijk Havenbedrijf*) was also influential, which was, from 1959, the charismatic Frans Posthuma. Most council members were not able to follow him critically, due to his elaborate arguments and arrogance¹⁴⁴⁷.

The port continued to be the subject of an ongoing flow of media productions, from the Netherlands and abroad¹⁴⁴⁸. Among these film one may also count, for example, the navy propaganda film *HET KORPS MARINIERS* (1965). It was made on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the corps that was spectacularly celebrated in the city¹⁴⁴⁹. Through its expressive cinematography, which was the work of Peter Alsemgeest, the film showed the challenges of the navy as a great adventure, which was directed as such by second Lieutenant Paul Verhoeven. It would be the beginning of his prosperous career as a film director. Since the anniversary received much media attention, various newsreels might eventually be considered as 'companions' to Verhoeven's film, which draws the larger media landscape in which his film appeared¹⁴⁵⁰.

Further, the municipality sponsored a range of port films. Rotterdam's city branding, according to Paul van de Laar (2000: 492), was a continuation of earlier strategies of the *transitopolis*: 'Image and message were part of a contention of Rotterdam's elite to actualise industrial ambitions and to transform the Rijnmond area into a work and traffic island for the oil and petrochemical industry'¹⁴⁵¹. This was accompanied by social-cultural and political motivations, while the industrial rhetorics also generated their own aesthetics. As a result, news reports and other informational films that monitored the developments were often not so different from promotional films. It hints at cultural ecological interdependencies and common 'attractors'.

A film that was explicitly political was *ROTTERDAM AND ITS HINTERLAND* (1974, Joep Könings¹⁴⁵²). The production of this film, of only half an hour, took four years, and was carried out by the educational media institute NIAM and the *Stichting Film & Wetenschap* ('Foundation

¹⁴⁴⁷ According to Van de Laar, 2000: 488/492.

¹⁴⁴⁸ Many references to visits by foreign producers and directors have been made in the official magazine of the city (i.e. *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*). The titles and credits of most of the productions are unknown, and therefore not included in the filmography. Here I give just a representative indication of some of the productions at stake (with references to the magazine). Productions by: Green Park Productions Ltd, London (vol. 4/3, 1966, p21); Ilya Kopalin, USSR (vol. 4/3, 1966 p21); Akira Mihara, Japan (vol. 4/2, 1966 p21); Maurice de Wilde / BRT, Belgium (5/2, 1967p21); Arne Rasmussen, Denmark – on the River Rhine (5/3, 1967); Walter Schmitt / WDR, Germany (6/2, 1968 p22); Prof. dr. Malassis, France on transshipment of grain and meat (6/2, 1968 p22); André Libik / Freies Berlin (6/2, 1968 p22); Gerhardt Quack & Kurt Walter Krebs / NDR, Germany (6/3, 1968 p26); Piet van de Sijpe / BRT, Belgium (6/3, 1968 p26); Pelican Films, UK (6/3, 1968 p26); Bob Guenette / CBS, USA (6/3, 1968 p26); Hans May, Switzerland > film on the river Rhine (6/3, 1968 p26); Herman Larcher / BRT, Belgium > on the Netherlands and the Northsea (6/4, 1968 p22); RAI, Italy > on the river Rhine (6/3, 1968 p26); Ms. Pfeiffer, Germany > on grain transshipment (6/4, 1968 p22); John F. Mackay / CBC, Canada > on containerisation (6/4, 1968 p22); Lilian Jordan (UK) > on tourism (7/1, 1969; p21); Leif Wagel, Denmark > on containerisation (7/1, 1969 p21) – and many more in the next decade, e.g. *GEHAVENDE STEDEN* (1971, Peter Robinson / BBC, NCRV); *NARANJAS DE ESPAÑA* (1974, José Lopez Clemente, Spain) > on the distribution of Spanish oranges; *DE RIJN ZOEKT ZIJN WEG NAAR DE ZEE; DE RIJNDELTA* (1977, Ion Bostan; Rumenia). The latter was the result of an exchange project, see: 'Uitwisseling', p28 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 13/4, 1975.

¹⁴⁴⁹ See the book: *1665-1965, 10 December, Driehonderd jaar Korps Mariniers. Een verslag in woord en beeld van de viering van het driehonderdjarig bestaan*, introduction by J.G.M. Nass (Commandant Korps Mariniers), Rotterdam: Korps Mariniers, 1966, GAR coll. Bibliotheek, aanvraagnr. IX E 119. The film is mentioned on pages 4, 11, 34.

¹⁴⁵⁰ Reports by Polygoon (1965-12-10) and a.o. ATTENTIE (NCRV, 1965-11-17), *JOURNAAL* (NTS, 1965-11-17).

¹⁴⁵¹ Van de Laar, 2000: 492. Original quote: 'Beeld en boodschap maakten deel uit van het vertoog van de Rotterdamse elite om industriële ambities te verwezenlijken en het Rijnmondgebied te transformeren in een werk- en verkeerseiland voor de olie- en petrochemische industrie.'

¹⁴⁵² Könings had previously assisted on the American educational film *ROTTERDAM – EUROPOORT, GATEWAY TO EUROPE* (1971, Irv Rusinov).

for Film and Science”), under the auspices of the Council of Europe of the European Economic Community (EEC), and with the support of the Dutch government. The film was released in four language versions, with 120 copies for foreign distribution. Artistic animations explain the port’s history in connection to its hinterland, from the emergence of Germany out of small kingdoms, to international collaboration at present. It argues that a united Europe brings peace and welfare through economic development, in which Rotterdam takes a lead. It is the main gate for navigation in Europe, which implies a network that ultimately connects West and East¹⁴⁵³. Moreover, Rotterdam is a hub in the global economy. It is illustrated by the transportation of paper rolls, for the production of newspapers. They are brought from the American inland, through the Mississippi, across the ocean to Rotterdam and over the Rhine to Germany and further. Something similar counts for oil, and Japanese cars, for which Rotterdam has become the main European distribution centre. The film thus combines political and economic motifs in a scientific-educational production. It is the best propaganda the port could wish for: its modernisation and enlargement go hand in hand with global development and peace. And indeed, one week after its premiere at the Hofpleintheater (1974-06-07), the port (*Havenbelangen*) had already used the film for propagandistic purposes during a meeting in Düsseldorf¹⁴⁵⁴.

Being part of a system of global economic exchange, the port became what would later be called a ‘space of flows’ (Castells, 1996). But global processes *take place* in real places, as Appadurai has argued¹⁴⁵⁵. Too often there seems to be an opposition between two spatial scales, with the ‘global’ determining the ‘local’, while they are actually interrelated (cf. Urry’s ‘relationality’, 2003: 121). One should consider how large scale developments were enabled through local acts of planning and engineering.

The growth of the port relied upon a range of facilities, such as docks, cranes and loading bridges; their design history has still to be written (cf. Kingma, 2005), and similarly upon buildings such as terminals, warehouses, silos and service complexes, of which a small section has actually become part of the canon of architecture history¹⁴⁵⁶. Exemplary is the office of the *Graan Elevator Maatschappij* (1963, Herman Haan), which was not ‘discovered’ before 2000, when it had got out of use. This fine piece of renewed modernism hangs over the water, with surprising views over the port from the inside. In terms of oblivion, there is an analogy with the film *PORT OF GRAIN* (1969-1972, Jan Schaper), which was made for workers and clients of the company. While architecture and film were means to particular ends, the means themselves were left unconsidered afterwards. This also applies to the building of the ‘Havenvakschool’ (1955-1960, arch. Piet Elling), a school for future dockworkers¹⁴⁵⁷. It was featured in several documentaries for NCRV television, including films by Jan Schaper¹⁴⁵⁸. They show the activities of the school, and the perspectives of its pupils. As such it presented not the formal but the programmatic side of the school building. Seven years after the death of its architect, architecture historian István Szénássy remarked (1969)¹⁴⁵⁹: ‘The place of Elling within modern architecture in

¹⁴⁵³ Another film that explicitly addressed the connections between western and eastern Europe was THOMSEN (1971, Dirk Jan Braggaar). Thomsen carried out the transportation of steel gas pipes for a pipeline that had to be constructed between the USSR and Germany (the film was released in various language versions, including Russian).

¹⁴⁵⁴ ‘Film over Rotterdam en zijn achterland’, NRC 1974-06-08.

¹⁴⁵⁵ In a lecture called ‘Cultural Globalization and the Public Sphere’, De Balie, Amsterdam, 2003-12-14.

¹⁴⁵⁶ E.g. *Poortgebouw Müller-Thomsen* (1958-1961, Hugh Maaskant); *Cementsilo NCHM* (1964, Alexander Bodon); ‘Magazijnpand H.H. de Klerk’ (1966-1969, Jan Hoogstad). See: Groenendijk & Vollaard, 2007: p111 + 224 + 143.

¹⁴⁵⁷ The school was an initiative of Jan Backx, president of *Thomsen’s Havenbedrijf* (cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 519). For its architecture: De Wagt, 2008: 440; cf. Bakkeren, 2002: wk 35.

¹⁴⁵⁸ See: HAVENARBEID: EEN VAK! (1960, Kees van Langeraad) – in which the later well-known tv-presenter Frits Bom, here still as a pupil, explains about sports lessons. It was followed by the NCRV productions *WEG NAAR DE WERELD* (1963, Van Hillo, Schaper, Kálman Gáll), which pays special attention to the way the architecture facilitates the school’s curriculum, and *WEG VAN DE HAVEN* (1969, Jan Schaper), a.o.

¹⁴⁵⁹ 1969: 25. Original quote: ‘De plaats van Elling in de moderne architectuur in Nederland komt tot nu toe niet overeen met de belangrijkheid van zijn oeuvre, ondanks de waardering ervoor van andere architecten. Hij heeft dan ook nooit de publiciteit gezocht.’

the Netherlands does, hitherto, not correspond to the importance of his oeuvre, in spite of its appreciation by other architects. He, for that matter, has never looked for publicity.' Publicity, however, as Schaper's films exemplify, is no guarantee to be remembered.

There are many remarkable buildings and films concerning the port that have 'dissolved' – including Elling's buildings for Backx *Thomsen's Havenbedrijf* (1954-1962)¹⁴⁶⁰. Certain buildings and media expressions have been of specific value within processes of transformation, which then rendered these forms obsolete, and with them the reasons of cultural emergence.

Profound transformations took place in the port in the 1960s and 1970s. Film was used to explain and promote plans and to articulate visions. Television, instead, offered space for criticism, since it was still controlled by public and non-profit organisations. Within this force-field, film and television became anchored in Rotterdam through the port, while the port strengthened its 'cognitive domain' to ensure further development.

A major node in this respect became the *Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij* of Joop Landré (1909-1997). In Part II, I already sketched the conditions that lead to its establishment, through a significant investment by shipping entrepreneur Anthony Veder. The link between port and cinema was strengthened when Veder was appointed 'honorary secretary' of the *Gemeentelijk Havenbedrijf* (Port Authorities) in 1964¹⁴⁶¹.

§ 2. Europoort

After WWII, ocean-going vessels became larger, which required larger harbours. The petrochemical industry, moreover, called for extensions, and new complexes were built, since oil started to be distributed through pipelines. In order to facilitate these developments, the *Gemeentelijk Havenbedrijf* proposed the 'Europoort', which was accepted by the city council and the Dutch government in 1956¹⁴⁶². Gemeentewerken started the development in 1958, and its photographic department recorded it on film for reasons of documentation (EUROPOORT, 1958). Next to that, attention was paid to promotion and 'imagineering' through the media¹⁴⁶³.

The Europoort was projected at, and around the island of Rozenburg. Besides agricultural grounds, it also encompassed *De Beer*, a nature reserve of 1300 hectares (ca. 3200 acres) that was characterised by tides, dunes and woods, with special species of flora and fauna, especially birds¹⁴⁶⁴. This had already been addressed by filmmaker Simon de Waard, through a documentary for *Natuurstichting De Beer*, but in vain¹⁴⁶⁵.

In 1961 Wim van der Velde made the documentary *POLDERS VOOR INDUSTRIE* (1961), for VPRO television¹⁴⁶⁶. It explains that historically the port relied upon transshipment, which suffered from the crisis of the 1930s. More industry was needed, and the Botlek was developed for the oil industry. Farmers living there could move to the new Noordoost-Polder in the North of the Netherlands¹⁴⁶⁷. Whereas international developments affected the port, this affected the country in its turn. The film shows that the village of Rozenburg would rapidly grow, illustrated

¹⁴⁶⁰ Elling is only recently brought to the fore again, by Wim de Wagt, 2008 (for the buildings mentioned, see: p444).

¹⁴⁶¹ Lichtenauer (2003). www.inghist.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/BWN/lemmata/Index/bwn2/vedera

¹⁴⁶² The name 'Europoort' had been coined by Rien Peeters through a film with that title (1951), which was made for the *Rotterdamse Waterklerken Vereniging*.

¹⁴⁶³ Some examples of television reports are: NTS JOURNAAL 1958-06-18; 1958-11-19; 1960-09-02; 1960-12-16. The port was also promoted through special events such as the *Havendag*, which attracted substantial (media) attention too (e.g. Polygoon, 1965-09-24), or something like the opening of the BP refinery by minister Luns (Polygoon and NTS JOURNAAL, 1967-07-24). See also the Visnews Background Feature on the port of Rotterdam (1967-11-01). In the case of Polygoon, e.g.: 1958-wk38, 1960-wk34; 1967-01; 1969-wk24; 1971-06-11 a.o.

¹⁴⁶⁴ VERGETEN VERHALEN: DE BEER (2005, Harm Korst)

www.rijnmond.nl/homepage/rtv/tv_rijnmond/programma_info/vergeten_verhalen

¹⁴⁶⁵ DE BEER, 1949, Van der Knoop & De Waard.

¹⁴⁶⁶ After its broadcasting (1961-11-08), the VPRO received many requests for (theatrical) screenings too. Letter (1963-11-01) by the VPRO to the GAR, Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, archive 'Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam' (archief van het archief), dossier 'correspondentie filmcollectie', toegangsnr. 297.01, inv. nr. 461 (1958-1962).

¹⁴⁶⁷ See the film *EEN NIEUW DORP OP NIEUW LAND*, 1960, Louis van Gasteren.

by a panorama shot that moves from old to new houses¹⁴⁶⁸. But the picturesque Blankenburg, ‘the oldest village of the island’, has to disappear. And next to these villagers, farmers across the area are uncertain about their future; they do not even know if they will harvest what they sowed that day. The next sequence, supported by rapid jazz music, applies classical Soviet montage: shots of sowing farmers that walk behind a plough are rapidly interchanged with shots of farmhouses that are demolished and machines that level the land. We finally hear the ironic remark that ‘the ruins of the farmhouses can always be used for campshedding the new harbours’¹⁴⁶⁹.

The film allows for another perspective to be drawn, as expressed by Dr. H.J. Lamberts, physician and city council member (for the PvdA)¹⁴⁷⁰. He criticises the way big economic projects were accepted by the city without any problem, while proposals for green belts, playgrounds or the university create too much struggle. He observes increasing psychological pressure, and points to the need for physical and spiritual harmony. One sees the quiet landscape of *De Beer*, and all of a sudden there is an explosion. Birds scream and try to escape. An old man appears who takes care of the area. While he is watching nature, draglines and bulldozers smash the vegetation in the next shot (i.e. an example of the Kuleshov-effect).

The destruction of nature is linked to the consumerism of the city, and exemplified by people shopping at ‘De Lijnbaan’. It is accompanied by joyful accordion music. The narrator says¹⁴⁷¹: ‘Industrialisation is necessary to keep up in this world, because it is the engine of our welfare and our progress. But do we dare to face the other side of progress openly and honestly?’ Next are shots of threatening chimneys, while a woman hangs laundry outside. It is argued that scientific data concerning water, soil and air should be used by planners to find a natural balance, and to avoid residents suffering from pollution.

The port director Posthuma replies that someone abroad would look with despair at the fast growth of Rotterdam’s port, but here people just agitate, saying that the west of Holland is full, that farmers are chased away and that the air gets polluted. Firstly, he says, the population density in the planning area is low, secondly, the farmers are well compensated, and thirdly, all kinds of measures are taken to control exhaustion. The film ends with a 360° panorama shot of a void: the new Maasvlakte, with oil refineries at the horizon. The narrator asks¹⁴⁷²: ‘Will there be a time in which we will also give our support to underdeveloped areas of our own human existence?’ Whatever the effects of the objections were, the port continued to grow, to such an extent that by 1962 it was the biggest of the world¹⁴⁷³. The VPRO remained critical, and more productions followed as such, also by other television stations¹⁴⁷⁴.

While television monitored the development of the port, the municipality and the *Gemeentelijk Havenbedrijf* became increasingly aware of the power of media. In 1961, the new head of the municipal Office for Information and Publicity, Koos Bax, commissioned the *Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij* (NFM) to make two films. One had to promote the port, which became POORT VAN EUROPA (“Gateway to Europe”, 1962, Ytzen Brusse), and the other to promote the city in general, which became ROTTERDAM (1962, Eimert Kruidhof).

¹⁴⁶⁸ Rozenburg, with 2000 inhabitants, had to develop into a suburb of 18,000 people working in the Europoort.

¹⁴⁶⁹ Orig. quote: ‘Het puin van de boerderijen kan altijd worden gebruikt voor de beschoeiing van de nieuwe havens.’

¹⁴⁷⁰ For more information on Lamberts and other critical council members, see: Van de Laar, 2000: 488-489, 582.

¹⁴⁷¹ Original quote: ‘Industrialisatie is nodig om mee te kunnen in deze wereld, doordat ze de motor is voor onze welvaart en onze vooruitgang. Maar durven we de keerzijde van de vooruitgang open en eerlijk onder ogen te zien?’

¹⁴⁷² Original quote: ‘Zal er een tijd komen waarin we ook steun gaan verlenen aan de achtergebleven gebieden van ons eigen menselijke bestaan?’

¹⁴⁷³ See: Van de Laar, 2000: 512.

¹⁴⁷⁴ e.g. RUIMTE VOOR MILJOENEN (‘Space for Millions’, Wim van der Velde, VPRO 1965-10-27). It dealt with population growth and the economy to sustain it, which had consequences for land use and spatial planning, for the building of oil refineries. NCRV followed with a film on the demolition of the village Nieuwesluis (NIEUWESLUIS VAN DE KAART, Leo Moen: NCRV, 1968-09-30). The AVRO also paid attention to air pollution in the port: TELEVIZIER (1968-09-24), which had touched upon this topic already earlier (1964-04-17).

In 1965, Mayor van Walsum retired. On that occasion, Polygoon (1965-02) recorded him and his wife in a round-trip boat in the port, and emphasised his achievements concerning the Botlek and Europoort developments. He was succeeded by the social-democrat Wim Thomassen (PvdA), who supported the activities of Bax and NFM shareholder Veder even stronger. The year before, the two of them had already decided to have a film made by Joris Ivens. It was an exceptional choice since Ivens was disputed in the Netherlands for his political viewpoints. They were nevertheless convinced, for the impact that had been exercised by Ivens's *THE BRIDGE* (1928)¹⁴⁷⁵. By inviting a critical personality such as Ivens, they ran ahead of the critics.

While preparations were already happening for this film, the city council officially approved the budget of 121,600 guilders¹⁴⁷⁶. Next to it, the 'Office for Information and Publicity' stationed its employee Ivo Blom for a full year at the *Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij*, which produced the film together with Ivens's French agent *Argos Films*. Blom provided the information Ivens needed, organised meetings, arrangements, and suggested locations for shooting¹⁴⁷⁷. Most of the shooting and the actual production took place in 1965, for which Ivens closely collaborated with his wife Marceline Loridan. The premiere of *ROTTERDAM – EUROPOORT*, as the film was called, took place on the 29th of April 1966, at Lumière, where the invited guests saw first *THE BRIDGE*¹⁴⁷⁸.

The film became a modern (and autobiographical) interpretation of the legend of the Flying Dutchman¹⁴⁷⁹. This cine-poème of eighteen minutes, with poetry-commentary by Gerrit Kouwenaar, starts with the words: 'City at the river Maas, at the edge of Europe – where Europe ends, where Europe begins.'¹⁴⁸⁰ The film reflects upon the interconnection between port and city. It results in an alienating interchange between images of pilot boats and youths riding mopeds, people coming out of a cinema and warehouses, movements of ships and people at the railway station. This alienation is reinforced by a collection of futuristic images throughout the film, which is further reinforced by Tom Tholen's sometimes abstract sound score that turns this film into 'reality science-fiction'. This applies particularly to aerial shots of the petrochemical industry. It was recorded by cameraman Eduard van der Enden, actually for a Shell film¹⁴⁸¹. Before the production of *ROTTERDAM – EUROPOORT*, Van der Enden showed Ivens some of his work, and Ivens wanted to include this scene in his film. It exemplifies cross-connections between different films and their institutional settings.

Besides Van der Enden, Ivens asked the French cameraman Etienne Becker, who had an *Éclair* 16mm camera, which was especially suitable for synchronous sound recordings, for street interviews and hand-held recordings. Although little direct sound was eventually used, it gave the recordings a special dynamic. People are shown in a casual way – whether it concerns a wedding, a funeral or a traditional *Sinterklaas* procession. Yet, these events, interchanged with the images of the port and the industry, come to the fore as instances of a social-cultural system, almost a collective organism. This is also reflected by the city's architecture, for example in a shot of a man running up the illuminated staircase of a housing block at night. Through the glass façade we follow him by a tilting camera. The camera subsequently moves towards individual apartments

¹⁴⁷⁵ See the folder *ROTTERDAM – EUROPOORT* [GAR: coll. Bibliotheek XVIII E246]. The text refers to *THE BRIDGE* (1928) and also to *NEW EARTH* (1934). 'It was the last Dutch subject on which he focused his fierce but humanly registering camera, until he went to work in Rotterdam last autumn.' Original quote: 'Het was het laatste Nederlandse onderwerp waarop hij zijn fel maar menselijk registrerende camera richtte, totdat hij vorig najaar in Rotterdam aan het werk ging.'

¹⁴⁷⁶ 'Film over Rotterdam van Ivens', p23 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 3/4, 1965.

¹⁴⁷⁷ Ivo Blom in: Hazewinkel & Van der Schaaf, 1996: 74.

¹⁴⁷⁸ GAR: Geluidsregistratie première Rotterdam-Europoort, Ivens, GV-III-2 (Luisterkopie CD878).

¹⁴⁷⁹ Cf. *JORIS IVENS OVER ROTTERDAM EUROPOORT* (1967, Jan Blokker/VPRO).

¹⁴⁸⁰ Original quote: 'Stad aan de Maas, aan de rand van Europa – waar Europa eindigt, waar Europa begint'

¹⁴⁸¹ Information by Van der Enden, in an interview by FP (2008-12-19). It was part of the film *SONG OF THE CLOUDS* (1957, John Armstrong).

where people watch television. The voice-over says: 'My floor is your roof. At nine fifteen all rooms burst in the same laughter. Your floor is my sky. Every man lives in his own skin. And a kiss replaces words, and love exists'¹⁴⁸². There is the wedding again, and once more the apartments. The film touches upon Corbusier's conception of the house as a 'machine for living'. It is combined with systematic processes in the port, like the transportation of wood and bananas.

The structural approach becomes personal when a captain appears, who is the Flying Dutchman – a role played by the artist Carel Kneulman¹⁴⁸³. He experiences the city as a theatre (or opera), in which he plays a role himself. The captain is an ambiguous figure, both observer and participant, outsider and insider. He moves through a desolate environment, with an old ship left to rust. While he stands on the ship, which is interchanged by shots from the opera, the voice-over says: 'Realities jostle each other, watch each other, beat and discover each other'¹⁴⁸⁴. The captain searches his way, and meets Senta, a girl from the opera, in front of a shop window. At central station, during rush hour, he approaches strangers, while we hear: 'It is today. I am tired. The city flows straight through me'¹⁴⁸⁵.

The acted scenes contrast with the documentary parts, but they tell the same thing: the discovery of a city is also its construction. This is not just a matter of systems opposed to a liminal individual; it is also the industrial city becoming a stage for play. The film ends with a paraglider flying through the port and under 'De Hef', which is the bridge from Ivens's film from 1928. Not only the city moves from industry to play, but also the cinema that reflects upon it. In this way, ROTTERDAM – EUROPOORT shows an oscillation between political divides, city and port, art and industry, reality and fiction. In terms of Nowotny (2005), it gave shape to 'emergent interfaces' between these different realms.

With the release of the film a folder was issued to advertise it, which included a letter that Ivens had written hastily after finishing the film, and which I quote here.

I believe that it is my best film, I'm very happy with it. It is good, strong, has a vigorous style and is new in its form of expression. It has become much more concise than I expected, giving the city and the harbour relief that is necessary in a film of these days. // One could say that it is a tribute to Rotterdam, the power of its harbour and the city are in it – of course also things like depersonalization and uniformity (...), which Rotterdam has in common with every modern city.¹⁴⁸⁶

Landré, Bax and Veder had been well aware of the reputation and ideas of Ivens, which was the very reason to invite him. They understood the developing public sensitivity for propaganda and promotional messages and chose a less singular, even paradoxical approach. This caused excellent publicity, according to information officer Koos Bax, although not everybody understood that immediately.

When Mayor Thomassen wanted to show the film 'Rotterdam Europoort' during a visit of a delegation of the Port of Rotterdam to the United States, in 1967, a revolt was about to happen. The port people grumbled, as such an artistic film did not give an appropriate image of reality. Thomassen persevered and a day later he had no longer any trouble or objections of any harbour

¹⁴⁸² Original quote: 'Mijn vloer is jouw dak. Alle kamers barsten om negen uur vijftien uit in dezelfde lach. Jouw vloer is mijn hemel. Ieder mens leeft in zijn eigen huid. En een kus vervangt woorden, en de liefde bestaat.'

¹⁴⁸³ Kneulman (1915-2008) was a sculptor based in Amsterdam; in Rotterdam he made (a.o.) a work for the façade of Cinema Thalia (1955).

¹⁴⁸⁴ Original quote: 'Werkelijkheden die elkander verdringen, elkander bekijken, slaan en onthullen.'

¹⁴⁸⁵ Original quote: 'Het is vandaag. Ik ben moe. De stad stroomt dwars door mij heen.'

¹⁴⁸⁶ Original quote: 'Ik geloof dat het m'n beste film is, ik ben er erg blij mee. Hij is goed, sterk, heeft een forse stijl en is nieuw in z'n uitdrukkingvorm. Hij is veel strakker geworden dan ik gedacht had, geeft de stad en de haven het relief dat nodig [sic] [is] in 'n film van deze tijden. // Je zou kunnen zeggen het is een ode aan Rotterdam, de kracht van de haven en de stad zit erin – natuurlijk ook dingen als depersonalisatie, eenvormigheid (m'n Nederlands!), die Rotterdam met elke moderne stad gemeen heeft.'

baron. The Journal of Commerce put an appreciating, extensive review of the film on its front page. The paper called it a relief that not every harbour promotion film consisted of just images of embankments, ships and containers. Joris Ivens had also signalled people. The city of Rotterdam – the paper concluded – had apparently done so too.¹⁴⁸⁷

A lot of footage had been shot, which became the basis for another film, called TOUCH (1967). Information officer Ivo Blom has recalled its production history.

Tom Tholen, who collaborated with Ivens, knew that there were many left-overs of Rotterdam Europoort. He asked me: ‘Shall we make a film of that material ourselves?’ ‘Alright’, I said. We actually stole that material. It was owned by a French film producer, Dauman, who did not want to release it. We went to the studio in Paris and we took the reels. When we started to make a film out of it, the material that was suitable for a new production turned out to be disappointing. But we had already embraced the idea to make a new film.¹⁴⁸⁸

The story of the stolen material started to lead a life of its own¹⁴⁸⁹. The facts, however, were slightly different. Impressed by the skills of sound designer Tholen, Ivens himself had encouraged him to create a film from the left-overs¹⁴⁹⁰. Ivens mediated its production, and acted as an adviser to Tholen. After the left-overs turned out to be not sufficient, new recordings were made, by the highly talented cameramen Robby Müller and Anton van Munster. The film would be sponsored by the public-private port promotion council (*Havenbelangen*), which signed a contract with the *Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij*.¹⁴⁹¹

Whereas Ivens’s film concerned the city and the port, TOUCH was exclusively focused on the port, but it was not less ‘artistic’. Exemplary are the shots of ‘Water Purification Plant Berenplaat’ (1959-1965, arch. Wim Quist). The ‘plant’ appears like a large hydrological body. The moving camera follows the steel-and-glass façade, along the basins, while bubble sounds are to be heard, and turns smoothly when moving over winding stairs. The camera and the sound transform the highly artificial environment into a fluid organic structure; the building becomes part of the flows and cyclic courses of nature. As such the aesthetics direct the attention to the logic of the complex. Also important is the editing by Hetty Konink. Atmospheric images are contrasted to shots with strong movements and opposite screen direction. The film can be considered as a study of rhythm, to which the sound is crucial, which is not surprising, for the fact that Tholen was first of all a sound designer. The sound track is characterised by interchanging abstract and minimal music, dramatic music, ambient acoustic textures, songs, and sounds of seagulls and other diegetic and associational elements. Next to that, Tholen plays with the diegesis: we see the cameramen of the film and also the American singer Dorris Henderson, who did the title song. We are aware of the production of the film, which creates its own realism.

¹⁴⁸⁷ Koos Bax in: Hazewinkel & Van der Schaaf, 1996: 74. Original quote: ‘Toen Thomassen de film Rotterdam Europoort in 1977 [should be 1967] wilde vertonen tijdens een bezoek van een Rotterdamse havendelegatie aan de Verenigde Staten, dreigde er opstand uit te breken. De havenmensen liepen flink te morren, want zo’n artistieke film gaf toch helemaal geen reëel beeld van de werkelijkheid. Thomassen heeft doorgezet en had een dag later geen enkele last meer van welke havenbaron dan ook. De Journal of Commerce had op de voorpagina een lovende, vrij forse recensie van de film gepubliceerd. De krant noemde het een verademing dat niet elke havenpromotiefilm alleen maar uit beelden van kades, schepen en containers bestaat. Joris Ivens had ook mensen in de haven gesignaleerd. De gemeente Rotterdam – zo concludeerde de krant – blijktbaar ook.’

¹⁴⁸⁸ Blom in: Hazewinkel & Van der Schaaf, 1996: 74. Original quote: ‘Tom Tholen, die met Ivens werkte, wist dat er heel veel restmateriaal was van Rotterdam Europoort. Hij vroeg me: ‘Zullen we van dat materiaal zelf een film maken?’ ‘Akkoord,’ zei ik. We hebben dat materiaal eigenlijk gestolen. Het zat bij een Franse filmproducent, Dauman, en die wilde het niet vrijgeven. We zijn naar de studio in Parijs gegaan en hebben de rollen meegenomen. Toen we er een film van wilden gaan maken, bleek het materiaal dat bruikbaar was voor een nieuwe productie, tegen te vallen. Maar het idee van een nieuwe film hadden we al omarmd.’

¹⁴⁸⁹ Stufkens, 2004.

¹⁴⁹⁰ Boost, 1969, biographical section: Tom Tholen.

¹⁴⁹¹ Signed 1967-02-17. GAR: archief ‘Stichting Havenbelangen’, nr. 317, bestanddeel: 274 – contract.

While Tholen made TOUCH he was also asked to direct BACHER (1967), about dredging. Ivens had been a mediator again, and he advised Tholen. The film, produced again by the NFM, was made for the 'Royal Adriaan Volker Group'. Dredging and hydraulic engineering – the business of Volker – was crucial to the construction of the Europoort. The film framed contemporary dredging practices into a historical perspective, for which it animated old prints¹⁴⁹². The imagery was again the work of Robby Müller and Anton van Munster, together with Jan de Bont and Jan Oonk (which makes it a monument of Dutch cinematography). The visual quality goes well together with Tholen's conception of the music by Johann Sebastian Bach. The title is a play of words, since *Bagger*, which is pronounced similarly, means 'dredge' in Dutch.

Tholen's films were successful as promotional films and as works of art. TOUCH even won the Silver Bear for the best short at the Berlinale (1968), and also prizes in France and Italy¹⁴⁹³. However, this success caused a conflict. In the meantime the NFM had been dissolved and the rights were passed, *together* with those of ROTTERDAM – EUROPOORT, to Argos Films in Paris. Argos claimed the prizes (about 15,000 guilders). However, according to the chairman of *Havenbelangen*, Mr. A. Blussé van Oud Alblas, the prizes were not acquired by way of 'commercial exploitation', and according to the agreement *Havenbelangen* still had the 'non-commercial' rights – which was something rather vague¹⁴⁹⁴. In the end the deal was made that *Havenbelangen* got 75% and Argos the rest. Blussé wrote Tholen three letters to sign the contract in order to receive his remuneration, but Tholen did not understand what was going on and kept away from the affair¹⁴⁹⁵. The initial conflict between *Havenbelangen* and Argos, in combination with the story of the stolen images, was the basis for a self-reproducing myth. Eventually, this might also have been fed by the fact that Ivens's film did not win any award – on the other hand, the Rotterdams Arts Council (RKS) gave Ivens an honorary distinction, the *Penning van de Leuwe*¹⁴⁹⁶. This, of course, had a direct connection with his film for Rotterdam, and marked the beginning of his rehabilitation in his home country.

Taking ROTTERDAM – EUROPOORT, TOUCH and BACHER together, there is a direct relationship in terms of content, conditions and connections, but this has not been framed as such before. The three films are all mentioned in the book *Dutch Film, '66-'68*, edited by Charles Boost¹⁴⁹⁷ (1969), which was published by the Government Publishing Office to promote Dutch cinema abroad. The book addresses the policy to sustain attempts that 'use film as a means of self-expression'. Besides fiction films, documentaries and experimental shorts, there is only a very brief paragraph on 'industrial and other commissioned films', although they made up the majority of Dutch films at that time, and in spite of the fact that Boost had previously made an argument in favour of industrial filmmaking¹⁴⁹⁸. In the fact sheets Ivens's film is said to be made for the Rotterdam Municipal Council, but in the case of Tholen there are no commissioners or reasons mentioned. The artistic value is credited, but not the economic role of cinema.

¹⁴⁹² According to the technique of the Czech Karel Zeman.

¹⁴⁹³ The status of these prizes is unclear. In the documentation the French prize is called 'Prime à la Qualité' and the Italian is called 'Premio di Qualità' (apparently for the film's use of colour).

¹⁴⁹⁴ GAR: archief 'Stichting Havenbelangen', nr. 317, bestanddeel: 274 – letter of 1970-11-04 by Blussé to Mr. H.M. Alvarez Correa. A delegated commissioner of the NFM, P.H. du Boisson, wrote Blussé a letter (1970-11-05). He mentioned that he had discussed the case with Argos by phone, and that they proposed a division of the French prize by the rate 25% for NFM/Argos and 75% for *Stichting Havenbelangen*. About the Italian prize they would talk later.

¹⁴⁹⁵ Letters dated: 1970-11-25; 1971-01-07 and 1971-01-21, *ibid*.

¹⁴⁹⁶ I.e. 1969-02-19. *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, Rotterdam: GAR, 1970 – p14. In 1978, moreover, Museum Boijmans-Van Beuningen presented an exhibition and a film programme dedicated to the work of Ivens (1978-12-09 – 1979-01-14), 'Films en Tentoonstelling Joris Ivens, 50 jaar wereldcineast'.

¹⁴⁹⁷ Charles Boost was one of the most important Dutch film critics after WWII. In 1964 he received the *Pierre Bayleprijs* in Rotterdam (*Kriterion*, 1964-12-19).

¹⁴⁹⁸ For the concerning paragraph: Boost, 1969: 9; for the role of commissioned film in Dutch cinema: Hogenkamp, 2003: 179/282; for the earlier argument: Boost, 1960.

A similar argument can be made for a film like ROTTERDAM – EUROPOORT, GATEWAY TO EUROPE (1971, Irv Rusinov). It was produced by Milan Herzog for the film department of the Chicago based 'Encyclopaedia Britannica'¹⁴⁹⁹. It was also supported by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, while the Dutch director Joep Könings assisted on the production and created several additional recordings¹⁵⁰⁰. This film was used at educational institutes, and it informed shipping professionals about the world's largest port, which is presented, along with images of the petrochemical industry, as a 'well-oiled machine'. The film tells the stories of a Dutch bargeman on his way to the German Ruhrgebiet and of the captain of the American vessel 'Atlantic Champion'. During a spare moment the latter tours through Rotterdam and visits the Euromast. Watching the city he understands that it is tied to its port and industry. Slightly critically, the narrator says that some Dutch wonder if the city has not become a machine itself, but this remark promoted Rotterdam's efficiency all the more.

The port, the industry, the city and the infrastructure that connected them, was a smoothly operating system that provided a common attractor. This is also clear in cases such as the launching of the world's largest tanker, the 'Esso Europoort', from the yard of Verolme Rozenburg (NOS JOURNAAL, 1970-07-11). The port, the shipbuilders and the oil industry, among others, supported one another to enlarge facilities and to strive for further growth, which had become a development that supported itself. But criticism became stronger, which was fuelled by the presentation of the too ambitious municipal *Plan 2000* (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1969-02-20). It foresaw further growth of the port and the industry south of Rotterdam, in and around the rural area of the Hoeksche Waard¹⁵⁰¹. What used to be positive feedback turned into negative feedback.

The NCRV, for example, showed the documentary WIJ STINKEN ERIN...! (1970, Jan van Hillo). It addressed environmental pollution and the danger of explosion and intoxication: 'we live on top of a volcano', which is illustrated by Jan Schaper's spectacular recordings of fire at an oil refinery. Although the port authorities took measures against pollution, and to guarantee safety, such voices became ever louder¹⁵⁰². In 1972, the Club of Rome organised an exhibition in Rotterdam, which accompanied its report *The Limits to Growth* (1972)¹⁵⁰³. The oil crisis of 1973 made it rather concrete, at least in the perception of the public. In that year too, the Japanese director Tatsuo Sunagawa visited the Europoort for a documentary on the world's energy supply¹⁵⁰⁴. He was not the only one. Since Rotterdam had become Europe's main energy supply centre, the oil crisis was directly felt in Rotterdam, which attracted substantial attention from abroad¹⁵⁰⁵.

¹⁴⁹⁹ By then the Yugoslavian-American Herzog had already produced 400 educational films. With degrees in journalism and law, he worked for the US Office of War Information during WWII, before joining the film department of Encyclopaedia Britannica. In 1973 he began Herzog Associates; www.herzogmedia.com (2005-12-16).

¹⁵⁰⁰ 'Bezoekers', p21 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 8/3 1970; *ibid* p23 vol. 8/4.

¹⁵⁰¹ Before the plan was officially presented it was already rejected: HIER EN NU (NCRV, 1969-02-17).

¹⁵⁰² Various measures were taken concerning pollution and safety, e.g. JOURNAAL, NOS, 1970-04-08; WAARSCHUWINGSNET RIJMOND, Polygoon, 1969; cf. Polygoon, 1972-18 and NOS JOURNAAL, 1972-04-16. Reports on environmental issues e.g., a protest against the establishment of Hoogovens (DEMONSTRATIE TEGEN VESTIGING HOOGOVENBEDRIJF, 1970, J. van Rhijn); a dispute between city council and college about environmental measures (JOURNAAL, 1971-09-02; cf. 1971-09-20 and 1971-09-24); oil pollution (e.g. JOURNAAL, 1971-10-01 and 1974-08-16), transportation of chemicals (TELEVIZIER, AVRO, 1972-03-20), the dependency on oil (LEVEN MET OLIE, 1973, Albert Gols / KRO) etcetera, including foreign reports, e.g. by Japanese television on preventing water pollution (by Makato Murai): *Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1, 1973 – pp26-27.

¹⁵⁰³ *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 10/2, 1972 – p24.

¹⁵⁰⁴ *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1, 1973 – pp26-27.

¹⁵⁰⁵ On the oil crisis and Rotterdam a large number of reports were made by a.o.: Bob Holst, Yorkshire Television (UK); David Harrison, BBC (UK); Claude Gagnière, ORTF (F); Jeffrey Archer, ITN (UK); Denis Poncet, ORTF 2 (F); Kärner, WDR (D); next to them a large number of radio and press reports were made, see: 'Bezoekers', p26 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 12/1, 1973. For more references to television (and radio) programmes related to the oil crisis and Rotterdam, see the next issue of *Rotterdam* (vol. 12/2, 1974 p25).

a tale of giants

Those responsible for the Europoort development, particularly the city of Rotterdam, the Ministry of Traffic and Waterworks, and a joint-venture of contractors (CH3), drew their own image to guarantee support. Following the example of the Delta works in the province of Zeeland, they established, near Rozenburg, a permanent exhibition centre, called 'Eurorama' (since 1969-03-26). According to Minister Bakker, the reason for this centre was to show the Dutch tax payers what is done with their money, and to show foreigners how a small country grows day by day¹⁵⁰⁶. The centre was included in various tourist excursions (e.g. by Spido). Within the exhibition, films were shown too, next to models, maps, drawing, photographs and so on. Mundofilm was asked to make the film GATEWAY FOR GIANTS (MOND VOOR MAMMOETS, 1970, Burcksen & Herblot)¹⁵⁰⁷.

The film, of half an hour, with a production time of three-and-a-half years, was commissioned by the Ministry, the Dutch cement industry (ENCI) and CH3¹⁵⁰⁸. According to Mundofilm-director Joop Burcksen¹⁵⁰⁹, they got this commission because of their film ELEMENTS FACING ELEMENTS (1966). It deals with the construction of the Zeelandbrug, a bridge of five kilometres that is part of the Delta Works, and the contractor Van Hattum en Blankevoort had also been part of the consortium at that time. However, the cement industry, which provided its products to all companies, took a leading role in coordinating the film production this time.

The commissioners and the filmmakers thoroughly discussed the construction plans and the requirements for the film. Burcksen and Herblot wrote a draft of the script and started. Rather than showing the construction works, they paid attention to the research that preceded it¹⁵¹⁰. Because of their previous work the commissioners had confidence and did not interfere. Instead, the filmmakers themselves regularly inquired what was going on, and once they were into the subject they knew what would happen next.

The film starts with an oil tanker at sea. A man rides a bicycle over its deck, which emphasises its enormous size. This needs special facilities: the Europoort. It has to be close to the sea, and therefore the island Rozenburg is sacrificed. Further extensions are projected into the sea, which will be the new Maasvlakte. It is illustrated by animated maps (made by Toonder Studios). For the construction of the new port's mouth, the film tells, it is necessary to analyse the movements of the ships. It is done by travelling with them, and by scale models, to study the effects of waves and the required depth. The results are applied to the design of the port, which is created by 'trailing suction hopper dredgers' (*sleephopperzuigers*). People count and draw. Next are experiments with machines shooting giant blocks of concrete to simulate the construction of dams in sea. The method fails: the blocks simply break – to the astonishment of the engineers. It is an engaging scene, since it is an instance of negative feedback, amplified by the film, which requires new methods to be developed. Besides this, shingle is shot in sea, which is shown by spectacular shots. Brief scenes show the quarries where the shingle comes from: Belgium, Germany and Sweden. For the construction of the southern dam (*Zuiderdam*), one sees the production and transportation of the concrete blocks, now being shot by precision cranes. Underwater shots show the blocks sinking to the bottom; without an index of scale they look like

¹⁵⁰⁶ *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 7/2, 1969 – pp10-13. See also the television reports OPEN OOG (NTS, 1968-08-02), which explicitly heralded the Eurorama as part of the ANWB harbour tour, and VRIJ UIT (NTS, 1970-12-30), which as such were 'extensions' of the Eurorama.

¹⁵⁰⁷ The appearance of the mammoth tanker (or VLCC) drastically affected the shape of the harbour, which has been addressed, for example, by the television report EUROPOORT-OLIEPOORT (1968, Will Simon, AVRO).

¹⁵⁰⁸ Ministry of Traffic and Waterworks = *Ministerie van Verkeer & Waterstaat*, cement industry = *Eerste Nederlandse Cement Industrie* (ENCI), CH3 = *Combinatie Havenmond Hoek van Holland* (CH3). The latter was a joint-venture of (indeed) Adriaan Volker, Dredging Company Bos & Kalis and Van Hattum & Blankevoort (Stevin). Factsheet MOND VOOR MAMMOETS, archive Mundofilm (private archive Joop Burcksen).

¹⁵⁰⁹ For this and other information: interview by the author, Almere Hout, 2007-05-22.

¹⁵¹⁰ In article 'Achter de camera's van Mundo-film' (anon. tv-magazine), in relationship to the broadcasting of ACHTER DE KAMERA'S [on Mundo film] (Jan van Hillo, Han Baartmans, NCRV Ned. 1, 1973-08-17, 21h55 – title missing at B&G) – personal archive of Joop Burcksen. Cf. Bromberg, 1973.

sugar cubes in a cup of tea. A montage-sequence shows the act of pulling handles and falling blocks, which is emphasised by a rhythmic editing of the sound.

When the film was almost finished, Burcksen and Herblot presented a working copy, with a draft of the commentary, to a committee of about ten people, which consisted of engineers and company representatives. Burcksen¹⁵¹¹:

There were always members that missed something, and they wanted the thing they worked on to be shown. There were discussions about it, and sometimes it became much too technical. It was at a time when there were no specialised PR departments. There were people who were directly involved, although Van Hattum & Blankevoort was the first to appoint someone for it. I always explained that not all stages can be shown. A film should not be too complete, because then one won't make head or tail of it. Events have to follow each other logically, and I think that was our quality. At the premiere of the film on the Zeelandbrug, for example, the wife of an engineer told me that she finally understood what her husband had been doing all the time. But it was also illuminating to the engineers themselves, since one usually worked on parts of the plan, without having the overview. Moreover, much happened at the same moment, which we put in a certain order. We streamlined the process. One suddenly saw the connections. Their appreciation appears from the fact that we were asked once and again. One literally said: "it should be just as nice as last time".

GATEWAY FOR GIANTS had its premiere in April 1970¹⁵¹². It was subsequently shown at 'Eurorama', which attracted more than 120,000 visitors¹⁵¹³. Besides that, two hundred copies of the film were distributed abroad¹⁵¹⁴. The film was shown to specialised audiences, such as the 'Society of American Military Engineers' in Frankfurt¹⁵¹⁵. It was also shown at various film festivals, where it won major prizes for industrial cinematography¹⁵¹⁶.

Certain commissioners, however, still wished to highlight other aspects. Burcksen:

¹⁵¹¹ In an interview by the author, Almere Hout, 2007-05-22. Original quote: 'In zo'n commissie waren er altijd leden die zeiden 'ik mis dat en dat', en wilden dat hetgeen waar zij aan werkten getoond werd. Daarover ontstonden dan discussies. Soms werd het veel te technisch. Het was in een tijd dat je nog geen gespecialiseerde PR-afdelingen had, met talloze mensen die zich daarmee bezighouden. Hier zaten gewoon de directe betrokkenen zelf, hoewel Van Hattum en Blankevoort op een gegeven moment wel iemand speciaal hiervoor aanstelde. Ik legde altijd uit dat niet alle etappes getoond kunnen worden. Een film moet niet te compleet zijn, want daar kan je geen touw meer aan vast knopen. De gebeurtenissen moeten elkaar logisch opvolgen. De mensen konden het inderdaad volgen. Ik denk dat dat onze kracht was. Zo was er bij de première van de film over de Zeelandbrug, in Goes was dat, een echtgenote van een ingenieur die tegen mij zei: 'nu snap ik eindelijk waar die al die tijd mee bezig is geweest'. Ook voor de betrokkenen zelf had het betekenis, want men werkte altijd aan delen van een plan, en hadden zelden het overzicht. Er gebeurde ook veel op hetzelfde moment, wat wij dan in een bepaalde volgorde zetten. Betrokkenen zagen plotseling de verbanden. We stroomlijnden de gang van zaken. Dat men daar tevreden over was blijkt wel uit het feit dat ze steeds weer bij ons terugkwamen. Men zei letterlijk: "het moet net zo mooi worden als vorige keer".'

¹⁵¹² *Congrescentrum*, The Hague; 'Mond voor Mammoets' [review], in: *Handels- en Transport Courant*, 1970-04-20. The film would also be shown as part of the Filmweek Arnhem, in the programme 'Opdrachtfilm 1971', at theatre Saskia (1971-10-13), where it was introduced by J.F. Agema, chief engineer of Rijkswaterstaat – ref. p9 in: *Film, orgaan van de Nederlandse Bioscoopbond*, nr. 271, Dec. 1971.

¹⁵¹³ In article 'Achter de camera's van Mundo-film' (anon. tv-magazine), in relationship to the broadcasting of ACHTER DE KAMERA'S [on Mundo film] (Jan van Hillo, Han Baartmans, NCRV Ned. 1, 1973-08-17, 21h55 – title missing at B&G) – personal archive of Joop Burcksen.

¹⁵¹⁴ It was, for example, part of a programme of Dutch films that was distributed in Switzerland by the RVD i.c.w. Cinéma Scolaire et Populaire Suisse, ref. personal archive Joop Burcksen.

¹⁵¹⁵ Letter to the Dutch Consulate in Frankfurt, 1975-05-28 by A.R. Textor of 'Louis Berger GMBH engineers'. He mentions that 75 members of the 'Frankfurt Post of the Society of American Military Engineers' have seen the films ELEMENTS FACING ELEMENTS and GATEWAY FOR GIANTS. He reports on the enthusiasm of the viewers and expresses his gratitude for seeing the films. Copy of the letter in the personal archive of Joop Burcksen.

¹⁵¹⁶ E.g. first prizes at the 'International Festival for Industrial Films' in Florence (1970); at the 'Film Festival of San Francisco' (category 'films as communication', 1971), at 'Techfilm' in Czechoslovakia (1971), in Milan (E.A. Fiera, Premio Prua d'Oro), at 'Mediorama Filmfestival' in Blankenberge (Belgium), a.o.

This was negotiated by the members of the committee, which resulted, without any objections of anyone, in another film commission. They immediately agreed upon a budget, and all companies took a share in it. Since it concerned a combination of enterprises, together they could afford a reasonable budget, of about 200,000 guilders [\approx 90,000 euros]. The government had no money for it, but that was easily fixed. The contractors, which carried out the work for the government, just put it on the bill under the heading of 'extra work'. (Listen, I haven't said it, but I know it went that way.) In this manner, we subsequently made POORT VAN EUROPA, which shows the things from a slightly different perspective.¹⁵¹⁷

POORT VAN EUROPA (1972) was released in episodes, before the final version premiered at *De Doelen* (1972-03-09), as part of the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the *Nieuwe Waterweg*.

The film begins with the development of the seaway since the 17th century¹⁵¹⁸. Because of sedimentation, ships had to travel increasing distances to reach the port. In 1858, engineer Caland proposed a canal and the first ship passed through it in 1872. One hundred years later, mammoth tankers need a similar intervention, and so the film provides a historical legitimacy: 'The North-western part of Rozenburg, an island that emerged through centuries of sedimentation, which almost suffocated Rotterdam in earlier times, is deemed to disappear'¹⁵¹⁹. This comment, a reversal of the argument of POLDERS VOOR INDUSTRIE, is accompanied by shots of dunes. There are bird tracks, which are wittily 'replaced' by bulldozer tracks through a graphic match. This brutality is followed, alternatively, by a scene of weaving enormous mats of twigs, according to an old tradition. They are needed to build a dam to split the Europoort from Caland's 'Nieuwe Waterweg'. Amidst modern building technology it suggests a link between people and nature, in the Dutch spirit of struggling against the water. On the mats, rocks are shot. Next to that dredging is carried out (for a depth of 23m). While old things disappear, new things come instead, such as (unintended) beaches, illustrated by girls in bikinis walking over a great heavy metal tube that discharges sand. Finally the film deals with navigation; ships will be coached from the port until thirty-five kilometres offshore, by a chain of radars. To design it, tests are carried out in a laboratory¹⁵²⁰. A mobile camera registers movements of ships in a model, monitored by a woman behind a television screen. In this way positions of light houses are determined, to build a light line. At the end, the Europoort is opened by Queen Juliana.

While Mundofilm worked on POORT VAN EUROPA, Van Hattum & Blankevoort also commissioned the film EROP OF ERONDER (1971), about Kleinpolderplein, while cement industry ENCI asked for a film to present the new cement trucks (EEN STOET VAN REUZEN, 1972). Moreover, another film was made out of the material of POORT VAN EUROPA. Free in its conception, it was simply called EUROPOORT, which offered a brief general impression.

Besides films, the combination CH3 commissioned photographer Cas Oorthuys to make the book *Tideway to Tomorrow* (1971). It contains aerial views of the port, close-ups of the construction work, and shots, some in colour, of ships and building machines, all with straight compositions. Typical for Oorthuys, many pictures show people: designing the plans, testing them in huge models, and constructing them. The book was made apart from the films, but 'when

¹⁵¹⁷ Original quote: 'Als men toch vond dat er bepaalde aspecten meer aan bod moesten komen dan werd daar over onderhandeld. In dit geval kwam daar uit voort dat er een tweede film moest komen. Daar werd dan ook verder niet moeilijk over gedaan. Er werd gewoon zakelijk een budget afgesproken, en alle bedrijven namen een deel voor hun rekening. Bij grote bouwprojecten ging het altijd om aannemerscombinaties. Ieder bedrijf betaalde een deel van de film, en zo waren het flinke budgetten, van rond de 200,000 gulden. Vanuit de overheid was er vaak geen geld, maar dat werd wel geregeld. De aannemers, die het werk in opdracht van de overheid deden, zetten het gewoon onder 'meer werk' op de rekening, en als zodanig betaalde de overheid toch (ik heb het niet gezegd hoor, maar ik weet wel dat het zo ging). Op die manier maakten we vervolgens POORT VAN EUROPA (1972), dat de zaken vanuit een iets ander perspectief liet zien.'

¹⁵¹⁸ This film won several awards as well, e.g. at the Maritime Documentary Film Festival of Milan, 1974.

¹⁵¹⁹ Original quote: 'Het noordwestelijk deel van Rozenburg, eiland ontstaan door eeuwenlange aanslibbing, waardoor Rotterdam in vroeger tijden bijna verstikte, is gedoemd te verdwijnen.'

¹⁵²⁰ i.e. *Scheepsbouwkundig Proefstation Wageningen*

you have a look at it now', Burcksen says, 'you would almost think that some of the pictures have come immediately from the film. Apparently we had a similar take on the things those days.'

Burcksen and Herblot would make many other films on technical subjects, such as *DUNLIN-A*, about the construction of an oil-rig¹⁵²¹. Burcksen: 'Our film productions had something in common with building projects, in the way we had to make plans for them. I think that if I had not become a filmmaker, I would have done something in the world of building, as an architect or so.' Due to the complexity of its productions, Mundofilm fed the 'know-how' in Hilversum, through collaborations with, for example, Toonder Studios, and with broadcasting stations¹⁵²². Besides that, its films became transmitters within the network of the Dutch industry, since engineers and company representatives watched each other's films to learn about one's achievements, and to have reference material before commissioning a film themselves.

§ 3. corporate images

In the 1960s and 1970s, many enterprises related to the port asked filmmakers for 'corporate images'. Different from films on particular projects, they had to communicate the company's general identity, to workers, clients, investors and social organisations. In order to give an idea how film was applied, and how complications were solved, the case of warehousing firm *Pakhuismeesteren* may be exemplary. In 1961, it commissioned Polygoon to produce *KEY TO WORLD TRAFFIC* (1961, Jan Moonen). From the point of view of logistics, the port is seen in a general perspective; the company and the port are presented as interdependent. The film was shown about 1,500 times to groups visiting the company's home, and several copies of the film were distributed abroad through government and business organisations¹⁵²³. Due to the rapid changes in the port, the company commissioned a new film from Polygoon a few years later: *THE RESTLESS PORT* (1967). It was directed by Charles Huguenot van der Linden, who said about it:

It is definitely not the first time that I, Amsterdammer, have filmed in Rotterdam, and it won't be the last time either, if it is up to me. Because a filmmaker, who needs action, will get inevitably in the flush of the restless being-in-movement of the *Maasstad*.¹⁵²⁴

However, as Huguenot van der Linden has addressed too in this case, of logistics and storage, much happens behind the scenes, like a great deal of office work, which is a challenge to make visually attractive. He did so through fast-forwarding images, a rhythmic repetition of parts of telephone conversations, and a fast montage that makes use of graphic matches and contrasts of colours and compositions. The film was produced in 1966 and it premiered early 1967. Different language versions were made. However, within the same year *Pakhuismeesteren* fused with *Blauwhoed* to become 'Pakhoed'. A new version had to be made (released in 1969). Internal discussions took place to decide which shots had to be left in and what needed to be added¹⁵²⁵. As a matter of self-reflexivity, it became a discursive agent that channelled the priorities and visions of the stakeholders. The film was not a fixture, but able *and* subject to change.

¹⁵²¹ For some other productions by Mundofilm, see: www.nfdb.nl keys: Mundofilm, Burcksen, Herblot. (2007-04-05).

¹⁵²² In 1971, for example, Van Hattum & Blankevoort approached Burcksen, since they worked on the construction of the harbour Mina Zayed in Abu Dhabi. Through his contacts in Hilversum, they went there to shoot a film for the NCRV: *ABU DHABI; AAN DE PERZISCHE GOLF* (1971, dir.: Jan van Hillo).

¹⁵²³ 'Rusteloze haven: een film van Huguenot v.d. Linden', in: *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1967-02-17. See also letter from *Pakhuismeesteren* to Landeskonferenz der Filmdienste, Bad Godesberg, 1961-10-24. Collection GAR, dept. *Bewegend Beeld*.

¹⁵²⁴ Huguenot van der Linden, 'The Restless Port', report in: *Cinecentrum Filmbulletin* (Hilversum), early 1967 (?), collection GAR, dept. *Bewegend Beeld*. Original quote: 'Het is bepaald niet de eerste keer dat ik, Amsterdammer, in Rotterdam heb gefilmd, en het zal ook wel niet de laatste keer zijn, als het aan mij ligt. Want een filmer, die het van actie moet hebben, komt onvermijdelijk in de roes van het rusteloze in-beweging-zijn van de *Maasstad*.'

¹⁵²⁵ NFM, arch. nr. 04/IX 'Huguenot van der Linden', letter of G. Bakker to F.A. van der Horst (1969-04-23) and annotated shotlist.

Regarding corporate interests, film has fulfilled different functions in moments of change. Illustrative is the case of the Holland America Line (HAL). In the 1950s, emigration meant business for this renowned shipping company. But after 1960, the numbers of emigrants decreased. The branch had to change, by providing other services and addressing new groups of people. Film helped to do so, for example the comic triptych *DIG THOSE DUTCH* (1960, Rosinga & Trebert), commissioned by the *Nederlands Bureau voor Toerisme* and supported by HAL, to promote tourism in the Netherlands. In the first part, *A DOG'S LIFE*, a French dog travels with her owner Jane through Holland in a convertible. They start in Rotterdam, with its modern high-rise buildings and 'De Lijnbaan', where the lady buys perfume, before having dinner at the exceptional restaurant of the Euromast. While Jane enjoys the cityscape, the poodle is running after a cat. In the second part, *FLYING HIGH*, an (animated) Italian fly arrives at Rotterdam Airport, where the car of its driver is taken from the aeroplane by a special lift. The fly visits the Dutch cuisine, through the kitchen of the HAL ship 'SS Rotterdam'. In *FISH AND SHIPS*, finally, a big British fish visits the Dutch waters, together with a girl in bikini, who visits, in this outfit, different cities and the port of Rotterdam.

While HAL shifted its attention towards tourism, it gradually experienced competition from air traffic. Therefore it promoted exclusive cruises¹⁵²⁶. In *FLYING HIGH* one even travels by aeroplane in order to embark on a cruise ship. The studio of Joop Geesink made various (colour) films to advertise these cruises¹⁵²⁷. Many of them feature the flagship 'SS Rotterdam' (V), since it was HAL's showcase of luxurious travelling¹⁵²⁸. Carrying the name of its hometown, the ship itself became a floating advertisement for Rotterdam. Besides that, modern Rotterdam even got its own 'embassy' in New York, when HAL built 'Pier 40' (1959-1963), at the foot of Houston Street¹⁵²⁹. Instead of the traditional finger pier, this terminal was a square, which was the biggest of its kind, and 'certainly the most modern, with inner-core as well as roof-top parking, drive-alongside facilities and three instead of the usual two berths'¹⁵³⁰. This too was advertised by way of film (*PIER 40*, 1965, Bob Chrispijn)¹⁵³¹.

The HAL filmography reflects its changing business¹⁵³². Remarkable, however, is the lack of films on cargo transport, which the company had run since WWII, next to other marine businesses¹⁵³³. The company gradually restricted its interests and concentrated on passengers, which is emphasised by the documentary *LADING? PASSAGIERS!* (1963, A. Tjepkema/VPRO).

Instead of line shipping, moreover, cruises became central, and Rotterdam as a terminal lost its importance. Instead of destinations, the cruise became the main thing, which is clear from film titles such as *THE BEST FOOD AFLOAT* (HAL, 1970), and *THE MEMORYMAKER* (HAL, 1975), about cruises to South-America, and *WELCOME ABOARD* (HAL, 1975), which was made to attract American clients for cruises towards the Caribbean¹⁵³⁴. The Holland America Line became an 'experience provider', and film was an appropriate medium to address this quality.

¹⁵²⁶ For its history in connection to HAL, see: William Miller, 1998: 11. An example of a film that promotes cruises, with entertainment and relaxation aboard of the 'SS Statendam' and 'SS Nieuw Amsterdam', is: *VAREN IS GENIETEN* (Max de Haas, 1959). To emphasise its message, the film was shot in colour.

¹⁵²⁷ E.g. *KOERS AMERIKA MET DE HOLLAND AMERICA LIJN* (1963; *YOUR SAFETY OUR CONCERN* (1965, Joop Geesink).

¹⁵²⁸ See also: *KOERS AMERIKA MET DE HOLLAND AMERICA LIJN* (1963, Joop Geesink), *ROTTERDAM V* (1965, HAL), s.s. *ROTTERDAM* (1970, HAL). Besides that, the HAL made also a film on the ship *STATENDAM* (HAL, 1970). See furthermore: *SCHEPEN VAN DE HOLLAND AMERICA LIJN* (1963, see: HAL, made by Polygoon).

¹⁵²⁹ Cf. : William Miller, 1998: 37.

¹⁵³⁰ William Miller, 1998: 4.

¹⁵³¹ See Geesink in filmography. The construction of the new pier was also reported by Fox Movietone News (1961).

¹⁵³² An exception is *HOLLAND AMERICA LINER TESTS*, showing a ship in the MIT towing tank that simulates waves. It is recorded in slow-motion to see the effects.

¹⁵³³ Miller, 1998: 66.

¹⁵³⁴ See also the films made for the Rotterdamsche Lloyd, e.g. films by Jaap Nieuwenhuis, such as *PASSAGE NAAR DE ZON* (195x ?), *CIRCLING THE GLOBE IN COMFORT* (1958), *WIE VAART MEE OVER ZEE* (1960).

In 1977, the headquarters of HAL moved from Rotterdam to Seattle, and the next year the last travel from Rotterdam to New York took place, after 105 years of service¹⁵³⁵. A prelude had been the farewell of the famous 'SS Nieuw Amsterdam' some years before (reported by J. van Rhijn for the *JOURNAAL*, 1971-11-08). Later on the NOS made a tribute to its history¹⁵³⁶. It shows historic images of its construction, its launching in 1937 and its maiden trip to New York in 1938, and finishes with its deconstruction in Taiwan. This documentary marks the end of a history, in which film accompanied and reflected the ability to adapt to changing conditions of transport and leisure, which demanded new visions and marketing strategies.

Many other corporations related to the port used film, which supported the emergence of a professional film infrastructure in Rotterdam. As such I have already paid attention to the NFM, and to the Open Studio, and others can be mentioned here too, especially Capricornus and Korver. Together they made up a small-scale cultural industry, but in this case it was part of a larger cultural ecology, related to the port. Moreover, corporate images were expressed through different means, including photography, (graphic) design, and architecture. In programmatic terms, one might therefore speak of a corporate *Medienverbund*.

The NFM production *BACHER* (1967, Tom Tholen) is a case in point. It stressed the growth of dredging company Volker, which indirectly helped to prepare the grounds for the construction of a new headquarters. In 120 years, the company had rapidly grown in parallel to the port, and it had developed into a multinational. To confirm that status, it wanted a representative building: the *Adriaan Volkerhuis* (1968-1974, Hugh Maaskant e.a.¹⁵³⁷). The initial plan was a ninety metre high tower, but it became sixty metres in the end because of protests from citizens and because of 'public opinion'¹⁵³⁸. By way of a zigzag-like ground plan and interchanging tender black and white walls, the building kept its vertical dimension. It is situated along the river Nieuwe Maas and the Maasboulevard, which is one of the main routes from the *Ruit* towards the city centre. 'Maaskant designed an abstract, autonomous office building, which was not bothered by the environment. The unapproachable forms are purely conceived as an abstract composition of white and black verticals. The building contains no reference whatsoever to the human dimension or human activity'¹⁵³⁹. It was one of Maaskant's last works; it marks the end of high modernism in the Netherlands and the beginning of a new era. According to Michelle Provoost (2003), the building is emblematic for a new kind of architecture, that of corporate identity.

An even more elaborate example of corporate identity, to address the parallel tracks of film and architecture, is that of Shell. This case may simultaneously give an idea of how the city's film production network was extended, since Shell made use of film services in and outside the city. Shell had its own building department, which constructed – apart from its headquarters in Hoogvliet – a representative office in the city (1956-1960, C. A. Abspoel)¹⁵⁴⁰. The film board was housed here too, which initiated films about different topics, in collaboration with Shell's London based Film Unit. These films were directed by well-known filmmakers, among them Bert Haanstra, George Sluizer and Charles Huguenot van der Linden, while the cameraman Eduard

¹⁵³⁵ In 1984 the office in New York was closed too. http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holland-Amerika_Lijn (2006-04-27).

¹⁵³⁶ I.e. *PANORAMIEK* (1974-12-01). The HAL achieved a mythical status, which is also reflected by amateur films, e.g. *ZEEKASTELEN* (1958-1971) by J.W. Soek. He first shot the launching of 'SS Rotterdam' (1958-09-13), the last trip of the Willem Ruys (1964-10-16) and of the 'SS Nieuw Amsterdam', to New York (1971-11-08). The latter includes interior shots that express the atmosphere of the ship, next to shots of loading and mooring, and of a crowd saying farewell at the Wilhelminakade.

¹⁵³⁷ Cf. Provoost, 2003.

¹⁵³⁸ Groenendijk, 2004: Architectuur > Gebouwen > Adriaan Volkerhuis.

¹⁵³⁹ Original quote: 'Maaskant ontwierp een abstract, autonoom kantoorgebouw, dat zich niets aantrekt van de omgeving. De ongenaakbare vormen zijn puur als abstracte compositie van witte en zwarte verticalen opgevat. Het gebouw bevat geen enkele verwijzing naar de menselijke maat of menselijke activiteit.'

¹⁵⁴⁰ i.e. Shell Building at the Hofplein, see: Groenendijk, 2004: Architectuur > Gebouwen > Shellgebouw. For Shell films, see: www.nfdb.nl (2007-04-05).

van der Enden became a frequent collaborator¹⁵⁴¹. With Sluizer he made, for example, *HOLD BACK THE SEA* (1961), in which the port of Rotterdam was shown as part of Dutch water maintenance, and with Huguenot van der Linden he made *OKTOBERVAART* (1964)¹⁵⁴². This film was produced by the NFM, for which Van der Enden used to do cinematography, which exemplifies already personnel interconnections. Since the film is illustrative for the way Shell made use of film, I will discuss it here in some further detail.

OKTOBERVAART has a poetic touch. The narrator says, ‘The last October days... and still sparkling is the sun in a clean washed sky’¹⁵⁴³, and later, ‘October... the ship ploughs its way. In the furrow of the wake the roving scum searches for the swag’¹⁵⁴⁴, while seagulls dive into the water. The film was made for the role of Shell within inland navigation, since it provided fuel to barges, and for the importance of inland navigation to distribute fuel as well. The film is not obviously promotional, nor is the company the main subject. Shell is an integral factor within a broader landscape; its position is self-evident and hence reliable. Similarly, throughout the film several references to Rotterdam are made, as ships have to load, unload or provide services there. Like Shell, Rotterdam affects the whole system of inland navigation.

The film tells the story of the family Kamphuizen and its barge ‘Casa Nova’. There is an emerging love between their eighteen year old daughter Jannie, and Wim, who works on the ‘Shell 42’ tanker. They briefly meet at the beginning of the film, when their boats pass. He tells that he is going to Leeuwarden, while she is going to Rotterdam. When the family arrives there, we hear skipper Kamphuizen thinking, through a *monologue intérieur*.

For forty years I have come to Rotterdam already ... but things have changed so much! Of course, as it is located on the Rhine mouth it made Rotterdam grow. But there would never come so many sea vessels without the inland navigation, which enables the transit to the hinterland after all. How would they get all that cargo transported otherwise? Won’t it be far too expensive?¹⁵⁴⁵

The narrator mentions that like this family, 15,000 barges are on the move, through a network of waterways that extends to Germany, Belgium, France and Switzerland. It is also the reason that the film was released in four language versions (Dutch, French, German and English).

In the end, Jannie and Wim meet each other. We just see their feet; Jannie’s dog is the only witness of what happens. Like Italian neorealism, Huguenot van der Linden worked with non-professional actors playing themselves. He selected a family working on a barge that transported various goods, without fixed routes, so it was flexible and able to be contracted for the film. Although *OKTOBERVAART* looks like a documentary, it was entirely scripted and staged. The way Huguenot van der Linden conceived it can be illustrated by an incident after the shooting. On the 14th of October 1963, Huguenot van der Linden was upset; he wrote an angry letter to NFM director Landré for the fact that the dog from the film was ‘annihilated’, due to the executive producer (Mr. Kits). ‘You know that I have turned all the rushes through this morning. In many of them the dog does what the Americans call ‘stealing the scene’. If later, at the premiere, the skipper’s family presents itself, it will be hard to let the journalists be devoid of the

¹⁵⁴¹ E.g. *SONG OF THE CLOUDS* (1957, John Armstrong). Van der Enden frequently collaborated with the Shell Film Unit afterwards, but also for its competitor BP – information by Van der Enden in an interview with FP, 2008-12-19.

¹⁵⁴² Cf. Hogenkamp 2003: 206. For the script, see: NFM, archive ‘Charles Huguenot van der Linden’, 04-VII.

¹⁵⁴³ Translation FP from the original Dutch quote: ‘De laatste oktoberdagen... en nog sprankelt de zon in een schoongewassen lucht.’

¹⁵⁴⁴ Transl. FP from or. Dutch quote: ‘Oktober... het schip ploegt... voort. In de voor van het... kielzog speuren zeeschuimers [meeuwen duiken in het water] naar buit.’

¹⁵⁴⁵ Transl. FP from or. Dutch quote: ‘Veertig jaar kom ik al in Rotterdam... maar wat is het hier veranderd! Natuurlijk, dat het aan de monding van de Rijn ligt, dat heeft Rotterdam groot gemaakt. Maar er zouden nooit zoveel zeeschepen komen als de binnenvaart er niet was. Die zorgt toch maar voor de doorvoer naar het achterland. Hoe zouden ze al dat goed er anders heen willen krijgen? Dat zou toch veel te duur worden?’

fact that one of the four ‘main characters’ has been murdered for financial reasons¹⁵⁴⁶. Moreover, he wrote, it prohibits promotion activities such as a photo shoot for women’s magazines.

The dog embodies the crossing of film genres, the balancing act to pull audiences into the subject matter, and to provide information. The dog is an emotional marker of an otherwise impersonal system, that of transportation networks, its logistics and the fuel that keeps it running. Moreover, the dog underlines not only the staged character of the film, but also the staging of the film’s *value*, through its premiere and through magazines (i.e. *Medienverbund*). Like this film, Shell made various other ones related to different aspects of its business.

At the same time, Shell articulated its presence through architecture. It extended its office complex in the city centre by a new tower with a height of nearly one hundred metres (1971-1976, arch.: Zanstra, De Clercq, Zubli & Lammertsma). On the occasion of the opening, Shell commissioned Gerrit van Dijk to make a film about it (OUR HOUSE, 1976). Meanwhile Shell enlarged its industrial complexes in Pernis (1975, arch.: Postma, Smit, Haayen), and it continued to grow over the next years¹⁵⁴⁷. Besides that, the Maasvlakte Oil Terminal was developed, a joint-venture of Shell and other oil companies, which became one of the largest of the world, notwithstanding initial tensions due to the oil crisis of 1979¹⁵⁴⁸. Both complexes have often been featured in films and reports on Rotterdam’s oil industry¹⁵⁴⁹.

Many other companies in Rotterdam were actively involved with media, among them Unilever, whose films were also, like those of Shell, distributed as educational films¹⁵⁵⁰. Especially concerned with media, and not the least in terms of corporate identity, was shipbuilder Cornelis Verolme (•1900-†1981)¹⁵⁵¹. In 1954, as part of the Botlek development, he established the *Verolme Dok en Scheepsbouw Maatschappij NV* (VDSM). Near the encapsulated village of Rozenburg he built the largest Dutch shipyard (1957). It was able to construct oil tankers, and allowed for the construction of even bigger ships in the future¹⁵⁵².

Since Verolme was new in Rotterdam as a ship builder, and not accepted by the elite, he used media to promote his concern. It became the responsibility of spin doctor Gert van der Hoest, who joined Verolme in 1957¹⁵⁵³. In about fifteen years, Verolme appeared in more than

¹⁵⁴⁶ Carbon copy of this letter in the NFM archive ‘Huguenot van der Linden’, arch. nr. 04/VIII. Original quote: ‘U weet dat ik vanmorgen alle rushes heb doorgedraaid, waarbij er vele zijn, waarin het hondje doet wat de Amerikanen “stealing the scene” noemen. Als straks, op de première, het schippersgezin zich presenteert, zal het moeilijk zijn de journalisten onkundig te laten van het feit dat een van de vier “hoofdrollen” om financiële redenen werd vermoord.’

¹⁵⁴⁷ Up to 80 km of roads, 160,000 km of pipelines and fifty factories in 2005.

¹⁵⁴⁸ Cf. JOURNAAL, NOS, 1979-05-18.

¹⁵⁴⁹ E.g. EUROPOORT-OLIEPOORT (AVRO, 1968-11-11); directors of oil companies are interviewed: Martin (Gulf), Rodenburg (Shell), Claessens (Esso), and Posthuma (Port Authorities). It was not a promotional film, but it gave the companies nevertheless an opportunity to explain their reasons and to generate support.

¹⁵⁵⁰ e.g. through the *Gemeentelijke Filmotheek* (Catalogus 1976, GAR: ‘Collectie Bibliotheek’ P2815). Once more there is the connection between ‘food and fuel’, regarding the collections of films produced by Unilever, and that of Shell, as well as that of, for example, oil company Esso, e.g. ESSO BOUWT (1960), ESSO IN NEDERLAND (1961), and also the annual ESSO JOURNAAL (since 1954, Otto van Neijenhoff > 1960s) – for these references see the correspondence between Esso and GAR, 1960-1961: Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, archive ‘Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam’ (archief van het archief), dossier ‘correspondentie filmcollectie’, toegangsnr. 297.01, inv. nr. 461 (1958-1962).

¹⁵⁵¹ We might draw here a direct link to Anthony Veder. In 1928, Verolme began to work for the Stork engineering works in Hengelo. During WWII he supplied engines to various Dutch shipping companies, especially that of Veder, which was not allowed according to the laws of the occupier. Through these illegal transactions, Verolme had been able to gather capital that enabled him to establish his own company, in 1946, as mentioned in his biography written by Ariëtte Dekker (2005: 89). Verolme soon moved to Rotterdam (IJsselmonde). In 1950, he took over the shipyard of Jan Smit at Alblasterdam, near Rotterdam, and his enterprise grew rapidly. He kept in touch with Veder, and as such he was aware of his interests.

¹⁵⁵² See e.g. the Polygon newsreels of 1961-wk39; 1969-wk20; 1971-wk13.

¹⁵⁵³ As addressed by Dekker (2005: 144), he used to operate together with his wife Miny (not unlike Verolme who was often accompanied by his wife Anneke, *ibid.*, 449-450).

one hundred newsreels and various other television programmes and documentaries¹⁵⁵⁴. The first feature length television documentary about Verolme was ANDERS DAN ANDEREN: CORNELIS VEROLME (VARA, 1960-01-15). Van der Hoest collaborated on it for months. This portrait, presented by Bert Garthoff, propelled the prestige of Verolme in the Netherlands¹⁵⁵⁵. Next to that, Verolme commissioned about thirty promotion films¹⁵⁵⁶. Several of them were made by Polygoon-Profilati, like IT'S MORE THAN JUST A SHIP (1964, Lajos Kalános)¹⁵⁵⁷. This film, directed by one of the most talented cameramen working for Dutch television, including the JOURNAAL, showed the complex organisation, technology and skills needed to construct a gas tanker.

Because of his interest in media, Verolme got involved with an initiative for commercial television, the *Reclame Exploitatie Maatschappij* (REM), which ran TV Noordzee. Its director, Jo Brandel, had previously directed TV55, the experiment with commercial television at the E55 in Rotterdam. Joop Landré, the director of the Rotterdam based film production company NFM, and former director of Polygoon, who had been involved with TV55 too, became its adviser. Verolme was one of its investors, and its spokesman¹⁵⁵⁸. He was interested in it as a business, and to get access to television.

As the Dutch law did not yet allow commercial television, the station was located in the North Sea, outside the Dutch territorial waters, ten kilometres from Noordwijk. It followed the example of Veronica, which broadcast from a ship since 1960. The REM, instead, was located on a platform, which was thought to be safer. Verolme built the platform, at his expenses, at his yard in Cork, Ireland. After some complications – it collapsed on the ship ‘Global Adventurer’ during transshipment (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1964-05-24) – it was brought to Rozenburg to be finished. The REM broadcast its first television programme on the 12th of August 1964. It raised much discussion.

An emergency law soon prohibited broadcasting from constructions in sea¹⁵⁵⁹. On the 17th of December, a day after Verolme had explained the reasons of REM once more for the JOURNAAL, the island was confiscated by the navy. It is a remarkable coincidence that on this day Verolme himself was to be seen as a guest of Phyllis Knight in her programme SMALL TALK on WHAS-TV (Louisville, Kentucky), which was an example of commercial television in America. After Verolme was introduced, an advertisement for shoes was shown; it was not so different from Verolme’s own appearance, who was there to promote his metalised curtains.

¹⁵⁵⁴ Concerning newsreels about Verolem and/or his firm: 23 x Polygoon, 74 x NTS JOURNAAL in 1957-1972; www.beeldengeluid.nl collections Polygoon + NOS Journaal. Some examples are: JOURNAAL, NTS [catapult installation at aircraft-carrier ‘Minas Gerais’ for Brazil] 1960-06-24, cf. Polygoon 1960-wk50; NTS JOURNAAL [launching of tanker “Esso Hampshire” at Verolme Rozenburg] 1962-03-18, cf. Polygoon 1962-wk13; JOURNAAL [inauguration of two docks by Minister Pous, at Verolme Rozenburg] 1962-05-10; cf. Polygoon 1962-wk21; JOURNAAL [tanker Esso Libya] 1962-08-26; cf. Polygoon 1962-wk36; JOURNAAL [christening of “Esso Den Haag” by Princess Beatrix] 1963-07-04; cf. Polygoon 1963-wk28. Verolme used all possibilities to attract media attention (e.g. the ‘event’ of launching the 100th ship at Verolme Rozenburg, JOURNAAL, 1965-02-10), which also meant that the media knew their way when an incident happened. An example of the latter is the fire and ravage that happened after an explosion took place at the tanker ‘Rona Star’ at Verolme Rozenburg (JOURNAAL, 1965-06-16).

¹⁵⁵⁵ Dekker, 2005: 178.

¹⁵⁵⁶ Verolme was particularly keen on using film and television for publicity purposes (including Polygoon and the NTS Journaal). See filmography > Verolme, for a number of examples. Most of these films are to be found in the collection of the Maritiem Museum, Rotterdam (www.maritiemdigitaal.nl – 2008-12-28).

¹⁵⁵⁷ See also the Polygoon productions: WHEN THE TRIGGER FALLS (1960s); MAMMOETTANKER – MAMMOETHELLING (1969); A WHARF IN THE WILDERNESS (1966), a.o.

¹⁵⁵⁸ Van Lier, 1963; Landré, 1994: 70; Dekker, 2005: 269. See also the interview with Verolme in TELEVIZIER (1964, AVRO, dir. Gerard van der Meyden). The REM had been the idea of the publisher W. Hordijk from The Hague (Van Lier, 1963). In order to carry out his plan he contacted Jan Marie Fehmers, of the bank Texeira de Mattos, offshore engineer and entrepreneur Pieter Heerema, and through him Cornelis Verolme (Dekker, 2005: 270). Soon a conflict arose; Hordijk withdrew and sold his plan to the others. They asked Jo Brandel to become REM’s director instead (Van Lier, 1963). Later on the entrepreneur Reinder Zwolsman got involved too (Landr , 1994: 70). Landr  had collaborated with Zwolsman on the construction of the Pier of Scheveningen (cf. Polygoon, 1964-wk34).

¹⁵⁵⁹ i.e. Wet Installaties Continentaal Plat (anti-REM-wet). It did not catch, however, the pirates of Veronica.

The REM developed into the legal station TROS, with Landré as its director (1966-1973)¹⁵⁶⁰. The end of the NFM was a loss for Rotterdam, but Landré's move reinforced the connection with *Standort Hilversum*¹⁵⁶¹. Verolme, in turn, would be frequently shown in television programmes, especially in 1967, when he presented his plan for a shipyard to build and repair the world's largest *mammoettankers* ('Very Large Crude Carriers')¹⁵⁶². The way it had to be financed became a struggle between Verolme, the state, and other yards, which was largely fought in the media¹⁵⁶³. It is also no coincidence that it was in this period that Roelof Kiers made his well-known documentary CORNELIS VEROLME, SCHEEPSBOUWER (AVRO 1967-09-17). It was the onset of the 'direct documentary' movement in the Netherlands, as a variant of the *cinéma vérité*, which became known as the VPRO-school after Kiers moved to the VPRO. However, as Dekker has argued too (p279), the content of this production was actually not so different from the former ones. Verolme himself was, after all, the figure who decided what was shown. In this way, cinema and television, promotion films, newsreels and documentaries got all interwoven in respect of one agenda: raising publicity and reinforcing the reputation of Verolme.

Verolme, already sixty-seven years old, finally won the competition to build the yard¹⁵⁶⁴. To celebrate his victory he commissioned Polygoon to make the biographical TIME TO WORK (1968)¹⁵⁶⁵. The preconditions for the support, which the Dutch state had set, and the changing economic perspectives, nevertheless caused his downfall in 1970¹⁵⁶⁶. He had to withdraw as the president from his enterprise, which had to merge with the Rijn-Schelde enterprise¹⁵⁶⁷.

Verolme's competitors also established significant track records in respect of media. The shipyard RDM even produced films itself, such as SAMEN WERKEN AAN DE TOEKOMST (1960, RDM), to attract pupils to the RDM school, and various films about the construction of cranes, ships, power plant instruments, weaponry, and oil rigs, among other¹⁵⁶⁸. Since the 1970s it had also made an annual *journaal*, after the example Wilton-Fijenoord in Schiedam, which had done so since the early 1950s¹⁵⁶⁹. These reports dealt with major commissions, innovations and achievements, and to some extent labour conditions or the company school. The images were professionally made, shot in black-and-white and accompanied by a voice-over, music and occasionally diegetic sound.

¹⁵⁶⁰ TROS = *Televisie Radio Omroep Stichting*, but 'Tros' was also the title of the film that was produced by Piet van Mook in 1956 (dir.: Wim van der Velde, scr.: Jan Schaper). Van Mook made several films for Landré's NFM afterwards (e.g. Brusse's POORT VAN EUROPA, 1962). Moreover, the director and scriptwriter of TROS established the production group Trosfilm, which (briefly) shared the building with NFM (Eendrachtsweg).

¹⁵⁶¹ Landré became also a member of a committee (1970) to advice on the future of the NOS JOURNAAL, see: Scheepmaker, 1981: 67.

¹⁵⁶² see for example the NTS JOURNAAL, 1967-09-22 and 1968-01-02, in which Verolme explains his plans.

¹⁵⁶³ The main yards included RDM, Rijn-Schelde, Wilton-Fijenoord, NDSM.

¹⁵⁶⁴ See: JOURNAAL (NTS, 1968-04-26), which shows the start of the construction works of the *mammoetdok*.

¹⁵⁶⁵ Cf. Dekker, 2005: 310.

¹⁵⁶⁶ In order to construct the *mammoetdok*, Verolme had to take over the NDSM yard in Amsterdam (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1968-07-09 and 1968-12-29), cf. HIER EN NU (NCRV, 1968-07-04). NDSM was in trouble and it caused serious problems for Verolme (cf. HIER EN NU, NCRV, 1969-09-11 and 1969-09-25). In some sense, his down fall was already announced by the first strikes that took place at Verolme Rozenburg, see: BRANDPUNT (KRO, 1968-09-21) and JOURNAAL (NTS, 1968-09-20, 1968-09-23, 1968-09-24).

¹⁵⁶⁷ Cf. tv-interviews with Verolme, a.o. by the VARA ACHTER HET NIEUWS (1969-09-18); AVRO: TELEVIZIER (1969-09-23); NOS JOURNAAL (1971-02-11 and 1971-04-08); VOOR DE VUIST WEG (1971-02-12) and TELEVIZIER (1971-09-07); and the NCRV: HIER EN NU (1970-09-04; 1971-02-13), a.o. See also discussions in the parliament about Verolme, e.g. ACHTER HET NIEUWS (VARA, 1969-09-26); NOS JOURNAAL (1971-03-23 and 1971-04-07). However, the dramatic change in his career did not harm his newly gained position within the elite (e.g. his 70th anniversary: NOS JOURNAAL, 1970-09-04). The new firm made also use of media to promote itself, e.g. RHINE SCHELDE VEROLME (1974, Tuscan).

¹⁵⁶⁸ Resp.: BOUW VAN EEN 90 TONS KRAAN (1960); BOUW ONDINA (1960); BOUW VAN DE ARRIVA (1968); OPBOUW EN PROEFSCHieten M 114 (1970); HET BOOREILAND PETRO BALTIC (1975) etc. Next to such films the RDM made also film about, e.g. its 75th anniversary (75 JAAR RDM 1902-1977), the launching of ships (e.g. TEWATERLATING FINA ITALIA, 1975), and various other activities. More titles can be found at GAR.

¹⁵⁶⁹ Gemeentearchief Schiedam, <http://archieff.schiedam.nl/content/schiedambeeldengeluid/2b.pdf> (2006-04-27)

The WILTON-FIJENOORD JOURNAAL of 1970, which I take here as an example, features the newly acquired 'mammoth crane' that removes damaged parts of the ship 'Theologos'. It is shown from low perspectives and special vistas; long shots give an overview of the work, interchanged by close-ups of the workers. The report makes use of comic effects, such as organ music and the sound of a whistle when the production of pipes is shown. There are startling shots of a dock that needs to be relocated, including a ship in it that is under construction. While the dock floats through the port, workers continue their job, not to waste time. Also remarkable are shots of an oil tanker under construction, which is pictured by a photographer of the magazine *Wilton-Fijenoord Nieuws*, as mentioned by the narrator. This cross-media reference is another instance of *Medienverbund*, to communicate what was accomplished, and to generate an understanding of the enterprise as a whole. They created involvement and provided feedback, literally as 'reports', to generate further growth.

In the next chapter I will present another case in detail, that of ECT, as part of the process of containerisation and its effect on socio-economic development. It shows the way that corporate images were embedded in a broader cultural ecology, and that all of them have helped a media infrastructure in Rotterdam to emerge. Through the port, cinema got firmly anchored in the city.

CHAPTER 14. CONTAINER CONTAINED / STRIKING DEVELOPMENT

§ 1. the composition of growth

In order to stabilise social-economic development, the government decided each year how much wages could grow by (i.e. *geleide loonpolitiek*). Unions respected these rules. The post-war period, directed by the social-democratic (PvdA) Prime Minister Drees (1948-1958), was thus characterised by collective agreements in order to rebuild the country and to enable progress¹⁵⁷⁰. Over the course of the 1960s, workers experienced increasing welfare, but their relative position worsened. They had no direct share in the profits, while they were confronted with unstable conditions. Moments of economic change, for the better or the worse, are a reason for workers to strike (Van der Velden, 2000: 288). There is more to it in this case. In a period of rapid, but unpredictable development, brokers arranged temporary labour contracts, which reduced the risks for companies. In this way, temporary workers, among them the foreign *gastarbeiders* ('guest workers'), could be easily fired, but they could earn more, irrespective of their skills. Permanent personnel began to protest against this competition. It resulted in so-called 'wild strikes', without the union, in the ports of Rotterdam and Amsterdam in October 1963, which was reported by the NTS JOURNAAL¹⁵⁷¹. Workers demanded higher salaries, but that was prevented by the *geleide loonpolitiek*. Unions thought that its abolition would weaken the position of the workers in the long run¹⁵⁷². In 1965, wild strikes took place at the shipyards of Wilton-Fijenoord and Verolme. In the *Zwarte Nacht van Wilton* ("Black Night of Wilton") workers occupied the firm, which was not reported by television, but only by radio¹⁵⁷³. Against the will of the employers association, private agreements were made by the companies. Higher wages had become a goal in itself, and as such the cause for the protests moved to the background¹⁵⁷⁴. The conditions remained the same.

The lack of attention from television might have played a role here in the maintenance of the status quo, when compared to the heavily mediatised events of the 1970s. In retrospect, the absence is striking since the events of 1965 set the tone for those to come. It might have had two reasons. At the moment of the strike the news was dominated by another strike in Rotterdam, by taxi-drivers¹⁵⁷⁵. It made the one in the port seem unimportant, since it was relatively small and concentrated on particular firms, but that was exactly the point. The nature of the protest had changed and firms did no longer obey to the general agreements and procedures. The fact that the JOURNAAL operated from outside Rotterdam, played a role too. The developments seemed to be a local affair, but in fact it was a sign that the Dutch social-economic system was about to change.

In the port of Rotterdam, these changes were accelerated by containerisation, as addressed by Sjaak van der Velden (2005: 20). The container largely replaced the labour intensive piece-good handling. It affected the overall conditions in the port, and as such it has been one of the reasons, within a complex web of factors, that caused the strong labour protests in

¹⁵⁷⁰ Immediately after the war, various strikes took place (Sjaak van der Velden, 2004: 117). A relatively quiet period followed, with only occasional protests (see also: Hooiring e.a., 1979: 94-95). An example was a strike at Wilton-Fijenoord in 1951 (Sjaak van der Velden, 2004: 123) and a harbour strike in Rotterdam in August 1955 – see: JOURNAAL (NTS, 1955-08-16). Whereas unions respected the agreements, the employers took also care for social issues, which they also expressed through film – see e.g. *KIJK UIT!* (1955, Nol Bollongino) and *WERKERS AAN DE HAVENKANT* (1962, Ronny Erends), both made for *Scheepvaartvereniging Zuid* (SVZ); cf. *ACHTER HET NIEUWS* (VARA, 1967-08-31).

¹⁵⁷¹ JOURNAAL (NTS, 1963-10-26 and 1963-10-27), cf. Nas, 2001. Both ports had a tradition of labour protests. For reflections upon this tradition and its reasons, see: Van der Velden, 2000: 187.

¹⁵⁷² Nas: 2001 (a.o.).

¹⁵⁷³ This is particularly striking since *Wilton-Fijenoord* and *Verolme* were engaged with film and television practices. For radio, see *RADIOKRANT* [nr. 70] (NCRV-radio, 1965-02-18); comment: P.G.J. Korteweg, reporter: Henri van der Zee [B&G: 82252]; *NIET BEKEND* (VARA-radio, 1965-02-19), 5'40", reporter: Kees Buurman [B&G: 5104] with an explanation of Chairman I. Baart of the trade-union ANMB.

¹⁵⁷⁴ Nas, 2001.

¹⁵⁷⁵ See a.o. JOURNAAL (NTS, 1965-02-12)

the 1970s (cf. De Goey, 2005: 55). Within this framework of economic and technological change, the policy of the unions became outdated, and unable to direct tensions. The economists Alfred Kleinknecht and Ro Naastepad (2005) have argued that instead of collective agreements characterised by wage-moderation, offensive trade-unionism is the best strategy for a small country with an open economy¹⁵⁷⁶. In moments of change, companies should not opt for temporary measures, but develop new strategies and visions. In this way, labour movements are important factors for growth, which force the social-economic and technological system to innovate itself. Paul van de Laar (2005) has emphasised the significance of this argument, especially within the current debate on technological innovation and the knowledge economy. I would consider the role of media here as well, as part of this complex.

Concerning the press, Van der Velden (2000: 89-90) has also addressed that it is one of the players within the event of a strike, although it remains a brief remark that needs further investigation. His assumption (concerning the period 1830-1995) is that the press has generally been negative towards strikes, and that strikers had little to expect from it. Whether this vision is correct remains to be seen. The tendency to reject the strike was indeed present in various media reports, but it might actually have empowered the strikers. For the 1970s, I would, in my turn, stress the role of television, as the main public medium, to channel claims and views, and to enable exchange between the different agents. By 1970, television was able to provide immediate feedback. As such it became a prominent factor in the discussions. Especially important was the JOURNAAL. Over the course of the 1960s it established itself as the main Dutch news medium – I will often refer to it by especially marked footnotes: (*”).

The absence of the JOURNAAL in 1965 was soon compensated, during the wild strikes of the tugboat personnel (*¹⁵⁷⁷). It was the onset of an era of mediatised social-economic changes, and a different picture may come to the fore than the one suggested by Van der Velden. Media monitored the events taking place, and displayed opportunities. A cross-connection can be drawn here with the role of public space, as built structures enable events to take place (cf. Tschumi, 1994 [1983]: 140). Media and urban space made up the public domain that enabled an exchange of views. Whereas the media landscape had radically changed due to the emergence of television in the previous fifteen years, public space also changed its character in Rotterdam, due to the changes in the port. Piece goods handling in the harbours in the city, started to be replaced by container transshipment west of the city. Its space is archetypical for what is now known as the ‘space of flows’ and ‘non-place’ (Castells, 1996; Augé, 1992), but it is, as we will see, still related to the social-cultural structures of the city, the empowering of particular urban sites, and to media practices. Within the framework of urban development, social action, containerisation, and the media are interrelated, but indirectly. In this chapter, I will *interchangingly* discuss the development of container transshipment and its connection to film and television, and similarly the role of media vis-à-vis the major strikes in the port of Rotterdam in the 1970s¹⁵⁷⁸.

¹⁵⁷⁶ Cf. review by Van de Laar (2005) who finds this hypothesis the most relevant to test the role of trade-unionism in the economic-technological development of post-war Rotterdam.

¹⁵⁷⁷ As shown by the JOURNAAL (NTS, 1968-01-02); the first strike was led by syndicalist Leen van Os. He had a reputation as a union member (EVC); in 1948, in opposition to the communist leaders of the EVC, he was an important factor in the reorganisation of transport unions (see: Nas, 2000; ‘Wederopbouw’). Another strike took place that year; the JOURNAAL (NTS, 1968-11-11) showed strikers gathering in neighbourhood centre ‘Odeon’ in Het Oude Westen. More reports followed, e.g. BRANDPUNT (KRO, 1969-01-03), with speeches by Leen van Os e.a., and an interview with Chairman Alink of the Union of Transport Personnel (NBV). At the same time reporter Wibo van de Linde (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1969-01-03) interviewed harbour deputy H.J. Verhoef, who did not see a serious threat yet. Some ships moored by themselves, while others went to the port of Amsterdam, like the Greek ship Ellines (images by Pim Korver). The next day Van de Linde spoke with Van Os (JOURNAAL, 1969-01-04), as a board was established to represent the strikers (cf. JOURNAAL, 1969-01-07).

¹⁵⁷⁸ This research on the way strikes have been reported on television has largely been based on information provided by the database of B&G (up to 2008). Many reports are only studied through their *written transcriptions*: there is only a limited number of reports available on viewing copies, and practice limits full access. The archive material concerns mainly 16mm reels, which was the common format for reports; 16mm reports have usually been preserved, but it might

§ 2. container contained I – the scenario of ‘process architecture’

On the 4th of January 1961, the NTS JOURNAAL reported on the American container ship ‘Warrior’ visiting the port of Rotterdam, with shots of the ship unloading and then loading again. The young entrepreneur Frans Swarttouw (1932-1997), who was the director of Quick Dispatch, a company for bulk transshipment, had done a traineeship in the United States a few years before, where the first container crane was put to service in 1959¹⁵⁷⁹. Swarttouw saw possibilities for Rotterdam too¹⁵⁸⁰. In October 1965, he announced a plan to construct a container terminal together with *Thomsens Havenbedrijf* and the Dutch Railways (NS), which would be located at the site of Quick Dispatch at the Eemhaven¹⁵⁸¹. During the next year, three other companies joined the venture. In the meantime, more container ships came to Rotterdam, which was also shown on television¹⁵⁸².

The container accelerated automation, which demanded a different organisation of the port and its labour forces. Van Driel and De Goey, who have written on the history of cargo handling in Rotterdam, speak of a ‘regime-transformation’¹⁵⁸³. The port authorities accommodated and promoted this change in several ways, for example by the exhibition ‘Nedex 66’ in Ahoy’, on container transportation. The exhibition was also reported by the NTS JOURNAAL (1966-10-25), which as such became an extension of it.

One day earlier, on the 24th of October, an agreement was signed by Frans Swarttouw and others to found the Europe Container Terminus (ECT)¹⁵⁸⁴. This enterprise needed promotion in order to execute its plans. It succeeded. In August 1967, the first container ship moored at the ECT at the Eemhaven, which was the ‘Atlantic Span’ of the Atlantic Container Line (ACL)¹⁵⁸⁵. Whereas containerships had visited Rotterdam already before, the real news for the JOURNAAL (NTS, 1967-09-05) was, the ride of the first container train (from the Margriethaven).

Containerisation was also discussed in television programmes. One of the first was HIER EN NU (NCRV, 1967-10-10), which addressed the need for innovation, but also its consequences for employment, since it put existing labour structures under pressure¹⁵⁸⁶. That was also recognised by the elaborate AVRO-documentary VRACHT IN BLIK; GROEI CONTAINERVERVOER (“Canned Freight; Growth of Container Transport”, Philip Bolhuis, 1969-03-03). It briefly draws the history of containerisation: it got a major impetus in the 1950s through the efforts of the American entrepreneur Malcom McLean (the founder of Sea-Land)¹⁵⁸⁷. Transport through standardised steel containers turned out to be efficient, but it demanded high investments, and

be possible that some reports have been lost, which have therefore been omitted in my text. On the other hand, not all the preserved material has actually been broadcast, but only some excerpts, which is not always exactly clear. Furthermore, live-broadcasting has often not been registered, which include certain introductory comments and concluding remarks, and (possibly) certain studio discussions. I have tried to keep these complications into account, and I do not expect that eventual omissions in this respect won’t make substantial changes in the general picture that I have drawn.

¹⁵⁷⁹ Kingma, 2002.

¹⁵⁸⁰ See also: Van der Velden, 2005: 20.

¹⁵⁸¹ Dierikx, 2005.

¹⁵⁸² E.g. the documentary RIDDERS VAN DE GROTE WEG (“Knights of the Big Road”, KRO, 1966-03-08). Among various modes of transport it showed containers being loaded on board of the British ship ‘Pool Fisher’ in Rotterdam; it is followed on its way to England, where the containers are transhipped to trucks.

¹⁵⁸³ Van Driel & De Goey in: Kingma, 2005; see also: Lintsen, 2002.

¹⁵⁸⁴ Established by Quick Dispatch, Thomsen, Müller-Progress, PHM, NS; Van de Laar (2000: 515) emphasises the active role played by F. Posthuma (*Gemeentelijk Havenbedrijf*) in the foundation of ECT.

¹⁵⁸⁵ www.ect.nl/ ‘History ECT’ (website visited: 2006-04-03). The ACL was established as a joint-venture, in which the HAL, for example, held a share of 20% (Van de Laar, 2000: 515).

¹⁵⁸⁶ Cf. TECHNIEK, JE VRIEND OF JE VIJAND (“Technology, Your Friend or Enemy”, AVRO, 1968-01-20). The title is rhetorical; this impressionist documentary actually highlights world-wide technological achievements, like automated production processes, truck and aeroplane developments, traffic monitoring systems, the state of the art of monorail and metro engineering (with test rides in Rotterdam), and container transshipment in Rotterdam.

¹⁵⁸⁷ Cf. De Goey, 2005: 53-54.

only in the 1960s it became profitable. It caused a fierce fight in America between employers and employees, who feared unemployment.

Journalist Frans van Houtert shows the situation in New York – ‘the container capital of the world’. He visits the office of the Atlantic Container Line, with large panels and computers to manage the operations; after all it had been the development of new communication technology that enabled container transportation¹⁵⁸⁸. Transportation by aeroplane is addressed too, but it requires specific containers. It is mentioned that it takes only seven hours to fly goods from New York to Amsterdam’s Schiphol Airport, and seven days to ship them to the port of Rotterdam. Air cargo, it is predicted, might therefore increase in this way, but for now it is shipping that is most important¹⁵⁸⁹.

Van Houtert leaves New York and arrives at ECT in Rotterdam, which is the largest container terminal of Europe. Eighty percent of the containers delivered here have their eventual destination abroad. The film shows in detail the work that is carried out. A crane driver is asked how many people are involved with unloading a container ship. The answer is fifteen, against one-hundred-twenty for the same freight in the traditional way; however, he adds that behind the scenes many other people are needed to enable this, for example regarding container transport by rail. This means that there is still a lack of personnel. The documentary finishes with the remark that the prospects for the Netherlands are promising.

The interrelated transportation modes strengthened the development of a new overall system of international logistics and economic progress. It is reflected by promotional films of other companies made in collaboration with ECT, such as CONTAINER UMSCHLAG MIT TECHNIK VON SIEMENS (Siemens-Filminformation, see: ECT), on the production and use of automatic systems for container handling, and FOCUS ON DAF-TRUCKS (DAF, see: ECT), in which trucks are used for container transport by road. The container connected different industries, driven by a common attractor, which was articulated by film. As such, film was part of this complex system, as an aspect of industrial production, and driven by the same attractors.

Swarttouw, supported by the Rotterdamsche Lloyd (a.o.), attracted large container companies to Rotterdam¹⁵⁹⁰. He turned ECT not only into Europe’s largest, but also its most innovative container terminal. While in the USA containers were stored on trailers, ECT developed a method for stacking (Kingma, 2005). ECT was able to maintain its position since Swarttouw had reinvested the profits¹⁵⁹¹. The developments went fast. By 1968, the port of Rotterdam handled around 65,000 containers. Ten years later, this was already more than a million, and it would continue to grow¹⁵⁹². To that end, Swarttouw conducted a sophisticated media campaign, which was produced by Albert Tromp and his company All Art. He designed the company’s typography, created its publications, organised its marketing and produced various films, which were made together with cinematographer Eddy van der Enden¹⁵⁹³. In one of these promotion films, Rotterdam is called a ‘point of impact’, which is also the film’s title. It refers first of all to the ECT headquarters: three large buildings, built in 1968 by Hugh Maaskant¹⁵⁹⁴. This complex, including the ‘control terminal’, is an architecture of connections. It links up with the container terminals, shown in the next shots, which exemplify rationalist planning and logistics. The terminals are connected to the mainland by railway and highway; impressive aerial

¹⁵⁸⁸ Cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 514.

¹⁵⁸⁹ This is also addressed in RIDDERS VAN DE GROTE WEG (KRO, 1966-03-08).

¹⁵⁹⁰ On the 1st of January 1969, the *Rotterdamsche Lloyd* had become the main shareholder of ECT.

¹⁵⁹¹ Dierikx, 2005.

¹⁵⁹² By 1971: 250,000 containers (= TEU). By 1986: 2 million. ‘1966 - today: The arrival of the container’ (2006-04-03). www.portofrotterdam.com/organizations/UK/CompanyInformation/History/1966-today.asp?ComponentID=55150&SourcePageID=60029

¹⁵⁹³ Information by Van der Enden in an interview with FP, 2008-12-19.

¹⁵⁹⁴ Provoost (2003); see also: www.bonas.nl (2007-03-24); address: Margriethaven, Rotterdam; Reeweg 25, Rotterdam.

shots show junction Kleinpolderplein to underscore that Rotterdam is a major hub. Such an environment has given rise to an industrial landscape and skyline of, what we may call, 'process architecture'¹⁵⁹⁵. The container terminals are a city in themselves, almost devoid of people, consisting just of modular spaces as envisioned only by the most radical modern architects of the 1920s.

striking development I – the metal and harbour strike of 1970

The container affected logistics, the organisation of labour, and the industry. In 1970, for example, the WILTON-FIJENOORD JOURNAAL reported that the yard received a commission to extend seven ships. Each was cut in two pieces, and a large section was inserted. Things were done quickly, which was emphasised by fast-motion images and slapstick music. With RDM it also built three new containerships for 'Sea-Land'. 'Yes, we had plenty of work in the machine factories, but to persevere, people must be there. In order to face up the burdensome lack of personnel, Wilton-Fijenoord has, for the first time in its existence, employed the woman in professions that were previously exercised by men only. To contract female crane drivers was a national scoop'¹⁵⁹⁶. There are shots of women driving cranes. The commentator says that they needed little time for orientation, and 'now they are fully accepted by their male colleagues' – in the canteen they play cards together. Not mentioned was the fact that Wilton-Fijenoord made also use of brokers.

By 1970, an estimated six-hundred brokers operated in the port area. They had contracted about 7,000 workers, who received 25 guilders extra per week¹⁵⁹⁷. Permanent workers began to protest against it (*¹⁵⁹⁸). After three weeks, on the morning of Tuesday the 25th of August, the workers council of Wilton-Fijenoord blamed the directors' evasion of the collective labour agreement¹⁵⁹⁹. About 3,000 workers of the yard in Schiedam began to strike. It was not mentioned by the WILTON-FIJENOORD JOURNAAL. The report just pointed to the low attendance for the workers' council election, to stress that workers complain instead of exercising their formal power. However, workers of other yards joined the strike (*¹⁶⁰⁰), next to dockworkers of *Thomsens Havenbedrijf*. The latter was the main harbour company in Rotterdam, and actively involved with the container terminals. On the 28th of August, the union of transport personnel (NBV) expressed its claims to the employers.

The strike grew day by day. Aerial shots in the JOURNAAL (1970-08-28) emphasised that the whole port was out of order, while in Amsterdam workers started to strike as well (*¹⁶⁰¹). After five days, 20,000 metal workers and 14,000 dockworkers were striking in Rotterdam¹⁶⁰². It was again shown by aerial shots of Hook of Holland where ships waited to enter the port (*¹⁶⁰³). While negotiations went on, a protest meeting took place at Schouwburgplein, where speeches were held to address the demands of the strikers (*¹⁶⁰⁴). After a week, on the 1st of September, there were still strong discussions between the union and the employers, but the next day the employers association *Scheepvaart Vereniging Zuid* (SVZ) agreed that workers would get 25

¹⁵⁹⁵ It is not just a matter of logistics, but also of industrial architecture. In the same perspective, Kingma (2005) has argued to consider the, until now, underexposed history of cranes in terms of engineering and design.

¹⁵⁹⁶ Original quote: 'Ja, wij hadden volop werk in de machinefabrieken, maar om dit te kunnen volhouden moeten er mensen zijn. Om het hoofd te kunnen bieden aan een nijpend personeelsgebrek heeft Wilton-Fijenoord, voor het eerst in haar bestaan, de vrouw ingeschakeld in beroepen die voorheen slechts door mannen werden uitgeoefend. Het aannemen van kraanrijdsters betekende een landelijke primeur.'

¹⁵⁹⁷ Nas, 2000. In 2002 the rate between Euro and Guilder was 1: 2.2.

¹⁵⁹⁸ NOS-JOURNAAL, 1970-08-02.

¹⁵⁹⁹ This CAO was made in February. The use of brokers also caused protests at W-F in 1965. See: Nas, 2000.

¹⁶⁰⁰ Of RDM and *Nieuwe Waterweg N.V.*; JOURNAAL (NOS, 1970-08-26); of Thomsens in the night of 1970-08-27.

¹⁶⁰¹ JOURNAAL (1970-08-29).

¹⁶⁰² Nas, 2000.

¹⁶⁰³ JOURNAAL (NOS, 1970-08-31); strikes at shipyards in Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Flushing.

¹⁶⁰⁴ NOS JOURNAAL and NCRV's HIER EN NU, 1970-08-31.

guilders extra per week. However, it was gross and the workers wanted it nett. The strikers held a protest march through the city centre (*¹⁶⁰⁵). Due to earlier agreements, the union could not support this demand and withdrew. The workers sought for others to lead the strike and found the small communist group 'KEN (ml)'¹⁶⁰⁶. It founded the committee *Arbeidersmacht* ("Workers Power"). KEN-member Wouter ter Braake, only twenty years old, became its spokesman, since he had some experience as such due to his involvement with resident actions in Het Oude Westen earlier that year¹⁶⁰⁷.

Instead of 25 guilders, *Arbeidersmacht* suddenly demanded 75 guilders extra. It was made clear in a massive demonstration and through television reports (*¹⁶⁰⁸). HIER EN NU (NCRV, 1970-09-04) showed strikers gathering in district Feijenoord before marching through the Maastunnel. It became a symbolic event: one moved from Rotterdam Zuid, the labour district, to the SVZ building (1920-1922, arch. W. Kromhout). The tunnel became a gateway for social-economic appropriation, and literally a communication channel to transmit the message *25 nee, 75 ja*. Media reporting on it functioned as 'amplifiers', as extensions of the megaphones that became typical for the protests of the 1970s. When the crowd arrived at SVZ, people sat down on the road and read their claims. A delegation of three was admitted access to the building. The negotiations resulted in an offer of 25 guilders nett and 100 guilders twice incidentally¹⁶⁰⁹. It was accepted by a number of metal workers¹⁶¹⁰. A meeting was held at the Rivierahal of Blijdorp Zoo, which was similarly turned into a medium, and reinforced as such by the NOS JOURNAAL (1970-09-05) that reported on it. The majority of the workers decided to continue the strike. Interestingly to note, this decision was supported by 83% of their wives¹⁶¹¹.

The JOURNAAL (1970-09-07), next to HIER EN NU and ACHTER HET NIEUWS, showed groups of strikers posting in front of firms; those who were willing to work again were hooted. The next day KRO's BRANDPUNT (1970-09-08) also showed protest actions, while Mayor Thomassen gave his comments¹⁶¹². His party PvdA feared that too much radicalism would alienate the electorate from the social-democratic ideas. He emphasised that the strike was led by Maoists, who got their instructions from Albania. Certain journalists, among them from the *Rotterdams Nieuwsblad*, also expressed such views. Although there might have been connections with Albania and China indeed, such imputations actually had a counter effect, since it only raised the interest in the protests, especially among students. Moreover, the attitude of the press became even subject of a forum discussion between press and dockworkers, which was broadcast by NCRV¹⁶¹³. It is an instance of the delicate role of media, and it exemplifies a complex dynamic of, as Luhmann (2000) would have it, first- and second-order observations, with the observer being observed, which is observed again.

Meanwhile the employers offered 37,50 guilders. The JOURNAAL (1970-09-09) showed *Arbeidersmacht* discussing it internally. The workers decided to continue the strike and their

¹⁶⁰⁵ JOURNAAL (NOS, 1970-09-02): demonstrations of dockworkers at the *Holland America Line* in Rotterdam.

¹⁶⁰⁶ i.e. *Kommunistische Eenheidsbeweging Nederland – Marxistisch-Leninistisch*. It had emerged as a splinter from the *Communistische Partij Nederland* (CPN) shortly before. Its involvement with the strike has been told by Ter Braake in the series *ANDERE TIJDEN* (VPRO-tv/website, 2001 – reporter Karin van den Born). Important figures, next to Ter Braake and behind the scenes, were Nico Schrevel and Daan Monjé (Meeus, 1999). Monjé, according to Van den Born, used his contacts with student organisations to set up collections; he coordinated food supplies and printing matter.

¹⁶⁰⁷ Ter Braake in the television programme *VERGETEN VERHALEN: HAVENSTAKING 1970* (2005, Harm Korst).

¹⁶⁰⁸ JOURNAAL (NOS, 1970-09-03).

¹⁶⁰⁹ Nas (2000).

¹⁶¹⁰ Dick Nas (2000) mentions the 4th of September as the official end of the strike in the metal industry.

¹⁶¹¹ Source: Marianne van Es & Wilbert Dijkers, 1970; edited reprint of questionnaire in: Van der Velden, 1970: 39.

¹⁶¹² For the (social-democratic) ideas of Thomassen, see also the extensive television interview: *MARKANT: WIM THOMASSEN* (NOS, 1979-10-04), which was broadcast when another major strike took place (see ch. 14 § 3).

¹⁶¹³ HIER EN NU (1970-09-12). The discussion was organised by 'Universitair Instituut Vormingswerk Bedrijfsleven'.

wives supported them behind the scenes¹⁶¹⁴. But, in the end, *Arbeidersmacht* could not reach an agreement. The *Communistische Partij Nederland* (CPN), which hitherto had stayed at a distance, finally got involved in the person of Fré Meis. He managed to increase the wages with 50 guilders, as announced by SVZ-chairman Jan Backx in the NOS JOURNAAL (1970-09-14¹⁶¹⁵). Strikers gathered at Odeon to discuss it. The next day, at another meeting in the Rivièrahal, *Arbeidersmacht* proposed to continue the strike, but it had come to an end (*¹⁶¹⁶).

The strike lasted for three weeks and with 35,000 participants it was the biggest in Rotterdam in the second half of the 20th century¹⁶¹⁷. In an evaluation of the events, *Arbeidersmacht* criticised the attitude of the media, *including* the NOS JOURNAAL. Considering the actual reports of the NOS, and several other broadcasters too, one may wonder if the strike could have been continued for such a long period without media attention. The media enabled a particular discourse to take place, which helped to delineate the development possibilities. This continued during the following years.

Within the overall social-economic development, the policy of gradually growing wages was on its return. However, in December 1970, wages were frozen by the government to control inflation¹⁶¹⁸. It caused protests all over the country (*¹⁶¹⁹). On a Friday (1970-12-11), the JOURNAAL announced that a brief general strike would take place next Tuesday – it was valuable publicity, and a matter of ‘projective reflexivity’. That Tuesday (1970-12-15), the JOURNAAL spent much attention to the ‘one hour strike’, with shots of striking television workers in Hilversum (apparently not the cameramen), next to shots of still public transport in Rotterdam, and a quiet port (cf. KRO’s BRANDPUNT). The government had to undo its measures, while it had unintentionally strengthened the will to protest. More strikes followed. On the 31st of January (1971), the JOURNAAL announced a strike of tug boat workers the next day. The announcement was again an instance of television being an active force in the carrying out of the strike (*¹⁶²⁰).

In their turn, the strikes reinforced the connection between Rotterdam and Hilversum, and hence the position of Pim Korver as a local correspondent. This became especially clear in 1972, when a wave of protests took place. It started with the *Nederlands Vakverbond* (NVV) distributing a call for a 24-hour strike, which Korver reported (JOURNAAL, 1972-02-03). The next day Van Rhijn filmed the strike at Wilton-Fijenoord, while Korver showed workers of RDM playing football¹⁶²¹. The ‘24-hour strike’, would finally last for more than two weeks (*¹⁶²²).

¹⁶¹⁴ An uncredited factor might have been the fact that Feyenoord then played the finals of the world cup football: on the 26th of August against Estudiantes de la Plata, in Argentina (2-2), and on the 9th of September the return match in Rotterdam (1-0). It was party time, while the winning mood might have strengthened the self-esteem of the workers.

¹⁶¹⁵ Backx was the director of *Thomsens Havenbedrijf*, which played a major role at the beginning of the strike. See also: Van den Born, 2001.

¹⁶¹⁶ At Odeon, Leen van Os, leader of the tug-boat strikers, gave a speech in order to motivate the workers to continue to strike (JOURNAAL, 1970-09-14). Rivièrahal: speech by Wouter ter Braake, JOURNAAL (NOS, 1970-09-15). KRO’s BRANDPUNT would broadcast a last report in connection to the strike on 1970-10-27.

¹⁶¹⁷ Cf. VERGETEN VERHALEN: HAVENSTAKING VAN 1970 (Harm Korst, TV Rijnmond, 2005-11-29).

¹⁶¹⁸ See: www.vakbondshistorie.nl (2010-02-02); www.parlement.com/9291000/modules/g09er8v0 (2010-02-02)

¹⁶¹⁹ JOURNAAL (NOS, 1970-12-11), e.g. a strike at Cincinnatti in Vlaardingen and at Wilton-Feijenoord, Schiedam.

¹⁶²⁰ The next day the JOURNAAL (NOS, 1971-02-01) broadcast a speech by Hulsker for tugboat personnel, after employers made summary proceedings against the unions. Tugboats are kept aside, while the 165 metre MS Krugerland moors by itself. Cf. HIER EN NU (NCRV, 1971-02-01; ACHTER HET NIEUWS, 1971-02-03). The strike continued till February the 5th, with daily reports by the JOURNAAL. Afterwards the situation remained agitated (NOS, 1971-03-01 and 1971-03-12), and strikes in other branches began as well, at Chrysler Rotterdam: JOURNAAL (NOS, 1971-04-01) and at dredging companies: JOURNAAL (NOS, 1971-04-13). For a year things stayed quiet, but discontent remained; the media kept reporting on it and tried to frame the reasons: LINKERWANG – RECHTERWANG: ROTTERDAMSE HAVENSTAKING EN ARBEIDSETHIEK (IKOR, 1971-06-13).

¹⁶²¹ In Amsterdam workers were striking too at NDSM, cf. ACHTER HET NIEUWS (VARA, 1972-02-04), which also showed strikers at Verolme (and Verschure in Amsterdam).

¹⁶²² JOURNAAL (NOS, 1972-02-07); see also: JOURNAAL (NOS, 1972-02-10, 1972-02-14; 1972-02-16; 1972-02-21). In the next years more strikes would follow, see e.g. JOURNAAL (NOS, 1973-03-22 = metal industry; 1973-06-09 = port).

Others became involved too, like the tug-boat workers of Smit. At the same time, Korver also made promotional films for Smit and other companies, like SKILL AGAINST PERIL (1971, Korver) and THE SMIT LLOYD STORY (1974, Korver)¹⁶²³. Whereas the protest actions damaged Smit's image, film was used to show its reliability.

The strike affected other film productions too. The young filmmaker Ferri Rontelap, for example, took the issue of a strike as a subject for his fiction short VERWACHTINGEN (1971) – which was shown at Film International: a husband and wife work for the same firm; he takes part in a strike and she does not, which causes tensions between them.

The strike can be framed within a much broader social-cultural tendency. Historian Van der Velden relates the strike to a general protest movement (*¹⁶²⁴). Earlier that year, residents of Het Oude Westen had protested against their abominable housing conditions, among them metal worker Gerrit Sterkman, and the spokesman of the strike and 'KEN (ml)' member Wouter ter Braake¹⁶²⁵. They gathered in neighbourhood centre Odeon, which also played a role in the harbour strike. The communist splinter party 'KEN (ml)', quickly grew and unexpectedly became a success¹⁶²⁶. It was initially helped by the Dutch central intelligence agency (BVD); to divide and rule, it infiltrated in communist parties – another example is the Maoist *Rode Jeugd*, which was responsible for a – thwarted – bomb attack on the Bank of America in Rotterdam; the bomb was eventually defused (JOURNAAL, NOS, 1972-10-16)¹⁶²⁷. Although this party got dissolved, the BVD lost its control over the 'KEN (ml)', after the board discovered the infiltration.

Finally the *Socialistische Partij* (SP) emerged out of the 'Ken (ml)', in 1972. It paid much attention to publicity, which is exemplified by the film SOCIALISTIESE PARTIJ (1976, SP). It promoted its activities, like those of *Arbeidersmacht*, which the SP had extended to other cities too. Remi Poppe and the later SP-leader Jan Marijnissen also addressed the pollution in the port. Since the SP was part of a broad critical movement, it enabled others to make films as well, by borrowing its equipment. In this way, Bob Visser made the subversive essay J.A. DEELDER'S STADSGEZICHT (1977)¹⁶²⁸.

§ 3. container contained II – the choreography of modular spaces

In the television reports on the strike of 1970, ECT was not mentioned. Strictly speaking, the firm was not involved in it, but the events cannot be disconnected from containerisation handling. Rather, Frans Swarttouw and the ECT knew how and when to approach the media, and to provide facilitary conditions to them. In this way it appeared only positively in various reports¹⁶²⁹.

ECT also commissioned films itself, like MOVE (1970, Jan Wybe van Dijk). This 'film impression of ECT', had no voice-over; it was an artistic essay, a choreography of containers, accompanied by experimental sound¹⁶³⁰. Director Van Dijk contributed to the music score by playing flute, giving the film an atmospheric, dreamlike touch. It is reinforced by some long takes at twilight that render objects into mere shapes. The film is characterised by strong compositions

¹⁶²³ Next to that, Korver also made news reports on Smit such as the towing of an oil-rig (JOURNAAL, 1975-11-05).

¹⁶²⁴ As such one can also consider, for example, a one-hour strike against air pollution in the Rijnmond area, at the yard of Gusto in Schiedam (NOS JOURNAAL, 1971-09-21). Another example is the refusal of dockworkers in Rotterdam and the labour union NVV to unload the copper transport of the Chilean ship Birte Oldendorff; the Chilean division of this US mining company had been nationalised by Allende, but the US headquarters wanted to have the ship load attached (NOS JOURNAAL, 1972-10-16) – both reports by J. van Rhijn. See also: IISG, arch. Vervoersbond NVV, nr. 1124.

¹⁶²⁵ Regarding Sterkman, see: Van der Velden, 2000: 157)

¹⁶²⁶ Meeus, 1999.

¹⁶²⁷ Van Nimwegen, 2007: 37.

¹⁶²⁸ Mentioned by Bob Visser in an introduction to his film, on the occasion of the presentation of the book *Dromen van een metropool* (Van Ulzen, 2007) at bookstore Donner, Rotterdam (2007-02-09). Visser also made spots for the SP, see: Schmidt, 1978: 19.

¹⁶²⁹ JOURNAAL (NOS, 1970-04-27), on the occasion of the official opening of the container harbour by Princess Margriet; Polygoon e.g. KANGEROESCHIP TILLIE LYKES (1974). Documentaries, e.g. WEET JE WEL (2) DE ROTTERDAMSE HAVEN (AVRO, 1975-12-06), with container transshipment and aerial shots of the terminal.

¹⁶³⁰ By Max Berg and Peter Vink and music by Enrico Neckheim.

and quiet camera movements that show container ships and cranes installing the containers on 'automatic guided vehicles'. At a certain moment a minibus appears, shot from above, and men get out: the crane drivers. One of them is followed while he climbs a staircase. It is a rare instance of human presence, since the whole area appears like a moving sculpture of ships, cranes, containers and trucks. Most images are crane shots (literally), which show the subject from a distance. The end is again a composition at twilight. The film, articulating sense perception, is a matter of corporate branding. It deals with container transshipment in aesthetic terms, to enhance the image of ECT, and to set a discourse away from social-economic conditions.

Besides such an impressionist film, ECT also commissioned films with outspoken acquisitional aims, like POINT OF IMPACT (1970s, ECT – All Art Productions)¹⁶³¹. But notwithstanding its conventional voice-over providing business information, this film had also an obvious artistic ambition. It starts with four women dancing on a beach, which is interchanged by shots of containers, to emphasise the choreographical aspect of container handling. The dancers play with a big ball that is thrown high in the air. In the next shot it falls down on the map of Europe to indicate Rotterdam – the 'point of impact'. ECT presented itself, through Rotterdam, as the spider in a web of modern infrastructure, including information networks. A woman sits behind a computer. The narrator tells: 'Inside the peace of ECT's control terminal, which sends the containers, one can easily dream of countries and places ['Italy' appears on the computer screen] where trains and trucks take or bring the containers'¹⁶³². At the Plaza San Marco in Venice, dancers appear again with the ball, to indicate another 'point of impact'. Similarly, the woman visits Germany and France. At the end the dance reaches its climax. Crane drivers and engineers join the dancers in their geometrical choreography amidst containers, juggling with the 'point of impact'. This playful presentation was again a deliberate attempt to distract the attention from the political juggling that continued throughout the 1970s (*¹⁶³³).

striking development II – the February strike of 1977

In the 1970s, labour in the Netherlands had become relatively expensive and companies moved to third-world countries. Unemployment was the result, which caused worry among the unions and the government. To avoid a recession, the government moderated the wage growth in 1976. It temporarily did not allow the *automatische prijscompensatie*, which otherwise offered workers a compensation for inflation. A short strike took place in May 1976. It was not reported by the JOURNAAL, but only by the VARA, which maintained close connections with the PvdA in the bench of the Mayor and Aldermen¹⁶³⁴. Six weeks later, the strike got a follow up, by crane drivers and tugboat workers, which was reported again by VARA, and by the JOURNAAL (1976-07-01). In the second half of 1976, modest compensations were accepted again.

Early 1977 the national employers association VNO wanted to get rid of the *automatische prijscompensatie* altogether. It upset the trade-unions, which therefore prepared actions since there was enough willingness to protest in the metal industry and the port of Rotterdam¹⁶³⁵. Even the employees in the oil industry, in particular those of ICI Holland and Cyanamid in the Botlek area, which had no tradition of protesting, were willing to participate,

¹⁶³¹ Other examples are STRONG LINKS and THE THIRD WAY (on container transport over the Rhine to Switzerland).

¹⁶³² 'Binnen in de rust van ECT's control terminal, waar de containers worden aangeleverd of afgehaald, kun je makkelijk dromen van landen of plaatsen, waar treinen of trucks de containers halen of brengen.'

¹⁶³³ After the February strike of 1972 there were, for example, a couple of spontaneous protest actions, like in February 1973, when a general strike took place in the Dutch colony Suriname and solidarity demonstrations took place in Rotterdam (JOURNAAL (NOS, 1973-02-17), and one month later, with a strike in the metal industry, in particular at RDM (JOURNAAL (NOS, 1973-03-22).

¹⁶³⁴ VARA's ACHTER HET NIEUWS, 1976-05-20; the next one referred to is 1976-07-01.

¹⁶³⁵ VNO = *Vereniging van Nederlandse Ondernemingen*. The unions wanted repair of the *automatische prijscompensatie*, a general wage increase of 2%, and to use profits for more employment (Scheele, 2006).

including the process-operators, who knew how to stop the processes¹⁶³⁶. It was an important sign to the employers that even employees in the labour extensive and capital intensive petrochemical industry were willing to strike, which would quickly result in high losses.

From the 7th of February, the unions put down different branches according to a national 'spearhead strategy'. After several reports on television about the negotiations, the JOURNAAL (1977-02-07) showed union members distributing pamphlets calling for strike, which the JOURNAAL thus amplified. That night VARA's ACHTER HET NIEUWS showed striking dockworkers and a meeting with their leader Nico Sannes: due to its economic interests the port of Rotterdam was a spearhead. Moreover, the dockworkers were ready to strike, which motivated others. Another spearhead was the public transport in the main cities (JOURNAAL, 1977-02-08). This spearhead strategy was also a media strategy, in which television brought the necessary publicity. On the third day, the JOURNAAL (1977-02-09) reported actions all over the country; in Rotterdam the workers of the petrochemical industry ICI put down the work indeed.

On the 10th of February, the employers association VNO (i.e. Chris van Veen) negotiated with the unions of NVV (i.e. Wim Kok). A preliminary agreement was made, which was discussed internally by both parties (*¹⁶³⁷). Two days later, after a session of twenty hours, when the meeting was postponed in the late morning, the JOURNAAL took the opportunity to approach the leaders. Kok explained that besides the *prijscompensatie*, they agreed upon profit returns for the workers and their participation in decisions that would affect their jobs. Van Veen was asked if he had lost, but he said that Minister Boersma had provided the missing money (*¹⁶³⁸).

Although the *prijscompensatie* had thus been guaranteed for 1977, the strike went on for the other claims, supported by 500,000 people across the country. Even the graphic industry went on strike, which prevented newspapers from being issued. This absence was compensated by radio and television that together broadcast more than one hundred items on the national strike¹⁶³⁹. Polygoon gave summaries of what happened, explaining the spearhead strategy of the unions¹⁶⁴⁰. They also addressed the legal objection against the food industry to strike. In the second week, Polygoon showed a march in Rotterdam (16th of February), with 25,000 people marching to the Coolsingel¹⁶⁴¹. In front of the town hall, union chairman Kok emphasised that not only compensation was needed, but a true increase of wages. The march was also filmed by the *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam*, with shots of Mayor André van der Louw and Alderman Wim van der Have¹⁶⁴². While the main function of the archive was to preserve documents, the thing to be preserved here was thought to be the event, as a live manifest. It is a particular take on media and its subject, which is history.

An impasse followed (*¹⁶⁴³). At a moment that little news was to be reported, cameraman Pim Korver made a remarkable, dramatic shot; moving by boat through the port he shot a desolate, immobile industrial landscape (JOURNAAL, 1977-02-21). On Friday the 25th of February, the JOURNAAL finally reported on agreements, which was told to the dockworkers by an emotional union leader Piet van Keulen, in the rain, in the Sparta football stadium¹⁶⁴⁴. He

¹⁶³⁶ Scheele, 2006. The process operators worked in four shifts (6 hours p/d, 7 days p/w), which meant that they worked 42 hours per week. They complained that their biological rhythm got disturbed by irregular working hours, which also affected their leisure time, while they had also little free days in the weekend. Instead, they wanted a five-shift service (*vijfploegendienst*), which would reduce their week to 33.6 hours, with more free days in the weekend.

¹⁶³⁷ See: JOURNAAL (NOS, 1977-02-10 and 1977-02-11), interviews with Wim Kok and Van Veen.

¹⁶³⁸ Cf. JOURNAAL (NOS, 1977-02-14).

¹⁶³⁹ Information extracted from the database of Beeld & Geluid, 2006.

¹⁶⁴⁰ STAKINGSACTIES OP VELE PLAATSEN (Polygoon, 1977-week08).

¹⁶⁴¹ HAVEN- EN BOUWSTAKINGEN DUREN VOORT, SOLIDARITEITSMARS IN ROTTERDAM (Polygoon, 1977-week09)

¹⁶⁴² I.e. DEMONSTRATIEVE STAKINGSOPTOCHT (1977, Max van Essen); cf. 8mm version, shot by various people (anon.). They walked from Marconiplein, along the Maastunnel and through the Nieuwe Binnenweg to the Coolsingel.

¹⁶⁴³ The union CNV was willing to end the strike (JOURNAAL, NOS, 1977-02-19), but the FNV wanted to continue (JOURNAAL, 1977-02-21).

¹⁶⁴⁴ Piet van Keulen was chairman of the *bedrijfsgroep havens, vervoersfederatie NVV (FNV)*.

explained that after a long night of discussions, agreements were made concerning the *automatische prijscompensatie*, initial wage increase (1.8%), and the possibility for early retirement at the age of 63¹⁶⁴⁵. After his speech, the workers, sitting with red flags on the tribune, began to sing the ‘International’, with Van Keulen joining them. Reporter Frits Bom explained that Minister Boersma took the financial responsibility for early retirement, after Prime Minister Den Uyl had been consulted that night¹⁶⁴⁶. On Monday work began again, as the NOS reported.

§ 4. container contained III – the peace treaty

The February strike caused film director Rudolf van den Berg and producer Ireen van Ditshuyzen to make the documentary *DE VREDE VAN ROTTERDAM* (“The Peace Treaty of Rotterdam”, VPRO 1977-11-06). The main characters are the ECT-president Frans Swarttouw, the chairman of the employers’ association SVZ, Ludo Pieters, and crane driver Willem Baris. Much information is left implicit; the film builds on previous news reports, and atmospheres. Van den Berg opens up a space for individual motivations. In the style of the VPRO-school, he asks questions casually, with the camera following gestures and facial expressions, often in close-up, while keeping an eye on the décor too¹⁶⁴⁷.

First shown is the control chamber of the *Havendienst*, followed by a container ship at the Nieuwe Waterweg. Van den Berg visits Swarttouw at home, who sits in an easy-chair, while being filmed from the back. Next to him are his wife, daughter and dog. Van den Berg asks offscreen if the dog accepts Swarttouw’s leadership. His wife confirms it. While Swarttouw attends a meeting of the SVZ, as a member of the board, a voice-over tells that in 1889 the first big strike took place in the port when complaining workers were replaced by countrymen. In the 1910s, workers protested against the introduction of the grain elevator that caused unemployment. However, socialist Domela Nieuwenhuis argued that machines had to be used to improve conditions, and that workers needed to be organised. In response to this red force, the employers founded the SVZ. In the meantime we see the meeting, chaired by Ludo Pieters.

Pieters is subsequently followed home. Van den Berg asks if he had aspired to this function. He replies that it is not something to be aspired to; there is always struggle, since there are too many interests. As Pieters is also chairman of the “Rotterdam Arts Council” (RKS), the subject turns to arts. Pieters writes poems himself. Van den Berg finds them romantic. Pieters recalls that writer Gerard Reve, who shortly lived with his family, found him too leftist.

In the car Van den Berg asks Swarttouw, who is from a dynasty of harbour entrepreneurs, about authority. Swarttouw is glad that management has been professionalised. His name, he thinks, has helped him at first, but now his authority is based on prestige. Van den Berg asks if he is a ‘harbour baron’. In some sense, he says, but without hereditary possessions. Next is a quiet sequence of containership ‘Tokyo Express’, with the camera placed on it. The ship enters the port and moors. Containers are handled. Crane driver Willem Baris tranships twenty containers per hour at the ‘fully continuous’ terminal of Unit Centre. At home, next to his wife and child, he tells that he was previously a dockworker carrying loads on his back; now he works with the computer and his head. Van den Berg asks if he still makes friends, which is not so; he sits alone in a cabin whereas before he worked with others with whom he discussed personal problems. Van den Berg asks ‘Are you average?’ His wife says that *Jantje Modaal* earns 26,000 guilders a year, while he earns 40,000. ‘In that case’, Baris says, ‘I move in the direction of the VVD’ [conservative liberals]. As he hears that Pieters votes PvdA he says: ‘So he votes red, well, that surprises me.’

¹⁶⁴⁵ In the following decades the *automatische prijscompensatie* would nevertheless disappear from most CAOs.

¹⁶⁴⁶ According to Van Hasselt (*ANDERE TIJDEN*, VPRO, 2004), Minister Boersma had a meeting with NVV chairman Kok. Afterwards, while going home, he decided to go to The Hague, to discuss the crisis with Prime Minister Den Uyl. He improvised to co-finance an experiment for ‘early retirement’ (VUT) – like in the building industry.

¹⁶⁴⁷ Cinematography by Jochgem van Dijk and Jules van den Steenhoven.

While moving with a boat through the port, Pieters says that many dockworkers have become programmers and process controllers. Talking about power, he explains his dilemmas; as a member of the PvdA he agrees with distributing wealth, but he recognises that high taxes withhold foreign investors. Pieters doubts if he has power, but at least he has many relations. A broad network can be drawn indeed. With Pieters being a member of the PvdA, links existed with the Mayor and Aldermen, and the national government. After this documentary was produced, furthermore, VPRO's commissioning editor Hans Keller became the director of the RKS¹⁶⁴⁸.

The film returns to Swarttouw. He says that the works council can definitely influence the firm's policy; a manager has to give account to the workers too. He states that too much power leads to nothing, but control in advance is also no good, as it obstructs quick decisions. He wants to pay responsibility afterwards. Meanwhile we see a meeting of the ECT works council. Van den Berg thinks that Swarttouw controls it, but he tells that there is too much opposition within it, also between unions (FNV and CNV). The council even refused to have the camera present that morning when the controversial topics were discussed. We hear a council member saying that they had reached the point where they had agreed upon filming until, and he puts a hand on the lens.

In the end, Pieters and Swarttouw visit a congress in Düsseldorf, to promote the port. It emphasises the connection between them, which is mediated by the film too. When they are asked about the future, Swarttouw says that the government should not push business to the point that it then needs to support it. This echoes the wish to abolish the *automatische prijscompensatie* as proposed by the Dutch employers association VNO (with Swarttouw as a director), which led the negotiations in 1977. Pieters (as a member of the coalition party PvdA) says that together they have to solve it. The film ends with Baris being wakened by his wife early in the morning.

Swarttouw considered himself left-liberal and a 'streetfighter' concerned with social issues¹⁶⁴⁹. ECT was presented as a progressive enterprise, for example by the film *PORTRAIT OF A YOUNG MAN (ECT, 1978)*¹⁶⁵⁰. It says that the success of ECT is the achievement of the employees, for whom the firm provides good facilities – illustrated by sports games – while they can participate in the works council. It also says that Rotterdammers are vital people who do not complain, but just work. That was wishful thinking.

striking development III – the harbour strike of 1979

The 'Peace Treaty' lasted two-and-a-half years, but it was never quiet (*¹⁶⁵¹). On Wednesday the 22nd of August 1979, a long lasting protest began, an 'ideal' wild strike, as Sjaak van der Velden has classified it (2000: 159). Things started when employees of Smit got their pay slips, which confirmed the new collective labour agreement. It did not match their demands of a wage increase of 30 guilders per week, 25 holidays per year and the possibility of retirement at 60¹⁶⁵². Since the FNV (former NVV) could not support these claims, workers anticipated a wild strike.

¹⁶⁴⁸ Within this network other connections were established. A month after this documentary was broadcast, the VPRO showed the television debut of Bob Visser, who was also linked to the RKS, and who had invited Hans Keller to come to Rotterdam and convinced him to broadcast his film (Visser in: Schmidt, 1978: 20). Visser would later make the film *KLASSESTRIJD* (1983), shot by Jules van den Steenhoven, who was a cameraman of *DE VREDE VAN ROTTERDAM*.

¹⁶⁴⁹ Dierikx, 2005.

¹⁶⁵⁰ It is actually a slide show on film, with only a moving dog of the security guards of ECT, by way of surprise.

¹⁶⁵¹ E.g. protests at plastics firm Ferro Holland (*JOURNAAL, NOS*, 1978-05-15+17), protests by civil servants (*TELEVIZIER*, 1978-12-07, *AVRO*), protests at the City Cleaning Department (*JOURNAAL*, 1978-12-08), and by bargemen concerning regulations to divide freight, with a tumultuous shipping-exchange and policemen protecting non-strikers (*JOURNAAL*, 1978-08-17, 1978-12-15, 1979-01-02+08+09), and a strike at Verolme (*JOURNAAL*, 1979-04-06 and 1979-06-12).

¹⁶⁵² The employees of Smit demanded a wage increase of 50 guilders. Hooiring e.a., 1979: 15, 18. Cf. www.rodemorgen.nl/krant/krantsel.htm 'Wat valt er nu te leren van de havenstaking van 1979?' (2006-04).

The next day 500 employees of Smit moved their tugs to the headquarters at the Willemskade¹⁶⁵³. The NOS was alert and sent out its cameramen: Drost to take images of Smit personnel, Koekoek of the harbour, and Korver, who had just completed another promotion film for Smit (*GIANT CARGO*, 1979), to shoot the port from the air, with ships at sea waiting to enter it. Another ‘developing composition’ began: a complex story told by various narrators¹⁶⁵⁴. It helped the protest to grow, even when criticised, as it was indeed the case with many of the newspapers¹⁶⁵⁵. But also through television, critiques were expressed. On Friday, *BRANDPUNT* invited FNV economist Drabbe, who had been furious when the strike had started. He warned that when the strike would rapidly spread and affect other sectors too, it would seriously harm the Dutch economy. During the television interview he had already calmed down, which those supporting the strike interpreted as a retreat¹⁶⁵⁶. Instead, the *Communistische Partij Nederland* (CPN) took a leading role¹⁶⁵⁷, and workers applauded communist Cor van der Zanden’s call to strike, which was broadcast by *TROS AKTUA* (1979-08-25).

The *JOURNAAL* (1979-08-25) reported that Smit brought sixteen strikers to court for a summary proceeding¹⁶⁵⁸. Two days later it showed strikers, in the rain, on their way to the court to hear the verdict: prohibition of a strike. But the sixteen men were held back by their colleagues¹⁶⁵⁹. The reports helped to mobilise workers from other sectors, especially the piece-goods branch. According to their leader Bertus van der Horst, the jobs were dangerous, exhausting and with great responsibility, particularly for the transshipment of heavy barrels and chemicals¹⁶⁶⁰. Moreover, the sector felt the pressure of the container. However, also the container sector was in turmoil, for the demand to replace a 4-shift by a 5-shift service (*vijfploegendienst*).

On Tuesday the 28th of August, 10,000 workers were striking. The *JOURNAAL* showed them marching towards the employers’ office SVZ where a delegation entered, while aerial shots showed the still port and ships at sea¹⁶⁶¹. *VARA* broadcast comments by Van der Zanden and other leaders, while FNV chairman Kok stated that the employers had been too passive¹⁶⁶². Images of the protest were followed by a long tracking shot along an empty quay with ‘frozen cranes’. It remained *VARA*’s only television report on the strike¹⁶⁶³. It simply avoided difficulties for its political backbone, the PvdA.

In the meantime, more groups had joined the strike. The communist party (CPN), together with the *Socialistische Partij* and others founded the *Gezamenlijk Actiecomitee*¹⁶⁶⁴. It included workers from each firm. It held a daily mass-meeting at 9 a.m. at the Afrikaanderplein, a square in the working class neighbourhood Afrikaanderwijk. This square had a rich history; football club Feyenoord played its matches here in the 1910s, while after WWII it was also used

¹⁶⁵³ Cf. Kok Kraayeveld, chairman of the council of Smit and the leader of the protest, in: Onnink, 2004.

¹⁶⁵⁴ Many of the people involved here were real storytellers; correspondent-cameraman Hans Koekoek, for example, was also a novelist and a director of fictions films.

¹⁶⁵⁵ Cf. Homma & Hoeksema, 1979: 14. The only paper that supported the strike was the communist *De Waarheid*.

¹⁶⁵⁶ *Ibid*, 16.

¹⁶⁵⁷ The CPN founded (1978-11-27) the *Comité Rotterdamse Havenarbeiders*, as suggested by Fré Meis after the strike of 1970, cf. Homma & Hoeksema, 1979: 35.

¹⁶⁵⁸ The strikers are supported juridically (throughout the period of the strike) by the lawyers Bernard Tomlow and Sjoerd Brunia of the *Socialistische Partij*, see: Hooiring e.a., 1979: 10-11.

¹⁶⁵⁹ For more details about this strategy, see: Hooiring e.a., 1979: 10.

¹⁶⁶⁰ In: Onnink, 2004.

¹⁶⁶¹ Erik Boshuyzen asked J. Schoufour (SVZ) and J. van Eldik (FNV) about a possible new CAO. The employers association and the union decided to talk to one another.

¹⁶⁶² *VARA-VISIE* (1979-08-28). Wim Kok and FNV-transport chairman Jan Schroër were invited to the studio. The FNV did not support the strike, but Kok (as said the day before in the *NOS JOURNAAL*) understood the workers, who expressed their solidarity. The employees did not listen to the arguments of the union. Kok proposed to negotiate again.

¹⁶⁶³ According to the information provided by the B&G database, 2007.

¹⁶⁶⁴ Also involved with the *Gezamenlijk Actiecomitee* were KEN (ml), *Rode Morgen* and other communist and syndicalist groups (cf. Hooiring e.a., 1979: 22).

for meetings of the communist party¹⁶⁶⁵. Now it again became a forum, for news exchange and speeches¹⁶⁶⁶. These daily meetings were also broadcast by the NOS JOURNAAL (*¹⁶⁶⁷). Although television was also criticised by the leaders of the strike¹⁶⁶⁸, the JOURNAAL operated like a moderator. The strikers understood the need for publicity and set up a *Solidariteitskomitee*¹⁶⁶⁹. It made and distributed pamphlets, posters, and banners; it arranged sound equipment, and organised benefit concerts, since the union treasure was kept closed¹⁶⁷⁰. It also supplied food, and asked support from lawyers and people like clergyman Hans Visser¹⁶⁷¹. Women organised themselves in special groups, as shown by AVRO's TELEVIZIER (*¹⁶⁷²). All this inspired more people to strike (*¹⁶⁷³).

The union finally negotiated again and set the employers an ultimatum, on the 4th of September. On that day the protesters, among them many women, marched through the Maastunnel – which recalled the success of 1970 (*¹⁶⁷⁴). A group occupied the office of the joint port enterprises (*Samenwerkende Havenbedrijven*), to prevent its 'reserve workers' to do their jobs. The union and the employers agreed upon a wage increase of 28,50 guilders per week, early retirement at 62, and twenty-three holidays per year¹⁶⁷⁵. The next morning, at Afrikaanderplein, this proposal was rejected. In the evening sixty-eight tugboat workers occupied the offices of Smit¹⁶⁷⁶. The Mayor had previously refused police actions against strikers that held back their colleagues, but now he called the riot squad (M.E.). At night it cordoned off the building and in the early morning of Thursday the 6th, it was cleared. The JOURNAAL was not present, but it did report the clearing of the office of the *Samenwerkende Havenbedrijven* the following night. There, the police expected a group of three hundred people, but only ten men were left, who got arrested (*¹⁶⁷⁷). The following night, one hundred and eighty policemen, with sixteen assault vans and assisted by boats, broke into a blockade of strikers at Seaport Terminals. Loads of citrus fruit needed distribution. Twenty-nine trucks, protected by the police, came to take it away.

¹⁶⁶⁵ See e.g. the film report CPN 1 MEI 1949 (1949, Ed Millecam).

¹⁶⁶⁶ After a few days, since 1979-08-30, the meetings followed a particular order, with speeches by respectively George Klaassen, Flip Schults, Bertus van der Horst, Jim Stavinga, see: Homma & Hoeksema, 1979: 33.

¹⁶⁶⁷ The first one was at 1979-08-29. It also contained an aerial shot of the harbour. The 8 o'clock news presented more aerial shots of the port (until sea); the report also showed strikers in Amsterdam (cf. JOURNAAL, NOS, 1979-08-30).

¹⁶⁶⁸ See, for example, Homma and Hoeksema, 1979: 30.

¹⁶⁶⁹ Archief *Solidariteitskomitee Gezamenlijk Aktiekomitee Havenarbeiders* (Rotterdam); Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis, www.iisg.nl/archives/en/files/s/10769950.php (2006-04-06). Cf. Hooiring e.a. 1979: 26.

¹⁶⁷⁰ I.e. 300,000 guilders in total from all over the country, see: www.rodemorgen.nl/krant/krantsel.htm 'Wat valt er nu te leren van de havenstaking van 1979?' (visited: 2006-04-06).

¹⁶⁷¹ Janssen, 1999/7.

¹⁶⁷² I.e. 1979-08-30. One also interviewed strikers, union representatives, H.I. Möller (SVZ), Alderman J. Riezenkamp (port affairs), information officer J. Bax (*Gem. Havenbedrijf*), and E. Peereboom, economic editor of *Het Parool* (who said that 'the tug's strike is just a matter of communist interests'). On 1979-08-31 the JOURNAAL reported strikers posting at firms; KRO's BRANDPUNT asked opinions of employers (Schoufour, SVZ), unions (Van Eldik, FNV) and those supporting the strike: Frank Buys (KEN-ml), Hans van Hooft (SP), Jim Stavinga and Siem van der Helm (CPN). Meanwhile a 24-hour strike had begun at ECT (cf. Homma & Hoeksema, 1979: 53).

¹⁶⁷³ In the 8 o'clock JOURNAAL (1979-09-03) a.o.: fierce speech by Schults (Afrikaanderplein, cam.: Koekoek), workers voting for a strike at the *Graan Elevator Maatschappij* – which was important for the food industry (it became a 24-hour strike, see: Hooiring e.a., 1979: 31).

¹⁶⁷⁴ JOURNAAL (NOS, 1979-09-04). The FNV now actively supported workers in the container terminals, see: Bosma, 2004. / JOURNAAL (NOS, 1979-09-05). Leaders also gained support in Amsterdam: JOURNAAL (1979-09-06). In the 8 o'clock JOURNAAL (1979-09-06), FNV leaders spoke about a possible strike in the petrochemical industry. Cf. TELEVIZIER (AVRO, 1979-09-06). Women got their own organisation, headed by Ellie Stavinga (wife of strike leader Jim Stavinga) and Nel le Noble, see: Hooiring, e.a. 1979: 41.

¹⁶⁷⁵ But not on the 5-shift service, cf. Bosma, 2004. See also: Hooiring e.a., 1979: 39.

¹⁶⁷⁶ Another office, of the firm Rijdsdijk, is briefly occupied too (Hooiring e.a., 1979: 41).

¹⁶⁷⁷ JOURNAAL (1979-09-07). Riot squad = ME.

On television, politicians criticised the strikers (BRANDPUNT, KRO, 1979-09-07)¹⁶⁷⁸. The port made losses; ships went abroad. The TROS, which first broadcast the enthusiasm of the strikers, now paid attention to those willing to work, while the evangelical EO was simply against the strike¹⁶⁷⁹. The written press was also critical¹⁶⁸⁰. The strikers were aware of it; on Sunday, the tugboat workers saved a chemical tanker that ran aground. The *Smit Finland* and the *Smit Rusland*, the ‘action centre’, went out to prevent a catastrophe with the dangerous pyrolyse-gasoline load of the tanker. The strikers used it to stress their difficult and responsible work.

The JOURNAAL continued to show the meetings at Afrikaanderplein¹⁶⁸¹. There, on the 10th of September, after a speech by Jim Stavinga, a group of strikers, headed by Paul Rosenmöller, occupied the office of FNV-Transport at the Westzeedijk¹⁶⁸². The FNV refrained from calling the police, to avoid escalation (*¹⁶⁸³). In fact, the action caused friction among the strikers themselves. Moreover, workers struggled with their finances, and many wanted to work again, but the hard core prevented them to do so, eventually with violence. The atmosphere worsened.

While employers reproached Mayor Van der Louw for not being neutral, strikers blamed him for the three successive police assaults, and expressed it during a march through the city centre towards the town hall (*¹⁶⁸⁴). The strikers, accompanied by the JOURNAAL and AVRO’s TELEVIZIER, called him nevertheless to mediate¹⁶⁸⁵. When strike leader Cor van der Zanden entered the room of the Mayor, he did not want any journalist to be present, since the press criticised the strike too much, especially the *Rotterdams Nieuwsblad*¹⁶⁸⁶. The Mayor refused to mediate, but proposed to call the different representatives to talk again. That was no option, according to SVZ-chairman Ludo Pieters. The labour expenses were already too high, especially for the piece goods branch. The next day (1979-09-13), strikers undertook harsh actions against colleagues who wanted to work. The police did not act. The strikers also prevented journalists from working. They grasped the cameras of photographers and took out the films, while others were threatened¹⁶⁸⁷. Further, the NOS was unable to show the events, and it could also not follow the negotiations that were hidden from the media.

On Friday the 14th of September, after three weeks of striking, a meeting was organised by the strikers to vote on the earlier proposal (28,50 guilders e.a.). They looked for a large location and found Stadium Feyenoord, but only 2450 people showed up. Journalists were not welcome. However, a vote was organised as to whether NOS-television was allowed to report, and the majority agreed, because the JOURNAAL had announced the meeting the previous evening¹⁶⁸⁸. In any case, the NOS had also arranged a helicopter, for cameraman Koekoek to make aerial shots, in case they would not get access. The majority of those present voted to continue the strike, and radicalised (*¹⁶⁸⁹). In the meantime, employers offered strikers advances on a new labour agreement. A large number of them accepted it, which raised the anger of the radicals. On the 19th of September, hundreds of strikers went from garden village Heijlplaat

¹⁶⁷⁸ Interviews with police officers from Rotterdam, politicians V/d Doef (PvdA), R. de Korte (VVD), M. Engwirda (D66), Van Zeil (CDA), V/d Meulen of the union CNV, and economist Prof. N. Douben.

¹⁶⁷⁹ TROS AKTUA (1979-09-08) showed it by the case of Bas Blaak and his wife Willy. TIJDSEIN (EO, 1979-09-11) presented an interview with the anti-Marxist and reactionary economist Prof. Dr. A. van Doorn.

¹⁶⁸⁰ E.g. Rotterdam Nieuwsblad, in: Hooiring e.a., 1979: 17.

¹⁶⁸¹ See a.o.: JOURNAAL (NOS, 1979-09-10 and 1979-09-11).

¹⁶⁸² See: Hooiring e.a., 1979: 47.

¹⁶⁸³ JOURNAAL (NOS, 1979-09-10); interview of journalist Erik Boshuyzen with FNV leader J. van Eldrik.

¹⁶⁸⁴ JOURNAAL (NOS, 1979-09-12)

¹⁶⁸⁵ AVRO’s TELEVIZIER (1979-09-13) interviewed Mayor Van der Louw, as to why he refused the request of employers to offer police protection to non-strikers; both strikers and employers asked his support.

¹⁶⁸⁶ Hooiring e.a., 1979: 53.

¹⁶⁸⁷ Hooiring e.a., 1979: 54.

¹⁶⁸⁸ Hooiring e.a., 1979: 55. NB this went without a report.

¹⁶⁸⁹ Cf. BRANDPUNT (KRO, 1979-09-14); Joost Middelhoff made an engaged portrait of striker Sjef Lang and his family – with discussions at Afrikaanderplein, a fence of a company’s lot being rammed to stop non-strikers, and the final poll. JOURNAAL: [blocking roads] (1979-09-16); [radicalizing strikers] (1979-09-17 and 1979-09-18).

towards Unit Centre at Waalhaven¹⁶⁹⁰. It was the largest container firm after ECT, and the strikers wanted both companies to put down, since that would have a major impact on the traffic in the port. For this reason the firms were already under permanent police protection for a couple of days.

The riot squad halted the strikers, with dogs, horses and water cannons. Strikers threw stones, but the police squad countered the attacks. The leaders Schults and Stavinga escaped, but Rosenmöller, Van der Horst, and seventeen others got arrested, who were picked out by police infiltrators¹⁶⁹¹. During their actions, the police wanted the journalists to move away. The JOURNAAL showed a photographer being pushed aside, and subsequently the NOS cameraman himself. This aggression raised the critique of Mayor Van der Louw. He replied, to the JOURNAAL, that the strikers had gone too far, by trespassing and vandalist acts. The next morning, two hundred strikers yelled in front of the town hall and demanded the release of their colleagues¹⁶⁹². Journalists of the *Rotterdams Nieuwsblad* (Hooiring, e.a., 1979: 66), remarked that ironically enough, one hundred metres further, in cinema Oscar at the Meent, the premiere took place of Rotterdam's new port promotion film (CROSSROAD ROTTERDAM, Kees van Eijk & Werner Jansen).

The strike approached its end. At Afrikaanderplein, on Saturday the 22nd, Flip Schults called the strikers to work again (*¹⁶⁹³). Instead, the petrochemical industry started to strike, supported by the unions, after they had warned the employers in the JOURNAAL (*¹⁶⁹⁴). Surprisingly it began at Shell Chemistry. Its white-collar workers marched through the city towards the town hall. This unique protest was closely monitored by television (*¹⁶⁹⁵). At the same time one still followed the tugboat strike, which went on as Smit rejected the general agreement. Since other branches operated again, much work was waiting, and the pressure on Smit increased. The wives of the strikers marched to its headquarters to talk to the management, but it only wanted to talk to the unions. The women said: 'When you have a fight with your wife, do you always go to your mother-in-law?' (*¹⁶⁹⁶).

The same day something else happened. When tugboat *Smit Duitsland* went out for its job, it was chased and entered by forty strikers. They beat the non-strikers, who escaped to police boats. The strikers brought the tug back to the Willemskade, where colleagues were waiting, and the NOS reporters too (*¹⁶⁹⁷). But the riot squad loaded its carbines and drove the others off the quay. The next day, seven 'hijackers' were arrested. Their wives protested in front of the jail (JOURNAAL, 1979-10-08). Two men were released in the afternoon, and the others at night. The Mayor eventually mediated, and he and Smit director Scheffer finally announced a solution (JOURNAAL, 1979-10-11). They made a deal with the port authorities to increase the wages with 28.50 guilders plus a one-off payment of 1000 guilders¹⁶⁹⁸. Two days later Pim Korver, for the JOURNAAL, filmed the workers releasing their tugs; with loud hooting they began to work again.

The strike had a long echo¹⁶⁹⁹. It caused Joost Middelhoff, of KRO-television, to make the documentary ROTTERDAMSE HAVEN NU (1979-11-27), in which a background was drawn to the events of that year, by investigating the overall situation and the labour conditions in the port

¹⁶⁹⁰ Hooiring e.a., 1979: 64, mentions 300 workers. Bertus van der Horst, in: Onnink, 2004, mentions 2000.

¹⁶⁹¹ Hooiring e.a., 1979: 65.

¹⁶⁹² See: Homma & Hoeksema, 1979: 118-119.

¹⁶⁹³ JOURNAAL: [arrests] (1979-09-19); [Van der Louw] (1979-09-20); [employer's offer] (1979-09-20); [suggestion to end] (1979-09-21; 1979-09-22); [back to work] (1979-09-22 and 1979-09-24).

¹⁶⁹⁴ Announced by action leader Piet Scheele (JOURNAAL, 1979-09-20); E. Schwarz of Shell defended the need for a 4-shift service, since it lacked personnel. Scheele replied that it was due to Shell itself, since it had just closed its school.

¹⁶⁹⁵ See: VARA-VISIE, 1979-09-25; JOURNAAL (NOS, 1979-09-26 + 27 + 29); JOURNAAL, 1979-10-02.

¹⁶⁹⁶ JOURNAAL (1979-10-03). www.rvu.nl/archief/per-saldo/archief3/deezenijnbrood/deezenijnbrood.html (2004-04-06), 'Commentaar: Buigen of barsten – De wilde havenstaking van 1979'. Cf. Hooiring e.a. 1979: 81.

¹⁶⁹⁷ JOURNAAL (NOS, 1979-10-04).

¹⁶⁹⁸ www.rvu.nl/archief/per-saldo/archief3/deezenijnbrood/deezenijnbrood.html (2004-04-06).

¹⁶⁹⁹ Cf. Van der Velden, 2000: 157: n49.

as a whole, and what the workers actually earned – which was usually more than average. In April the next year, VPRO television showed the documentary GROETEN UIT ROTTERDAM (1980, Rijneke & Van Leeuwen¹⁷⁰⁰), which included recordings of a punk rock concert at Kaasee to support the strike (1979-09-15). The event was initiated by the singer of the radical left Rondos, Johan van der Weert. In the film we see him together with his father, who took part in the strike, watching the 8 o'clock JOURNAAL of the 19th of September, about the fights between the riot squad and the strikers, and the reaction of Mayor Van der Louw. It is an instance of television showing television providing feedback that reinforces the development at stake. Finally, Bertus van der Horst, a leader of the dockworkers, began to present the leftist VRIJHEIDSJOURNAAL (“Freedom Journal”) of the cineclub *Vrijheidsfilms* in Amsterdam, whose director, At van Praag, had been a freelance cameraman for the JOURNAAL and various news magazines¹⁷⁰¹.

§ 5. implications

Whereas Kleinknecht and Naastepad (2005) have argued that offensive unionism forces companies to innovate, I have extended the argument to media, and framed it explicitly in the perspective of containerisation. I have done so by pointing to the two sides of the same coin, of protest and prospect. They existed parallel to one another; the issue of containerisation was rarely addressed by the media reports at stake, just like the corporate films did not speak about social consequences. Yet, television and film were part of the larger social-economic and technological complex, as addressed by Van der Velden (2005).

Innovation needs a critical mass. The film frame, as the modern ‘container’ of the container, reinforced its value as a vehicle of progress. The film content became a double abstraction: a choreography of movement that was directed by the attractor of industrialisation.

At the same time offensive unionism needs a critical mass too. To that end media have been crucial, especially television as the main public medium. We can link it to the theory of Luhmann (2000 [1995]: 65). He has addressed that mass media guarantee the level of so-called ‘first-order observations’ that feed the ‘public opinion’. Whereas Luhmann considers the main functions of mass media to be information and entertainment, in my view the main functions are monitoring and feedback. They actively shape what Luhmann calls ‘the inferences one can draw about oneself or others’, or the observation of the observer, which he calls ‘second-order observations’ (ibid). News programmes started to invite ‘experts’ to discuss the events. In this way, media got to play an active role in the politics at stake. Luhmann says (ibid): ‘behavior is “political” when participants react to how they are being observed.’ In the case of mass media, by following their observations, employer and employee observe one another, and everyone else may get involved too. In this way power relations are settled through what Luhmann understands as public opinion. This is ‘not an aggregate of psychic system-states, but rather a product of a specific communication that provides the starting point for further communications’ (ibid).

The question moves beyond traditional political divides, which were emphasised by strikers and commentators. Certain reports might be considered true by either party. Yet, by observing tensions and tendencies, and by amplifying them, the need is expressed to explore new directions. Media function as catalysts for change.

In terms of ‘public domain’, media are a matter of ‘augmented space’ (Manovich, 2006). It concerns particular places, often carrying a history related to the labour movement, such as the Maastunnel, the Willemskade, the Afrikaanderplein, the Rivièrahal, the Feyenoord and the Sparta Stadium, and the Coolsingel, which became means for protests and demonstrations, speeches, discussions, marches, traffic blockades, and battles. Next to that, the borders of ‘public space’ were explored, by occupying company offices and lots. Media served as ‘audiovisual amplifiers’

¹⁷⁰⁰ I.e. Part 3. HUIZE SCHOONDERLOO, broadcast on 1980-04-20.

¹⁷⁰¹ O.a. HIER EN NU (NCRV), ACHTER HET NIEUWS (VARA) www.cineclubvrijheidsfilms.nl/overons.htm (2006-04-11).

of the way one used and marked the environment. The 'public domain' enabled the workers to express themselves and to communicate with each other, which in turn attributed (controversial) meanings to the environment as well as the media. Places and images reinforced one another as references of a collective memory, and as markers of collective ambitions.

For national television, the port of Rotterdam was a measure for the country's social-economic development. Through feedback, the port was also affected by television. Alternatively, the changes that were monitored affected media practices too, strengthening and renewing the connections between Hilversum as *Standort*, and Rotterdam as *Tatort* – and gradually as *Stand Ort* too. Positions sometimes moved from journalism to promotion and sponsorship, back to journalism, like monitoring and feedback that enable *poiesis*.

CHAPTER 15. THE URBAN MEDIUM

§ 1. Floriade

Following the Ahoy' and E'55, the Floriade was the next big event to take place in 'Het Park' (25 March-25 September 1960). It was once more organised by Jacques Kleiboer, and the masterplan was drawn again by Van den Broek & Bakema, which included the existing Ahoy' hall, various new pavilions, green houses, and gardens¹⁷⁰². Like at the E'55, a cable lift connected the 'Land van Hoboken' with 'Het Park'. Whereas the previous events were related to the reconstruction, the Floriade was an aesthetical show on floriculture and horticulture. It was framed as 'the confrontation between culture and nature', as Peter de Winter has remarked (1988: 86). But there was more to it. The new Rotterdam, based upon the modern ideals of air, light and space, had to be associated with greenery. This had not yet come to blossom in the city centre itself, which still looked like a cool business district. Even more important was an economic motivation, since horticulture was highly important to the Dutch economy. Illustrative is the final remark by De Winter in his essay on the event, in which he quotes the actual statement of the organisation; 'The Floriade was once more a grandiose event. It did not only raise much international interest, but it also turned 'Het Park' into a "symphony of beauty in the middle of the dynamic heart of the city of Rotterdam and the equally dynamic river, on which an important part of the horticultural export finds it way abroad"¹⁷⁰³.

The Floriade attracted three million people in six months¹⁷⁰⁴. It was a major instrument to promote Rotterdam, and for that purpose the media played a crucial role. As the last big event in 'Het Park', the Floriade marks the end of a period, but in terms of media it also marks the beginning of a new era. Five years earlier, during the E55, television was still a novelty in the Netherlands. By 1960, the NTS JOURNAAL had outbeaten Polygoon in numbers of reports and viewers, although Polygoon was still important. Both of them paid attention to the Floriade, next to foreign media, such as Visnews and Fox Movietone. Reports began with the construction of a watchtower that was made for this occasion (1958-1960, Hugh Maaskant)¹⁷⁰⁵. Maaskant's design consisted of a one hundred metre tall shaft, with three pavilions connected to it: an entry pavilion at ground level, one at thirty metres, and at the top an asymmetrical 'crow's nest' with a restaurant for three hundred people, to be reached in 25 seconds by one of the two elevators in the shaft. By panoramic windows, the visitors could watch the surroundings. According to Maaskant, one hundred metres was the ideal height for a watchtower in order to have a perfect view over the Floriade and the city, while keeping contact with the ground¹⁷⁰⁶. This was also explicitly addressed by the educational short FLORIADE (1960, NOF), which gave a general impression of the event (and as such functioned as an 'extension' of it).

The 'Euromast', as it was called, became the tallest building of the Netherlands, which attracted much attention. It was first shown by the NTS JOURNAAL (1959-03-25) and soon by Polygoon too¹⁷⁰⁷. The latter had the most detailed report; it showed concrete being prepared and kept on the right temperature, and hoisted in boxes through the shaft, while machines pull up the so-called 'slide-sheetpiling' (*glijbekisting*), to pour the concrete. Polygoon's next report on it was made when King Boudewijn from Belgium came to the Netherlands, to visit the highlights of the

¹⁷⁰² Garden designs by J.T.P. Bijhouwer and M.J. Vroom.

¹⁷⁰³ De Winter, 1988: 90. Original quote: De Floriade was wederom een groots evenement, dat niet alleen internationaal zeer veel belangstelling opriep, maar bovendien Het Park veranderde in een 'symphonie van schoonheid midden in het dynamische hart van de stad Rotterdam en de even dynamische rivier, waarover een belangrijk deel van onze tuinbouwexport zijn weg naar het buitenland vindt.'

¹⁷⁰⁴ Groenendijk, 2004: Architectuur > Gebouwen > Euromast; Spacetower.

¹⁷⁰⁵ Van den Broek & Bakema had also proposed a design, constructivist in appearance, with four big panoramic platforms, see: De Winter, 1988: 91.

¹⁷⁰⁶ Groenendijk, 2004: Architectuur > Gebouwen > Euromast; Spacetower.

¹⁷⁰⁷ DE EUROMAST TE ROTTERDAM BEREIKT HOOGSTE PUNT, Polygoon, rec.: 1959-03-28/31.

country¹⁷⁰⁸. Even before its completion, the Euromast had become a landmark. Polygoon used the royal visit to make some more recordings, for a separate newsreel, showing the ‘crow’s nest’ being pushed to the top by hydraulic presses. The NTS reported the same thing a week later¹⁷⁰⁹.

In the next month, the Euromast reached the stage that one could go up. When the new HAL ship ‘SS Rotterdam’ made its first official trip, with Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard as its guests, people were greeting the ship from the Euromast, as shown by Polygoon¹⁷¹⁰. Two months later the Queen was again in Rotterdam (Polygoon, 1959-wk44)¹⁷¹¹. The report shows her visiting the construction site of the Dijkzigt Ziekenhuis. When she looks over Rotterdam from the tenth floor, the most striking thing she sees is the Euromast: an ‘exclamation mark’ (as it has been called) behind the sentence of reconstruction. It was still before the opening of the Floriade.

The NTS JOURNAAL (1960-03-23) showed the last preparations. Two days later, Princess Beatrix inaugurated the event, which was recorded by NTS and Visnews (for EBU), by the NCRV and Polygoon, and more reports would follow¹⁷¹². Media attention was maintained by a special event, which existed only *because* of the media, due to its narrative nature. It was told that in 1560, Marquis Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq brought the first tulip bulb from Turkey to Western Europe, by stagecoach. The Floriade commemorated its fourth centenary. For this purpose a man was dressed up as the marquis (or as ‘Carolus Clusius’, alternatively), who would make the same travel, to bring a selection of tulip bulbs from Turkey to the Floriade. To that end, a stagecoach was brought to Istanbul, irrespective of the fact that it was built in 1850, and originally commuted between the towns Meppel and Steenwijk for postal services.

The historic event, however, was a little different, including the dates. In 1593, the Flemish botanist Charles de l’Écluse (Carolus Clusius) was contracted by the University of Leiden to set up a botanical garden, after he had been working at the Imperial Gardens in Vienna. Shortly before he had met Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq in Vienna, who had just come back from the Turkish Court. The latter gave tulip bulbs to Clusius, who cultivated them in Leiden¹⁷¹³. The fourth centenary of the ‘Dutch Tulip’ would thus be in 1993. The only true anniversary was the centenary of the “General Dutch Association of Floriculture” (*Algemene Vereniging voor Bloembollencultuur*), to which the Floriade was officially dedicated. The stagecoach story was a media event. The modification of facts is not noticed by Peter de Winter (1988), although he has noticed the media attention, and that it was an idea of Floriade organiser Jacques Kleiboer¹⁷¹⁴.

The actual story was subordinate to the adventure, which brought the event international attention, already before its start. About three weeks before the opening, Polygoon showed the training of the three coachmen and their ten horses in The Hague¹⁷¹⁵. The stagecoach, its horses and the coachmen were brought to Istanbul in order to travel back to Rotterdam by themselves (accompanied by trucks with supplies). The travel was followed by Polygoon, NTS and Visnews, and transmitted by the European Broadcasting Union (EBU). It began with its departure from Istanbul, followed by its transit through Greece, Yugoslavia, Austria and further on¹⁷¹⁶. Historic

¹⁷⁰⁸ HET STAATSIEBEZOEK VAN KONING BOUDEWIJN, Polygoon, rec.: 1959-07-08/11 (cf. JOURNAAL, NTS, 1959-07-09).

¹⁷⁰⁹ HET ‘KRAAIENNEST’ OMHOOG IN DE EUROMAST, Polygoon, rec.: 1959-07-09; JOURNAAL, NTS, 1959-07-17.

¹⁷¹⁰ PROEFVAART MET DE "ROTTERDAM", Polygoon 1959-wk34; cf. JOURNAAL, NTS, 1959-08-21.

¹⁷¹¹ i.e. Polygoon, rec.: 1959-10-24; Cf. JOURNAAL, NTS, 1959-10-30.

¹⁷¹² JOURNAAL, NTS, 1960-03-25 [twice], JOURNAAL (NTS, 1960-04-01); PRINSES BEATRIX OPENT DE FLORIAD, Polygoon, 1960-13; and for the opening speech by Beatrix: NIET BEKEND, NCRV-Radio, 1960-03-25. Within a week, NTS also broadcast an interview with the director of the Floriade, Jacques Kleiboer, and in the next days other reports would follow: JOURNAAL (NTS, 1960-03-31); among following reports: LANDBOUWJOURNAAL, NTS, 1960-04-05).

¹⁷¹³ www.hollandrijnland.nl, Historie >> Leidse Wetenschappers >> Carolus Clusius. VVV Leiden, 2005-2006.

¹⁷¹⁴ In 1932, Kleiboer had made himself a name by organizing the flight of the Zeppelin to Rotterdam, for which he did something similar, as radio reporters narrated the flight from Germany to the Netherlands. See chapter 3.§2.

¹⁷¹⁵ POSTKOETS RIJDT IN DEN HAAG, Polygoon, 1960-week 9.

¹⁷¹⁶ Istanbul: Visnews / EBU, 1960-03-30; JOURNAAL, NTS, 1960-04-02; Greece: JOURNAAL, NTS, 1960-04-13; Yugoslavia: (FLORIADKOETS TREKT DOOR ZUID-SLAVIE, Polygoon, 1960-week 17); Austria: (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1960-04-20; and NTS, 1960-04-29).

routes were followed, and old halting-places were visited. After thirty-nine days, and 3000 kilometres, the stagecoach arrived in Rotterdam on the 7th of May¹⁷¹⁷. Once arrived, the ‘Marquis’ offered the bulbs to Jonkheer J.E.M. Van Nispen tot Pannerden, the chairman of the “General Dutch Association of Floriculture”.

Just before the stagecoach arrived, a girl in traditional costume climbed on the box. She was the ‘the girl from the Floriade poster’. She frequently showed up, for example in the television programme FLITS (AVRO, 1960-05-14, dir.: Leo Akkermans). It was a report about the reconstruction of Rotterdam, made on the occasion of the Floriade. Historical footage of the bombardment was combined with shots of modern buildings (a.o. ‘Stationspostkantoor’, ‘Zuidpleinflat’, ‘De Lijnbaan’), of a model of the port and of the metro that was planned to be built, next to general views of the city. Similarly, on the occasion of the Floriade, Visnews (1960-04-28) also made a special programme on the city’s reconstruction, which was broadcast internationally by the EBU. This also applies to other media. Bruna Publishers, for example, took the opportunity to issue the paperback *Rotterdam* (1960, Herman Besselaar), with photographs by Henk Jonker¹⁷¹⁸.

In the period of the event, all kinds of related presentations were taken as reasons to report on the Floriade, as the general exhibition was already largely covered¹⁷¹⁹. This media attention would last until the end, and beyond¹⁷²⁰. It shows how the Floriade functioned as a medium to attract attention to the city as a whole, through a strong interconnection between the triangle of the event’s organisation, the city, and the media¹⁷²¹. According to Ward Rennet (2007: 36), this triangle is the core network model of what he calls ‘CityEvents’: recurring events that are each time hosted by another city. In a similar way, the Floriade became a recurrent ‘horticultural world exhibition’ that would take place in another (Dutch) city every ten years¹⁷²².

§ 2. exhibitions, games, concerts

Since the Ahoy’ had been organised, in 1950, various smaller events took place at its halls that got simply known as *Ahoy*’¹⁷²³. Notwithstanding its temporary constructions, it continued to be used, and spectators and journalists soon knew their way to this ‘urban medium’. Many of its events were reported on television, especially by the NTS JOURNAAL, from youth activities, fairs, exhibitions (e.g. on ship building), to international animal shows, and sports games¹⁷²⁴. Most shows were opened by a minister or a member of the royal family. The Ahoy’ grew also into a

¹⁷¹⁷ Visnews / EBU and NTS JOURNAAL, 1960-05-07; NTS JOURNAAL 1960-05-13; FLORIAD-POSTKOETS WEER THUIS (Polygoon, 1960-week 20).

¹⁷¹⁸ Cf. Bool, 2004.

¹⁷¹⁹ Polygoon, for example, made a news item of a fashion show at the Euromast. The report was called ‘High Level Fashion’, as Polygoon used to do word games (MODE OP HOOG NIVEAU, rec.: 1960-06-02/03), while the children’s programme OMNIBUS (VPRO, 1960-07-13) also referred to the fashion show. The official visit of Queen Juliana was another reason for a news report (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1960-07-21), which was immediately followed by the visit of the Japanese floral artist Sofu Tessikawara and his assistants (BLOEMSCHIKKEN OP FLORIAD, Polygoon, 1960-31). His demonstration was preceded by one on television (ESPRESSO, VARA, 1960-07-23), which raised extra interest in his show at the Floriade. It is another instance of the way television served the event.

¹⁷²⁰ See also: VERREKIJKER (NTS, 1960-08-17); e.g. HET VORSTELIJKE BEZOEK UIT THAILAND (Polygoon, recording: 1960-10-24, 1960-10-25, 1960-10-26, 1960-10-27); JOURNAAL (NTS, 1960-10-25 and NTS 1960-10-28). King Bhumibol Adulyadej and Queen Sirikit from Thailand visited the Netherlands a month after the event. Although the exhibition was over, they nevertheless saw remaining parts of it, and they also visited the Euromast. In the next years, the Euromast was frequently shown in films and on television.

¹⁷²¹ This explains the relatively large number of Visnews reports made in Rotterdam in 1960 (filmography > Visnews).

¹⁷²² Amsterdam 1972 & 1982, The Hague/Zoetermeer 1992, Haarlemmermeer 2002, Venlo 2012. www.floriade.nl (2008-04-22).

¹⁷²³ Next to that, various events were organised in the ‘Rivierhal’ of the Rotterdam Zoo, like fashion shows and boxing matches. See: www.rotterdamers.nl/gebouwen/riviera.htm (website visited: 2006-04-04)

¹⁷²⁴ e.g. (resp.) NTS JOURNAAL: 1959-08-07 and 1961-07-27 [Jeugdland]; 1959-09-25 and 1961-10-01 [Femina]; 1964-04-05 [education fair]; 1964-06-21 [Austrian week]; 1963-05-13 [bakery exhibition]; 1962-11-25 [ship exhibition]; 1963-10-20 [dog show]; 1964-02-20 [bird show]; Polygoon 1963-12 [cat show]; 1962-08 [sports].

stage for pop music. A concert by Cliff Richard (1962-04-07) became infamous; four thousand young visitors made so much tumult that the show had to be stopped (Polygoon, 1962-wk16). Other kinds of entertainment took place here too, like a show by the American circus Ringling Bros and Barnum & Bailey (Polygoon, 1964-wk06)¹⁷²⁵.

In 1965, plans were made to build a permanent and larger Ahoy' complex elsewhere; its current site would then be used to build the medical faculty, next to hospital Dijkzigt. The Ahoy' hall was temporarily moved to the former 'Heliport' at Pompenburg, which in turn was moved to Airport Zestienhoven. This jostling of urban functions, monitored by the media¹⁷²⁶, exemplifies the interdependencies within the city's ecology. The city was rapidly changing, and, regarding large events, a bifurcation was about to happen.

city in motion

The horticultural Floriade had been a direct investment in 'Het Park'. The next event in this series had to give a direct impulse to the city, which entered a new era after the retirement of city planner Van Traa, in 1964¹⁷²⁷, and subsequently that of Mayor Van Walsum. The event would be a tribute to them, by celebrating two decades of reconstruction, while pointing to new horizons¹⁷²⁸. A less extensive, but still ambitious exhibition was organised in the city, at the 'Bouwcentrum', which was extended, including a permanent municipal information centre.

On *Opbouwdag* 1965, Mayor Thomassen opened the exhibition, called *Stad in Beweging* ("City in Motion"), which was accompanied by a book, written by architecture (and film) critic Rein Blijstra¹⁷²⁹. According to Wagenaar (1992: 28), the book confirmed the myth of the victory of Van Traa's modern scientific planning methods over Witteveen's alleged longing for historical design; for more than two decades the book would dominate the historiography of Rotterdam's reconstruction. This can be understood in connection to the exhibition, which, until now, has been left unnoticed¹⁷³⁰.

The exhibition was supervised by a committee chaired by K.P. van der Mandele¹⁷³¹, who was also the motor behind the other large events. This draws an immediate connection to the Club Rotterdam (see Part II, Chapter 7.§2). It offers also a view upon a film that was made for this occasion, which had its premiere during the opening: the 'remake' of EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM (1965, Polygoon). Whereas the version of 1950 was an argument for a new and modern city, envisioned by the Club Rotterdam, this argument was entirely left behind in the new version. Instead it stresses the achievements, just like the exhibition and the book by Blijstra.

After the premiere of the film, an excursion took place to watch 'De Doelen' and metro station 'Stadhuis' under construction, and to overview the city from the Euromast¹⁷³². The book, the exhibition, the film and the 'scripted space' of the city itself: they all celebrated the reconstruction as social medicine (healthy city, a new social order), science (the rational city), revelation (the vision of Van Traa), and wizardry (the resurrection of Rotterdam), to speak in terms of Gold and Ward (1997: 66). In this way, the strategy and the process that the Club Rotterdam had set in motion worked out, but from the viewpoint of the historian, as Cor

¹⁷²⁵ Cf. Wagenaar, 1995-1996: 247; on the 28th of January, elephants moved through the city advertising the circus.

¹⁷²⁶ The construction of a temporary Ahoy' hall and the medical faculty (1965-1968, arch. OD 205) were, for example, reported by the NTS JOURNAAL, 1966-01-28; 1966-08-10, and Polygoon (rec. 1966-11-00); cf. a report by the NTS JOURNAAL (1969-10-21) on a crane that broke during the construction of the faculty building.

¹⁷²⁷ For the farewell of Van Traa, see: NTS JOURNAAL (1964-11-23), for that of Van Walsum: Polygoon (1965-02), a.o.

¹⁷²⁸ see: *Bouw*, nr. 20, 1965: middle pages, back side.

¹⁷²⁹ Blijstra was a member of the Filmliga, and wrote for its magazine. He was also the editor of the book *Beeld en Verbeelding* (1948), on film and literature.

For more information on Blijstra: Santen-Mout, 1979.

¹⁷³⁰ This even applies to De Winter's book on the large events in Rotterdam (1988).

¹⁷³¹ See: *Bouw*, nr. 20, 1965: middle pages, back side.

¹⁷³² See: *Opbouwdag* (1965-05-18) – *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1966: 35.

Wagenaar has argued (1992: 26), it put the interpretative and cultural frameworks to the background, as if the reconstruction was self-evident.

The engine of Rotterdam's reconstruction had been its modern movement, which was not self-evident, but a joint venture of enlightened minds and economic reasoning. The building industry followed in its wake, after a reorganisation by Jan van Ettinger – the later director of the Bouwcentrum, and organiser of this exhibition. The building industry had its own pavilion, while it was also prominently present in the catalogue of the exhibition (a special edition of *Bouw*, nr. 20, 1965). The event integrated values of culture and economy, art and industry, housing and commerce, which were presented in different sections, one after the other, next to presentations of art works and photographs. There was also a special film theatre, where visitors watched EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM that showed much of this in a succinct, attractive and coherent way.

the new Ahoy'

At the former Heliport, the temporary Ahoy' continued its activities, including (annual) fairs as well as occasional events, such as a manifestation by the 'union of rural women', industrial exhibitions and political meetings, which all generated publicity for the city¹⁷³³. The 'Energiehal' – another part of the former Ahoy' complex – was moved to the northwest of Rotterdam¹⁷³⁴. This sports hall would stay here for three more decades¹⁷³⁵. It became additional to the new Ahoy' that would be built at the 'Zuiderpark'. It was part of a larger strategy to develop the south of Rotterdam¹⁷³⁶. For that purpose, the WWII emergency village 'Brabantse Dorp'¹⁷³⁷ was demolished, in 1966, to make space for a metro and bus terminal, the commercial centre 'Zuidplein' (1967-1972, Herman Bakker) and the Ahoy' (1967-1971, E. Groosman, Van der Stoep & Pinnoo). The latter contained facilities for exhibitions and fairs, and an indoor sports stadium (*Sportpaleis*). The whole complex was created on the basis of a sophisticated construction with curved beams, sliding walls, and an elaborate circulation system¹⁷³⁸. It would become the biggest of its kind in the country, and its construction was accompanied by a range of news programmes¹⁷³⁹. Besides its construction, Polygoon addressed its planning context too; it showed the infrastructure of the area, and also the commercial centre 'Zuidplein'¹⁷⁴⁰.

The Femina was the first event to take place at the new Ahoy', even before its official opening (1971-01-15)¹⁷⁴¹. The first big sports event was a cycle tournament (*Wielervedstrijd*),

¹⁷³³ Resp. JOURNAAL [Femina], NTS, 1967-09-28; LENTIADÉ, 1967, Henk Vrijmoet; JOURNAAL [Binnenhuis 68] 1968-02-00; JOURNAAL [rural women] 1968-05-06. For more events, see e.g. JOURNAAL [exhibition on oil-rigs] (1968-05-20), JOURNAAL [Czechs meeting after the events in Prague] 1968-08-22, cf. HIER EN NU, NCRV, 1968-08-23; JOURNAAL [water exhibition] 1968-09-17.

¹⁷³⁴ To the Abraham van Stolkweg, near the *Nenijto* area from 1928 where the first large event in Rotterdam took place.

¹⁷³⁵ Many games were held here, see e.g. INDOOR ATLETIEKKAMPIOENSCHAPPEN IN DE ENERGIEHAL (Polygoon, 1971).

¹⁷³⁶ It succeeded the construction of housing estate 'Zuidpleinflats' (1941-1947, Willem van Tijen, Ernest Groosman); the Grote Schouwburg (1952-1954, Sybold van Ravesteyn), and Industriegebouw Zuidplein (1954-1961, Hugh Maaskant).

¹⁷³⁷ See e.g. BRABANTSE DORP (1962, Jan Soek).

¹⁷³⁸ A.o. the *circulatorium*, and the *passerel* walkway to the 'Zuidplein'. The constructor of the Ahoy' was Arie Krijgsman (ABT). Groenendijk, 2004: Architectuur > Gebouwen > Sport en Tentoonstellingscomplex Ahoy'.

¹⁷³⁹ One of the first was the television programme SCALA (NOS, 1969-11-19), an interview by reporter Koen Verhoef with Ahoy' director Harry Hofmeester, interchanged by shots of the construction works. The construction of the 'sports palace' was also to be seen in programmes on sports, e.g. SPORTPANORAMA (AVRO, 1970-06-19) and STUDIO SPORT (NOS, 1970-12-30), as well as in the JOURNAAL (NOS, 1970-08-04).

¹⁷⁴⁰ NIEUW HART VOOR ZUIDELIJK STADSDEEL (Polygoon, 1970-wk39)

¹⁷⁴¹ E.g. SPORTPALEIS AHOY GEOPEND (Polygoon, 1971-01), JOURNAAL (NOS, 1971-01-15). It was opened by Prince Claus. Part of the opening was a judo-demonstration by Anton Geesink and a cycle match, won by Jaap Oudkerk.

which was quickly sold out¹⁷⁴². The public interest continued afterwards, fed by the media, which also covered events such as a Moroccan feast and the Indonesian *pasar-malam*¹⁷⁴³.

Regarding sports, the Ahoy' strengthened its reputation by organising various European and World championships¹⁷⁴⁴. It also hosted the annual ABN World Tennis Tournament. The American Arthur Ashe won the first edition in 1972. Due to this success, the American NBC made a special report on Rotterdam, preceding the broadcasting of the matches in 1975, with shots of 'De Lijnbaan', the 'Euromast', the port and historic Delfshaven. The newspaper *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad* described it as 'a tremendous chance to show the city's touristic possibilities all over the USA'¹⁷⁴⁵. After Tom Okker had won in 1974, Ashe won again in 1975 and 1976. In this way the Ahoy' contributed to the position of Rotterdam within the international arena of sports.

amplified sports

The new Ahoy' complex propelled a development of large sports events that had started after WWII. Since 1948, Rotterdam hosted the annual *Concours Hippique International Officiel*, in the Kralingse Bos, which raised substantial media attention¹⁷⁴⁶. Rotterdam had also come to the fore as a city of football. The Feyenoord stadium hosted matches of the national team, while Feyenoord and Sparta became Dutch champions several times. In 1960, moreover, Sparta reached the quarter finals of the European championship (EC1); preceding the match against Glasgow Rangers, the Scottish television broadcast a report on the city and the club. It meant valuable publicity for both, notwithstanding Sparta's loss¹⁷⁴⁷. In 1963, Feyenoord reached the semi-finals of the EC1, in which it played against Benfica. The first match, at home, was live broadcast by Dutch television¹⁷⁴⁸. It ended in a draw (0-0), so that the return match became most exciting. Two vessels were chartered, *Grote Beer* and *Waterman*, which brought 1500 supporters to Lisbon. Thousands of people went to the port to wish them good luck, all along from the city centre to Hoek van Holland, which in itself attracted much attention¹⁷⁴⁹. Although Benfica won (3-1), it marked the emergence of massive, mediatised fandom. Feyenoord continued its success, which was amplified by television¹⁷⁵⁰. The zenith was in 1970, when Feyenoord became European and world champion; to celebrate the victories, large crowds gathered at the Coolsingel¹⁷⁵¹. It was shown by NOS television and by Polygoon, which became iconic images.

Holland Pop Festival

The Ahoy' complex in 'Het Park' had been a motor of post-war urban culture, which gradually extended across the city, not the least regarding music. In 1966 concerts hall 'De Doelen' was opened. It immediately linked up with the 'Holland Festival' – a national event taking place

¹⁷⁴² SPORTPANORAMA (AVRO, 1971-01-23) 'Wielerzesdaagse Rotterdam', won by Peter Post and Patrick Sercu.

¹⁷⁴³ JOURNAAL [Binnenhuis '71] (NOS, 1971-02-19); JOURNAAL [R'71, post stamps] (NOS, 1971-06-10); JOURNAAL [Moroccan feast] (NOS, 1971-03-06); PASAR-MALAM IN DE AHOY HAL, OPTREDEN HOFDANSERS VAN DE SULTAN VAN DJOKJAKARTA (Polygoon, 1971-04).

¹⁷⁴⁴ E.g. European championship sprint cycling: ITALIAAN TURRINI EUROPEES SPRINTKAMPIOEN WIELRENNEN (Polygoon, 1972-12), world championship ice hockey: IJSHOCKEY OM DE WERELDTITEL (Polygoon, 1973-03).

¹⁷⁴⁵ 'Rotterdam-film voor uitzending op televisie in de V.S.', p7 in: *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1974-11-27. See also: 'Bezoekers', p25 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 13/2, 1975. Mentioned are the television producers Dick Auerbach and Paul Gherkin of NBC.

¹⁷⁴⁶ Organised by the Rotterdamsche Manège, see e.g. Polygoon, 1960-wk33; 1961-wk37; 1962-wk37; etc.).

¹⁷⁴⁷ The match in Rotterdam (1960-03-09): 2-3 for the Rangers; return match (1960-03-16): 0-1 for Sparta.

¹⁷⁴⁸ SPORT IN BEELD, NOS, 1963-04-10; cf. the Polygoon newsreel FEYENOORD – BENFICA (1963-04-10).

¹⁷⁴⁹ E.g. Polygoon, 1963-05-04/08.

¹⁷⁵⁰ E.g. in 1964-1965 when the club won 'the double' (national championship and the national cup), and when it reached the monster score of 9-4 against arch-rival Ajax (NOS, 29-11-1964) – although the reverse happened too.

¹⁷⁵¹ European champion: Feyenoord-Celtic: 2-1 (NOS, Polygoon, 1970-05-6/7); world champion: Feyenoord-Estudiantes: 1-0 + 2-2 (NOS, Polygoon, 1970-09-09).

annually since 1947¹⁷⁵². 'De Doelen' initiated several (mediatised) events afterwards, like the 'New Port All Star Jazz Festival' (1967)¹⁷⁵³. In the meantime, the temporary Ahoy' at the former Heliport continued to organise concerts. Most remarkable was the *Hippy-Happy Beurs*, November 1967, with art workshops and performances by Jimi Hendrix and Pink Floyd, among others¹⁷⁵⁴.

An absolute highlight became the 'Holland Pop Festival' (1970), which was part of the 'Holland Festival', and similar to Woodstock the year before, with The Byrds, Pink Floyd, T. Rex, Jefferson Airplane, Santana, and many more. For three days (June 26/27/28), about 75.000 people gathered in the woods of Rotterdam (Kralingse Bos), which contributed to the hippy atmosphere. It was the largest festival of its kind in Europe, organised by Berry Visser and Georges Knap, while Toos Knap-Van der Sterre coordinated its promotion. A month in advance the festival was announced on television (DOEBIEDOE, AVRO, 1970-05-22). Two weeks later its preparations were shown in the JOURNAAL (NOS, 1970-06-11). The 'Holland Festival', which had also its own television programme, announced the pop festival shortly before¹⁷⁵⁵. Once it began, it was followed by the JOURNAAL¹⁷⁵⁶. The socialist VARA and the Christian NCRV, moreover, offered general impressions, including shots of the audience in the rain at the last day, and shots of the band of the 'Salvation Army'¹⁷⁵⁷. The Catholic KRO broadcast an interview with the "Municipal Medical Service" (GGD) about people turning psychotic after taking drugs, and with Mayor Thomassen about the hygiene¹⁷⁵⁸. Next were shots of youths camping, and smoking grass, and of a stand to buy condoms. Polygoon showed also such 'shocking images', including shots of girls painting their breasts, next to a play garden for children, and of performances by The Byrds and Sygurd Cochius playing a German flute¹⁷⁵⁹. The festival was finally recapitulated by the HOLLAND FESTIVAL MAGAZINE (NOS, 1970-07-07).

The festival became also the subject of the feature length documentary LOVE AND MUSIC (1971, George Sluizer & Hansjürgen Pohland). Sluizer had become known for his short HOLD BACK THE SEA (1961), made for Shell, which was awarded a Silver Bear at the Berlinale¹⁷⁶⁰. Pohland was a 'usual suspect' of that festival; he lived in Berlin and was associated with the 'Oberhausener Manifest'¹⁷⁶¹. So they met and got in touch with the Berlin company *Planet Film*¹⁷⁶². LOVE AND MUSIC was released in America as STAMPING GROUND, with the subtitle 'Holland's answer to Woodstock'¹⁷⁶³. The filmmakers, including cinematographer Jan de Bont, turned it into an audiovisual endeavour by applying innovative techniques, such as split screens, while they showed both the performances 'on stage' and 'off stage' – music and love. It became a hit and bootleg copies have circulated worldwide¹⁷⁶⁴. The film contributed to the fame of the festival and put Rotterdam on the map of pop music and alternative culture.

¹⁷⁵² The opening of the festival (*De Doelen*, 1966-06-14) was attended by Princess Beatrix and Prince Claus (JOURNAAL, NTS, 1966-06-14).

¹⁷⁵³ See: MONITOR (NTS, 1967-10-22).

¹⁷⁵⁴ The event was organised by Wim van Krimpen. Reports: HIPPIE-HAPPY BEURS, Polygoon, rec. 1967-11-10, 1967-11-14; JOURNAAL, NTS, 1967-11-10.

¹⁷⁵⁵ I.e. HOLLAND FESTIVAL MAGAZINE (NOS, 1970-06-23).

¹⁷⁵⁶ JOURNAAL (NTS, 1970-06-26, 1970-06-27, 1970-06-29).

¹⁷⁵⁷ POPFESTIVAL KRALINGEN, 1970, T. van Mastrikt/VARA; POPFESTIVAL ROTTERDAM, NCRV, 1970-06-29.

¹⁷⁵⁸ BRANDPUNT, KRO, 1970-06-30. cf. amateur film KRALINGEN POPFESTIVAL 1970 (1970, Jos Corver).

¹⁷⁵⁹ HOLLAND POP-FESTIVAL (1970-27, Polygoon).

¹⁷⁶⁰ In 1961, see: Hofstede, 2000: 108.

¹⁷⁶¹ In 1965, Pohland was a member of the jury at the Berlin International Film Festival (ref. imdb). See furthermore: http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oberhausener_Manifest, article: 'Oberhausener Manifest' (visited 2006-03-20).

¹⁷⁶² It had just produced some alternative productions, like the fiction film PSYCHOLOGIE DES ORGASMUS (1970) and the documentary ANATOMIE DES LIEBESAKTS (1969, both directed by Hermann Schnell).

¹⁷⁶³ The film was released in Germany as ROCK FIEBER.

¹⁷⁶⁴ With a semi-official DVD issued in Brazil, and later (2004) by Columbia Japan. Pink Floyd fan site: www.floydstuff.com/lowlandslog.asp, report: 2004-06-14 (website visited: 2006-03-04).

In comparison to Woodstock, however, the festival was less engaged with politics, and actually more commercial. Its legal form was a foundation, which was a strategic choice: the organisers would not be responsible for eventual losses, while it gained the trust of the government that provided a guarantee-subsidy¹⁷⁶⁵. A major sponsor was Coca Cola¹⁷⁶⁶. This marks the beginning of its long term involvement with music events in the Netherlands, especially those organised by Mojo Concerts, the firm that organiser Berry Visser had just established (1968). After this successful test case, many concerts would follow, which made Mojo the leading company in the Dutch music industry, while Rotterdam became an important place for music events, which was largely fed by the media¹⁷⁶⁷. An extensive network was thus created, in terms of accommodations, programming and media, which triggered the emergence of other initiatives too.

§ 3. C'70

After the exhibition *Stad in Beweging* had taken place at the Bouwcentrum in 1965, the next large event in this series was *Communicatie 1970* or C'70 (5 May – 3 October 1970), which was directed by Anton Fibbe and supervised by Alderman Jan van der Ploeg¹⁷⁶⁸. Whereas the theme was 'communication', it was also a celebration of twenty-five years of liberation and reconstruction. The aim of the event, which took place all over the city centre, was to turn the city as a whole into a communication medium. Whereas the previous events were located in 'Het Park', the only link with it this time was the Euromast. It was extended, from 107 to 176 metres, by a 'space tower' (constr.: Willy Bühler¹⁷⁶⁹) that made it the highest building of Rotterdam again, to secure its function as a landmark. A moving cabin around it brought visitors to the top. Its vista was an instance of 'communicating the city', an act of city branding that was supported by the media invited to witness the extension¹⁷⁷⁰.

A striking element of the event was a cable lift circuit through the city¹⁷⁷¹, which turned it literally into Debord's 'society of the spectacle' (1967). It followed a 2,5 km promenade that was part of the masterplan by architect Herman Bakker¹⁷⁷². Along the promenade were pavilions with cafes, multicoloured polyester triangular shelters, designed by Bakker himself and produced by aeroplane manufacturer Fokker, and domes of 10 and 25 metres. In one of them Shell presented itself through films and a sound and vision play called GROWTH. On twenty-one screens its worldwide activities were shown by computer directed projectors and a stereo sound installation. Next to this was a prototype of a future petrol station, designed by the French *Compagnie de L'Esthétique Industrielle*¹⁷⁷³. In two domes Philips showed films, photographs and models to exhibit its engagement with environmental issues, third world development and global communication. KLM presented itself at the Schouwburgplein with a flight simulator of a Boeing. Next to it were workshops to stimulate creative expression.

¹⁷⁶⁵ www.wikipedia.nl article: 'Festival' (website visited: 2006-03-04); the text is based upon information from 'Het Nederlandse Wetenschappelijke Instituut voor Toerisme'.

¹⁷⁶⁶ Report: 'Holland Pop Festival, Stamping Ground', www.sunrising.it/holland.htm, website visited: 2006-03-04.

¹⁷⁶⁷ As such we could also mention the annual free 'New Pop' festival (since 1977), which was organised at the Zuiderpark, next to the Ahoy', whose sports palace became gradually a music temple too, just like the near-by Feyenoord stadium. For 'New Pop', see e.g. Polygoon, 1978-wk38; COUNTDOWN, Veronica, 1979-09-12. For music events at Ahoy', see e.g. JOURNAAL (NOS, 1971-09-11) ['pop show']; RANDY NEWMAN (1979-10-12, VARA). For concerts at the Feyenoord stadium, see e.g. Polygoon, 1978-wk27 [concert by Bob Dylan].

¹⁷⁶⁸ Matthijsse, 1969.

¹⁷⁶⁹ Groenendijk, 2004: Architectuur > Gebouwen > Euromast; Spacetower

¹⁷⁷⁰ E.g. Polygoon, 1970-wk03.

¹⁷⁷¹ From Central Station to the Weena, Coolingsingel, Binnenweg, Karel Doormanstraat and back; De Winter, 1988: 110.

¹⁷⁷² At different sites in the city activities took place, including theatre and music performances in different quarters. At the former Heliport, in the rebuilt Ahoy' hall, low profile programmes were organised. Next to it was a spectacular amusement park. At the Coolingsingel Boulevard was the so-called *energielijn* ("energy line") with high-tension electricity masts, in order to promote nuclear power.

¹⁷⁷³ It would be installed at the Oostplein afterwards.

A major attraction was *Havodam* at the Weena, a large and precise model of the port, with a length of 200 metres (scale 1:200). ‘Havodam was also open at night, with 20,000 lamps creating a fairy-like illumination. For its visitors, Philips introduced a precursor of the walkman, which was called ‘guidofoon’. For fifty cents one could rent a player that gave succinct information in French, German, English or Dutch about everything the model showed’¹⁷⁷⁴. The port was also presented at the Coolsingel in a capsule with an interactive model using slide projections. Sites of recreation were highlighted; it meant a shift of focus, from business to leisure. Next to it, in the *Leuvehaven*, this was exemplified by the floating *Dolfirodam*, with six dolphins and eight sea-lions¹⁷⁷⁵. It was designed by Herman Bakker, and built on two barges with rafters of the old Ahoy’ hall. The port was furthermore presented by Schaper’s films for the *Havenvakschool*¹⁷⁷⁶.

Besides presentations on the port, a show on the city was organised in front of the St. Laurens Church, called KLANK- & LICHTSPEL ROTTERDAM (dir.: Willy Hofman, Gabri de Wagt). This ‘sound and vision play’, written by Bob den Uyl, showed every night the history of the city, from its beginning (*Hoekse en Kabeljouwse twisten*), via Erasmus and the bombardment, to the resurrection of the St. Laurens Church, and the victory of football club Feyenoord¹⁷⁷⁷.

Among several art projects, coordinated by Ton Frenken, one of them had to generate ideas for a design of the Schouwburgplein. However, artists like Frans Zwartjes and Wim Gijzen presented mere conceptual plans; Gijzen proposed to turn the square into a meadow with cows. According to Alderman Van der Ploeg, the artists ‘lacked any sense of reality’¹⁷⁷⁸. The ‘Bouwcentrum’, in its turn, opened its renewed exhibition hall, with a show on the last twenty-five years of ‘building and living’. It included a prototype of the ‘Futuro House’ by Matti Suuronen: a polyester saucer for six people, placed on adjustable legs. The Bouwcentrum had also commissioned film director Milo Anstadt to make eight shorts on different cities that had been reconstructed after WWII. They were shown in two theatres that were part of the exhibition¹⁷⁷⁹.

One of the shorts was ROTTERDAM C’70 (1970, Milo Anstadt), which presents the city in a nutshell, including impressions of the C’70. Some shots are taken from the cable lift, while the ‘Havodam’ serves as a ‘film set’ to explain the port, interchanged with shots of the actual port. A voice-over says that the interpretation is left to the viewer. The comment is minimal indeed, and the camera directs the viewer instead. It often zooms in, from a street view to a person walking with shopping bags or sitting behind a shop window. It is done smoothly and subtly; the camera observes different facets (and faces) of the city. In a quasi ironical way, known from Haanstra, urban development is framed: shopping centre De Lijnbaan is both a success and a topic of criticism; too many banks were built, at a time that fusions were not yet anticipated; many people recreate in the city, like children swimming in a pool at the Schouwburgplein, while swimming baths in the suburbs are overcrowded. The districts Lombardijen and Alexanderpolder are presented as models, in contrast to the old districts, like Het Oude Westen, which need to be ‘sanitised’. Not long after the C’70 was finished, Anstadt made an extensive version of this film for VARA television (ROTTERDAM NU, 1971-01-18)¹⁷⁸⁰.

¹⁷⁷⁴ De Winter, 1988: 111. Original quote: ‘Havodam was ook ‘s avonds geopend waarbij 20.000 ingebouwde lampjes voor een feeërieke verlichting zorgden. Speciaal voor de bezoekers was door Philips een voorloper van de walkman geïntroduceerd, [p110] de ‘guidofoon’. Voor vijftig cent huurde men bij de entree een casetrecorder die in Frans, Duits, Engels of Nederlands beknopte informatie gaf over alles wat de makette liet zien.’

¹⁷⁷⁵ De Winter, 1988: 111.

¹⁷⁷⁶ I.e. WEG VAN DE HAVEN, 1969/1970; TOPSPORT ZONDER TRIBUNE, Jan Schaper.

¹⁷⁷⁷ De Winter, 1988: 112.

¹⁷⁷⁸ Mentioned by De Winter, 1988: 112. Among other art projects were a ‘communication column’ (André Volten) and a sculpture by the Norwegian artist Carl Nesjar after the design ‘Sylvette’ (1958) by Picasso (Hellweg, 2002: 186).

¹⁷⁷⁹ Matthijsse, 1969: 3.

¹⁷⁸⁰ Different is that the television programme includes interviews with residents and specialists (e.g. arch. Wim Quist).

Before the C'70 started, it was promoted by radio and newspaper advertisements. However, the event as a whole had problems to raise substantial media interest. Two brief reports were made that paid attention to the 'Havodam', still under construction, which was shown on television in August 1969¹⁷⁸¹, and once it was nearly finished (JOURNAAL, 1970-01-22). In addition, VPRO-radio spent an item on the C'70, to question its costs, since protests had risen. In the quarter Het Oude Westen people organised the *Ludiek Kreatief Sabotaasjesentrum* to object the waste of municipal resources, about five million guilders [2.3 million euros]¹⁷⁸². According to the group it should have been used to improve the old quarters. VPRO reporter Bob Visser, after presenting the C'70 radio spot, interviewed the spokesman of the protesters, Mr. Barneveld, as well as Alderman Van der Ploeg¹⁷⁸³. Supported by this attention, the *Ludiek Kreatief Sabotaasjesentrum* occupied the C'70 office two weeks before the beginning of the event. Windows were broken, barricades were set and a red flag was put on top of the building. Smoke bombs were thrown at the police, which removed the occupants. It was reported the same day by the NOS JOURNAAL and VARA's ACHTER HET NIEUWS (1970-04-25). This act of 'socialist vandalism' actually helped the event, for the attention it generated, as information officer Richard Matthijse admitted (in 1996)¹⁷⁸⁴. More television reports followed.

The JOURNAAL showed the opening on the 5th of May ("Liberation Day"), which was attended by Prime Minister P.J.S. De Jong as a guest of Mayor Thomassen. The next day Feyenoord football club won the European Championship, which was celebrated by 100,000 people in front of the Town Hall at the Coolsingel (see also next section)¹⁷⁸⁵. It was valuable publicity for the event, and it was cultivated by the organisers by installing a pavilion to exhibit the cup. Feyenoord would come to the fore once more, when it won the World Cup, which was again celebrated at the Coolsingel¹⁷⁸⁶.

More activities were organised to raise attention. At the end of May, a show of building vehicles took place (JOURNAAL, 1970-05-28; Polygoon, 1970-wk26). The march of engines was like a military and a circus parade in one; the vehicles were the 'Heroes of the Reconstruction'. The biggest one was the crane (140 metres) that had just installed the 'Space Tower' on top of the Euromast. It received special attention by Polygoon. The report showed that the engines were idolised as much as the Cup of Feyenoord, which people photographed with themselves next to it. The media paid attention till the end, and beyond¹⁷⁸⁷. Besides television, the C'70 also had broad press coverage. Moreover, the organisers had made a strategical move to collaborate with the critical *Het Vrije Volk*, which issued a daily paper on the event¹⁷⁸⁸. Next to that, the C'70 also published a booklet on the history of Rotterdam, which was sent to all its citizens¹⁷⁸⁹.

The event became the subject of many 8mm amateur recordings, something that I have called 'retentions' of the event. Most of them, emphasising the cinematic features of the C'70, include images of the city taken from the cable lift and shots of the 'Havodam'¹⁷⁹⁰. Much of this material is part of reels with other city recordings too¹⁷⁹¹. One of them, CAPITOL STADSNIEUWS 1971, was presented as a newsreel by J.W. Soek at the Capitol theatre. Another amateur film is a

¹⁷⁸¹ Fibbe was then also interviewed by reporter Wibo van de Linde: JOURNAAL, NOS, 1969-08-20.

¹⁷⁸² cf. : De Winter, 1988: 112.

¹⁷⁸³ VPRO-VRIJDAG (1970-03-27). Collection Beeld & Geluid, docid: 77744, nr.: HAD9660 Start ID 1 {DAT}.

¹⁷⁸⁴ Matthijse in: Van der Schaaf & Hazewinkel, 1996: 79-80. He used it as a reason to organise a press-conference.

¹⁷⁸⁵ See: FEYENOORD – CELTIC & FEYENOORD WINT EUROPACUP (NOS, 1970-05-06); AANKOMST ELFTAL FEYENOORD EN HULDIGING OP HET STADHUIS (06-05 & 07-05-1970). Celebration on the 7th of May.

¹⁷⁸⁶ See: FEYENOORD – ESTUDIANTES (ARGENTINIË) (NOS, 1970-09-09).

¹⁷⁸⁷ Respectively e.g. ZIEZO ZOMER (TROS, 1970-09-03) and e.g. JOURNAAL (NOS, 1971-08-04).

¹⁷⁸⁸ Richard Matthijse in: Van der Schaaf & Hazewinkel, 1996: 80.

¹⁷⁸⁹ Wagenaar, Aad & Fibbe, Anton; *Rotterdam 25 jaar na dato*, Rotterdam: Stichting Communicatie '70, 1970.

[collection: Bibliotheek Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam, <http://opc.ubib.eur.nl>]

¹⁷⁹⁰ E.g. EEN BEZOEK AAN C'70 (1970, C.Th. de Ruiters), C'70 (1970-09-12, C.W. Amstel)

¹⁷⁹¹ E.g. ROTTERDAM IN DE ZEVENTIGER JAREN (1975, J.A. Visser), ROTTERDAM II (1970, Anonymous), KRIS-KRAS DOOR ROTTERDAM (1970, Wemelsfelder) and CAPITOL STADSNIEUWS 1971 (1970-71, Jan Soek)

one hour production on an international sports tournament that was part of the C'70: INTERNATIONAAL SPORTFEEST, which was made by the *Nivon Smalfilmgroep Rotterdam*. The Nivon had developed out of the Socialist IvAO, whose concern with film went back to the 1920s. The first part of the film shows the preparations, the arrival of sportsmen and sportswomen by buses from different countries, and a reception at the town hall. It is followed by shots of sports at different locations (a.o. the relocated 'Energiehal' of the E55). Such amateur films were part of the communication process that the event was about, as instances of the way it was appropriated by the citizens.

All the activities together turned the city into a large variété show; any medium was used for entertainment, information, publicity and promotion. The city became a festival, which was appreciated by its visitors¹⁷⁹². It is striking that its masterplan was drawn by Herman Bakker (•1915-†1988), who was one of the most productive architects of the reconstruction¹⁷⁹³. He built the kind of architecture that Jacques Tati commented upon in *PLAYTIME* (1967). Tati showed an extremely functionalist city, with indistinguishable steel-and-glass buildings that could be airports, offices, trade fairs, hospitals or housing complexes. Although the film was set in Paris, this city became known as *Tatville*, after the set that Tati had built for it. The inhabitants were called upon to appropriate the city. This happens in the end when a roundabout is transformed into a 'merry-go-round' with all kinds of vehicles. The C'70 shows analogies.

There was also a parade of lift trucks, which was organised by the companies *Hysters* and *Geveke*, and documented by the short film *VORKHEFTRUCKPARADE* (1970, anon.). It exceeded the usual means of self-promotion by turning both the port and the city into playful realms. In a competition of skills, tricks were demonstrated, like lifting and turning barrels, tree trunks and also tiny things. There is a direct connection to Tati, for his collaboration with Bert Haanstra, which resulted in *TRAFIC* (1971, Tati)¹⁷⁹⁴. In this film a newly designed camper is brought from Paris to Amsterdam for an automobile show. During this trip, all kinds of problems occur. Some of the shots were made in Rotterdam, at the time of the C'70. The idea of cities becoming interchangeable was also put into practice by Tati, since Rotterdam served as a 'stand-in'. The images of the metro entrance, for example, became part of Amsterdam Airport Schiphol.

The C'70 was considered a success by the city, which honoured its director Anton Fibbe with the *Wolfert van Borselenpenning*, the highest distinction by the city¹⁷⁹⁵. In total, the C'70 attracted, besides the city's 600,000 inhabitants, another two-and-a-half million people. This was the main argument of Alderman Van der Ploeg to defend the costs¹⁷⁹⁶. On top of the six million guilders that had raised protests, another four million were needed, because of lacking revenues. The cable lift had attracted one million people, which was half a million less than expected. Plans to exploit it and the *Havodam* were not executed afterwards. For years, the costs were justified by Van der Ploeg, who would become, ironically, the Alderman for 'Urban Renewal'.

§ 4. Film International

Whereas the large events in post-war Rotterdam were extensions of its reconstruction, the C'70 was the first to make arts, entertainment and communication a part of the urban fabric. It contributed to the development of a lasting cultural climate, and an institutional infrastructure that

¹⁷⁹² According to NIPO-research, De Winter, 1988: 113.

¹⁷⁹³ He designed many modernist office buildings and housing projects. Groeneveld, 2004, architectuur >> Bakker. Examples of projects by Bakker: Offices: Twaalfprovincienhuis Hoogstraat, 1954; Schiedamsedijk/Schilderstraat, 1958; De Boompjes (1965-1969), Nederlandse Dagblad Unie (Westblaak, 1967-1972); housing projects: Hoogstraat, 1954; Maastorenflat, 1956; Lijnbaanflat, 1957, Kralingsehoutflat, 1958; commercial centres: Hoogvliet (1962); Groot-IJsselmonde (1970), Zuidplein (1967-1972).

¹⁷⁹⁴ E.g. there were other Dutch filmmakers as well with whom Tati was in touch, e.g. Louis van Gasteren – mentioned by Van Gasteren in a conversation with the author FP, 2003-10-07.

¹⁷⁹⁵ Cf. Vroegindeweyj, 2005.

¹⁷⁹⁶ Richard Matthijssse in: Van der Schaaf & Hazewinkel, 1996: 81.

supported it¹⁷⁹⁷. The *Rotterdamse Kunststichting* (RKS, 'Rotterdam Arts Council') would play a major role in this. Its new director Adriaan van der Staay (from 1968 to 1979) and the head of the literature section, Martin Mooij, went to London in 1969, to attend the festival 'Poetry International',¹⁷⁹⁸. They intended to establish contacts to create something similar in Rotterdam¹⁷⁹⁹. The next year, during the C'70, they organised 'Poetry International Rotterdam'. It attracted substantial attention¹⁸⁰⁰. Due to its success, Van der Staay thought of a similar event for film. In 1971, the RKS got its film section, headed by Frank Visbeen. Alderman Vos (Art & Culture) asked him to investigate the possibilities for the development of cinema¹⁸⁰¹. Anticipating the conclusion, Huub Bals – who had previously organised the *Cinemanifestatie* in Utrecht – was asked to organise 'Film International'. Like 'Poetry International', the first edition (1972) was part of the 'Holland Festival',¹⁸⁰². Thirty-one films attracted five thousand visitors.

After a year, Bals and Visbeen came with the *Filmnota*, to conclude that the municipality had to focus on distribution, different from the opinion of fifteen years earlier¹⁸⁰³. Distribution was considered to be the main bottleneck for art films¹⁸⁰⁴. Moreover, in comparison to film production, it would be the most effective way to intervene with limited resources, although some money would be available for the production of experimental films too. The annual film festival had to function as a motor to set up a national distribution network of independent art houses – which was elaborated on the idea of the *Filmliga* from the 1920s and 1930s. In Rotterdam the art house (*filmhuis*) would be established in De Lantaren, next to 't Venster.

The *Filmnota* motivated the ideas with the argument of providing local alternatives to commercial cinema, as the quantitative most important form of entertainment, and to implement instead 'conscious cultural participation',¹⁸⁰⁵. It relied on the same idea as expressed about twenty-five years earlier in *De Stad der Toekomst, De Toekomst der Stad* (Bos e.a., 1946: 257). Bos addressed that the centre, with its cinema, would offer both a cultural elite and a broader group the opportunity for self-development¹⁸⁰⁶. This had also been the ambition of the *Filmliga*, but it implied a tension. In the *Filmnota* it was rhetorically overcome by framing it as *conscious cultural participation*. In practice, however, Bals radically chose for a cinephile approach.

To carry out the plan, an organisation had to be founded that would first operate as part of the RKS, in order to become independent later on¹⁸⁰⁷. The report was presented to the college in November 1972. Half a year later, in March 1973, the municipality granted 180,000 guilders [€ 82,000]. This subsidy was already anticipated by the RKS, as they organised the second edition of the festival in the meantime, in February 1973. More films were programmed and more visitors

¹⁷⁹⁷ Cf. De Winter, 1988: 12.

¹⁷⁹⁸ Founded in 1967 by Ted Hughes.

¹⁷⁹⁹ Website of 'Poetry International Rotterdam >> Geschiedenis (visited: 2008-07-29)

<http://www.poetry.nl/read/nederlands/overpoetry?submenu=3251>

¹⁸⁰⁰ Although a short television interview with poet Galway Kinnell was eventually not broadcast (i.e. ZOMAAR EEN ZOMERAVOND, POETRY INTERNATIONAL, Pier Tania/VARA), the NCRV largely compensated it by broadcasting a one-hour programme on the radio– VOORRANG (NCRV-radio, 1970-07-13), featuring Galway Kinnell, Zbigniew Herbert, Eugene Guillevic and Lars Gustafsson; ref. B&G: 23163-23166, HA5977 {1/4inch-BAND}. Besides that, the *Wereldomroep* also made a short item of it, with the Dutch poet Gerrit Komrij: NIET BEKEND (Wereldomroep, 1970-06-17, 1970-06-19), From 'De Doelen' In Rotterdam, 7'22" [B&G: 18359, HA3633 {1/4inch-BAND}]. See also, for example, HOLLAND FESTIVAL 1972 (Jan Venema, NOS, 1972-06-25). It shows many different performing poets. They are interchanged with shots of other activities and some experimental images of Rotterdam, which show a woman riding a motor bike, 'De Doelen', urban renewal areas, and a (staged) street fight.

¹⁸⁰¹ Gaemers, 1996: 129.

¹⁸⁰² Derksen, 2001: 30. Cf. Sonnen, 2005, with a reference to Pierre Audi, on the role of the Holland Festival. For more information on Bals, see: Heijs & Westra, 1996.

¹⁸⁰³ Policy note by the *Sectie Film*; 'Advies voor de Sectie Film van de Commissie voor het Kunstbeleid', February 1955: GAR, archive: 'Secretarie afd. Kunstzaken', toegangsnr. 487.01, bestanddeel 6.

¹⁸⁰⁴ Gaemers, 1996: 129.

¹⁸⁰⁵ I.e. *bewuste cultuurparticipatie*, see: Heijs & Westra, 1996: 91.

¹⁸⁰⁶ As expressed in his opening speech (1949), and recalled in *Ons Huis Rotterdam, 1909-1959* (Brusse, 1960: 32).

¹⁸⁰⁷ Heijs & Westra, 1996: 91.

came, while it also attracted substantial media attention¹⁸⁰⁸. The festival continued to grow during the following years, attracting more visitors and media attention¹⁸⁰⁹.

'Film International' became an important institution within Dutch cinema. On the occasion of the fifth edition (1976), NOS-television made a 'behind the scenes' documentary, with explanations by Huub Bals (BEELDSPRAAK, NOS, 1976-02-22). He remarks that 70% of the audience comes from Rotterdam, so that it is first of all important for the city. For one year, he says, the city can suck this magic sweet (*toverbal*). It is striking that this documentary presented Bals as a kind of festival *auteur*, both through questions and imagery, by positioning him as a lonely individual in empty spaces. Bals himself, however, emphasises that the festival is a collective endeavour, and that he has not the guts and the courage to make films himself. Instead, he fulfils an intermediary function. At the end, moreover, he expresses his uneasiness about the fact that *he* is the focus of the documentary, instead of the festival, just before its start, and that it is broadcast at prime-time Sunday night, as if it is all about him. At the same time he articulates his idiosyncratic ideas about cinema and stresses that his view is decisive for the programme. As film scholar Marijke de Valck has argued (2006: 183), Bals was an exponent of the 'age of programmers' (as opposed to the next 'age of festival directors'). The programme was not made to please a general public, nor was cinema directly connected to television.

As a film authority, Bals was also asked to be in other television programmes¹⁸¹⁰. However, television was not yet part of the festival, as an extension of the programme, or to broadcast interviews. In some years the festival was even not reported by television at all¹⁸¹¹. Instead the RKS used to make video recordings itself¹⁸¹². It shows that the target audience was still limited¹⁸¹³. However, when Van der Staay celebrated his tenth anniversary as the director of the RKS, he explained for NCRV-radio that he considered Film and Poetry International to be the main vectors in the arts policy of Rotterdam, since they had created larger audiences for the kinds of works presented¹⁸¹⁴. In 1979 Van der Staay left the RKS. He was succeeded by Hans Keller, who had worked as a filmmaker for VPRO-television before¹⁸¹⁵. On this occasion, VARA made a radio documentary on the arts in Rotterdam, a week after a programme had been made that dealt specifically with the festival¹⁸¹⁶. It is surprising that it was radio to report on these events, all the more so since one of its makers, Kees Breedijk, also worked as a filmmaker (a.o. for the RKS).

Bals made all possible efforts to promote art cinema¹⁸¹⁷, except that from the Netherlands¹⁸¹⁸. Dimitri Eipides, programmer of the festival of Montreal said that for young Dutch filmmakers Rotterdam could have played a more active role¹⁸¹⁹. For Rotterdam itself this was slightly different. According to Jacques van Heijningen, 'Bals liked its filmmakers because they were half-wits or rascals, such as Dick Rijnke, Hans de Ridder, Ferri Ronteltap and Bob Visser'¹⁸²⁰.

¹⁸⁰⁸ E.g. BRANDPUNT (KRO, 1973-02-17), interview by Aad van den Heuvel with Huub Bals, a.o.

¹⁸⁰⁹ E.g. UIT DE KUNST (NOS, 1974-03-01).

¹⁸¹⁰ For example in television programmes, e.g. DROOMLAND (VPRO, 1976-01-29), on film in the Netherlands; VARA-VISIE (1978-06-09), on Film Festival Cannes.

¹⁸¹¹ i.e. 1975, 1977, 1979, 1980; in 1978 it was briefly reported by KORTWEG, NOS, 1978-02-07.

¹⁸¹² e.g. INTERVIEW MET REGISSEURS (1977, RKS).

¹⁸¹³ The number of visitors by 1978 was 27,000; for more information see: Nibbeling, 1989.

¹⁸¹⁴ LUNCHCONCERT (NCRV-radio, 1978-04-26, Kirsten Kleinsma & Robert Weeda); see also: ADRIAAN VAN DER STAAY (1979-01-31, sound rec. Gemeentearchief Rotterdam) on the occasion of the departure of Van der Staay.

¹⁸¹⁵ And afterwards too; he left the RKS again in 1981, to make various other films, broadcast by the VPRO (a.o.).

¹⁸¹⁶ HET ZOUT IN DE PAP, 1979-02-01 and 1979-02-10, VARA-radio.

¹⁸¹⁷ E.g. HUUB BALS [interview] (1979-06-05, sound recording, Gemeentearchief Rotterdam).

¹⁸¹⁸ See e.g. Ryclef Rienstra, director of the *Nederlands Fonds voor de Film* (1984-1989)

www.cultuurprofijt.nl/index.php?pageid=wie&catid=wie&cntid=14 (2008-04-03).

¹⁸¹⁹ Quoted in: Heijs & Westra, 1996: 256.

¹⁸²⁰ Ibid, p260. Bals showed e.g. Rijnke's PINKEL (1982, Rijnke & Van Leeuwen), De Ridder's WE ZIJN ER ZELF BIJ (1978), Ronteltap's RICHARD (1970), DRIE FASIG (1971) and VERWACHTINGEN (1971), Visser's J.A. DEELDER'S

An example of a film that was shown here was Rijnke's *LIVING ONE'S LIFE* (1979). Three women in their early twenties are followed over a period of two and a half years. In his own words, Rijnke 'observed them in their mutual relationships and their outlook on life in general, such as it is expressed mainly by one of the girls'¹⁸²¹. The central figure follows classes to become a nursery school teacher, and reflects upon education, the position of women, and being independent and unbound. 'Modern human beings start to think', she says by way of conclusion, and laughs about herself since she finds it rather high-handedly. Made with the support of the ministry of culture (CRM), the film is presented as an *auteur* documentary (which is emphasised by an animated autograph of Rijnke at the end of the film). With mostly close-up shots of the faces, shot in black-and-white in *cinéma vérité* style, the film is akin to the VPRO-school. And indeed, Roelof Kiers of the VPRO was highly enthusiastic about the film, and acquired it for broadcasting¹⁸²². As a result of it, Kiers and the VPRO commissioned Rijnke to make another film about the cultural scene in Rotterdam, which became the trilogy *GROETEN UIT ROTTERDAM* (1980, Rijnke & Van Leeuwen). Before broadcasting, the first part, about a collective of artists (Citroen, Van Persie, Kraat), was subsequently shown at the festival (1980). In the meantime, this production and the connection with the VPRO generated considerable spin-off, such as the production *OVER DE BRUG* (1981, Hans Keller), which was produced by Rijnke & Van Leeuwen, and broadcast by the VPRO.

While maintaining the same quality standards, things would gradually change in the 1980s. Besides *Lantaren/Venster*, the festival started to show films in other theatres (Calypso, Lumière and Luxor). It made the event more visible and accessible. The festival became important to present Rotterdam as 'a city of culture', and a device in its city marketing¹⁸²³. It provided the city with another image, made out of many images from all over the world. This encompassed various other media, like flyers, booklets, and posters. As addressed by Jan Heijs (2006), such images were spread across the city, which generated a 'buzz'. Something was happening here, in which various organisations took part; Bals offered them the opportunity to link up with 'Film International'. This composed cosmopolitan image would be elaborated by extending the programme through other artistic expressions, by supporting filmmakers and organisations, and by connecting filmmakers to one another and the public. 'Film International' gradually turned Rotterdam into a film centre, as a node within the international film festival circuit (see: De Valck, 2006), and as a mediator that connected different ideas, movements, and places. Or, as Ulf Hannerz has said (1996: 149): 'centers are often centers not because they are the origins of all things, but rather because they are places of exchange, the switchboards of culture.' Hence the image that was created for Rotterdam was that of a 'switchboard of culture'.

STADSGEZICHT (1977), and also experimental shorts of the young Rotterdam artist-filmmaker Edward Luyken, as well as productions by Pieter-Jan Smit. See a.o. Heijs & Westra, 1996: 125.

¹⁸²¹ See: www.rotterdamfilms.nl > producties > 't is Gewoon leven (2008-05-14)

¹⁸²² Information by Rijnke & Van Leeuwen in an interview with FP, 2009-01-16.

¹⁸²³ I.e. 1983-1984, as said by communication consultant Kees Bode, in: Van der Schaaf & Hazewinkel, 1996: 111-112.

CHAPTER 16. RE/VISIONS

§ 1. the human dimension

Rotterdam had been rebuilt as a ‘functional city’ according to CIAM’s ‘Athens Charter’ from 1933, which became internationally the main reference for post-war planning. However, a group of architects within CIAM, among them the Dutch architects Jacob Bakema and Aldo van Eyck¹⁸²⁴, observed a technocratic tendency and a preoccupation with functions rather than with human needs. In 1954 this group wrote the *Doorn Manifesto*, which started as follows: ‘It is useless to consider the house except as a part of a community owing to the interaction of these on each other.’ One had to ‘study the dwelling and the groupings that are necessary to produce convenient communities’, but one also emphasised that: ‘The appropriateness of any solution may lie in the field of architectural invention rather than social anthropology.’

This group, which became known as ‘Team X’ [Team Ten], did no longer think of architecture and planning as the sum of functions, but as the ‘material form of relations’, with form having its own function, inseparable from social interaction¹⁸²⁵. New ways to arrange dwellings and communities were conceived through issues like the ‘layered city’, circulation, growth and change, flexible structures, the aesthetics of numbers, and generally the link between architecture and urbanism – the premises of what was later called ‘structuralism’. One argued that individualised approaches were needed, rather than a charter with general prescriptions. As a result, CIAM was eventually dissolved in 1959¹⁸²⁶. Bakema and Van Eyck subsequently became involved with ‘Forum’, which was a magazine that represented the new movement, which would also include people like Herman Herzberger, Herman Haan and Piet Blom, among others¹⁸²⁷.

Bakema, together with his companion Van den Broek, was a key figure within the modern movement in Rotterdam, and as such their studio received much attention¹⁸²⁸. At the same time Bakema was also its critic. Besides his emphasis on the human dimension and social needs, he spoke of *beeldend functionalism* (‘visual functionalism’) and ‘the function of the form’, which he also expressed in a television series, VAN STOEL TOT STAD (‘From Chair to City’, NTS, 1961-1963). The series, which made him a well-known personality in the Netherlands, were like public lectures, with Bakema explaining his ideas on design, architecture and urbanism, while drawing on a blackboard¹⁸²⁹. The series dealt with the development of human settlement, and the search for a balanced relationship between people and their surroundings, including nature and the social environment. It was an appeal to the senses, to understand space, and to understand the position of the individual in industrialised society. Although a small book was published afterwards (1964), which made use of the material from the series, live television, allowed for a different rhetoric, which made use of the ephemeral character of the medium¹⁸³⁰. Rather than a written argumentation that could be read once and again, with fact and figures to be checked, this was a communication of ideas through speech, gestures and drawings¹⁸³¹. The

¹⁸²⁴ Other members were Georges Candilis, Giancarlo de Carlo, William & Jill Howell, Alison & Peter Smithson, John Völcker, Shadrach Woods. www.team10online.org/team10/text/doorn-manifesto.htm (2007-04-10).

¹⁸²⁵ See e.g. www.kunstbus.nl/verklaringen/team-10.html (2007-04-10).

¹⁸²⁶ Cf. www.kunstbus.nl/verklaringen/team-10.html (2007-04-10). Team-X remained to exist for 20 years.

¹⁸²⁷ All of them would become involved with projects in Rotterdam: Aldo van Eyck contributed to the E55; Herman Hertzberger made a design for the Schouwburgplein (not carried out), see Pim Korver’s news report for the NOS JOURNAAL (1977-03-30); Herman Haan built various private houses (e.g. ‘Woonhuis Uitenbroek’, 1954-1956) and the office of the GEM (1963), a.o.; Piet Blom built the ‘cube houses’ (1976-1984).

¹⁸²⁸ Besides various programmes that included their work (e.g. OPENBAAR KUNSTBEZIT; MODERNE ARCHITECTUUR, NOS, 1963-10-07), see also e.g. KIJK OP KUNST, KRO, 1962-11-01.

¹⁸²⁹ Cf. Van den Heuvel e.a., 2003: 64.

¹⁸³⁰ Only one show (1961-10-22) has been preserved through telerecording (i.e. 16mm recording from a television screen).

¹⁸³¹ The series is often mentioned in (biographical) texts on Bakema, but little has actually been recalled. More specific references make use of quotes from the book.

programme had a great impact, both within the community of architects and outside it, and as such it contributed to a critical discussion on architecture and urban planning in general.

At about the same time a public discussion started on the development and the identity of Rotterdam. Whereas the reconstruction of Rotterdam had first been heralded as a model of modern planning, it became subject to criticism once it reached completion. The VPRO broadcasting Van der Velde's *POLDERS VOOR INDUSTRIE* (1961) was important. Although this documentary concerned primarily the extension of the port, it also drew a link with city planning (see Chapter 13. §2). In 1965, the discussion was propelled by the KRO report *DE NIEUWE STAD, LEEFBAAR?* It was broadcast on the 10th of May, the day of the German invasion in the Netherlands in 1940, and shortly before the publication of Rein Blijstra's book, the opening of the exhibition *Rotterdam, Stad in Beweging*, and the premiere of the remake of *EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM* (Polygoon), which celebrated the achievements of the reconstruction. Instead, this television report focused on *leefbaarheid* ('liveability').

DE NIEUWE STAD, LEEFBAAR? starts with explanations by Van Traa, who was just retired, but willing to address once more the spatial merits of the city plan, especially its openness. City architect Rein Fledderus explains that some people are not so happy with it today, but it may take two more generations to see the results, both in the city centre and the suburbs. Only then a community and an urban culture will be fully grown. The film pays respect to the intentions of the planners and architects, but still questions the principles on which the city is conceived. It recognises that the rectangle is a clear and powerful matrix of Rotterdam's planning and architecture, which is illustrated by various images (e.g. of the suburb 'Ommoord'), but at the same time, it is said, it is boring when it is endlessly repeated, up to 'deadly uniformity'. Instead, an argument is made for 'organic growth'. This is stressed by architecture critic J.J. Vriend, who calls Rotterdam 'an exhibition of architecture that closes at ten p.m.' He finds it difficult to predict what the next generations will consider as 'liveable', but according to him it means a pub and things like a carpenter's workshop around the corner, where residents can be in touch with the city. The film thus asks attention for 'more simple things' that generate an urban atmosphere.

In the meantime, Jan Schaper worked on the documentary *STAD ZONDER HART* (1966, see Chapter 11. §2), broadcast by NCRV, which expressed a similar view. Television in general, and Schaper's film in particular, played an important role in the public discussion on the identity of Rotterdam. Within this discussion, a renewed interest in the old city came to the fore, and what had happened with it during the war and afterwards. Like *STAD ZONDER HART*, which made use of images of Von Bary's *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* (1928), many of these films made use of existing footage, in order to evaluate the historical process¹⁸³². Schaper's emphasis on the vividness of the old city, his argument for the human dimension, for the city to enable social interaction, is striking if one considers the fact that he began this film only a few years after his plea *in favour* of modernist planning (*OLD TOWN GROWING YOUNGER*, 1958).

The changing public opinion directly affected business interests. Therefore D.C.P. van de Pavoordt, director of department store Vroom & Dreesmann, commissioned a study to analyse the problems, which was conducted by social-psychologist Prof. Dr. Rob Wentholt. In the resulting publication, *De Binnenstadsbeleving en Rotterdam* (1968), Wentholt reached the same conclusion as Schaper: Rotterdam had become a victim of modernist planning ideology that did not take into account vital psychological functions of a city, like sociability, vividness, and visual attractiveness. He suggested to turn Rotterdam into a compact city with a high density of

¹⁸³² See e.g. *TELEVIZIER* (AVRO, 1964-04-17), on the bombardment, *DE BEZETTING*; AFL. 20: *DE HONGERWINTER* (Milo Anstadt, NTS: 1968-02-13), including an interview with Ms. J.M. van Walsum-Quispel on razzias in Rotterdam for the *Arbeitseinsatz*; *ACHTER HET NIEUWS* (VARA, 1970-04-20), an interview with General Kurt Student; *ROTTERDAM SINDS MENSENHEUGENIS* [stories about the city before WWII] (AVRO, 1970-05-10); various films by Jan van Hillo: *INTERVIEW MET ELISABETH VAN DOP-HUFKENS* (1975), and *DE TIJD STOND EVEN STIL*; *ROTTERDAM - 14 MEI 1940* (NCRV: 1978-04-24), on the bombardment, including a film fragment of the fiction film *ERGENS IN NEDERLAND* (1940, Ludwig Berger), and *INTERVIEW MET DR. W.B. VAN STAVEREN* (1978), also on the bombardment.

dwellings in the city centre, instead of shops and offices, and to intensify public space. According to Paul van de Laar (2000: 542), who did not notice the television reports, this book started the public discussion on the identity of Rotterdam (cf. Rooijendijk, 2005: 153, 178). It is remarkable though that Van de Laar does not refer to the reason of this study, and its initiator, Van de Pavoordt (who is mentioned, however, by Rooijendijk, 2005: 182).

Parallel to the rising critique upon the city, television came to discuss socially problematic issues, such as homelessness, drug abuse, and crime, which had remained underexposed so far¹⁸³³. This too showed the limits of the modern project. Illustrative is the case of prostitution. It caused a serious planning problem in the 1970s, which was amplified through reports from various broadcasting stations, whether Socialist, liberal, Catholic or Evangelical¹⁸³⁴. Like in any port city, prostitution had always been prominently present in Rotterdam. Until the 1920s it took place in the Zandstraatbuurt, right in the city centre; the quarter became then subject to a 'civilisation offensive' and it was 'sanitised' to make place for the new town hall. Prostitution simply moved elsewhere, near the Schiedamsedijk, which was closer to the port¹⁸³⁵. The war changed this situation again, and it subsequently moved to the old quarter of Katendrecht, a peninsula surrounded by harbours. It remained there, as the 'sailor's quarter' that Van Traa had foreseen in the 'Basisplan' was not carried out¹⁸³⁶. Katendrecht gradually deteriorated. The municipality recognised the problems of the residents, but advised them to move, by offering housing elsewhere¹⁸³⁷. Residents refused it and united themselves (i.e. *Aktiegroep Redt Katendrecht*). It caused tensions with the pimps, which resulted in shoot-outs and fires. The reports on television enabled a public discussion, which caused the municipality to rethink the problem. The municipality developed a plan to concentrate prostitution in an *Eroscentrum*, to be located in the 'Poortgebouw' (1879, arch. J.S.C. van der Wall). This was, in turn, not accepted by the residents of Feijenoord, and the plan was finally cancelled. Other plans to relocate it failed too¹⁸³⁸. While Katendrecht was appointed as an urban renewal area, prostitution moved to different parts of the city, which was finally left that way since nuisance turned out to be limited as such¹⁸³⁹.

This case shows one of the problems that the municipality could not solve by way of planning, like so many other problems that occurred in the old quarters, which I will discuss in the next section. They would dominate the political agenda for the next decade, after the national elections of 1972 (November 29) were won by the social-democratic PvdA. With the progressive cabinet Den Uyl, spatial planning got to serve social welfare first of all, which required new approaches¹⁸⁴⁰. 'The focus shifted from form and function in design to the regulation of decision-

¹⁸³³ One could think of issues such as homelessness, which was addressed by programmes like VARA's ACHTER HET NIEUWS (e.g. 1964-09-24), KRO's BRANDPUNT (e.g. 1969-04-05 and 1974-02-16), as well as the NOS JOURNAAL (e.g. 1972-01-02); illegal gambling houses (e.g. AKTUA, TROS, 1975-01-20); vandalism (e.g. JOURNAAL, NOS, 1974-05-30 and 1977-09-17); because of its port, Rotterdam became a major centre for drugs traffic, see e.g. NOS JOURNAAL 1973-12-24 and 1974-12-24; crime in general became an important issue (e.g. ACHTER HET NIEUWS, VARA, 1966-05-14 [= work of the police]; AKTUA, TROS, 1978-02-14 [= crime victims] a.o., including JOURNAAL reports), and with it the accommodation for detention (e.g. of women: KENMERK, IKOR, 1963-04-15; TELEVIZIER-SUPPLEMENT, AVRO, 1972-10-04; JOURNAAL, NOS, 1978-02-04; AKTUA, TROS, 1978-02-07; HIER EN NU, NCRV, 1978-11-13).

¹⁸³⁴ See: AVRO's TELEVIZIER (1971-12-27; 1974-10-18; cf. 1972-09-11); NCRV – HIER EN NU (1973-08-21); NTS – PROSTITUTIE OP KATENDRECHT (1975-02-13); EO – NADER BEKEKEN (1977-10-04); EO – NADER BEKEKEN (1977-10-18); VARA – VARA-VISIE (1978-01-21); KRO – BRANDPUNT (1979-03-30). For a general image of Katendrecht, see: KAAP DE GOEDE HOOP (1970, Mathieu van den Bos).

¹⁸³⁵ Van de Laar, 2000: 294.

¹⁸³⁶ Van de Laar, 2000: 545.

¹⁸³⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸³⁸ E.g. to move prostitution from Katendrecht to Wijnhaven (JOURNAAL, NOS, 1975-06-27).

¹⁸³⁹ Van de Laar, 2000: 546.

¹⁸⁴⁰ De Vletter, 2005: 40. Minister of housing became Hans Gruijters; secretary of state for urban renewal became Jan Schaefer and for social housing Marcel van Dam. One of the measures taken by this government was the introduction of a system of income-related rents (ibid, p47).

making processes, and from grand plans for the future to small-scale and more topically driven interventions' (De Vletter, 2005: 40). The attitude was no longer to think in terms of large-scale planning, but rather in small-scale social involvement with great social prospects. Architecture and planning concerned above all the human environment. Its main subject was not space, form and structure, but social relations that were accommodated, generated and mediated by space. This, however, went beyond the ideas of Team X, so that planning and architecture eventually turned into a kind of applied sociology¹⁸⁴¹. Communication became an important part of it, to such a degree that media became direct extensions of planning – with the media themselves shifting from aesthetic approaches of form, rhythm and perception towards social engagement¹⁸⁴².

§ 2. urban renewal

Most of the old quarters surrounding the city centre had been saved during WWII. Built around 1900, when the city grew fast, they were characterised by jerry-building and narrow streets. After the war the conditions of these quarters rapidly worsened. It caused the more wealthy residents to move to the new suburbs, and as a result of it, low-income groups became concentrated in the old quarters, which reinforced the problems.

Along with the plans for the reconstruction of the city centre and the creation of new residential districts, plans were made for the redevelopment of the old quarters, which had to be carried out after the reconstruction would be finished and after solving the problem of housing shortage. Based upon older ideas of slum clearance, one foresaw the demolition of about 20,000 dwellings, which implied that an equal number of households had to be relocated.

A priority scheme of quarters was made. It suggested that preparations were going on, but nothing was actually done¹⁸⁴³. As Paul van de Laar has emphasised (2000: 540), Mayor Van Walsum said that the money was needed to develop the port. Next to that were social-economic complications. For many of the residents from the old quarters the rents for new houses would be too high. Certain residents were also stigmatised as 'antisocial', who would not match the model workers family that appreciated a good dwelling¹⁸⁴⁴. Already in 1953, the physician and critical PvdA city councillor H.J. Lamberts (who also appeared in *POLDERS VOOR INDUSTRIE*, 1961, Wim van der Velde) predicted that adaptation to the new conditions would create too much pressure for the residents, with serious effects, which would worsen their position (Van de Laar, 2000: 540). Lamberts advised to restore the old quarters, and to involve the residents. However, these ideas did not correspond to the modern ambitions of Rotterdam. One thought of building *for* society rather than an interactive development process *with* society. Moreover, the question how existing social relations and their related physical structures could accommodate processes of renewal was not much of an issue within the discourses of architecture and planning.

Another critical PvdA city-councillor, Jan van der Ploeg, argued that, in any case, the city had to take its responsibilities and he proposed a "sanitation committee" to prepare concrete plans for the old quarters. It started in 1958, but it took eight years before the committee came with a report of the committee. On that occasion, the television programme *ACHTER HET NIEUWS* (VARA, 1966-10-25) articulated the need for action by showing the deplorable condition of many old houses. The report proposed demolition in order to build new high rise housing estates, which ran parallel to ideas to solve traffic issues. It took another three years before the plans were elaborated and made into the so-called *Saneringsnota* (1969)¹⁸⁴⁵. This, however, would cause a

¹⁸⁴¹ Cf. De Vletter, 2005: 45.

¹⁸⁴² See also the so-called *Samenlevings-Opbouwweek* in various districts in Rotterdam (Ommoord, Pendrecht, Dijkzigt, Katendrecht) and the report about it on national television by HV (broadcasting: 1973-09-30).

¹⁸⁴³ I.e. around 1956. Van de Laar, 2000: 539.

¹⁸⁴⁴ Van de Laar, 2000: 540.

¹⁸⁴⁵ Van de Laar, 2000: 541.

phenomenon that Van der Ploeg called *saneringsnomaden* (“sanitation nomads”), which were residents that moved from one slum to another¹⁸⁴⁶.

One of the sanitation areas was Het Oude Westen. In 1964 the “Department for Urban Development” (*Dienst Stadsontwikkeling*) presented a study for its redevelopment. The suggestion was made to build here the new Erasmus University and other city functions¹⁸⁴⁷. In this plan the quarter would be swept from the map, and residents would be moved to new suburbs¹⁸⁴⁸. In 1968 the *Rotterdamse Kring* of the Union of Dutch Architects (BNA) took Het Oude Westen as a case-study to develop approaches for sanitation¹⁸⁴⁹. Five different plans were made, among others by Ernest Groosman, and Leo de Jonge, which were presented to the municipality on the 6th of March 1970 – one month before the city council would discuss the *Saneringsnota*. The plans were not so different from those of the municipality, except for one, which was made by a group that included Nico Witstok and the Swiss architect Pietro Hammel, who were residents of the quarter themselves¹⁸⁵⁰. Architect and critic Endry van Velzen has mentioned (1993) that the four other plans still followed, in steps, the idea of the *tabula rasa*.

The different phases of sanitation were actually nothing else than burdensome stop-overs on the way to a new final situation, the City of Tomorrow, whose becoming required unfortunately twenty years. Hammel and partners instead took the duration of the renewal process as the starting point for their plan; there is no City of Tomorrow, only a City of Today, which could be tinkered with continuously.¹⁸⁵¹

Hammel articulated his ideas in his book *Unsere Zukunft: die Stadt* (1972), in which ‘Het Oude Westen’ served as a case-study. According to Van Velzen, the book followed the ideas of the American urban theorist Jane Jacobs, for whom ‘city diversity’ was the key term. It implied mixed functions, small units, a combination of old and new buildings, and a high population density. Hammel combined it with the ideas of Aldo van Eyck, with whom he and Witstok had already had an exchange of ideas in the magazine *Forum* a decade earlier¹⁸⁵². Van Eyck addressed the importance of urban and spatial ‘identity’, where (social) events and place define each other. Such events could be triggered by combining different functions in a well-composed spatial and non-hierarchical urban configuration, instead of a generic plan based on standardised units. Van Eyck had also drawn an argument in which existing structures, rather than the *tabula rasa*, became the point of departure. However, such ideas caused commotion within the circle of the BNA, to such an extent that Hammel and Witstok even withdrew from the union¹⁸⁵³.

Four days after the studies had been presented, the conditions in Het Oude Westen were first reported on television by the popular-liberal AVRO in its news programme TELEVIZIER (1970-03-10). Reporter Marcel de Groot showed deteriorated houses, traffic jams, obstructed fire engines, children dancing on the roofs of cars and some residents distributing posters, calling for change. These activists became the pivotal force in the redevelopment of the quarter. As

¹⁸⁴⁶ Van de Laar, 2000: 543.

¹⁸⁴⁷ Groenendijk, 2004: Architectuur > Personen > ‘Aktiegroep Het Oude Westen’.

¹⁸⁴⁸ www.rotterdam.nl/smartsite2043508.dws?Menu=2004581&MainMenu=0

¹⁸⁴⁸ Van Velzen, 1993: 29.

¹⁸⁴⁹ Van Velzen, 1993: 29/39n7.

¹⁸⁵⁰ ‘Studie sanering Gouvernekwartier Rotterdam’, werkgroep: A.J. ter Braak, W. Eijkelenboom, P.P. Hammel, A. Middelhoek, W.G. Quist, N. Witstok, see: www.bonas.nl (2007-04-14)

¹⁸⁵¹ Van Velzen, 1993: 30. Original quote: ‘De verschillende fasen van de sanering waren eigenlijk niet meer dan de hinderlijke tussenstations op weg naar een nieuwe eindsituatie, de Stad van Morgen, waarvan de wording helaas [p29] twintig jaar zou vergen. Hammel en de zijnen namen juist de duur van het vernieuwingsproces tot uitgangspunt voor hun plan; er is geen Stad van Morgen, alleen een Stad van Vandaag waar voortdurend aan moet kunnen worden gesleuteld.’

¹⁸⁵² Van Velzen, 1993: 39n13. *Forum*, 1960-1961; 4 & 9.

¹⁸⁵³ See: Van Elzen, 1993: 39n7.

architecture historian Groenendijk has mentioned (2004a), a number of mothers joined forces at meetings in social-cultural centre *Ons Huis* (“Our House”, later De Lantaren).

VPRO-radio reacted by reporting on a neighbourhood meeting that took place the next day, in which the plans were discussed, in favour of the plan by Hammel and company (VPRO-VRIJDAG, broadcast 1970-03-13). Its reporter, Bob Visser, opposed it to an interview with city planner B. Fokkinga, who understood that the residents had to be taken seriously. The attention paid by the media strengthened the self-confidence of the residents. As such they also protested against the C’70 event, for which they arranged the so-called *Ludiek Kreatief Sabotaasjesentrum*. They argued that the money spent on the C’70 could have been better used to improve the old quarters¹⁸⁵⁴. It was once more reported by VPRO-radio (1970-03-27)¹⁸⁵⁵. Next to that the residents founded an action committee, *Aktiegroep Het Oude Westen*¹⁸⁵⁶. They came together for another meeting, at community centre ‘Odeon’. This time it was attended by VARA television¹⁸⁵⁷. It reported on the discussions between residents and politicians, which showed the whole country that residents wanted to participate in the developments, while claiming support of the government in their struggle against the deterioration of privately owned estates. A few days later, on the 2nd of April 1970, the city council discussed the *Saneringsnota*. The public stand was packed with citizens from the old quarters to protest against the plans. Soon afterwards, in April, the *Aktiegroep* entered the house of Mayor Thomassen and took a bath in his bathroom, to address that they did not have a bath or shower at home. This act received much attention from the newspapers¹⁸⁵⁸. In the same month the *Ludiek Kreatief Sabotaasjesentrum* occupied the C’70 office, which was reported by the NOS JOURNAAL (1970-04-25) as well as ACHTER HET NIEUWS (VARA, 1970-04-25). The Mayor and Aldermen, replying to the *Saneringsnota* and to the protests, put away the notion of *sanering*, and spoke instead of *stadsvernieuwing* (urban renewal).

Once Het Oude Westen had become a focus of the media, more television programmes followed¹⁸⁵⁹. Although they showed different perspectives, the attention shifted to the issue of increasing numbers of immigrants that came to live in the old quarters, their housing conditions, and their position in society¹⁸⁶⁰. Tensions increased between Dutch residents and so-called *gastarbeiders*. The “Turk riots” (*Turkenrellen*) were infamous in the Afrikaanderwijk in August 1972. A Dutch woman with children was evicted from her house by a landlord, who wanted to turn it into a boarding house for Turkish *gastarbeiders*. Neighbours defended the woman and the conflict escalated. For several days Dutch and Turkish residents were fighting, which was reported by various television programmes¹⁸⁶¹. In his book *Stad van Formaat*, Paul van de Laar says:

¹⁸⁵⁴ Cf. : De Winter, 1988: 112.

¹⁸⁵⁵ Bob Visser interviewed Alderman J.G. van de Ploeg and his opponent Mr. Barneveld of the Ludiek Kreatief Sabotaasjesentrum. Collection B&G, Docid: 77744, title: VPRO-VRIJDAG, nr.: HAD9660 Start ID 1 {DAT}.

¹⁸⁵⁶ Important people within the *Aktiegroep* were Theo Gootjes, a cartoonist, the metal worker Gerrit Sterkman (1901-1980), construction engineer Toni Koopman (1948-1982), as well as the Italian-Swiss architect Pietro Hammel.

¹⁸⁵⁷ i.e. ACHTER HET NIEUWS (1970-03-28), director: Siem Suurhoff, reporter: Pier Tania.

¹⁸⁵⁸ See: Van der Schaaf & Hazewinkel, 1996: 41. Cf. Wagenaar, 1995-1996: 325.

¹⁸⁵⁹ E.g. ANDER NIEUWS (NCRV, 1971-05-10); ACHTER HET NIEUWS (VARA, 1972-06-20) – the latter concerns an action meeting at Odeon, attended by Minister B.J. Udink for Social Housing and Spatial Planning, who demands that no media are present – so the camera was not allowed, but sound recordings were made nevertheless. Udink promises that the central government will improve the situation. The critical city councillor Dr. Lamberts is subsequently interviewed, who is indeed positive about the eventual support for the old quarters from the central government.

¹⁸⁶⁰ See: KRO-BRANDPUNT, 1971-09-10; VPRO: BERICHTEN UIT DE ZOMER; GASTARBEIDERS IN ROTTERDAM, 1971-09-16; VARA-ACHTER HET NIEUWS, 1971-11-30.

¹⁸⁶¹ E.g. NOS JOURNAAL 1972-08-10, 1972-08-12, 1972-08-13, 1972-08-14; KRO-BRANDPUNT, 1972-08-11; AVRO-TELEVIZIER III/45, 1972-08-14; NCRV-HIER EN NU, 1972-08-18; VARA-ACHTER HET NIEUWS, 1972-10-07. Already one year before, the latter reported on *gastarbeiders* buying houses in Feijenoord (HIER EN NU, 1971-06-14). For related reports, see (a.o.) TELEVIZIER, 1972-03-27 and 1972-11-20, AVRO). The event would have an echo for years; an example of a thoughtful background report that exemplifies this is EEN VAN MIJN BESTE VRIENDEN: AFL. 4. TURKEN (IKON, 1979-05-09).

The riot police was sent and Mayor Thomassen interrupted his holidays to hush the rioters. For several days the Afrikaanderwijk was front page news and the newsreaders of radio and television began with the racial riots in Rotterdam. In the evening, when watching TELEVIZIER [i.e. 1972-08-14, AVRO], you saw an affected Jaap van Meekren who began the AVRO night with a report on the riots, which suggested that *gastarbeiders* had become the target of Rotterdam fascists. According to the star reporter the riots were not an incident. He emphasised that the residents of these quarters had already forgotten the lessons of WWII, twenty-five years after the liberation.¹⁸⁶²

The images of the riots were alarming though, and foreign media reported on them as well. It caused a kind of ‘riot tourism’ (*reltourisme*), which worsened the situation¹⁸⁶³. It fuelled the discussion on local broadcasting, since that would have provided a more balanced media coverage, as said by Mayor Thomassen in the city council¹⁸⁶⁴. Van de Laar argues that the riots were actually an expression of powerlessness and discontent of residents, whose complaints had been ignored for years. At the same time the city did not develop an immigration policy, assuming that ‘guest workers’ would stay temporarily. It seriously underestimated their needs, not the least in social-cultural terms¹⁸⁶⁵.

After the *Turkenrellen* had taken place, the city introduced a measure to avoid concentrations of immigrants of more than 5% of the total population of a district, in order to spread them over the city. In certain quarters this figure was already 15%, which implied that people had to be moved. Those concerned rejected this policy, which was clearly ventilated in the television programme BRANDPUNT (KRO, 1972-09-30). Since this measure also concerned Antilleans and Surinamese, which were still part of the Netherlands and therefore Dutch citizens, it was considered as simply a matter of racism. The case was brought to the Queen and the measures were finally cancelled¹⁸⁶⁶. While television concentrated on this issue, the actual problems of the old quarters, and how they could be solved, received gradually less attention.

All this propelled the discussion on local broadcasting: ‘one clearly sees the necessity of appropriate communication between citizens, and between citizens and the government. Through a local broadcasting station one can achieve a social constellation that is also beneficial in respect of harmonisation of parliamentary and extra-parliamentary democracy’¹⁸⁶⁷. Local broadcasting would be valuable as an informative and educational medium, which could also be useful for *gastarbeiders*¹⁸⁶⁸. It would also enable citizen participation, in order to provide feedback to the college and the city council¹⁸⁶⁹. Local broadcasting, however, remained a future affair, notwithstanding the increasing need for it.

The issue of participation and communication became pressing when protests took place in other quarters as well, among them Het Oude Noorden, Rubroek, Crooswijk and Feyenoord. In

¹⁸⁶² Van de Laar, 2000: 531. Original quote: ‘De oproerpolitie werd ingezet en burgemeester Thomassen onderbrak zijn vakantie om de rellen te sussen. De Afrikaanderwijk was enige dagen voorpagina’s en de nieuwslezers van radio en televisie openden met de rassenrellen in Rotterdam. Wie ‘s avonds naar Televizier keek, zag een geëmotioneerde Jaap van Meekren die het avondje AVRO inleidde met een verslag over de rellen dat de indruk wekte dat Rotterdamse fascistische opgasterbeiders hadden gemunt. De sterreporter beschouwde de rellen niet als een incident en onderstreepte voor de kijkers dat de Rotterdamse wijkbewoners vijftig jaar na de bevrijding de lessen van de Tweede Wereldoorlog al waren vergeten.’

¹⁸⁶³ A. Daane, in: ‘Stichtingsvorm voor regionale omroep in Rotterdam’, p3 in: Elfferich, Edzes, Matthijsse, 1973.

¹⁸⁶⁴ Reference by A. Daane (ibid).

¹⁸⁶⁵ Van de Laar, 2000: 532. See e.g. JOURNAAL (NOS, 1976-12-25): *gastarbeiders* expressing their need for a mosque.

¹⁸⁶⁶ Cf. Van de Laar, 2000: 532.

¹⁸⁶⁷ Mission statement of SRRO, quoted in: Elfferich, Edzes, Matthijsse, 1973: 1. Original quote: ‘Grote steden, agglomeraties en gewesten wensen een eigen regionale omroep omdat steeds duidelijker de noodzaak wordt gezien van een behoorlijke communicatie tussen de burgers onderling en tussen de burgers en de overheid. Met behulp van een regionale omroep kan men komen tot een samenlevingsopbouw die ook nuttig is voor een harmonisatie van parlementaire en buitenparlementaire democratie.’

¹⁸⁶⁸ See: Bax, 1973: 4; A. Daane, in: Elfferich e.a., 1973: 3; Van der Staay; 1973: 14.

¹⁸⁶⁹ E.g. Van der Staay, 1973: 14.

these quarters one fought against the ‘Rottetracé’, a route to connect the north and south side of Rotterdam, to be constructed by demolishing housing blocks, filling in the historic river Rotte, and through a new tunnel under the Nieuwe Maas¹⁸⁷⁰. Due to the protests, the plan was finally cancelled.

In Het Oude Westen the *Aktiegroep* continued its protest against the housing policy and started to squat empty houses. In December 1972, after Mayor Thomassen had threatened with a police attack, the group had a meeting with him and started to collaborate. It was reported by Bert Bakker for KRO-radio (ECHO, 1972-12-12), who subsequently reported on the district meeting of the PvdA. A majority voted for the dismissal of PvdA Alderman H.W. Jettinghoff for urban development¹⁸⁷¹. His priority was to provide jobs, rather than solving housing problems. Due to internal policies, however, Jettinghoff kept his position. Bakker asked the district chairman about it. ‘Does it mean, regarding the opinions ventilated tonight, that the PvdA fraction in the city council will look completely different in 1974 [after the next elections]?’ Reply: ‘In any case different, in the sense that we will do everything to strive for a more homogeneous fraction than it is the case now, to get a more uniform policy and not the fragmentation that is shown at the moment’¹⁸⁷². Things were about to change. The developments in Rotterdam, and Amsterdam, contributed to the decision to have a Secretary of State for urban renewal, Jan Schaefer, in the new, progressive cabinet of Prime Minister Den Uyl.

Due to the commotion, Jettinghoff took the initiative for a ‘discussion film’ on urban renewal, in November 1973¹⁸⁷³. This was still before the municipal elections took place that resulted in a progressive college, without Jettinghoff, and with Jan van der Ploeg as a special Alderman for Urban Renewal¹⁸⁷⁴. The film was commissioned to Dick Rijneke, who had previously made a discussion film on drugs (FEELING BETTER YOU CAN NEVER TELL, 1971), which was broadcast on television (KRO, BRT) and shown at schools and youth centres. De Ridder, who collaborated with Rijneke on this and another film, was asked to collaborate again, all the more so since he had already been involved with urban development through Schaper’s Open Studio¹⁸⁷⁵. In the end, De Ridder was appointed as the director of the film, and as such a link might be drawn between Schaper’s STAD ZONDER HART (1966) and this film, called ‘T IS GEWOON NIET MOOI MEER (“It’s just not nice anymore”).

The film starts with the process of suburbanisation, due to deteriorating residential quarters in the city and increasing congestion. Moreover, residents prefer low-rise above the impersonal outskirts with high-rise estates, like Ommoord. While leaving the old quarters, immigrants come in their stead. Such developments, it is said, are the result of the city policy from earlier decades, which was just aimed at economic growth. A large number of banks and offices were built, while old housing blocks were simply demolished. Things could be different though. There are still remnants of the lively city that Rotterdam used to be. The department for

¹⁸⁷⁰ Rooijendijk, 2005: 172. Van de Laar, 2000: 541. An example of a quarter that was planned to be demolished in order to build the Rottetracé and new housing estates was Rubroek, see: Van der Schaaf & Hazewinkel, 1996: 63.

¹⁸⁷¹ 148 said yes to dismissal versus 30 that said no.

¹⁸⁷² Original quotes – journalist Bert Bakker: ‘Betekent dat gezien de uitspraken van vanavond dat de nieuwe gemeenteraadsfractie v.d. PvdA er in 1974 heel anders uit gaat zien?’ District chairman Gerard Spruit: ‘In elk geval anders in die zin dat we er alles aan zullen doen om te streven naar een meer homogene fractie dan op dit moment het geval is, wil je meer éénvormig beleid krijgen en geen gespletenheid zoals die thans gedemonstreerd is.’

¹⁸⁷³ ‘Discussiefilm Stadsvernieuwing’, p16 in: NRC Handelsblad, section Rotterdam/The Hague, 1973-11-17.

¹⁸⁷⁴ For a report on the programme of the new college, see e.g. ACHTER HET NIEUWS (VARA, 1974-05-21).

¹⁸⁷⁵ Following Schaper’s film STAD ZONDER HART (1966) and a report on Rotterdam from 1967 (Moen & Schaper), the Open Studio was commissioned by the VPRO to make a report on the presentation of five plans for het Oude Westen and the public discussion following it. De Ridder directed these recordings, but the material, however, has (most likely) never been broadcast (to be found at GAR, AJS p65 OUDE WESTEN 1 + 2; p71-72 THOMASSEN 1 + 2 + nr. 112).

Urban Development (*Dienst Stadsontwikkeling*) therefore tries to revive the old quarters, together with residents, through renovation and piece-meal implementation of new projects¹⁸⁷⁶.

The commissioners found the film hardly focused and too negative. After the filmmakers had ignored their request to revise the film, the commissioners decided to have just a premiere for invited guests, and no active distribution in the quarters as they had intended. The premiere took place on the 31st of May 1976. City planner Fokkinga introduced the film: 'Usually we carry out commissions which then raise tumult, now it's the other way round. We have given the commission, but it has also raised tumult'¹⁸⁷⁷. After the screening De Ridder gave his comments. 'This film has especially been made for the people in the old quarters, in order to give them a bit of trust again in the municipal policy.' The film makes clear that the municipality recognises that things have gone wrong in the past, that the present situation is miserable, and that plans are carried out to improve this situation, but De Ridder added to it that 'in this film the plans of the municipality stand out rather poorly against the big and many problems. This is not only the case in the film, but also in reality.' Hence, 'this should be a reason for the Mayor and Aldermen to go hard at it', but 'they do not face the many sides of the problems. The measures taken are merely a matter of fear, and then the government just acts at random.' Alderman Van der Ploeg replied. 'I have said it already in August 1975: the film is artistically attractive, but the message is unclear. It seems as if one has to leave the city as soon as possible, to buy a house outside the city. You have to face reality; 80% cannot leave the city.' Van der Ploeg was the only alderman on the bench that had served in the previous period too. He emphasised that many houses had been built since WWII, and that the city was good to live in, but that action needed to be taken in urban renewal areas. 'I have offered to sit around the table to discuss how the message could be communicated, and the proposal was to leave out the story on busy traffic and suburbanisation, but this has not been picked up.' He finally remarked that it was not only the fault of the filmmakers; since the film had started, two years earlier, there had been substantial changes.

The comments of De Ridder and Van der Ploeg were rhetorical. It was a dispute over scale and citizen participation. De Ridder argued that the *government* had to invest more in appropriate solutions within the context of *urban development at large*, whereas Van der Ploeg wanted to stimulate *residents* to contribute constructively to the plans of the *quarters*. This required efforts from both sides, in order to change municipal practices and policies¹⁸⁷⁸.

Besides the fact that Van der Ploeg had become Alderman for Urban Renewal, the appointment of Van der Louw as Mayor immediately followed his chairmanship of the committee that had to solve the crisis around Alderman Jettinghoff and the issue of citizen participation¹⁸⁷⁹. As such, Van der Louw was familiar with the issues at stake. Paul Groenendijk (2004a) has summarised the measures as follows.

In 1975, 'Het Oude Westen' was appointed a Project Group Urban Renewal (*Projectgroep Stadsvernieuwing*), together with ten other quarters, in which the action committee (*Aktiegroep*) held a majority. Besides that, private housing property was acquired by the municipality, which transferred it to the housing corporations *Maatschappij voor Volkswoningen* and the *Gemeentelijk Woningbedrijf*. 'Building for the neighbourhood' became the motto, which meant that affordable rents were guaranteed and that residents from the neighbourhood had priority to live there. The participation of the residents was regulated by a decision-making meeting of residents. For the

¹⁸⁷⁶ One may also draw a link here to television programmes that articulated such an approach, e.g. VAN GEWEST TOT GEWEST (NOS, 1974-10-23 about an exhibition on renovation, at Ahoy'; 1975-08-13 about saving ornaments of buildings to be demolished).

¹⁸⁷⁷ This and following quotes are based on sound recordings made of the speeches (in Dutch) given before and after the premiere = 'premiere 't Is Gewoon Niet Mooi Meer' (1976-05-31, GAR: Gb 898, CD-A 00161).

¹⁸⁷⁸ See also: Nycolaas: 1983, 194-195.

¹⁸⁷⁹ 'In Memoriam: André van der Louw', Hans Kombrink, 2005-10-20; www.denhaag.pvda.nl/nieuwsbericht/851

various new-build and renovation projects special groups of residents were formed. There was also a monthly neighbourhood magazine in five languages.¹⁸⁸⁰

Film and video can be added here as media that were used to involve citizens, and to make planning processes transparent.

After the ‘failure’ by De Ridder and Rijneke, the municipality decided to have another film made, *EERST ZIEN, DAN GELOVEN* (“to see it first, in order to believe it”, 1978, Ton Dirkse). This time it was the Office for Information that coordinated the film (1977), instead of the Department for Urban Development itself. The office was actively involved with the production, through the assistance of Ivo Blom and through the work of presenter Koos Postema. Next to them, an organisation and communication consultant, Margreet van Persie, gave the filmmakers advice and comments. This forty minute film does not only show the achievements of the urban renewal process, but also the problems and challenges, and what residents can do about it.

The film opens with nice shots of the urban landscape, taken from the Euromast; at ground level, however, things look different. The film leaves the larger picture of urban development and immediately focuses on the trouble of deterioration of the old quarters. It not only matched the idea of Alderman Van der Ploeg, but it also corresponded to an emerging generic format of films mediating urban renewal¹⁸⁸¹. Rather than providing an analysis of urban planning, filmmaker Ton Dirkse enters the homes of people to show their living conditions, and to ask their opinion. The people are often portrayed in close-up (in the spirit of 1930s realism). The film addresses the work of the residents’ organisations that collaborate in the planning process. These cases serve as templates, to motivate residents to contribute to urban renewal in a constructive way. Dirkse and Postema do not avoid critical notes, however. During a meeting of the Commission for Urban Renewal in the town hall, in which residents participate too, one resident remarks that the municipality has concentrated on physical improvement, but resident also want measures against impoverishment, criminality and drug abuse. It points to the complexity of urban renewal, beyond housing and urban design, into realms of social welfare. *EERST ZIEN, DAN GELOVEN* had its premiere at neighbourhood centre Odeon in Het Oude Westen, and it was subsequently shown at the municipal information centre (HIC)¹⁸⁸².

Besides this film, various bottom-up media practices developed as manifestations of an explicit social agenda¹⁸⁸³. An example is the video-documentary *KUN JE HIER NOG LEVEN?* (“Can you still live here?”, 1975), by Max Mollinger and Adriaan Monshouwer, who were students at the Academy of Visual Arts. It shows Het Oude Westen during the last five years, beginning with general impressions and women calling for action. The narrator tells that VARA’s *ACHTER HET NIEUWS* (1970-03-28) reported a meeting at neighbourhood centre Odeon. It shows fragments of

¹⁸⁸⁰ Groenendijk, 2004: Architectuur > Personen > ‘Aktiegroep Het Oude Westen’; original quote: ‘In 1975 kreeg het Oude Westen samen met tien andere wijken een Projectgroep Stadsvernieuwing, waarin de Aktiegroep een meerderheid had. Daarnaast werd het particuliere woningbezit aangekocht door de gemeente, die het overdroeg aan de woningbouwcorporaties Maatschappij voor Volkswoningen en het Gemeentelijk Woningbedrijf. ‘Bouwen voor de buurt’ was het motto, wat betekende dat er betaalbare huren waren gegarandeerd en dat de wijkbewoners voorrang hadden. De inspraak van de bewoners was geregeld via een besluitvormende bewonersvergadering. Voor de verschillende nieuwbouw- of renovatieprojecten werden aparte bewonersgroepen gevormd. Er was een maandelijks buurtkrant in vijf talen.’

¹⁸⁸¹ The same format is applied by two films on urban renewal in Glasgow, *IF ONLY WE HAD THE SPACE*, on home improvement grants, and *PLACES OR PEOPLE*, on area amenity improvements (both 1975, Charles Gormley). ‘Both films have some formal views of Glasgow, but their focus is on recycled tenements and landscapes and their ordinary residents. The slums and big projects have gone, but so it seems has the city and its future.’ (Lebas, 2007: 48)

¹⁸⁸² *Uitmodiging voor de vertoning van EERST ZIEN, DAN GELOVEN*, premiere on 1978-03-21 (at HIC: 1978-03-22 – 1978-04-08) – GAR, ‘Collectie Bibliotheek’, PV8.7, NB: map jaren ’30!

¹⁸⁸³ The discussion on local broadcasting can be framed in this perspective too, although the issue was not settled before the 1980s. The discussion was nevertheless valuable, since it articulated the social role of media, while it also touched upon issues of other new media such as cable television and video. For local broadcasting and cable television, see: Bordewijk, 1973; For video, see: Van der Staay, 1973: 13; Valk, 1973.

it and later on also of a report by KENMERK (IKOR, 1973-04-04), on residents pulling down ruins. The reports are explicitly mentioned for their role within the developments. Architect Pietro Hammel stresses the need for public space, and to develop plans that enable participation by residents. At the end, the renovation of neighbourhood centre Odeon (arch. Hammel, 1976) is proudly presented by the old activist Gerrit Sterkman of the *Aktiegroep*. The video then answers its title: 'Yes – But you must want it indeed!'. This production was no exception.

§ 3. the promise of video, social-cultural explorations, and cinematic interferences

Parallel to the development of urban renewal, new media came to the fore. Besides television, which became ever more important to monitor social developments, video and cable television offered new opportunities in this respect as well. These media became part of what sociologist Helga Nowotny (2005: 24) has called 'emergent interfaces' between different groups of people and institutions, which come along with increasing social complexity. The 'emergent interfaces' regulate 'interface turbulence', which is the result of 'conflicting claims over diverging versions of the past and the future, wrapped in entangled webs of causality.' This view emphasises the social dimension of what I have already addressed in terms of 'cinematic bifurcation', which is the splitting of cinema into various audiovisual media. Bifurcation implies oscillation between different formats, so I will consider the interaction between video and film in connection to artistic and social practices related to media.

Lijnbaancentrum

In 1970, the RKS founded an art gallery and centre for experimentation, which was called *Lijnbaancentrum* (1970-1984), directed by Felix Valk. Its aims were to stimulate visual culture, to provide information and insights about society by visual means, and to inform about artistic developments within broader social-cultural perspectives¹⁸⁸⁴. The centre invested a significant part of its budget in video equipment and a studio, and it established the LBC Videogroep¹⁸⁸⁵. It meant an impulse for the development of audiovisual practices in Rotterdam¹⁸⁸⁶.

Video was initially used to record interviews to accompany exhibitions, about eight per year, and to document such and other events (Valk, 1973: 14). Due to the low costs of recording, the range and number of subjects enlarged¹⁸⁸⁷. It caused Henk Elenga, one of the members of the group, to say that '[t]he video camera is like a vacuum cleaner that sucks up culture'¹⁸⁸⁸. 'That's what made it subversive in the world of cinematography', as design critic Ed van Hinte wrote in respect of the work of Elenga and his colleagues, who were still inspired by the cinema, but considered themselves as 'art hooligans'¹⁸⁸⁹. Since tapes could be used again they were free to experiment. It is illustrated by various examples, such as a recording of an encounter with the poet Waskowsky that never took place, a recording of an interview with the American artist Jim Dine, with the interviewer and interviewee changing roles during the conversation, or a recording of a talk with the writer K. Schippers, which consisted just of close-ups of his face and body¹⁸⁹⁰.

¹⁸⁸⁴ Kappert, 2001: 7.

¹⁸⁸⁵ Its first collaborators were, besides LBC director Felix Valk: Henk Elenga, Frederic Kappelhof, and Wink van Kempen (Valk, 1973: 15). The studio was later headed by Erik van Dieren (cf. Van Hinte, 2000: 51). Other people that became involved with the LBC Videogroep were a.o.: Marja Bijvoet, Har Brok, Raymond Campfens, Josse Fermont, Joop de Jong, Ernst Pommerel, Hein Reedijk, Albert Roskamp, Joost Swarte (cf. Kappert, 2001: 7).

¹⁸⁸⁶ The LBC-Videogroep also collaborated with the videogroup Meatball from The Hague (Valk, 1973: 14). Moreover, it linked up with an artistic scene that existed already in Rotterdam, with a strong connection to pop art (e.g. Wim Gijzen, Woody van Amen e.a.), see: Van de Laar, 2000: 584. Through the Lijnbaancentrum, various people have been able to gain experience with audiovisual practices and to set up studios themselves afterwards (1980s-1990s).

¹⁸⁸⁷ See filmography > LBC Videogroep for a selection of productions.

¹⁸⁸⁸ Elenga, quoted by Van Hinte, 2000: 55.

¹⁸⁸⁹ Van Hinte, 2000: 55-56.

¹⁸⁹⁰ Van Hinte, 2000: 51.

The Lijnbaancentrum also invited artists to use its facilities. Several pieces were made in this way, among them recordings of performances, abstract videos and studio experiments¹⁸⁹¹. One of the first to explore the medium in this way was Wim Gijzen, who made a series called ‘mistakes’. His video *VERWISSELING VAN DE NAMEN VAN DE STEDEN ROTTERDAM EN DEN HAAG* (1971, Wim Gijzen) became well-known. It shows a view over the harbour, with an image of the skyline of Rotterdam, including the Euromast as its main landmark (and icon through the media). Gijzen enters the frame in order to install a sign post saying ‘The Hague’. In the book *The Magnetic Era* (Boomgaard & Rutten, 2002: 42), on the early years of video art in the Netherlands, Gijzen explains that it was a reaction to the reality claim of television. Another example is a video made by Bernard Besson, who mounted a camera on a bascule bridge, which gave the tape its title: *BINNENHAVENBRUG* (1973). When the bridge opens for ships to pass, it turns the perspective of the camera, from the earth to the air.

According to historian Carin Gaemers, in a brief note on video in her study of the RKS¹⁸⁹², it soon emerged that neighbourhood organisations and study groups were also interested in video. In this way the LBC Videogroep also made recordings of protest actions, discussions at schools, and various services. What Gaemers has not mentioned, in spite of her concern with networks¹⁸⁹³, is how this fuelled a collaboration between different agents.

video rally

In the autumn of 1971, after the newly established *videogroep* of the Lijnbaancentrum had already made a number of video tapes, its director Felix Valk came with a plan for a collaboration between different institutions. The idea was first of all to rent out tapes through the *Centrale Discotheek*. In 1960, this organisation had been established to rent out music records (financially supported by the private fund *Volkskracht*¹⁸⁹⁴). On behalf of the *Lijnbaancentrum* and the *Centrale Discotheek*, Valk approached Renting, the director of the city archive, with the question if collaboration would be possible in order to save the still expensive tapes¹⁸⁹⁵. In a letter by Valk, several productions were mentioned for their general interest, among them on the orphanage Lindenhof (Schiedam), on alternative building plans for the city centre, on an exhibition of Man Ray in Museum Boijmans-Van Beuningen, and a planned production on the intended demolition of the Koninginnekerk (church)¹⁸⁹⁶. It was a clever move to ask Renting first, since he had been actively involved with setting up a film collection, next to a sound collection, to which end he had been supported by director Rob Maas of the Centrale Discotheek¹⁸⁹⁷. Renting was indeed enthusiastic and he wrote immediately a letter to ask support from Mayor and Aldermen¹⁸⁹⁸.

¹⁸⁹¹ E.g. Vito Acconci, Woody van Amen, Jules Deelder, Douglas Davis, Dennis Oppenheim, and Ulrike Rosenbach, among others, see: Kappert, 2001; Van Hinte, 2000: 50-57.

¹⁸⁹² Gaemers, 1996: 130; original quote: ‘Aan de hand van contacten met het publiek blijkt al snel dat naast de kunstenaars, ook buurtorganisaties en werkgroepen grote belangstelling voor het gebruik van video hebben, maar dan vooral als voorlichtingsmedium’.

¹⁸⁹³ Cf. Gaemers, 1996: 18, in the historical introduction concerning the origin of the RKS.

¹⁸⁹⁴ A fund that had originally been established by industrialists and businessmen. The fund also continued to support the *Centrale Discotheek* afterwards, see: Van der Houwen, 1998: 137.

¹⁸⁹⁵ At that time one single tape cost about 200 guilders (app. 90 euros); a tape recorder between 10,000-15,000 guilders (4,500-6,750 euros). These costs were mentioned by Valk.

¹⁸⁹⁶ Letter from Valk to Renting, 1971-10-26, in GAR archive: ‘Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam > GAR; Archief van het Archief’, toegangsnr. 297.01, inventarisnr. 747. See also: filmography > LBC.

¹⁸⁹⁷ Kloppers, 1964: 8.

¹⁸⁹⁸ ‘One of the tasks of the City Archive Department is providing and archiving of the municipal sound and vision documentation. The development of video recording implies, to my opinion, the consequence that the City Archive Department becomes active in this area too.’ Original quote: ‘Een der taken van de Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst is de verzorging en archiverig der gemeentelijke beeld- en geluidsdocumentatie. De ontwikkeling van de videorecording brengt naar mijn mening de consequentie met zich mee dat de Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst ook op dat terrein actief wordt.’ Letter of R.A.D. Renting to College B&W, 1971-11-01, in GAR archive: ‘Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam > GAR; Archief van het Archief’, toegangsnr. 297.01, inventarisnr. 747.

In the meantime RKS director Van der Staay wrote a letter to J. Hurwitz, director of the Anthropological Museum (*Museum Land- en Volkenkunde*), in which he listed some possibilities of video. He suggested to commission tapes and to rent previously produced tapes for exhibition, and to produce weekly or biweekly cultural video agendas¹⁸⁹⁹. He also mentioned that this possibility was further explored with other cultural and municipal organisations and the 'Office for Information and Publicity'. These agendas, he suggested, could be shown on monitors in museums and other public places.

The letters by Renting and Van der Staay finally reached J.A. van Gorkom, the head of the municipal department of art and culture. After a discussion with other museum directors he wrote a report on video (1972-02-15)¹⁹⁰⁰. Three main questions were raised. What can be created by way of video that cannot be created by other audiovisual means? What problems are there in connection to equipment? What possibilities does video offer to museums? Van Gorkom mentioned concrete sites where monitors could be placed, including various cultural institutions as well as shops and even trains¹⁹⁰¹. He concluded that a commission (*werkgroep*) had to be formed, to follow current developments concerning video, to elaborate the points of the report, and to carry out the suggested possibilities in collaboration with different organisations.

As a result, the Mayor and Aldermen decided (1972-04-07) to organise the *Werkgroep Video*, for which Van Gorkom invited representatives of different institutions¹⁹⁰². During its first meeting (August 1972¹⁹⁰³), Renting was the first to express his thoughts. He made clear that besides collecting he had the intention to use video in the near future to 'draw into the neighbourhoods' and to record things that would be important for the history of Rotterdam, like the presence of *gastarbeiders* (immigrants). Other members proposed applications for museums, education and science, and, by way of Mr. Berggren of the municipal Office for Information and Publicity, the possibilities to use video in the *Open Boek* information centre for informative and promotional purposes in respect of sanitation and urban development¹⁹⁰⁴. Plans were made, furthermore, to establish a national network, through memberships of various institutions (a.o. *Video-werkgroep Openbaar Kunstbezit, Stichting Film & Wetenschap*). In the 'Bouwcentrum' in Rotterdam, a video workshop for educational purposes was established by the Netherlands Institute for Audiovisual Media for education (NIAM)¹⁹⁰⁵; in this perspective the *werkgroep* wanted to make a survey of the available equipment in the city, especially within educational institutions.

During the first meeting of the *Werkgroep Video*, Rob Maas of the *Centrale Discotheek* presented a booklet called *CD Video Visie*¹⁹⁰⁶. It emphasised the possibilities for individual

¹⁸⁹⁹ Letter by A.J. v/d Staay, 1972-01-28 (attached to the invitation by J.A. van Gorkom, 1972-07-31); GAR archive: 'Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam > GAR; Archief van het Archief', toegangsnr. 297.01, inventarisnr. 747.

¹⁹⁰⁰ Video-rapport ['Betreft: onderwerp Video'] by J.A. van Gorkom, 1972-02-15, in: GAR archive: 'Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam > GAR; Archief van het Archief', toegangsnr. 297.01, inventarisnr. 747.

¹⁹⁰¹ Mentioned are: *De Doelen*, the City Theatre (*Schouwburg*), *Bouwcentrum*, *Open Boek*, Town Hall, major department-stores, railway stations, metrostations and trains

¹⁹⁰² Invitation by J.A. van Gorkom, 1972-07-31 (for the meeting of 1972-08-04), in the GAR archive: 'Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam > GAR; Archief van het Archief', toegangsnr. 297.01, inventarisnr. 747.

¹⁹⁰³ Notes of the meeting of 1972-08-04, room 263 EN-gebouw (afd. Kunstzaken), in the GAR archive: 'Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam > GAR; Archief van het Archief', toegangsnr. 297.01, inventarisnr. 747.

¹⁹⁰⁴ An example of a video production that would serve such purposes was a report on the AFRIKAANDERWIJK (1972, LBC / Werkgroep Rob Maas).

¹⁹⁰⁵ NIAM (1970-2004) was the continuation of NOF (1941-1970). It was concerned with production and distribution of educational films and other media and provided video, film, sound and slides equipment for elementary and secondary schools. Its branch in Rotterdam was its training and information centre. See: *Nationaal Onderwijs Museum*, Rotterdam www.onderwijsmuseum.nl (website visited, 2007-04-20). Because of the survey Renting collected the booklet 'Cursusprogramma 1972-1973' by the NIAM, which as a result is kept in the 'archive of the archive': 'Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam > GAR; Archief van het Archief', toegangsnr. 297.01, inventarisnr. 747.

¹⁹⁰⁶ *CD Video Visie*, July 1972, in the GAR archive: 'Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam > GAR; Archief van het Archief', toegangsnr. 297.01, inventarisnr. 747.

programming (§ 2.02). In combination with (cable) television, video would make it possible for viewers to ask the station for particular programmes. It was also remarked that there existed a strong link between film and video, and that in the first years of video many existing films would be used, by scanning them, although this was still expensive. Therefore the *Centrale Discotheek* (§ 3.01) made a deal with Philips for a period of one year, as an experiment. For education many possibilities were awaiting, like schools producing their own programmes (§ 2.21). The role envisioned for the *Centrale Discotheek* was to establish a collection and to rent out tapes and equipment. At the end of the booklet (§ 4.00), which reads like a manifesto, the authors wrote¹⁹⁰⁷:

When the Lijnbaancentrum was furnished and when it was decided to invest many thousands of guilders in video, the Department of Art & Culture of the Municipality of Rotterdam did most likely not understand the shaking implications, and that is as good as it could be, because one would probably have hesitated and withdrawn, while Rotterdam today occupies a prominent position, and maybe even the first position in the cultural video realm.

The ‘manifesto’ ends with mentioning the collaborators, besides the *Gemeentearchief* also the medical faculty of the Erasmus University, and theatre De Lantaren, since they had become actively involved with video too, as I will briefly explain.

cable television

In 1967, the medical faculty established an audiovisual service and research centre. Headed by the physician A.C. Gisolf, it consisted of a team of thirty collaborators¹⁹⁰⁸. It was at the forefront of media applications for medical education, in order to enable self-study by way of video and to support the use of media for lectures. A cable television network had been integrated in the design of the faculty’s new building (1965-1968, OD 205), with the centre’s recording and editing studios being centrally located in the building¹⁹⁰⁹. The centre therefore had substantial experience with both video and cable television within the university, while experiments were carried out in respect of ‘social health’ and community organisation¹⁹¹⁰. In this way the centre also carried out a trial project for cable television in the district Ommoord, from December 1972, in collaboration with neighbourhood association *Stichting Wijkgemeenschap Ommoord*.

The audiovisual centre experimented with live broadcasting, for example when a new community health centre was presented (1972-12-08). Next to that it produced programmes such as *OMMOORD 1972* (Tonko Tomeï). Still shot on 16mm, and therefore suitable for additional screenings in neighbourhood centres, it was made to inform future residents of the new district ‘Ommoord’ (1962-1977, Lotte Beese). Although the film includes shots of the construction works, it mainly shows people who are concerned with its development: residents, social workers, a physician, a farmer who loses his land, associations, councils and committees. Building has first and foremost become social organisation, and those involved are critically monitoring its development¹⁹¹¹. Some people are enthusiastic about the new quarter, but there is also criticism, that the planning and architecture is too rigid to allow for spontaneous initiatives as well as possibilities for the youth to play. Tomeï interviews planner Beese, who replies that high-rise has

¹⁹⁰⁷ Original quote: ‘Toen bij de inrichting van het Lijnbaancentrum werd besloten enige tonnen in de video te steken, heeft de afdeling kunstzaken van de Gemeente Rotterdam vast niet begrepen wat men overhoop haalde en dat is maar goed ook, want anders had men zich misschien nog bedacht, terwijl Rotterdam nu een vooraanstaande plaats en misschien wel de eerste plaats in het culturele videogebeuren inneemt.’

¹⁹⁰⁸ See the booklet: *Audiovisuele Faciliteiten 1970, Medische Faculteit Rotterdam* (A.C. Gisolf), GAR: ‘Collectie Bibliotheek’ XXIXF390.

¹⁹⁰⁹ Van Spaandonk, 1973: 10; Binneveld & Vleesenbeek, 1976: 126.

¹⁹¹⁰ It also carried out an experiment with a beam transmitter on its building, which established a television connection with the universities of Leiden and Utrecht and the Instituut Film en Wetenschap (Utrecht), on 1972-04-06 – *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1973: 33.

¹⁹¹¹ cf. AKTIE; OMMOORD (NCRV, 1970-12-19).

simply been emaciated (*uitgemergeld*) for economic reasons. She fiercely explains that she would like to design high-rise differently, since it has much more potential. One could, for example, reserve space for playgrounds inside a block. As a reaction to the film, Alderman Henk van der Pols, for neighbourhood affairs, called Ommoord nevertheless a model for urban planning¹⁹¹². The model that the film showed, however, was above all a model of social organisation. For that reason the film was enthusiastically received by the ministry for “Culture, Recreation and Social work” (CRN).

During the 1970s, cable television remained in an experimental phase, although the municipality made concrete plans, since 1976, for the creation of a cable network¹⁹¹³. In the 1980s cable television would gain a structural position in the media landscape of Rotterdam. It started in 1981 with a talk show presented by Raymond Campfens, who had been involved with the LBC Videogroep before¹⁹¹⁴. The show was about the issue of local broadcasting itself, and the next district council election, with discussions on the possible closing of Airport Zestienhoven and the renovation of houses in the old quarters¹⁹¹⁵.

De Lantaren and socially engaged productions

In the *CD Video Visie*, the authors remarked that the *Centrale Discotheek* was a rental centre, but a workshop would be established too (§ 4.02): ‘De Lantaren will offer the facilities in the next season’ (1972-1973). In 1969, when the RKS prepared the opening of the Lijnbaancentrum, it became also involved with theatre De Lantaren (“The Lantern”). Plans were made to turn it into an ‘arts lab’¹⁹¹⁶. In October 1972, the renovated accommodation was opened, which was reported by Polygoon: first are city and street shots and a woman commenting on the bad housing conditions, yet the reopening is reason for happiness; there are shots of a neighbourhood party, with cabaret addressing the pressing issues in a humorous way. De Lantaren coordinator Rommert Boonstra explains the activities of the centre, and interior shots exhibit the theatre stage, the graphic workshop and the new video workshop, which existed next to a film workshop.

Both the film and video workshop would be run by Jacques van Heijningen¹⁹¹⁷. He had studied at the Design Academy in Eindhoven, where he had come in touch with filmmaking through Frans Zwartjes, who was a teacher there¹⁹¹⁸. In Eindhoven he became also involved with ‘The New Electric Chamber Music Ensemble’. It was a group that experimented with various forms of acoustic and electronic sound, light and video, which was supported by researchers and engineers of Philips¹⁹¹⁹. With this experience he came to facilitate all kinds of film and video projects at De Lantaren¹⁹²⁰.

The *Aktiegroep Het Oude Westen* soon approached Van Heijningen, who lived in the neighbourhood himself, to make the video documentary HET LEVEN IN HET OUDE WESTEN

¹⁹¹² In: Meijer, Jan; ‘Ommoord 1972: historie van wijk in beweging’, [review] p15 in: *Het Vrije Volk*, 1973-06-13.

¹⁹¹³ GAR, coll. Kartografische Documenten, cat. nr. 2005-1369 and 1979-349, document title: ‘Kabeltelevisie | Rotterdam | R.M.O.’, Gemeentewerken, afd. Landmeten en Vastgoedinformatie / Kartografische Dienst.

¹⁹¹⁴ See e.g. BERNISSE JOURNAAL (1978, Jacques van Heijningen).

¹⁹¹⁵ UITZENDING REGIONALE OMROEP ROTTERDAM RIJNMOND (1981, Raymond Campfens).

¹⁹¹⁶ It would be directed by Rommert Boonstra (1972-1978). Although he was just thirty years old when he was appointed as the director, he had already been the director of the *Schouwburg* (theatre) in the city of Assen.

¹⁹¹⁷ Whereas De Lantaren had initially been a general ‘arts lab’, with a strong social function, towards the end of the 1970s it focused on film and the performing arts, which also included a theatre workshop (Willemsen, 1979: 11-13).

¹⁹¹⁸ ‘Frans Zwartjes had been my teacher, for 45 minutes; students had to discover film for oneself’. Jacques van Heijningen in an interview with FP, 2008-10-09.

¹⁹¹⁹ One of the main figures of the group was Wim Langenhoff, who worked for Philips (Jonker, 2008). Another prominent member was Piet Verdonk, who gave also a show at the *Academie voor Bouwkunst* in Rotterdam, under the title ‘The New Electric Cinema’ (1967-05-12). See: <http://iaaa.nl/rs/NewElectric/index.html> ‘The New Electric Chamber Music Ensemble’ (visited: 2008-07-10), and www.thenewelectric.nl/ (2008-11-04).

¹⁹²⁰ These varied from something like a funds raising film for disabled people in order to buy wheelchairs (which he directed himself), to artistic films like those by the artist Jan van Munster (for which he did the camerawork). See also filmography > Heijningen, Jacques van.

(1973). It featured, among others, the activist Gerrit Sterkman, and showed the daily life of an ordinary family (with Stien and Bas, who was the barman of De Lantaren). The video addressed the conditions of the neighbourhood, and the things that had to be changed. It was shown during action meetings at neighbourhood centre Odeon, which meant immediate feedback that served further initiatives in the neighbourhood.

Parallel to that, a production was made at the film workshop to address similar issues regarding the district Feijenoord, but cast in the tradition of documentary cinema. It was financed by the RKS film section, and made by the young photographers Frans Peter Verheijen and Adriaan Staal¹⁹²¹. The film, *WIJK 20*, emphasises the bad condition of the houses, some of which are closed off by timber. The filmmakers speak with residents, among them some elderly people, who still appreciate their neighbourhood, in spite of the problems. They are carefully portrayed through close-ups, in the fashion of Koelinga's *DE STEEG* (1932). A few younger people would like to move to new suburbs, such as Alexanderpolder, but this is difficult, due to high rents and waiting lists. There are some breaks in the conversations – one can see people thinking – which reinforces the social realism of the film in the style of *cinema vérité*. Shot on sensitive black-and-white film stock, *WIJK 20* looks unpolished, which adds to the pressing atmosphere. The informal scenes are contrasted to a formal interview with Alderman Jettinghoff, who defends the 'Rottetracé', which requires demolition of old houses. The residents are against it and go into the street for a demonstration, yelling: 'this policy is not right, we continue the fight' (*dit is geen beleid, we gaan door met de strijd*). One person carries a banner with the text 'uncertainty is demolishing' (*onzekerheid is slopend*), which became the motto of the film. It had its premiere at a centre in the neighbourhood itself, where it was enthusiastically received¹⁹²². It attracted substantial attention, so that more than ten screenings would follow, which provided input for the local discussions¹⁹²³. Although Alderman Jettinghof had already left by that time, the problems remained, which were representative for those in various other parts of the city.

Verheijen and Staal were part of a socially engaged collective that was called 'Mediafront'. It also included designers and artists, who made things like posters and papers for neighbourhood organisations¹⁹²⁴. Among its members were Hansje Quartel, who worked for NCRV television, and Joop de Jong, who had collaborated on *WIJK 20*¹⁹²⁵. During the production of that film they noticed that there were relatively many children and elderly people in the old quarters, while the middle groups moved to the new suburbs.

The filmmakers decided to make another film on the position and housing conditions of elderly people. Many of them preferred to stay in their neighbourhood, but often they had to move to new homes for the elderly. The filmmakers approached ten of these homes and asked for permission to visit them, but in six cases their request was rejected. They visited the other four and concluded that they were neat, but that many of the residents were not satisfied; little was offered to them, and little was done to let them participate in neighbourhood life or within a larger community¹⁹²⁶. The film that resulted from it, *ZORGVULDIG AFGESTOFT* (1975, Verheijen &

¹⁹²¹ Verheijen has worked as a photographer, filmmaker, and web designer specialised in 'corporate identity', see: <http://flickr.com/photos/frans-peter-verheyen/page46/> and www.verheyen-design.nl/. Staal established his own studio for video productions, i.e. Dock-site productions.

¹⁹²² It was first shown at the Stampioenstraat, 1974-09-04, see: Meijer & Van Oosten, 1974..

¹⁹²³ 'Jonge filmers bezig met wijken en bewoners', p8 in: *Wijkwijs*, 1975/2. See also: De Vries, 1974.

¹⁹²⁴ De Vries (1975a).

¹⁹²⁵ Joop de Jong and Adriaan Staal would continue their collaboration for many years (1980s, 1990s), see the collection of GAR. This includes various titles in the sphere of urban renewal.

¹⁹²⁶ It was in contrast to the way outsiders looked at this issue; in 1973, for example, the German television director Lutz Bormann made a programme on Rotterdam as a model case concerning homes for the elderly (ref. 'Bezoekers', p26 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/2, 1973). On Dutch television, programmes were shown such as *WERKWINKEL* (NTS, 1973-09-30), on helping elderly people in Rotterdam-Zuid; *WAT HEET OUD* (KRO, 1976-12-29), about a service centre in Feijenoord that enabled elderly people to stay at home as long as possible. Similarly, the *Videocentrum* also made programmes on and for elderly people, such as *JOURNAAL*

Staal), included some staged scenes with alienating images, like a couple sitting quietly at a table in an empty room where nothing happens. The filmmakers had difficulties to finance the project, either because sponsors found it not artistic enough, which was the motivation of the RKS, or because the issue at stake was said to be ‘no priority’. In the end, however, they convinced the municipality and some social funds to support it¹⁹²⁷.

Besides such productions, which were shown at meetings of local organisations, and at De Lantaren, Mediafront made various short film and video reports, for example on the occupation of the Portuguese consulate, on issues like affordable housing, squat actions and something like the *Bouworde* (students renovating old houses), next to calls for participation in planning processes¹⁹²⁸. As such they collaborated also with Jacques van Heijningen¹⁹²⁹. In the meantime a new progressive national, and subsequently a local government had come into power, which paid special attention to neighbourhood activities. On top of that, the municipal *Werkgroep Video* gave a positive advice to the Mayor and Aldermen to invest in video as a ‘medium that will take a very prominent position among the communication media in the future’¹⁹³⁰.

Videocentrum

The RKS, De Lantaren and Mediafront, made a plan for what they called *wijkvideo* (“neighbourhood video”). At the end of 1974, it was submitted to the ‘Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Work’ (CRM)¹⁹³¹. The plan was accepted, and with additional support of the municipality, the *Videocentrum* was established in 1976, which got its own accommodation¹⁹³². Besides the *wijkvideo* it encompassed the sections *kunst- en voorlichtingsvideo* (‘art and information video’), *videotheek & documentatie* (‘rental and documentation’), and *werkplaats* (the former workshop of De Lantaren), next to administrative and technical services¹⁹³³. Altogether the centre had five regular employees and three freelancers. The central figure became Bob Visser (•1950), who had previously worked as a journalist for VPRO-radio (he had reported on the events in Het Oude Westen a.o.¹⁹³⁴).

The Videocentrum became an instrument in the communication between citizens, in connection to the environment, in order to act upon it. As such it was a factor in the city’s

DIENSTENCENTRUM (1977, Bob Visser), about a service centre for the elderly in Crooswijk; cf. ROTTERDAM SENIOR (1978, Bob Visser).

¹⁹²⁷ Besides the municipality, the project was sponsored by the X-Y Beweging, Anjerfonds, and the Raad voor Maatschappelijk Welzijn (see: De Vries, 1975b). An example of a request for funding that was rejected: *Stichting Bevordering van Volkskracht*: proposal 1974-11-01 and reaction 1975-01-08, GAR, archive: ‘St. Bevordering van Volkskracht’, toegangsnr. 618, inventarisnr. 449.

¹⁹²⁸ De Vries, 1975a. Some of these productions were commissioned, e.g. SCHIEDAM 700 / INSpraak in Zuid en Oost-Schiedam (1975, Mediafront). This video was commissioned by the municipality of Schiedam, on the occasion of its 7th centenary and to promote the organisation of residents in associations – as a way to institutionalise and to channel participation in local governance.

¹⁹²⁹ Van Heijningen started to work at De Lantaren in 1973 and collaborated on all kinds of film and video production, while he made also registrations for various social and cultural organisations, e.g. ER IS WAT AAN DE HAND OP CHARLOIS (1975, Van Heijningen), a video report on issues in the district Charlois, to invite residents to come to a neighbourhood meeting, and, for example, GROTEKERKPLEIN HERLEEF (1975, Jacques van Heijningen), a video registration of a cultural manifestation near the St. Laurens Church.

¹⁹³⁰ [transl. FP] *Rapport van de Werkgroep Video*, 1973-12-07, GAR archive: ‘Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam > GAR; Archief van het Archief’, toegangsnr. 297.01, inventarisnr. 747.

¹⁹³¹ De Vries, 1975a.

¹⁹³² At the Kipstraat 29a. After 1979, together with the graphics workshop of De Lantaren, located at the Pelgrimsstraat. In the early 1980s the centre would also get involved with productions for transmission through cable television, among them programmes of ethnic minorities. Due to the reduction of government expenses, as well as debts of Film International (as part of the RKS), the centre would be dissolved in 1984-1985 – see: ‘RKS: Videocentrum kan verdwijnen’, in: *Het Vrije Volk*, 1984-05-12. Collaborators at the end were Cees van de Stoep, Henk van Bruggen, Adriaan Staal, and Michael Jansen.

¹⁹³³ cf. Gaemers, 1996: 130.

¹⁹³⁴ i.e. VPRO-VRIJDAG (1970-03-13); Visser reported also on other issues, e.g. negotiations in the metal industry: VPRO-VRIJDAG (1973-02-02).

development and in the emergence of a broader socially engaged movement. This can be understood through the notion of stigmergy¹⁹³⁵. Stigmergy causes the appearance of spatial and social structures at a general level, through a mediation of interactions at the individual level. In this case, individual residents joined forces in work groups or action committees. These collectivities acted as the constituent units, informed by local data, which resulted in large (social) networks that affected the urban environment as a whole. Within these networks, the Videocentrum, in collaboration with residents, provided feedback, both negative and positive, that stimulated or recruited residents to improve their neighbourhood, and to explore prospects for urban growth. Moreover, it also provided feedback to the authorities. There was ‘a two-way influence occurring in two distinct contexts’, to use the words of Nikos Salingaros regarding feedback and urban development. ‘Units or mechanisms act in parallel on any level, and their output is available to each other, and to the higher levels. An adaptive system will use feedback to influence both the smaller and larger scales’ (Salingaros, 2005: 233). In this light I will illuminate the practice of the Videocentrum through a number of video productions, by pointing to the interactions at stake.

In August 1976, Visser began with a production on the quarter Crooswijk, in collaboration with the neighbourhood organisation *Wijkorgaan Crooswijk* (CROOSWIJK DAAR WOON IK, 1976, Bob Visser)¹⁹³⁶. In the video, residents are asked to give their opinion about the neighbourhood and the housing conditions, by way of street interviews. Visser also records conversations in a local shop, goes to a home for elderly people, a playground for children and an elementary school. The production was shown on a monitor in a so-called ‘neighbourhood exhibition’ by the RKS, next to a monitor in the shop of a cheesemonger, and another one in the window of a carpet shop, with a speaker outside. In this way about 10,000 people saw the video¹⁹³⁷. Resulting from this production, the Videocentrum started a ‘neighbourhood newsreel’ (CROOSWIJK JOURNAAL). One of them (nr. 2 ‘Sloop Schutting’, 1976), deals with residents that come into action in order to pull down a dangerous concrete fence. The action leader explains that the municipality has not taken its responsibility, so the residents have to take command themselves. Visser asks various people for comments. A woman, speaking with a broad Rotterdam accent, complains about the bad condition of the fence since her son ‘went up’ because of it. A little later the astonished viewer realises that her son has died, because of a falling piece of concrete from the fence, only three weeks earlier, which is the reason of the protest action.

Visser and his colleagues approached all kinds of people for reactions, including Alderman Van der Ploeg (e.g. in *WAT DOEN WE MET CROOSWIJK*, 1976; *SLOPEN*, 1977). In this way, the Videocentrum became an active force within the discussions in the different quarters¹⁹³⁸. Moreover, residents could watch the productions not only in the neighbourhood centres, but also at home with a group of people, by borrowing a video player of the Videocentrum – something that is shown by the *VIDEOCENTRUM PRESENTATIETAPE* (1979, Bob Visser)¹⁹³⁹.

Regarding the *wijkvideo*, productions dealt with the old quarters as well as new suburbs, like Groot-IJsselmonde (i.e. *WIJK 26*, 1977, Bob Visser). Here people criticise the greyness of the high-rise and blame the architects for making no difference between ‘London and IJsselmonde’ (the latter used to be a village). This feeling is articulated by ominous electronic music. In the

¹⁹³⁵ For an argumentation of the principles applied here, cf. Bonabeau, Dorigo, Theraulaz, 1999: 11.

¹⁹³⁶ Information about this and following productions has been provided by Bob Visser (telephone conversation with the author, 2007-10-09).

¹⁹³⁷ Edzes, 1976: 17 – Adrie Monshouwer is also mentioned by Edzes as one of the key figures of the Videocentrum.

¹⁹³⁸ Besides the quarters and districts mentioned already, see also other videos by Visser on e.g. Spangen (1977), Delfshaven (1978), Noordereiland (1978) and other productions by the Videocentrum on Delfshaven (1977), Cool (1978), Hillesluis (1979), among many others.

¹⁹³⁹ This presentation tape, to promote the Videocentrum itself, which was made in April 1979, says that its activities started in July 1976 and calls itself *De Kleine Televisie van Rotterdam*; equipment can be used for free (*mobiele kijkkisten; huisbioscoopjes*). The Videocentrum exists in order to support *bevolkingsparticipatie*, and residents are its commissioners. Its task is to signal problems and to suggest solutions.

end, residents are invited to come to a neighbourhood centre with ideas to improve the public space.

Visser also made a series on children in different quarters¹⁹⁴⁰. They tell about their daily experiences and their contact with children from other ethnic backgrounds is addressed too (e.g. in Crooswijk). In *KINDEREN IN OMMOORD* (1977, Bob Visser), children read notes and comment upon the high-rise flats in which they live. They like the views from their flats and the playgrounds between the buildings, yet they would also like to play near their homes on the galleries, which they may not; they also address the problem of noise, since neighbours can hear them easily; some children don't like the elevators since it takes too much time, while others play with its alarm. The voice-overs of the children are accompanied by shots of their homes, the public space and the games they play.

Alternatively, a production like *MOET JE ZELF WETEN* (1977, RKS) was made by children themselves, from a school in Het Oude Westen. They showed their surroundings, addressing the problems with cars and the poor housing conditions in which they had to live. Comparable is the video *WONEN EN SPELEN, OUDE WESTEN* (1977, Chris de Jongh), which was made by the SKVR, a foundation for art education, which had also come to the fore in respect of video training and production¹⁹⁴¹. A range of self-made (video) productions started to be made, by different organisations, including calls to take part in neighbourhood meetings, video pamphlets addressing problems such as expensive apartments built in urban renewal areas, and (playful) invitations to take part in the planning process¹⁹⁴².

Many of the Videocentrum productions explicitly called for action¹⁹⁴³. In this way Visser also made the 'dramatised documentary' *BUFFELSTRAAT IN BEWEGING* (1977). The story, which is narrated by Koos Postema, is about a plan for a major road through a quiet suburb¹⁹⁴⁴. The residents (played by amateur theatre group *De Maasstadspelers*) try to find out how they can oppose this plan. Their struggle and their solutions provide an example for other citizens who want to raise their voice too: by organising themselves in an association that can be a discussion partner for governmental bodies. Hence, it is a matter of institutionalizing protest, to give it a direction and to make it productive. In fact, the video was commissioned by a foundation in Leiden called *Burgerschapskunde* (≈ 'Citizenship Studies'), which organised the so-called 'Open School'. As such, the video was part of one of its courses, and written material accompanied it.

interferences

Whereas Visser made *BUFFELSTRAAT IN BEWEGING*, another staged film, but shot on 16mm, was made by Mediafront, which was called *TE HUUR AANGEBODEN* ("For Rent", 1977). It shows once more a parallel development between video and film. The choice for film in this case was largely a matter of presentation; whereas the former was shown on monitors in classrooms, the latter was projected for large audiences at special meetings. To that end, Mediafront collaborated

¹⁹⁴⁰ i.e. Crooswijk (1976), Zuidwijk, Hillesluis, Ommoord (1977), Landzicht (1979, Videocentrum). Next to these video productions, various others were made by the Videocentrum about the subject of education, e.g. *DE BASISCHOOLO* (1978), *CROOSWIJK* (1978), *DE TOEKOMSTBOUWERS* (1979) a.o.

¹⁹⁴¹ At the time of writing this book, the video collection of SKVR at the *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam* was not yet accessible for research, which therefore remains a subject for further investigation.

¹⁹⁴² e.g. *VERSLAG WIJKVERGADERING* (1978, RKS): residents of Crooswijk claim participation in the development of a housing project (Heinekenterrein); e.g. *HUREN AAN DE HAVEN* (1979, RKS) on problems with expensive apartments in Feijenoord (and Crooswijk); e.g. *WERKEN AAN 'T BESTEMMINGSPLAN, MET Z'N ALLEN ALS HET KAN* (1979, RKS), played by theatre group *Diskus*, to set the agenda for the urban masterplan of 'Het Nieuwe Westen', for which the video mobilises residents to work on it collectively. See also filmography: Rotterdamse Kunststichting as well as Bob Visser.

¹⁹⁴³ e.g. *OUDE NOORDEN* (1977, Bob Visser & Kees Breedijk); *COOL, WOONWIJK?* (1977, Videocentrum); *AANKONDIGING WIJKORGAAN VERGADERING* (1977, Videocentrum); *ACTIEDAG NIEUWE WESTEN/MIDDELLAND*, (1979, Videocentrum); etcetera.

¹⁹⁴⁴ This is located in Kralingseveer, a village in the east of Rotterdam.

with fifteen different quarters, which also sponsored the film, together with an organisation for community work (*Instituut Opbouwwerk Rotterdam*)¹⁹⁴⁵.

Like Visser's, it is an 'applied fiction film', rather than a docudrama (which is a fact-based representation¹⁹⁴⁶). The story stands for many, but in itself it is fictive. It deals with a young couple looking for an apartment. They get trapped by real estate speculator H. Fennis (an existing person). While improving their new abominable apartment they join a (real) protest against this malicious entrepreneur. On this occasion the arguments are recapitulated when a radio reporter 'interviews' the protagonists. It seems no coincidence that after the film was made, VARA-VISIE (1977-12-09) also reported on Fennis¹⁹⁴⁷. On the 16th of May 1979, the NOS JOURNAAL finally reported the winding-up sale of Fennis, which was attended by many angry residents¹⁹⁴⁸.

The municipal policy to buy old houses in renewal areas caused speculation. The film agitates against speculation, arguing that the houses must be improved instead. Although this was also the aim of the policy, the film shows at the same time a fragile equilibrium between the municipality ('subsidizing speculation') and organisations like Mediafront. The latter remained critical towards the former, notwithstanding the fact that the film had been made through the support of municipal institutions. It was a typical manifestation of tensions at the 'emergent interface', resulting interchangingly in conflict and collaboration. However, in the long run public and private institutions adapted to the new situation, at least for a decade or so.

Just like Mediafront used both video and film, the Videocentrum started to make productions on 8mm and 16mm film as well. On top of that, the centre ran a section for artistic productions. An example is *THE SINKING OF THE STOLWIJK* (1979, Cor Kraat): a ship made out of cheese is heated in a pan and melts, like a sinking ship. It reflects Rotterdam's shipbuilding industry that was gradually declining, and with it a living, and as such it is a cross-media reference to television reports about this subject¹⁹⁴⁹. Other cross-media connections can be recognised in the unconventional youth information programme *TILT* (1978, Bob Visser)¹⁹⁵⁰. While it started as a Videocentrum production, it was continued on VPRO television, as *NEON* (1979-1980), after the VPRO had already broadcast Visser's *J.A. DEELDER'S STADSGEZICHT* (1977).

Since there was an ongoing oscillation between categories and formats, Visser contacted the film section of the RKS to ask if the film workshop of De Lantaren could become part of the Videocentrum, turned into a general audiovisual centre. Although the Videocentrum was related to the RKS, its film section had hitherto nothing to do with the Videocentrum, since it was only concerned with 'cinema'. One invited Visser and his colleagues Van Heijningen and Van der Stoep. Visser explained that with the support of the Dutch government the Videocentrum had been established, first of all to promote citizen participation¹⁹⁵¹. In this way he immediately touched upon a difficult issue. Whereas the practices of the Videocentrum, like that of Mediafront, were explicitly socially motivated, and which often did not mention any names at all, the RKS film section proceeded from the notions of 'art' and 'auteur'. They discussed if artistic

¹⁹⁴⁵ Besides this municipal support it was also funded by the *X-Y Beweging*. This social organisation, mostly concerned with Third World Development, also funded other film projects, e.g. *DE PALESTIJNEN* (1975) by Johan van der Keuken.

¹⁹⁴⁶ According to the definition of a docudrama, see Staiger (2005). An example of a comparable film, on urban renewal, made for the city of Amsterdam is *STRIJD OM DE STAD* (1978, Pieter Verhoeff).

¹⁹⁴⁷ Veronica also broadcast an informative programme on housing agencies: *INFO* (Veronica, 1978-04-05).

¹⁹⁴⁸ See also auction of Fennis' property (art works): *TELEVIZIER* (AVRO, 1983-09-03).

¹⁹⁴⁹ See e.g. *NOS JOURNAAL*, 1977-08-23; *VARA-Visie*, 1978-11-28.

¹⁹⁵⁰ It provided information regarding jobs, social support, social-cultural activities etc. It did so through reports, interviews, video trick images (i.e. *Tilt Code*, later: *Neon Code*), and 'acts', while it also included entertainment, e.g. music by Gruppo Sportivo.

¹⁹⁵¹ Bob Visser in RKS meeting, *Sektie Film* 1979-06-05 – notes in: GAR, archive: 'Mr. L.J. Pieters', toegangsnr. 168, inventarisnr. 155.

and social productions could be mutually inspiring or if they would obstruct each other. They concluded that collaboration was desirable, but how to do so remained a question¹⁹⁵².

The discussion on film and video was bound up with ideas on approaches and intentions. Already before, questions had been raised internally concerning the kinds of films that needed support; should the RKS film section 'restrict itself to art, or should the vision be broadened to social and political motivation poured into artistic form, or should the RKS, as previously intended, concerning expenses from the budget of film development, restrict itself to stimulating (fiction) film activities and experiments, or should it also support practical documentaries?'¹⁹⁵³. It was an ongoing discussion, but the pressure grew as the Mayor and Aldermen asked for a five-year plan.

To find a way out, the section suggested a special budget for documentaries. That remained a proposal. For the time being, no decisions were taken and the actual policy became that only occasionally the section would support documentaries, and submissions would be judged individually¹⁹⁵⁴. This was problematic for documentaries as much as it was for experimental films. One pragmatically concluded that the films sponsored by the RKS needed to have a strong connection with Rotterdam, and that they had to stimulate the film culture in the city¹⁹⁵⁵. These criteria remained vague. In 1979, the coordinators of the film workshop and members of the RKS film section jointly made a policy plan, in which they focused on 'level'. 'Is an objective level aspired, or is it stimulated to achieve a personal, relative level?'¹⁹⁵⁶. The latter was favoured. Next was the question for whom the facilities were meant. The answer was: 'for those working professionally', with the remark that one should understand 'professional' as 'the mentality to achieve an optimal result'¹⁹⁵⁷.

§ 4. divergent visions

The 'interface turbulence' that occurred between citizens and the (local) government was not easily settled. On the contrary, different visions came to the fore, around 1980, which resulted in professionals criticising the developments that had relied too much upon the ideas of citizens, while a new generation dismissed much of the developments altogether. Along with this, audiovisual media, both in terms of formats and genres, developed in different directions.

television mediating new housing estates

Housing developments in the 1970s harked back to those of the 1920s and 1930s, regarding issues of slum clearance and the creation of green suburbs. This was highlighted by media reports, such as the television documentary *EENE WONING VOOR DEN WERKMAN* (1972, Leo

¹⁹⁵² They decided that together they would look, first of all, how the workshops could support each other, i.e. Bals and F. Peters of the Film Section, Van Heijningen, Van der Stoep and Visser of the Videocentrum, Notes of the meeting RKS, Sektie Film of 1979-06-05. GAR, archive: 'Mr. L.J. Pieters', toegangsnr. 168, inventarisnr. 155.

¹⁹⁵³ Questions raised in respect of submitted proposal 'GAB-film', notes of the meeting of the RKS, Sektie Film, 1978-01-17. GAR, archive: 'Mr. L.J. Pieters', toegangsnr. 168, inventarisnr. 155.

Original quote: 'Naar aanleiding van deze aanvraag ontspint zich opnieuw de uitvoerige discussie of de Kunststichting zich moet beperken tot kunst of de visie moet verbreden tot in kunstvorm gegoten sociale of politieke beweging, of de Kunststichting zich, zoals eerder voorgenomen, bij bestedingen uit het budget filmontwikkeling moet beperken tot het stimuleren van (speel)filmactiviteit en experimenten of ook praktische documentaires moet gaan subsidiëren.'

¹⁹⁵⁴ See for example the notes concerning the proposal 'Makara'; meeting of RKS, Sektie Film 1978-10-04. GAR, archive: 'Mr. L.J. Pieters', toegangsnr. 168, inventarisnr. 155.

¹⁹⁵⁵ These were the criteria expressed in respect of a rejection of a proposal submitted by Edward Luyken, discussed by the RKS Sektie Film at 1978-11-28. GAR, archive: 'Mr. L.J. Pieters', toegangsnr. 168, inventarisnr. 155.

¹⁹⁵⁶ Original quote: 'Wordt er gestreefd naar een bepaald, objectief niveau (vgl. Muziekschool) of wordt gestimuleerd tot het bereiken van een persoonlijk, relatief niveau?'. Notes of the meeting RKS, Sektie Film of 1979-05-08. GAR, archive: 'Mr. L.J. Pieters', toegangsnr. 168, inventarisnr. 155.

¹⁹⁵⁷ Notes of the meeting RKS, Sektie Film of 1979-05-08. GAR, archive: 'Mr. L.J. Pieters', toegangsnr. 168, inventarisnr. 155.

Akkermans)¹⁹⁵⁸. It focused on the difficulty of creating affordable housing that also allows residents to appropriate it according to their specific needs. It showed garden village 'Vreewijk' from the 1920s, which became successful since its construction was accompanied by the establishment of social organisations and through the commitment of its residents. Concerning workers, for whom it was intended, only those with decent jobs came to live here, next to socially engaged teachers, writers and artists. The documentary also paid attention to plans by Van den Broek & Bakema for housing estates that enable residents to make extensions to their dwellings over the course of years¹⁹⁵⁹. Both cases were based on ideas of differentiation and a concern with individual commitment, not unlike the ideas of the urban renewal movement. This was a reaction to the increasing rigidity of modern suburbs. The film highlights another direction, that of a small-scale approach that offers space to individuals and a vital community life.

Next to the piecemeal renewal of the old quarters, new housing estates became also subject to this small-scale paradigm. The first projects as such were built by architect Leo de Jonge. In collaboration with his father he had designed several public buildings and numerous housing blocks in Rotterdam since the 1950s. His work relied upon modernist principles, which can still be recognised in his BNA-study for 'Het Oude Westen', which foresaw demolition and entirely new estates. However, De Jonge quickly adapted to the circumstances¹⁹⁶⁰. In this way he created projects in various urban renewal areas, and with success¹⁹⁶¹.

Mayor Van der Louw gave impetus to the housing development through his personal connections. He had previously lived in Hoevelaken (near Amersfoort), just like architect Jan Verhoeven. The latter was the founder of *Stichting Nieuwe Woonvormen*, a foundation for housing innovation in the Netherlands¹⁹⁶². In his hometown, Verhoeven built the first project of the foundation, which received attention from (indeed) VARA-television¹⁹⁶³. It was followed by a housing estate in the village Berkel en Rodenrijs (1969-1973), near Rotterdam, which Verhoeven created in collaboration with, among other, Nico Witstok, who was simultaneously involved with the successful BNA-study for 'Het Oude Westen'.

When Van der Louw moved to Rotterdam he asked Verhoeven to build his private house¹⁹⁶⁴. He also received the commission to design 'Housing Hofdijk' (1977-1983), a complex

¹⁹⁵⁸ Concerning Vreewijk, cf: WONINGRENOVATIE (1970, Bouke Ottow). Other reports that refer to pre-war housing are e.g. VAN GEWEST TOT GEWEST (NOS, 1975-11-19, reunion of residents of Tuindorp Heijplaat); VOLKSWONINGBOUW 1920-1940 (1978, LBC Videogroep); WITTE DORP & BERGPOLDERFLAT (1977, Bob Visser & Kees Breedijk).

¹⁹⁵⁹ This concerns the housing project 't Hool' in Eindhoven (1962-1972).

¹⁹⁶⁰ In the decades after WWII, father Jos and son Leo de Jonge created several public buildings, schools in particular (e.g. 'Tweede Christelijke Technische School "De Vaan", Montessoriweg, 1956-1961; pedagogical academy 'St. Lucia', Hennekijnstraat, 1954-1958), and housing projects in Charlois, Oud-Mathenesse, Schiebroek, Kleinpolder-Oost, Tussendijken, Zuidwijk, Westpunt (Hoogvliet) and Lombardijen (cf. Groenendijk e.a. 2007: 217). In 1972 a number of employees became partners; the office of De Jonge was then called 'De Jonge, Dorst, Lubeek, De Bruijn, De Groot & Partners'. The first small-scale housing projects were 'Veemarktterrein' (1975-1976) and the neighbouring complex 'Goudse Rijweg/Vondelweg' (1975-1978). As such they carried out projects in a.o. Het Oude Westen, Cool, Kralingen, Charlois, Afrikaanderwijk, Provenierswijk, Liskwartier, and Het Oude Noorden. See: Groenendijk, 2004; Architectuur > Personen > Jonge, Jos en Leo de.

www.rotterdam.nl/smartsite229.dws?Menu=2004581&MainMenu=0&goto=2062613&style=1901

(2008-04-04). For other projects of this kind, designed by different architects, see: Nycolaas: 1983, 195.

¹⁹⁶¹ In 1979 critic Kenneth Frampton considered his project at 'Goudse Rijweg/Vondelweg' (1975-1978) as a major architectural achievement, see: *Wonen-TABK* (1979, nr, 16/17).

¹⁹⁶² See: www.bonas.nl >> zoekmachine archiwijzer >> alle architecten >> Verhoeven

¹⁹⁶³ I.e. 'Housing Kyftenbeltlaan' (1968-1971, Jan Verhoeven). VARA first showed Verhoeven explaining his plans and presenting models (ACHTER HET NIEUWS, 1968-08-10), followed by exterior and interior shots once they were carried out (GOED LEVEN, VARA, 1970-01-07). The latter showed first apartment blocks in Amsterdam Buitenveldert, as a contrast to the experiment by Verhoeven, which was followed by an item that addressed the problems of housing in Rotterdam. The project was also shown in VANDAAG OF MORGEN (AVRO, 1970-05-08), on housing in the Netherlands.

¹⁹⁶⁴ At Kralingseweg (1977-1980). See: www.bonas.nl, see also: Groenendijk (2004b):

www.wonen.rotterdam.nl/smartsite2033034.dws?Menu=2072028&MainMenu=2072028 (visited: 2007-04-14)

of more than 500 dwellings situated at the former Heliport, next to the river Rotte. Making use of its water, a canal was made in the shape of a rhombus, to create an island on which the complex was built (see e.g. TELEVIZIER, AVRO, 1980-03-24). The houses are individually recognisable through saddle roofs – which were ridiculed by critics. However, Verhoeven created a complex structuralist configuration, according to geometrical principles. Striking are the elevated walkways and squares that connect the houses and which facilitate contact between neighbours. The publicity that Verhoeven's earlier plans had received helped him to get his plan accepted, to such an extent that it was soon taken for granted. This is exemplified by amateur recordings as well as a television programme in which it illustrates the topic of mortgages and interest rates¹⁹⁶⁵.

'Housing Hofdijk' result from a study by Jan Hoogstad regarding the role of the river Rotte that had given the city its name, after the plans for the Rottetracé had been cancelled¹⁹⁶⁶. Instead the intention had become to reintegrate the Rotte in the city, to make it visible and to turn it into an attraction. As such it became also the subject of a television programme that showed the history and the current condition of the river (VAN GEWEST TOT GEWEST, NOS 1979-05-02). Another project that resulted from it was a housing complex at St.-Jacobsplaats (1975-1979)¹⁹⁶⁷. The latter was an ancient site, for which Hoogstad himself designed three hundred large, terraced dwellings with private and public platforms on the water and bridges connecting the parts.

Another member of *Stichting Nieuwe Woonvormen* was Piet Blom, who, like Verhoeven, had been a student of Aldo van Eyck in the late 1950s. In 1976, Blom was asked to make a study for a project near the *Oude Haven* ("Old Harbour"). For a number of years Blom had worked on his concept of 'the roof of the city': a high density of elevated dwellings, including public spaces such as squares and corridors, in order to leave the ground level available for other activities – similar to Verhoeven's plan (and Constant's 'New Babylon'). In this way, Blom created the Kasbah in Hengelo and cube houses in Helmond. They received much media attention¹⁹⁶⁸, which prepared a general understanding and appreciation of Blom's ideas.

Blom was convinced that housing around the old harbour needed to be connected to the other side of the Blaak avenue, to connect it to the city centre. He proposed to construct a bridge with dwellings. His final design consisted of three large canted cubes to be used for offices and the Rotterdam Academy of Architecture, (work)shops on the elevated ground floor, and thirty-nine smaller cubes for dwellings of three floors. All cubes are turned on one angle, each standing on a pole that is its staircase – hence the complex is called "Pole Dwellings" or "Blaak Forest"¹⁹⁶⁹. The whole plan was unconventional. Television helped to create support by paying attention to its concept. Still in an early stage, the plan was broadcast by the NOS JOURNAAL (1978-05-29). Pim Korver took a panorama shot of the old harbour area, followed by shots of the model of the Cube Houses, while reporter Herman van der Spek interviewed Blom. Half a year later TROS broadcast a documentary on Blom's work, which took his concept of *The Roof of the City* as its title: HET DAK VAN DE STAD (1978, René van Gyn). At the beginning Blom explains his ideas for Rotterdam. His other work is presented, and at the end are models of the cube houses. Within this narrative structure, the project in Rotterdam makes up the framework. The

¹⁹⁶⁵ Resp. WANDELING DOOR ROTTERDAM (1978-1982, Jan Soek), which documents the development of 'Housing Hofdijk' as a matter of fact next to the complex at the Goudse Rijweg and 'De Peperklip' (1979-1982, Carel Weeber); and TELEVIZIER (AVRO, 1980-03-24).

¹⁹⁶⁶ I.e. study *Waterverband* (1971-1973, J. Hoogstad); www.architectuur.org/hoogstad.php B. van Hoek (2007-04-17).

¹⁹⁶⁷ For 'St.-Jacobsplaats', see: Groenendijk & Vollaard, 2007: 9. See also: Rodermond, 1979. Next to this the study also resulted in 'De Leuvehaven' (1975-1980, Apon, Van den Berg, Ter Braak, Tromp), see: Groenendijk & Vollaard, 2007: 73; see also: Groenendijk (2004): Architectuur > Personen > Apon. See: www.rotterdam.nl/smartsite229.dws?Menu=2004581&MainMenu=0&goto=2004061&style=1901

¹⁹⁶⁸ See: e.g. KASBAH PROJECT VAN PIETER BLOM (1974-wk42, Polygoon), DE PAALWONINGEN VAN PIETER BLOM (1976-wk06, Polygoon), DRIE MAAL TWINTIG (1976-11-17, AVRO).

¹⁹⁶⁹ The complex is flanked by a tower, called 'the pencil', and, on the other side, along the *Oude Haven*, a 'Mediterranean' housing complex of two-hundred-fifty dwellings, cafés, terraces and shops (all designed by Blom too) – Barbieri (e.a.), 1983: 206-207 (a.o.).

programme thus helped to understand and accept the work. This also applies to another programme that compared Blom's projects in Helmond and Rotterdam¹⁹⁷⁰. Already before their completion, in 1982, the 'Cube Houses' became an attraction, and in the next years they would frequently appear on television, for example in NCRV's BOKKESPRONGEN (1985-05-15)¹⁹⁷¹, in which Blom presents his own project as well as 'Housing Hofdijk'.

Next to these projects, some new suburbs were also based on the small-scale approach, like 'Beverwaard' (1978-1983, plan: Mol/Reyenga & Tetteroo) and 'Zevenkamp' (1978-1983, plan: Abma & Hazewinkel). The creation of the latter was also shown in a television report, which paid special attention to an experiment with wooden shell constructions that people could arrange themselves in order to design their own dwelling (TROS AKTUA 408, 1982-09-10)¹⁹⁷². However, due to economic changes and restrictions of budget, the small-scale paradigm was finally reduced to more conventional principles, both in terms of aesthetics and organisation¹⁹⁷³. It also lacked the vitality of the urban renewal areas, since the residents were not yet there, while new models of participation and planning were not further explored.

turbulence

The paradigmatic small-scale approach was, however, not a foregone conclusion. There was an ongoing debate in the press between 'culturalists' and 'progressists', as Cordula Rooijendijk has framed it (2005, ch. 5)¹⁹⁷⁴. The culturalists argued for urban renewal according to a piece-meal approach, which respected existing structures. In a similar way they asked attention, supported by the media, for historical buildings at the outskirts that were about to be demolished, such as the 'Veerhuis' (1767) in Overschie, and the country estate 'D'Oliphant' (1591) at Voorne – which would eventually be saved (although the latter was 'relocated' to Charlois)¹⁹⁷⁵.

Within the municipality, however, the progressist view was still strong, which is clear from the support for the 'Europoint' office towers (1971-1975, SOM), which would become the home of the departments of Urban Development and Public Works (see the prologue of Part III). In fact, many architects and planners came to resist small-scale development in the end. In 1979, in an interview for *Hard Werken*¹⁹⁷⁶, Carel Weeber spoke of it as a matter of *truttigheid* (≈ 'frumpiness'), as something that is snug, tiny and cosy, being the opposite of rational and straight. The city was turned inside out; the way most people furnished their homes became also the way the city was made¹⁹⁷⁷. It was a result, according to Weeber, of the participation processes in which architects had lost their integrity. This critique was immediately picked up by colleagues.

Small-scale architecture became known as *Nieuwe Truttigheid*, being the reversal of *Nieuwe Zakelijkheid* from the 1920s¹⁹⁷⁸. As a counter statement Weeber built 'De Peperklip' (1979-1982), a large curved monolithic housing block in the district Feijenoord. Since remarkable buildings in Rotterdam get nicknames, Weeber anticipated it and called it *peperklip* ("paperclip"). He wrote it in large letters on the façade, with an ironical reference towards Dutchified spelling of that time. However, the shape of a paperclip is only to be recognised from above; the building has little in common with the actual features of a paperclip. It is a bold gesture to be recognised and appreciated by architects and planners only. Although some critics called it a prison or 'housing fortress'¹⁹⁷⁹, it is generally considered as the end of the small-scale approach¹⁹⁸⁰.

¹⁹⁷⁰ VAN GEWEST TOT GEWEST (1981, NOS), with interviews with residents, models and constructed parts.

¹⁹⁷¹ NCRV (1985-05-15), interview with Piet Blom by Louis Kockelmann, 11'15" [B&G: 12212M75684 {FILM}]

¹⁹⁷² Initiator of the do-it-yourself project was Frans Boekhorst, in collaboration with architect Willem Wagenaar.

¹⁹⁷³ For a comment upon the plans, see: Nycolaas, 1983: 190.

¹⁹⁷⁴ This dichotomy is based on Françoise Choay, see Rooijendijk, 2005: 32-35.

¹⁹⁷⁵ See resp. JOURNAAL, NOS, 1974-10-25 and 1975-08-12; cf. [D'Oliphant] Polygoon, 1970-wk24.

¹⁹⁷⁶ Boonstra, 1979.

¹⁹⁷⁷ Cf. De Vletter, 2005: 49.

¹⁹⁷⁸ Cf. Barbieri, Umberto, 'De nieuwe truttigheid is dood, wat nu?', pp40-47 in: *Plan*, 1979/11.

¹⁹⁷⁹ *Gevangenis* and *woonkazerne*, ref. in: Groenendijk, 2004 www.wonen.rotterdam.nl/smartsite2043793.dws

Weeber is usually mentioned as the first to criticise the small-scale paradigm. Instead, art historian Patricia van Ulzen (2007: 78-83) has argued that the break happened with the VPRO broadcasting Bob Visser's film-essay J.A. DEELDER'S STADSGEZICHT, at Christmas 1977¹⁹⁸¹. Walking at night across an empty 'Schouwburgplein' and through 'De Lijnbaan', poet Jules Deelder – dressed in black, and wearing sunglasses – denounces the attempts to make the city *gezellig* ("cosy"). He prefers the baldness of Rotterdam and literally turns its facts and figures into poetry. At the end he reads his poem *Stadsgezicht*, which is a tribute to modernist architecture. He writes for example: *Tall and hard as spikes the sky // with a tinny twinkling sun or // black and low in flurry-fly // along a concrete skeleton*¹⁹⁸². He also calls the city a 'posthistoric prospect'. Van Ulzen calls the poem 'prophetic'.

It describes a Rotterdam that didn't exist in 1977 but would take shape during the 1980s and '90s. It also describes aspects of Rotterdam (high-rise, distant prospects, concrete skeletons) that were condemned and contested in 1977 but would be reassessed and appreciated by policymakers and the public at large some 10 to 15 years later. (Van Ulzen, 2007: 82)

Although Alderman Mentink had called the Shell tower (1976) 'the last erection of capitalism'¹⁹⁸³, other office towers appeared indeed a decade later. We may wonder if the filmmakers welcomed such capitalist erections, but if we take Van Ulzen's words in terms of a metropolitan life-style against 'fiddliness' we can follow her when she says (2007: 87) that this vision was picked up by graphic designers related to the paper *Hard Werken* ['Hard Working']: '*Hard Werken* gave verbal and visual expression to a clear perspective on the city of Rotterdam. Several issues included trenchant critiques of the small-scale architecture being built all over the city centre.'

It is unlikely that the film caused a mentality change to the extent that Van Ulzen suggests. It was important since it was Deelder's first television performance *as such*, after he had briefly appeared on television a few times before¹⁹⁸⁴. It contributed to his status of a cult figure associated with Rotterdam. Moreover, in 1979, Visser and Deelder, as a roving reporter, began a programme called NEON, for VPRO-television, about 'neon-romanticism' and punk, which was the continuation of the Videocentrum production TILT – and hence there is a direct link with citizen participation¹⁹⁸⁵. After the successful broadcasting of J.A. DEELDER'S STADSGEZICHT by the VPRO, it was acquired by the municipality to be shown at the *Hulp- en Informatiecentrum* at the Coolsingel¹⁹⁸⁶. And so this film too enabled the communication between the city and its citizens.

¹⁹⁸⁰ Groenendijk, 2004: Architectuur > 'Ontstaan en ontwikkeling' [Rotterdam]: 'The end of small-scale development in architecture is marked by 'De Peperklip' by Carel Weeber from 1982'. Original quote: 'Het einde van de kleinschaligheid in de architectuur wordt gemarkeerd door De Peperklip van Carel Weeber uit 1982.'

¹⁹⁸¹ The title can be interpreted in three different ways; 'stadsgezicht' means both 'city sight' and 'city face', while it is also the title of the poem that Deelder reads; hence the title of the film refers to 'Deelder's poem', 'Deelder's view upon the city' and 'Deelder's urban face'. The film was part of the programme HET GAT VAN NEDERLAND (1977-12-25), which consisted of different items, the first being the gospel according to St. Lucas read by Prof. dr. Piet Steenkamp. Other items followed that showed, in contrast, different sides of contemporary society. Visser's film was included as item nr. 8. www.beeldengeluid.nl (2007-04-17).

¹⁹⁸² Translation by FP; original verses: Hoog en spijkerhard de hemel // met een blikkerende zon of // zwart en laag in wilde wemel // langs skeletten van beton.

¹⁹⁸³ Cf. Van Ulzen, 2007: 76.

¹⁹⁸⁴ The first time was in POÉZIE IN CARRÉ (VPRO, 1966-03-21).

¹⁹⁸⁵ Others that contributed to this programme were, for example, Rijnke & Van Leeuwen (i.e. spot for Rock Against Religion in Kaasee / RAR-SPOT, broadcast as part of NEON, 1979-12-23). Deelder was also involved with the television production VERHAGENCADABRA (Wim T. Schippers, VPRO 1979-06-17). Another film that was produced by Visser is the fiction short HEB JE JETTA WEL 'NS GEHAD? (1978, Ab van Ieperen). Deelder and Visser would make various other programmes afterwards. It would eventually enable Visser to establish his own production company, called 'Neon'.

¹⁹⁸⁶ Schmidt, 1978: 19-20. Visser also collaborated with the centre in respect of TILT (a.o.).

In a similar way, *Hard Werken* had been initiated by Willem Kars, who coordinated the graphics workshop of De Lantaren¹⁹⁸⁷, which actively supported the urban renewal movement. Moreover, it had been Rommert Boonstra, the director of De Lantaren, who had interviewed Carel Weeber, who himself carried out also a large number of urban renewal projects¹⁹⁸⁸. Besides that, he was a member of the RKS, where he headed the architecture section (1975-1988)¹⁹⁸⁹. Among its projects was an international visitation of Rotterdam, the so-called *Keurmeestersproject* (“Master Inspector Project”, 1979), for which the RKS invited the critics Kenneth Frampton, Stanislaus von Moos, and Francesco Dal Co. Besides a number of reconstruction buildings they, Frampton in particular, also appraised some small-scale housing plans in the city centre¹⁹⁹⁰. They were, however, critical on the visitation itself, which was based on a short list of twenty representative buildings. Von Moos and Dal Co argued for an approach that framed the architecture of Rotterdam in a broader (culturalist) perspective, in terms of history and surroundings.

The ‘small-scale’ development, which Van Ulzen considers anti-metropolitan, actually concerned different realms: urban renewal, suburban housing, and public space. It is mostly the proportioning of public space that was criticised by Deelder, especially street furniture such as flower boxes. Weeber was especially disturbed by suburban developments. However, he himself had been related to the *Stichting Nieuwe Woonvormen*. Regarding this foundation, Wim van Heuvel has stated, in his book *Structuralism in Dutch Architecture* (1992: 32), that the criticism concerned above all its *offshoot*, due to ‘extremely personal ideas about architecture and the desire for form [that] led to picturesque details’. It raised costs, so one had to economise on other aspects, which reduced the overall quality.

Compared to urban renewal, projects drawn on a *tabula rasa* had a different relation to sociocultural structures. Whereas suburban quarters were entirely new and encompassed just housing, urban renewal put the focus on actual environments and the mixture of functions.

In 1980, the *Aktiegroep Het Oude Westen* received a major architecture award, the *Rotterdam-Maaskant Prijs* (initiated by Maaskant shortly before). The jury stated¹⁹⁹¹: ‘The urban renewal process deserves the award and the *Aktiegroep Het Oude Westen*, as the most important generator and as a symbol of this process, receives the award.’ The quarter was ‘a laboratory of urban renewal’, which continued till the 1990s. The *Aktiegroep* still exists today¹⁹⁹². It corresponds to Pietro Hammel’s idea that the city is alive and that it should not be framed as a final plan or a built ‘result’. It is above all a matter of organisation, of place and events, of communication and social relationships eventually. This is a ‘product’ of architecture that takes time, which, however, is not supervised by architects, whose official task ends once a building is ‘ready’.

Regarding ‘Het Oude Westen’, Groenendijk and Vollaard (1998, 266) write that the ‘vitality of the Rotterdam approach received international acclaim’. In spatial terms, the achievements are characterised by ‘[c]onnecting side streets, district facilities and garages below

¹⁹⁸⁷ See also: Van Ulzen: 2007, 93.

¹⁹⁸⁸ www.fondsbkvb.nl/archief/india/deelnemers/19_weerber.html (visited 2007-04-18). In Rotterdam he created the housing estates Voorhaven, Slaak, Oostzeedijk, Tolhuislaan, Vasteland en Pompenburg. Also *De Peperklip* was located in an urban renewal area, and as such it is also shown in the art video GROETEN UIT ROTTERDAM (1982, Van Brummelen & Dullaart). See also ‘Weeber’ at www.wonen.rotterdam.nl/smartsite2043793.dws (2008-08-20).

¹⁹⁸⁹ Cf. Van Ulzen, 2007: 95.

¹⁹⁹⁰ E.g. Goudse Rijweg and Vondelweg (1975-1978, Leo de Jonge e.a.); St. Jacobsplaats (1975-1978, Jan Hoogstad). It was published in a special issue on the project by the architectural magazine *Wonen-TABK* (1979, nr. 16/17).

¹⁹⁹¹ A.o. Hedy d’Ancona, Ruud Brouwers and Wim Quist (who had been part of the study group who drew the first plan for ‘Het Oude Westen’ in 1970). Quote taken from Groenendijk (2004a):

www.rotterdam.nl/smartsite2043508.dws?Menu=2004581&MainMenu=0 Groenendijk mentions 1980; Provoost (2003) mentions that the prize was given in 1977 (being the first time that it was awarded),

http://dissertations.ub.rug.nl/FILES/faculties/arts/2003/m.provoost/biografie_medewerkers_lit_opg.pdf (at 2007-04).

¹⁹⁹² See: www.aktiegroepoudewesten.nl (May 2008).

houses [that] have made living conditions more attractive. New-build and various types of renovation, at times retaining only the structural walls, can here be found side by side.’ Notwithstanding the initial success of urban renewal, less than three decades later ‘Het Oude Westen’ is actually the only case that is still mentioned. Reviewing urban renewal, the authors say that ‘its architecture and planning, however, suffered during negotiations, leading to the negative expression “urban renewal architecture”.’ This was actually the experience of architects and critics who had lost their authority¹⁹⁹³. Moreover, the criticism concerned mostly aesthetics. It reveals the disciplinary difficulty with the new circumstances. Procedures and institutions had to catch up, the implications and possibilities still had to be explored; new models, approaches and design strategies were needed to recognise the complexity of micro-level developments.

Urban renewal meant a shift from functionalism, its ideology and aesthetics, towards an anthropocentrism. Something similar applies to audiovisual productions, especially since the emergence of video, which gave citizens a voice in urban development. Within an ever adapting urban system, these productions served a feedback function. This would be continued over the course of the 1980s, for example by Adriaan Staal and Joop de Jong, and by some incidental film projects, such as the triptych ROTTERDAM (1984, Rolf Orthel), which was commissioned by the municipality on the occasion of ‘ten years of urban renewal’ as an official policy¹⁹⁹⁴.

dystopian Rotterdam

While urban renewal initiatives fought deterioration, it was cultivated by a number of feature films. In less than ten years, the image of Rotterdam had changed from one of ‘construction’ to one of decay. This development was part of a broader, international post-1960s *film noir* revival that expressed a dystopian modernism¹⁹⁹⁵. This too can be understood in terms of an ‘emergent interface’, especially in connection to a new generation that expressed other kinds of values.

Until the 1970s, hardly any ‘crime movie’ set in Rotterdam had been made, except for rather innocent youth films like BOEFJE (1939, Detlef Sierck), and its post-war counterpart PIETJE BELL (1964, Henk van der Linden), which were both based on books from the early twentieth century¹⁹⁹⁶. Things changed in the 1970s, especially when the issue of narcotics came to the fore.

This was first of the case with the film CHINESE KUNG FU AND GODFATHER (1974, Tso Nam Lee). This co-production from Hong Kong and the Netherlands was partly recorded in Katendrecht, which used to be a Chinese quarter from the beginning of the century. The starting point of the film, which had to attract western spectators too, corresponded to a tendency of increasing immigration from China, especially Hong Kong, in the 1970s, and the rapid spread of Chinese restaurants¹⁹⁹⁷. The film tells the story of a young Chinese immigrant (played by Kam Tong), who comes to the Netherlands to work in a restaurant, but he gets involved in drugs trafficking. He tries to escape and to start a kung-fu school, but he is chased by the Dutch ‘godfather’, played by Jan Willem Stoker, who was, in reality, Dutch taekwondo champion and the owner of a sports and fitness school in Rotterdam. In the film, the boy’s girlfriend (played by

¹⁹⁹³ Cf. De Vletter, 2005: 48-49. She remarks that the position of the architect had come under great pressure. Besides residents, consultants and managers came to the fore, since projects grew and became more complex. She argues that the marginalisation of the authority of the architect and the urban planner was partly due to their own discipline, which had difficulties to find a common ground and to establish a new paradigm (cf. p45).

¹⁹⁹⁴ Premiere: 1984-10-17, De Lantaren. It contained three stories, based on actual cases: RINUS (by Joost Kraanen), on an odd-jobber collecting things from houses to be demolished; he has to move to a suburb, but he wants to return to his old quarter; TURKSE VIDEO (Otakar Votocek), on Turkish adventures and homesickness; HET WONDER VAN ROTTERDAM (Gerard Verhage), on a landlord who loses his property due to urban renewal and plans to bomb the municipality. GAR, archive: ‘Collectie Tj. De Vries betreffende Rotterdamse Bioscopen’, toegangsnr. 1289, inventarisnr. 26.

¹⁹⁹⁵ For this broader movement see e.g. Luhr & Lehman, 2006: 177.

¹⁹⁹⁶ *Boeffje*: 1903, Marie Joseph Brusse; *Pietje Bell*: 1914, Chris van Abkoude.

¹⁹⁹⁷ Rijkschroeff, 1998: 94. About 80% of the Chinese in the Netherlands work in the restaurant branch, see also: www.acbkenniscentrum.nl/chinezen (2008-07-11)

Ine Veen) gets killed, and he takes revenge. Two versions of the film were made, one for release in Western Europe, in which both the hero and the villain die, and which furthermore includes explicit sex scenes, and a Hong Kong version in which the hero wins, and in which even kisses are left out.

Notwithstanding the problems of the Chinese community, including issues of criminality, it did relatively well. It is also emphasised by the fact that the film was financed and executed by someone from this community, the young entrepreneur Yung Nin Yuen, who lived in Rotterdam, where he was born as well. This, however, might be an exception if we compare it to the overall situation of immigrants and the condition of the old quarters of the city.

Another major production featuring Rotterdam and dealing with narcotics was Philippe Labro's thriller *L'ALPAGUEUR* (F, 1976), in the context of which I have already discussed the role of the municipality (Chapter 11.§4). Since Rotterdam became also a centre for prostitution, it might be no surprise that it became the setting for a film like *LE FEU AU CUL* (1976, Yves Prigent), which was a French hardcore porn movie. It tells the story of a gangster who is released and returns to Rotterdam to find his love, but she has disappeared without leaving any trace. During his search for her he has all kinds of (sexual) encounters, which constitutes the 'body' of this film. Taken the genre into account, critics have described it as a carefully made film, in which the atmosphere of Rotterdam, it is said, is well framed¹⁹⁹⁸.

Besides foreign films there were Dutch productions that showed the move into dark Rotterdam as well, including the still rather innocent television drama *LIEFDE EN LANGE VINGERS* (1975, Gerben Hellinga), as well as experimental productions like the short *IF YOU KNOW THE END* (1978, Ferri Ronteltap), on a lost industrialist who seems to have become a wanderer, and Frans Zwartjes' *PENTIMENTO* (1979). The latter was shot at the former waterworks complex (DWL Honingerdijk, 1874, arch. Van der Tak). Here the artistic community 'Utopia' contributed to the reconfiguration of the area into a complex of dwellings and workshops, while providing opportunities for experimentation. In his film Zwartjes turned the complex into an uncanny, chilly surrounding, which could be 'a slaughterhouse, a prison or a psychiatric hospital'¹⁹⁹⁹. Scientists, headed by a traumatised Japanese physician, subject women to violent and sexual experiments, as a cruel manifestation of power and helplessness that results in killings. The film raised strong protests from feminists, who stopped screenings in theatres by entering the projection cabin, taking away the projector and destroying the reel²⁰⁰⁰. Commentators have addressed, however, that the term 'pentimento', from the history of painting, indicates an alteration on the canvas that is to be seen through traces of the previous image. It concerns layers on top of each other, hiding another reality²⁰⁰¹. Alternatively, the notion of 'pentimento' also applies to the city: through the urban decay one sees a remainder of the modern city.

Urban decay is also an issue in the work of Zwartje's former student Dick Rijneke. After he started with experimental films, he made documentaries on drug abuse and, in 1980, the documentary trilogy *GROETEN UIT ROTTERDAM*. It showed a city in decay, and it paid special attention to the punk movement and its music, especially that of the Rondos²⁰⁰²; it was the most successful punk rock formation from Rotterdam, and the most political, articulated its anarcho-

¹⁹⁹⁸ De Volkskrant / VPRO: www.cinema.nl (2008-08-13). Original quote: 'Dit is nu eens een tamelijk verzorgde verfilming, waarbij de sfeer van Rotterdam goed in beeld is gebracht.' The visit of Prigent to Rotterdam is also mentioned in: 'Bezoekers', p25 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 13/2, 1975.

¹⁹⁹⁹ www.filmbank.nl/artikel/301/ 'Hollandse Meesters' (2008-04-04).

²⁰⁰⁰ Ibid. cf. www.filmtaal.nl/module.php?section=nfdDetails&movieID=426 (2008-04-04) 'Pentimento'.

²⁰⁰¹ See e.g. Albers, 2004: 282-283.

²⁰⁰² Besides the Rondos it featured also the Tändstickorshocks a.o., which are also to be seen in *PINKEL* (1982, Dick Rijneke & Mildred van Leeuwen), as well as the video documentary *POPZIEN* (1980, Elenga & De Jong).

communism through its song texts, graphics, and its magazine *Raket* (produced at its studio *Huize Schoonderloo*, which had been a film studio in the past²⁰⁰³).

As a result of this project, Rijnke made the partly documentary and partly fictional feature film *PINKEL* (1982, Rijnke & Van Leeuwen). Whereas the former addresses the left wing radicalism of the punk movement, the message to ‘destroy the system’ turns into nihilism and even right wing radicalism in the case of the latter. There is a connection to be drawn here with the interests of Paul Verhoeven, who made at that time the provocative feature *SPETTERS* (1980), which was also discussed in film recordings that Rijnke made of an interview with Verhoeven, together with Wim Verstappen²⁰⁰⁴.

Like the other films, *SPETTERS* is a form of cultural oscillation²⁰⁰⁵. It was set in the historic town Maassluis, near Rotterdam, and in Rotterdam too, featuring locations like the Euromast, metro station Beurs and the Lijnbaan – all icons of the modern city. After its release, *SPETTERS* was criticised by both critics and the public, for racist remarks and sexual violence, especially by and against gays, and for its general shallowness. When the script had been submitted for state funding, the chairman of the *Productiefonds*, Anton Koolhaas, demanded a revision. This was done, but only on paper. Like the other productions, this film too reflects a shifting approach concerning the modern city. If we would only measure the strong opposition against *SPETTERS*, it fulfilled a negative feedback function within urban development.

While Anton Koolhaas criticised *SPETTERS*, its ideas were akin to those of his son Rem, who established his company OMA in Rotterdam (1978). In the previous years he too pointed to the other side of modernity, through his studies ‘The Berlin Wall as Architecture’ (1970) and ‘Exodus or the Voluntary Prisoners of Architecture’ (1972). It reflected the move of Constant, who began to realise the dystopian implications of his ‘New Babylon’, in which Koolhaas was particularly interested²⁰⁰⁶. However, after Koolhaas turned modernity inside out through his book *Delirious New York* (1978), by attributing agency to unintended developments, a move was made towards a new era that inscribed itself into the city²⁰⁰⁷. In respect of Rotterdam, Koolhaas made such an argument in his article ‘The Terrifying Beauty of the Twentieth Century’ (1985)²⁰⁰⁸. It was underscored by various other uncanny feature films shot in Rotterdam, as a city in decay, among them *Greenaways’ A ZED AND TWO NOUGHTS* (1985) and (erotic) thrillers such as *LOOS* (1989, Theo van Gogh) and *DE KASSIÈRE* (1989, Ben Verbong). The developments of the 1970s became, in a twisted manner, the prelude to the 1980s and 1990s: a new era of city planning, with booming architecture and media applications, with feature films concerning the city, its social life and functions.

²⁰⁰³ In the 1920s it was used by Rienks Machine Fabriek, which also started to produce films (as film company ‘Electra’). In the 1930s it became the studio of the *Rotterdamsche Smalfilmliga* (Smits, 2002: 12).

²⁰⁰⁴ See: *NOU, DAT WAS HET DAN!* (2005, Rijnke & Van Leeuwen).

²⁰⁰⁵ One of the main characters is played by Maarten Spanjer, who had made his first appearance in *LIEFDE EN LANGE VINGERS*. The cinematography of *SPETTERS* was the work of the German cameraman Jost Vacano. He had been a student of Andor von Bary in Munich, just like Rob Houwer, who had been the producer of previous films by Verhoeven (and thereby the link). The script for *SPETTERS*, like that of Verhoeven’s *TURKS FRUIT* (a.o.) was written by Gerard Soeteman. Besides fiction films Soeteman collaborated on other productions, including television programmes dealing with Rotterdam (e.g. *OPEN OOG, NTS*, 1968-05-24; *58 MILJOEN NEDERLANDERS EN DE ZEEVAART*, 1977, Jan Bosdriesz, NOS). For more information on *SPETTERS*, see: <http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spetters> (2008-03-02).

²⁰⁰⁶ Since he had interviewed Constant for HP, see: Van Garrel & Koolhaas, 1966.

²⁰⁰⁷ In Rotterdam, Koolhaas/OMA designed the projects ‘Busstation’ (1985-1987), ‘Museumpark’ (1985-1993), and the ‘Kunsthof’ (1987-1992) – see: Groenendijk & Vollaard, 1998: 355; see also Patteeuw, 2003.

²⁰⁰⁸ Reprint pp205-208 in: Koolhaas & Mau, 1995.

RECAPITULATION OF PART III – THE CINEMATIC PROLIFERATION OF A CITY

The 1960s and 1970s witnessed a bifurcation from cinema to television, to cable television, to video, which came to exist next to one another. It allowed for new media applications regarding urban development, which ran parallel to an increasing complexity and diversity of architectural projects. I have related these changes to the five main ‘elements’ that Allen J. Scott has marked as factors within creative processes (i.e. human input, skills, production networks, multiple stimuli at points of interaction, and institutional infrastructures). I have additionally invoked a sense of self-reflexivity of the urban system (cf. Conti, 2005, a.o.). This is, however, complicated by divisions between *Standort* and *Tatort*. I have articulated it through foreign productions, such as the Austrian television documentary ROTTERDAM (1964, Walter Klapper); besides institutions like Eurovision, I touched upon an international network within the field of architecture and planning.

Along with the proliferation of cinema and increasing spatial complexity, higher levels of socio-cultural integration developed. This implied internationally standardised media formats, and an ‘international style’ regarding architecture. At the same time, however, there have been practices of local monitoring, experimentation, and appropriation. It has been exemplified by the RKS and De Lantaren, and productions related to them, next to the establishment of local studios. Among them was the Open Studio of Jan Schaper, who made (television) recordings abroad and at home, in Rotterdam. By doing so he played an active role in the debate on urban development.

The changing media landscape gave, furthermore, rise to what I have called ‘developing compositions’. Cinema newsreels (i.e. Polygoon) used to be little stories, with pronounced aesthetic qualities and witty comments. Television news, instead, became an ongoing narrative, through many voices; news items linked up to earlier ones and other programmes. Narrative structures emerged that shared features with fiction stories. Polygoon, in turn, became just one of the media players, providing background information rather than ‘breaking news’.

Reports started to be made that presented the news without the aesthetic ambitions or wittiness of Polygoon. Many reports were made for just that day, rather than for weeks. As a consequence this also reduced the chance of material being reused or evaluated. Whereas critics initially paid attention to the television news, writing about it in the papers, this hardly occurred anymore in the 1970s. Such an ephemeral turn created another sense of time. Television news became a matter of fast feedback loops. Input-output cycles could be so quick that monitoring itself became an active force within events. This has been enabled by new technologies as well as institutional support that created a faster work flow. Especially important here was the practice of the NOS JOURNAAL to work with local correspondents, namely Pim Korver and J. van Rhijn in Rotterdam.

Within the developing multitude of connections between media and urbanism, there was still one clear path: that of the commissioned film. As a matter of ‘visual engineering’ rooted in the city’s culture core, large numbers of industrial films continued to be made. Filmmakers operated like technicians, while they were also narrators that streamlined processes in order to make them comprehensible to the public. In this way I have also followed the way cinema and television, in relation to one another, treated infrastructural projects, especially the construction of the metro, the ring road, the airport, and larger infrastructures that made Rotterdam part of the Randstad, as a network of strongly connected cities (also in terms of *Standort – Tatort*). However, the Randstad worked merely in a practical way, but it was hardly articulated discursively or reflexively and provided with feedback by way of film. Instead, various films framed the position of Rotterdam within larger natural and built environments, mostly showing its port within a system of waterways and its role within the Dutch economy.

Infrastructure enables mobility, which links up with motion pictures in terms of perception. The ‘modernity thesis’, as debated in film studies, says that the cinematic mode of perception is inherent in modernity, which is characterised by mobility and fragmentation.

Criticising this view, David Bordwell has argued that there are different ‘ways of seeing’ among different groups. Yet while the debate concerns mainly stylistic conventions (of feature films), Bordwell’s critique actually points to the social role of film, which I have addressed in the form of ‘scenes’ of commissioners, filmmakers, and audiences. Rather than aesthetic developments, media strategies have been important here. In this way, I have illuminated a particular dynamic between film and television; commissioned films were made as records of progress, which articulated itself across the rhetoric of rationalisation. Television in its turn enabled monitoring practices, offered a stage for alternative visions and debate, and affected the public opinion. Filmmakers, however, became used to working in both realms, which allowed for cross-connections. Competition and collaboration went together, through an oscillation between media, in an ongoing process of modernisation. It stimulated innovative approaches and styles, and new arguments and visions, which resulted in a web of audiovisual productions.

I have elaborated on these observations through the case of the Europoort development. Critical documentaries were broadcast by television, and promotional films made by companies and the municipality. Opposition can result in co-evolution, towards a common attractor, since radically opposed forces sharpen and strengthen themselves through interaction. This seems to have been the case with environmentalists and industrialists (i.e. the port), in the 1960s and 1970s, with media appearing as part of ‘emergent interfaces’ (Nowotny, 2005). Exemplary are, respectively, the television documentary *POLDERS VOOR INDUSTRIE* (1961, Wim van der Velde) and the municipal promotion film *ROTTERDAM – EUROPOORT* (1966, Joris Ivens). Ivens’s critical view became part of the promotion campaign. The film was framed in terms of personal and social motivations, to strengthen the port’s cultural basis in order to ensure its economic output in the end. Ivens and the commissioners consciously effected an ‘oscillation’ that went beyond the rationalisation that was so typical for the previous period. Alternatively, asking Ivens was also a matter of path-dependency, while invoking the memory function of culture, since the commission relied upon the international fame of *THE BRIDGE* (1928).

Other filmmakers became also involved with the port, especially Korver, both as a correspondent of the *JOURNAAL* and as a director of commissioned films. Entrepreneurs like Veder and Verolme invested in media practices. Various enterprises, next to the municipality, asked for films, for reasons of publicity and internal feedback (e.g. annual reports by Wilton-Fijenoord and RDM). While such ‘corporate images’ were made, television directors continued to express their criticism and journalists monitored social unrest.

Such dynamics were reinforced by the appearance of the container. Television monitored its development (‘the container contained’), which provided positive feedback. Rotterdam soon established the Europe Container Terminus, which was aware of the value of publicity. Additionally to television reports, it commissioned several films itself, away from the public discourse that, over the course of the 1970s, encompassed many reports on strikes that provided negative feedback. Different from the dynamic between industrialists and environmentalists, however, employees and employers still worked for the same enterprise; workers were not opposed to industrial values as such. The struggle in the port resulted finally in a ‘striking development’; the port was forced to innovate and to adapt itself to the new regime of the container. Media were part of this process, underscoring the double dialectic of modernisation.

Media ‘augmented’ the space of the city as an industrial complex, and that of the city as a public realm. Regarding the latter, reports ‘amplified’ the mediating role of public space. Quays, squares, streets, the Maastunnel, halls, and company lots, among other kinds of spaces, offered possibilities for events to take place, to empower the workers to express themselves, and for interactions to crystallise. This was also a matter of learning through space, extended by media, with places bearing meanings because of previous (recorded) events.

Whereas strikes were ‘spontaneous’ events of a socio-economic nature, accompanied by instantaneous benefit concerts, meetings, papers and the like, various planned manifestations took place as well, whose numbers rapidly increased over the course of the 1960s and 1970s. I have

considered the Floriade, and its conscious use of media by making up stories that could be reported. In a similar way, the Euromast was built on the occasion of this event, as an act of city branding. The Floriade took place at the Ahoy' hall, which subsequently accommodated all kinds of other fairs, games and concerts. This resulted eventually in a brand new Ahoy' complex. Since the activities were frequently reported, this helped to build a media infrastructure in Rotterdam. It was reinforced by other events, particularly football matches by Sparta and especially Feyenoord.

In the series of five-yearly events the exhibition *Stad in Beweging* (1965) was successively organised. It marked a change in the way the reconstruction was communicated – from explaining reasons to highlighting achievements, which was also reflected by the accompanying remake of *EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM* (1965, Polygoon). The next big event, the C'70, followed an entirely different concept. It took place in the city centre, in order to animate it immediately. It propelled a small-scale approach, and applied all kinds of media. Parallel to it, various other festivals were organised, such as the Holland Festival, with the legendary pop festival in the Kralingse Bos, and finally the film festival. Under the direction of Huub Bals, it put the city on the map of the film world. It gave an impulse to the cultural climate of the city, and as such it served as an alternative planning instrument.

Media practices were reinforced when Van der Louw became Mayor, in 1974, after he had worked for radio and television himself. The municipality supported a range of media productions. It sponsored videos to facilitate citizen participation, informational films on municipal services, recordings to discuss municipal plans, advertisements to attract tourists and investors, while the municipality also collaborated on (foreign) television reports and features. Additionally, the municipality supported artistic productions that as 'oscillators' imagined or predicted social-cultural developments, to anticipate them or to explore urban life.

Especially video became important, for experimentation and urban renewal. It has exemplified the issue of stigmergy, of collective learning and appropriating the environment as a communication process. Using the ideas of Nowotny (2005), I have considered this, next to socially motivated television reports, and (provocative) feature films, in terms of an 'emergent interface' regulating 'interface turbulence'. This turbulence concerned the struggle between different groups of people, and between citizens and institutions. Collective expressions (e.g. by Mediafront) and an explicit political engagement have, furthermore, recalled activities from the 1920s and 1930s, whose issues and ideas became actual again.

There are feedback loops of varying duration, from days to many years, through buildings that last for decades and through films that are preserved by archives (and, in some cases, used by contemporary media productions that recall past events). To account for future effects is part of a professional concern. Planning and designing *is* premediation (to use Grusin's term), while films have documentary value for future generations, which acquired an institutional base through the *Gemeentearchief*. Its film collection has enabled citizens, among them historians and filmmakers, to compare present and past conditions, to draw historical parallels and perspectives. This enabled at the same time as it reinforced a relationality between different moments in time.

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

The starting point of this thesis has been the observation that audiovisual media have become ubiquitous in modern life. Within this perspective I have asked the question how film has contributed to urban development. I opted for Rotterdam to carry out a case-study; an estimated five to six thousand publicly released audiovisual productions dealing with Rotterdam were made from the 1920s to the 1970s. I have asked the question why these films were made, what functions they fulfilled, and how they participated and intervened in social and spatial processes. The purpose of this research has been twofold: to write the film history of Rotterdam, in order to show how films about the city have participated in its development, and by doing so, to provide theoretical insights and concepts regarding the relationship between film and the built environment. The main strands of this thesis have been informed by audiovisual productions related to news practices, the port, the industry, construction works, social engagement (and housing), and events, next to a field that includes amateur films, avant-garde experiments and features. I will first recapitulate these strands, and subsequently the networks and some of the people associated with them, before I consider further theoretical implications.

the appearance of a modern city – main film practices and forces

The first film recordings of Rotterdam were made in 1898, by Stefan Hofbauer, for *Casino Variété*, which were early ‘newsreels’. Among those following were Tuschinski and Weisbard, who are known for their theatres, but since the 1910s, they also produced local newsreels. It caused a competition and then a collaboration with the nationally operating newsreel producers Polygoon and Profilti (1920s and 1930s). It implied a shift, since the city was no longer the focus of attention. However, companies could buy screentime, by commissioning promotion films of which newsreels were made too. Polygoon experienced its heydays in the 1950s. Instead of a reification of ‘the media’, it appeared that many of its (anonymous) reports about Rotterdam were made by Joop Burcksen, who came from Rotterdam. Once television news took command, Rotterdam was presented for formal events to indicate national growth; the monitoring of local developments was left to the press. This changed in the 1960s, because television news started to work with freelance correspondent-cameramen. In Rotterdam Pim Korver became the main figure, for the next forty years. This practice was possible since Korver could combine it with the production of promotion films, especially for companies in the port. It also gave him access to both realms, and interrelations existed as a result. When Korver was not available, freelancers from other cities came instead. A network of correspondents was established, also abroad, which enabled international exchange. It implied both globalisation and localisation. City news was eventually produced through local television, in which the city itself became of primary interest again – a full circle.

Newsreels have monitored all kinds of events in Rotterdam, and its port in particular. When cinema became increasingly popular, it also offered opportunities to promote the port, in order to raise general support, and to attract clients and investors. Since 1913, the municipality commissioned port promotion films, all made by talented filmmakers. Among them was Andor von Bary, who played a major role, especially through *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* (1928). Such films were supplemented by equally well-made films for private companies, through detailed views of particular businesses in the port, from transshipment and engineering to logistics and training. Altogether these films, as the counterpart of the port, have constituted an audiovisual web, which as such has a surplus value. Belonging to it are also harbour reports, which outnumbered other reports on Rotterdam. This was especially the case at the time of the reconstruction, but later too, in the 1960s and 1970s, when rapid changes took place in the port, which were accompanied by increasing criticism and large strikes. This resulted in interferences between promotional films and critical television reports. As part of a sophisticated marketing strategy, the authorities asked Ivens to make the promotion film *ROTTERDAM-EUROPOORT*

(1966). Also challenging were films made for private companies such as container terminal ECT, whose presence was decisive for the development of the port. While the media articulated the port's priority, the port has propelled the cinematic city, reinforced by entrepreneurs like Veder and Verolme through their investments in media practices.

Closely related to films about the port were industrial films, which were presented at factories, to employees and visitors, at conferences, schools and at large exhibitions. The first ones were made for yards and engineering factories, followed by shipping enterprises, next to 'food and fuel' companies, among others, which provide an audiovisual map of the city's subsistence arrangements. The films ranged from recordings of production processes, to commercials, to annual reports, and some companies had their own film services to make such recordings. Promotion films were often part of larger campaigns, including other media, and targeted at different audiences, so that straight and experimental productions existed next to one another. Films rendered production processes into comprehensive accounts, they facilitated exchange, and gave expression to corporate identity (e.g. Shell, Adriaan Volker, ECT). In this way films linked up with architecture serving similar purposes. Moreover, in terms of design and production practices, industrial films have also shown structural correspondences to architecture.

A particular kind of industrial films concerned the creation of large buildings. This 'genre' emerged in the 1920s, flourished in the 1950s, and remained important until the 1980s. Gemeentewerken ("Public Works") was particularly important in this respect, through films that it commissioned and films that were made by its own photographic service. All construction films expressed the idea that 'the future can be built', but they served different purposes, including promotion, documentation, instruction, and recruitment. Until the 1960s, many of them were made by Polygoon, often related to its newsreels. An important name in the following period became Peter Alsemgeest. From the early 1960s until the 1990s he recorded the construction of the metro, including its extension, which resulted in various 'episode films'. Different language versions were released, to be shown to foreign guests, and at community centres to inform residents. Alsemgeest maintained close connections with the engineers of Gemeentewerken; his work was actually a kind of engineering itself. Something similar applies to former Polygoon cameraman Joop Burcksen, who made such films about the creation of the Europoort. The films served discussions between engineers and managers, informed the public, and provided a record to attract (foreign) clients and investors.

Along with the forces of modernisation, all kinds of social-cultural programmes took place. Unique in Rotterdam was the *Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop* (1920-1933), since it not only showed but also produced films, often dealing with Rotterdam. In this way children learnt about the environment and nature, which linked up, also politically, with the agenda of modern architecture and planning, especially in respect of social housing. After WWII, Rotterdam and its port became the subject of several educational films, to be shown at schools or on television, while films from companies such as Shell and Unilever were also used for educational purposes. These cross-connections between education and industry existed through a common interest in appropriating modern conditions.

Modernisation was also accompanied by socially motivated film reports, avant-garde shorts and union films, which often showed close connections between the public and the commissioners. Of particular interest has been the feature length propaganda film *EN GIJ, KAMERAAD?* (1928, Joannes Ratté), which recruited people for the union of transportation workers. This successful but now largely forgotten film was inspired by Soviet cinema. It was not the work of an *auteur*, but of a scene or 'scenius'²⁰⁰⁹. Besides the film, other media were used too, which is exemplified by a poster designed by Schuitema (1930). In his turn, Schuitema made also the experimental film *BETOGINGEN* (1935), about the crisis, while he explicitly called for social engagement. Through films such as Ivens's *WE ARE BUILDING* (1930), for the union of

²⁰⁰⁹ Cf. De Jong & Schuilenburg, 2006, after Eno.

construction workers, and DE STEEG (1932, Jan Koelinga), which addressed the condition of the slums, a social realism developed in the 1930s. It continued after WWII, especially regarding modern housing and prefabricated construction methods. While large-scale planning accelerated in the 1960s, resistance increased too. It resulted in a critical monitoring through television, and, in the 1970s, promoted small-scale developments in respect of both housing and media practices. Urban renewal became a priority, which was accompanied by the emergence of video. Rotterdam was a frontrunner in this field. While the artistic video experiments of the Lijnbaancentrum gained critical attention, the social explorations by the Videocentrum (a.o.) were experimental in their own right. In interaction with film practices (e.g. in the case of Mediafront), this recreated ideas from the 1930s, in respect of collective action, social empowerment and participation of residents. Such local productions complemented national television reports on Rotterdam, although television became also increasingly concerned with all kinds of pressing social issues, including the deterioration of the old quarters and their abominable housing conditions, as well as immigration, labour conditions (in the port), and prostitution.

In between, or as part of the different strands, appeared various other films, from 'city symphonies' that heralded the modern city from before WWII, and amateur films that helped to appropriate the modern values after WWII, to features that addressed the uncanny side of the modern city in the 1970s and 1980s. These films were not made in isolation; there were various interrelations and interferences between them and other classes of films, along with similar exchanges between different social-economic areas – between art and industry, media and architecture, journalism and commerce, a.o. – due to common attractors of modernity and modernisation. It is exemplified by the link between amateur and art films (e.g. in the case of Rien Peeters, 1970s), between Ivens's avant-garde short THE BRIDGE (1928) and his port promotion film ROTTERDAM-EUROPOORT (1966), and by the fiction short TROS (1956) that was made by Jan Schaper and Wim van der Velde, who also made (port) promotion films as well as critical television documentaries about the city and its port. The urban system creates social-economic paths, which these films follow and reinforce, from which they split, or that they cross.

The networks and institutions that enabled various kinds of film productions have been related to Steward's (1955) 'levels of socio-cultural integration', which indicate the degree of cultural ecological interdependence. At one end of the spectrum are home movies, with common values and 'institutions' to be found within single families, which embody the most elementary level of integration. At the other end are feature films such as LENTELIED (1936, Simon Koster), which praised the modern city, or BOEFJE (1939, Detlef Sierck), which addressed the problems of the slums; these films were made with the support of foreigners, which revealed extensive networks with socio-cultural integration at an international level.

Most of the films about Rotterdam were rarely part of regular cinema programmes. Instead, they were often shown at large events, which, alternatively, gave also rise to new media practices that I have approached through the concept of *Medienverbund*. In 1928, the international industry exhibition Nenijs took place in Rotterdam. Besides industrial presentations, including those of sound systems (Philips) and television (Baird), and presentations by the press, various films were shown here. It had actually been the reason for Transfilma to be established in Rotterdam. After WWII, the main hall of the Nenijs was replaced to Het Park. It was extended by architect Bakema to accommodate the Ahoy' (1950), which celebrated the reconstruction of the port. It offered a context for the rhetoric reconstruction film EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM (1950, Polygoon). Evaluating the Ahoy' it was said that its film presentations had largely contributed to its success. Films presented here articulated the event's 'intentions'; newsreels of it served as 'extensions'; and visitors recorded their experiences that became 'retentions'. This also applies to other events, like the E55, which was dedicated to the reconstruction of the country. Part of it was an experiment with commercial television, supported by Philips, which affected later developments in this direction. Finally, the Floriade (1960), on horticulture, directly served city marketing purposes, while it made clever use of media attention.

Subsequent events took place elsewhere in the city, like *Stad in Beweging* (1965), which was hosted by the Bouwcentrum. It cheered the new city, supported by a remake of EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM (Polygoon). The five-yearly events ended with C'70, which took place all over the city, to 'communicate the city' to its residents. Rotterdam became literally a spectacle. While these events served as testing grounds, they also animated the city. In the following years an increasing number of events took place, including pop festivals and, above all, the international film festival: now film had become the subject itself, which also affected film production in the city.

spiders in a multitude of webs

It was already known that the elite of Rotterdam actively supported social and cultural organisations, including the Filmliga Rotterdam (1927-1933). Its chairman, secretary and treasurer were respectively the architect J.J.P. Oud, NRC journalist Johan Huijts, and banker Jacob Mees, but its network turned out to be much more extensive. It was interrelated with other organisations, including the business association Club Rotterdam and architecture association Opbouw, and it became important for cross-disciplinary developments. It gave rise, for example, to Ivens's *THE BRIDGE* (1928), and it motivated designer Paul Schuitema – a member of both Opbouw and the Filmliga – to make films himself. It also appeared that Oud's collaborators, the architects Pali Meller and especially Ida Liefrinck, were active supporters of the Filmliga. After Oud withdrew as its chairman, Liefrinck became its secretary, for several years, before she fulfilled a similar role for the magazine *De 8 & Opbouw*.

Jan Brinkman, the architect of the Van Nelle factory, was also a member of the board, while Kees van der Leeuw, director of Van Nelle, was a supporter behind the scenes. It offers a perspective to Van Nelle's media practice, comparable to that of *Das Neue Frankfurt* (Elsaesser, 2005b). Different films, and other media too, fulfilled complementary functions of documentation, information, recruitment, and exploration, aimed at different groups to promote the factory and its values of transparency, openness, efficiency, social responsibility, and innovation. Within this *Medienverbund*, which served a common agenda, there was not necessarily a convergence of styles and approaches between the modern architecture and the accompanying films. Instead of being avant-gardist in aesthetic terms, the films were part of avant-garde strategies to achieve modernisation. It also draws a link to the strategy that Van der Leeuw conducted during WWII regarding the city's reconstruction.

Another discovery is the fact that, during the last years of the Filmliga, the later city planner Cornelis van Traa succeeded Liefrinck as its secretary. It sheds a light on his *Basisplan* for the reconstruction (1946), as a kind of scenario, also literally for the films that were made about the city's reconstruction, often in collaboration with Van Traa himself. It also sheds light on his designs for spatial sequences, scenes, and perspectives such as 'the window on the river'. In terms of interactions, moreover, the Filmliga had been part of a network that enabled the city's reconstruction, due to the Club Rotterdam, and especially Van der Leeuw, who was supported by state planner – and film enthusiast – Ringers. One of the advisers for the reconstruction was Amsterdam's city planner Van Eesteren, who had also been a member of the Filmliga, just like many architects that would be involved with the actual reconstruction works. In order to promote the reconstruction plans, moreover, the Office for Information and Publicity was established. Its rhetoric is best illustrated by the film EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM (1950, Polygoon). It was the expression of a 'conspiracy' that developed during WWII, propelled by Van der Leeuw, Ringers and Van Traa, who are all present in the film.

More people, among them Alexander Bos, director of the housing department, and Jan Backx, the enlightened director of *Thomsen's Havenbedrijf*, as well as architects like Groosman, Van Tijen and Bakema were interested in film, as it promised to project new urban prospects, educate and mobilise people, and by doing so, effect public participation. Van der Leeuw, Backx and other members of the Club Rotterdam, initiated also organisations such as the "Rotterdam

Arts Council” (RKS) and the Bouwcentrum, which also supported media practices. Across the century, mayors and aldermen were interested in film and media too, from Mayor Droogleevert-Fortuyn before WWII (who supported the Filmliga) to Mayor Van der Louw in the 1970s (who previously worked for VARA), while the municipality also supported a range of productions (through Ivo Blom, 1960s-1970s).

The institutionalisation of media practices to support the modern city is explained through Heynen’s (1999) distinction between transitory and programmatic modernity. Whereas the transitory highlights temporality and the unknown, which is shown by the avant-garde experiments from before WWII, programmatic modernity implies modernisation as a project, through planning and institutionalisation. Regarding municipal filmmaking in Britain, Lebas (2000 e.a.) has said that many films were made for modernity, instead of being about modernity; municipal films supported a progressive social policy by explaining the opportunities and benefits of modern plans and institutions.

The transitory and the programmatic became closely connected through the work of film producer Joop Landré, who was born and raised in Rotterdam himself. In the 1950s, when he was the director of Polygoon, various films were made about Rotterdam that belonged to a programmatic modernity. Through his Rotterdam based production company NFM, established with the support of shipping entrepreneur Veder, various challenging films were made (e.g. by Huguenot van der Linden, Ivens, Tholen), which fuelled a transitory modernity. This also applies, although with a different impact, to his involvement with commercial television (E55, REM / TROS).

Many people acted like spiders in the numerous webs that were woven between the city and its cinematic counterpart. As such I have highlighted two names in particular: Von Barsy and Schaper.

Important before WWII was the Hungarian filmmaker Andor von Barsy. He is known for his avant-garde short HOOGSTRAAT (1929), which was shown by the Filmliga, of which he was a member too, and for his cinematography of various feature films. Although he worked in Rotterdam for about fourteen years, little was known about him. Looking for biographical data, an extensive network came to the fore, which also related Rotterdam to cities abroad. Important connections had been the directors Güsten, Koster and Rutten, as well as people like Ivens, Dudow, Richter, and Riefenstahl. Next to them were various cameramen, musicians and designers, among them the Hungarians Pali Meller, Lajos von Ébneth, Vilmos Huszár and László Moholy-Nagy. Von Barsy’s most important film about Rotterdam was THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS (1928), made for the municipality, which accurately mapped the city and its port, while Von Barsy always kept an eye for human details. Producer Transfilma made several other films for companies in the city and the port. Von Barsy shot all of them, and his role as a cameraman was more important than that of the director. His work is a matter of ‘functional cinematography’, akin to functionalism in architecture, which became characteristic for Rotterdam. Its cinematic counterpart, based on the same values, is similarly characteristic for the city. By revealing his role in various unknown or forgotten productions, links appeared between industrial films, port promotion films, avant-garde shorts, commercials, features, and photography too. In fact, much of this is related to the contingent history of Transfilma and THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS, which was decisive for the career of Von Barsy. When Transfilma was dissolved, in 1929, he took over its studio. In 1934 and 1938 he made, again for the municipality, two short ‘port symphonies’. His work set the standards for port films after WWII.

During the decades after WWII, Jan Schaper was especially important as a filmmaker in (greater) Rotterdam. He started as a cameraman at the E55, established his name as a script writer with the short fiction film TROS, and as the director of a film about Vlaardinggen. The latter was shown at the world exhibition in Brussels in 1958, to express the achievements of modern town planning in the Netherlands. Connected to it were various photographic series made by Schaper as well, who became a kind of (self-appointed) adviser to his commissioners. He subsequently

established the Open Studio in Rotterdam, which worked mainly for television. Schaper and his colleagues travelled around the world to make recordings, but often they also made recordings in Rotterdam, which enabled a critical monitoring of the city's development. Most important has been the (television) documentary *STAD ZONDER HART* (1966), which highlighted human encounters, instead of urban functions. Partly due to Schaper's (never fulfilled) ambitions to make feature films, the Open Studio attracted all kinds of people to collaborate with him. They made up a reservoir of workers. Several of them continued to work in the media industry and contributed to the development of cinematic Rotterdam.

A close observation of the Open Studio makes clear that it could only exist through the support of Schaper's wife Christine van Roon, who worked as a soundwoman, producer, and manager at the same time. This hidden role of the director's partner can be found more often. One can just consider some important films, like those by Van der Horst, Huguenot van der Linden and Ivens. The case of *THE BRIDGE* is exemplary. Besides it being the result of a cross-disciplinary exchange, Ivens's partner, Germaine Krull, played a crucial role in its realisation. Her photographs of the bridge were not secondary to the film, but part of a broader project that she started before, in which Ivens's film neatly fits. Besides explicit contributions, like sound recording and editing, the informal contributions of women are hardly credited, while they are also hard to trace and to evaluate. After all, women were also important for general organisational roles (e.g. Ida Liefrinck, Ida van Dugteren).

In terms of cultural connectionism, an individual cognitive network links up with a social network of a scene, which is a cluster of nodes in yet another network. It is illustrated by the cases of Van der Leeuw, Von Barsy, and Schaper; their connections helped to constitute the urban fabric, while they also extended to other places, within the Rijnmond, the Randstad, and within an international metropolitan network. Such intertwined networks of different levels match Hannerz's concept of the 'global ecumene', as 'an open fairly densely networked landscape' (1996: 50). In this 'ecumene' the city is a 'switchboard of culture' (ibid: 149). Products and ideas enter it, are locally elaborated and sent into the world again.

environment and information: stigmergy

The urban habitat, as a cluster within a 'networked landscape', encompasses a multitude of 'paths'. While following paths, people leave traces, which provide information to others. This includes spatial interventions and markers, such as buildings, as well as graphic signs and symbols. As 'stigmas' they become points of reference and fulfil a memory function. The remembered information is thus not just stored in individual heads, but also in networks, built structures and institutions²⁰¹⁰. Such a relationship between environment and information corresponds to the notion of 'stigmergy'²⁰¹¹.

Information is used to adapt to the environment or to appropriate it, which in turn provides new information, and so on. In modern society, such traces, markers and signs have become complex systems of information and communication. This is the 'augmented space' addressed by Manovich (2006). I have articulated the notion of stigmergy through the examples of the *Schoolbioscoop*, amateur films of the ruined city and the reconstruction, and productions by the Videocentrum that served urban renewal, among other. They are about collective learning and the appropriation of the environment, in order to improve it. Besides such small-scale practices, other productions have also been regarded in this way, for example films that accompanied the creation of infrastructural projects – literally a matter of paths.

The notion of stigmergy applies more generally to media and the city. It is exemplified by the reconstruction period, which has shown how the empty city became inscribed by buildings and media that provided spatial markers and temporal references. Paths were established that

²⁰¹⁰ Cf. Susi & Ziemke, 2001: 29; Conti, 2005: 30; Salingaros, 2005: 230-231.

²⁰¹¹ cf. CALResCo, 2004: §6.12; Susi & Ziemke, 2001; Bonabeau, Dorigo, Theraulaz, 1999.

caused various filmmakers to shoot, at different moments, the same subjects at the same places, to be transmitted through the same channels. This created layers of moments in space. Or rather, time has appeared through patterns of movements in space. It is a matter of mapping network transmissions that have their own coordinates within a concrete environment. Through such spatial charts, of a conceptual nature, I come back to one of the aims of this research, to contribute to a historiography that can grasp complex network dynamics as spatial configurations framing time.

Since audiovisual data dissolve into the environment, the role of film in urban development cannot be explained in terms of an immediate cause-and-effect relationship. Films added value to objects, enabled exchange, or modified visions, but in general one cannot claim that a film was preconditional for policy measures to be taken, for a planning process to become successful, for a spatial or social project to be carried out, for a company to increase its turnover, or for school children to learn, etc. At the individual level, all of this also happened without the intervention of a film, as other media were sometimes used to fulfil collective cognitive functions. Not every social or spatial project needs a film, but film has been an indispensable factor at the level of the modern city as a whole. It is a matter of emergence.

Film is not just an element in a collection of cultural forms; one can easily take away such an element, but taking away an element from a system affects the entire constellation. The urban system, understood as a cultural ecology, is not an accumulation of forms, but a composed entity in which different elements are integrated. Audiovisual media, together with other aesthetic forms, appeal to and are part of the cognitive dimension of the modern city, its institutions, its planning and architecture.

media and culture, times and tides

According to Urry (2003: 139), contemporary society is characterised by 'reflexive modernisation' and monitoring through aesthetic-expressive systems. Audiovisual media have been well equipped in this respect. They monitor development, in order to continue or to adjust its course, which is, moreover, pivotal to stigmery. But many films do not just follow events; they testify to different possibilities of use and interpretation, they preview developments, outline visions or propose alternatives. To articulate this I have spoken of 'projective reflexivity'.

Beyond monitoring are the ways in which the information links back to the environment. These 'effects' relate to classic social studies on cybernetics, complex adaptive systems, and collective learning. In all of them feedback is addressed, but often in general terms. Luhmann (1997) has explained that the output of a social system serves as input again, for the system to be able to develop. This is enabled through culture, which fulfils a collective memory function. Cultural products are needed to match the output of the system with its previous situation. Next to memory is oscillation: to cross boundaries in order to propose new states to move to. In this way culture is what marks the difference between past and future, and as such, generates conceptions of time. I have applied this general understanding to film as a modern and powerful medium, with its own characteristics. It has been exemplified, first of all, by the case of NUL UUR NUL (1927-1928, Simon Koster). Through techniques such as double exposure, montage (a.o. of found footage), and looping, and by using film on stage, this production presented urbanism and modernity as a continuously changing assemblage of various forms of communication, leisure, mobility and industry. By doing so it addressed the problem of separating past, present and future.

Various other films have been highlighted regarding memory and oscillation. Some of them previewed events, such as BESCHERM UW STAD (1939, Profilti) that 'premediated' the bombardment, which would eventually take place and be recorded too (ANGRIFF AUF ROTTERDAM, 1940, UFA). These UFA recordings have subsequently been used in other productions, including the reconstruction film EN TOCH...ROTTERDAM (1950, Polygoon-Profilti). The latter also contained images of the lively old city, from THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS (1928,

Andor von Barys). In this way it constructed a history, to motivate a particular vision of the future city, which would then be built, and shown by a remake of *EN TOCH...* (1965). Although this was intended to provide positive feedback, the new city was criticised, first of all by *STAD ZONDER HART* (1966, Jan Schaper). It interfered with *EN TOCH...*, from which it also used fragments, including shots from *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS*. While sharing the premise of a lively city, it reframed history again.

With the emergence of television, footage has increasingly been re-used. A particular case is a report on the Van Brienoordbrug (*OPENBAAR KUNSTBEZIT*, 1969, Aarden & Odufré), which included images of *THE BRIDGE* (1928, Joris Ivens). Whereas Ivens's film presented a new vision (an instance of 'oscillation'), its re-used extracts served a memory function and a media reflexivity forty years later. Other films affected conceptions of the past by being re-edited²⁰¹², or by applying approaches and styles from before²⁰¹³. Even once abandoned practices reappeared, such as local newsreel production. Moreover, themes like unionism, community development, slum dwelling, or traffic safety, have been recurrent. With film being a tidal force that enables feedback, the resulting tides caused old views to be reactivated and certain assumptions about the future to disappear.

Feedback implies a full circle that links back to an initial setting. It follows a circuit in a network. This can be short, when there are tight connections between commissioners, filmmakers and the public. This has been observed, for example, in the case of the union film *EN GIJ, KAMERAAD?* (1928, Joannes Ratté); its feedback resulted quickly in growing numbers of union members. Within extensive networks, feedback loops can be long, and information eventually dissolves into a broad cultural field, to link up with information from other media (e.g. in the case of *ANGRIFF AUF ROTTERDAM*). A feedback loop can also be extensive, but fast, because of preconstituted channels. This concerns television news in particular, such as the reports on the harbour strike in 1979, which immediately resulted in support from all over the country, which affected the situation that was reported again. When reports are part of what I have called 'developing compositions', which have longer time spans, loops of different duration may co-exist. Loops can also become recurrent, over long periods, they can interfere or merge with one another. This affects conceptions of time, since different moments become cognitively intertwined.

The complexity of feedback loops, and of the different temporalities that result from them, is made comprehensible through space. Feedback loops start at certain points in space, to which they will return after a series of interventions and transformations. They make the times and tides of the modern city.

hidden dimension

Media have contributed to the development of the city, but as tools they remained hidden for a long time. The city's toolbox has recently been turned inside out; the media used for marketing purposes have now become a focus of that marketing, while media productions today often refer to and reflect upon other media too, if it were just for the use of archival footage²⁰¹⁴. However, media have not become an end in themselves. They are still tools to promote the city's culture and economy, which are increasingly interwoven with media practices, but still (to come back to Steward) with a 'culture core' that is informed by the port. The culture core causes what economic geographers call 'path dependency', which has also informed Scott (2005) in his study of Hollywood's industrial clustering. Clustering gives rise to institutions that provide the urban

²⁰¹² e.g. *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS*, 1928 & *ROTTERDAM*, 1934, Andor von Barys; *VLAARDINGEN KOERST OP MORGEN*, 1955/1958, Jan Schaper; *THE RESTLESS PORT*, 1967/1969, Charles Huguenot van der Linden e.a.

²⁰¹³ E.g. *WIJK 20* (1974, Staal & Verheijen) that shows resemblances to *DE STEEG* (1932, Jan Koelinga).

²⁰¹⁴ This concerns all kinds of reports and documentaries as well as television programmes such as *HET WAS* (1993-2004, Peter Scholten), and *VERGETEN VERHALEN* (2000s, Harm Korst); an example of a fiction film that includes historical footage is *DE ARM VAN JEZUS* (2003, André van der Hout).

system with an identity and a memory, which confer reflexivity on the system (cf. Conti, 2005). In the case of Rotterdam this applies only marginally to the film business as such, but all the more to its 'culture core' that gives rise to media practices.

Rather than thinking of Rotterdam as a 'city of labour' or as a 'city of culture', there is a particular culture typified by artefacts such as industrial architecture and social housing, as well as by (commissioned) films that articulate the system's reflexivity. Such products are not the output of specialised 'cultural industries', but the manifestations of a general culture of industries in which filmmakers – like designers and architects – take their share. Many of the media practices, however, have remained invisible since they were an integrated part of regular business activities in Rotterdam.

Both commercial and municipal companies were somehow involved with media practices. Besides sponsoring, this encompassed preparations for productions, coordination, collaborations on the actual production, providing facilities, and once a film was ready, the organisation of screenings. Most companies appointed officers to supervise or to guide productions, and at certain moments, chief executives were involved too. These practices became gradually subject to specialisation. When professional filmmakers established themselves in Rotterdam, production tasks became more integrated, which created new clusters of media activities.

Film has been a hidden dimension within the history of Rotterdam – and I believe in that of many other cities too. The history of Rotterdam in the 20th century can no longer be thought of without the role that audiovisual media have played in it. Today, media have come to permeate urban life and virtually any business in Rotterdam. However, the times and tides of the modern city cause similar situations to appear, disappear, and to reappear. One may therefore consider the possibility that beyond a specialised media industry, and beyond media as an end in themselves, media practices may become, due to their ubiquity, once again an integrated and virtually unnoticeable part of social-economic activities in the city.

ontology – a prospect

In the 1920s and 1930s, the application of film was still explorative, but already substantial, in respect of urban development. After the destruction of the city in 1940, and the vanishing of its cultural infrastructure, film became ever more part of an institutionalised modernisation. Since the 1960s, a proliferation of cinematic productions took place. In this respect I have used Helga Nowotny's (2005) concept of 'emergent interfaces'. They are the new borders between different social groups and organisations that come into being. This applies to the city, and to private enterprises growing bigger, with increasing internal divisions as a result. For different branches to communicate with one another, new forms of mediations appear, including audiovisual media. In ontological terms, the concept of 'emergent interface' establishes a direct relationship between social organisation and media.

I have related my findings to the case studies of Frankfurt, Glasgow and Hollywood, in order to present Rotterdam as a template next to them. By doing so I have made an attempt to contribute to a film theory and methodology that relates *content* to *conditions*, while paying special attention to *connections* between people and productions across different social-cultural fields. Through these three Cs and the issue of feedback, now understood more broadly as encompassing culture as memory function, but also including the potential of film as 'oscillation', I have extended Elsaesser's three As. Moreover, I have amplified the concept of *Medienverbund* to become part of cultural ecology, itself refigured as the culture core. It operates through extensive social and spatial networks that relate different cultural forms, which are interdependent in respect of common attractors. By taking the three Cs into account I have added to Steward's theory of cultural ecology the intrinsic values, ideas and visions of cultural forms, films in particular, and with it the self-reflexivity of the urban system.

The history of Rotterdam in film (as an instance of ‘memory’) has been the precondition for this conceptualisation (as an instance of ‘oscillation’) of the role of film in urban development and society at large. As my study has shown, this approach provides an alternative to the paradigms of the art film, the *auteur*, and national cinema. It implies another ontology of cinema, which offers a new prospect to media studies – and regarding films about the city also to the spatial disciplines. Rather than reflections or representations of an experienced or imagined reality, films are part of a concrete environment. Beyond the ‘photographic traces’ that constitute the realist ontology of film, and beyond the constructions of space and time that are effected through cinematography and montage, films are part of transformations of resources, structures, ideas and values, through networks with particular coordinates, as part of the world, and the modern city in particular.

The ontology of media and that of the modern city are interrelated, like the sea and the shore when speaking of tides. Written back into the urban history of the 20th century, whose temporal horizon has been augmented by media, the ontological convergence provides critical feedback to understand the media saturated city of the 21st century. The collective cognitive functions of media may thus reinforce the development of the city’s culture core as a configuration of environment, institutions and values, as media continue to catalyse both the culture core’s radiating and integrative forces within the city’s cultural ecology.

FILMOGRAPHY

FILMOGRAPHY ROTTERDAM

references to films that (partly) deal with Rotterdam

The films are alphabetically ordered by director, if unknown or if a production is part of a series it is ordered by film company or broadcasting station; tv-series / magazines with more than four episodes are listed separately. Indicated are respectively (when known): year of production, *title*, [subject], {for tv:} station and date of broadcasting, duration {x'x''= minutes, seconds} or length in meters {m}, format / black & white or color / mute or sound format {co = commentary}, in some cases: makers other than director, production company, {if appropriate:} commissioner, [archive/collection; catalogue number], number of viewing copy.

film archives / collections:

B&G	Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid, Hilversum
Cinemacontext	database www.cinemacontext.nl [preservation unknown]
GAR	Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, Rotterdam
MM	Maritiem Museum, Rotterdam
NFM	Nederlands Filmmuseum (Eye), Amsterdam
NFDB	Nederlandse Film Data Base; www.nfdb.nl [preservation unknown]
NIMK	Nederlands Instituut voor Mediakunst, Amsterdam

FILMOGRAPHY ROTTERDAM 1890s, 1900s & 1910s – SELECTION

Benno, Alex

1913 – *Historische Optocht in Rotterdam* [parade 100 years Kingdom of the Netherlands] (1913-11-17), 2'10", 35 mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 01-2537 {Arch.nr.} V98689 {VHS}]

Binger, Maurits

1913 – *Onze Scheepvaart / Het Rotterdamsche Havenbedrijf*, 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Maatschappij voor Wetenschappelijke Cinematografie [ref. Albers, 2004: 266; see also: Hollandia]

Boedels, Leon

1912 – *Rotterdam op hol!* [fiction], 35 mm/b-w/mute {Premiere: 1912-04-01}, prod. Sol Kinsbergen, Philip Soesman, Casino Variété (Rotterdam), act.: Het Vroolijk Tooneel, Isidore Zwaaf, cam.: Leon Boedels, Stefan Hofbauer [ref. NFDB/NFM]

Delmont, Joseph

1913 – *Der Geheimnisvolle Klub*, 41', Eiko-Film GmbH Berlin, for: Jean Desmet [NFM]

Desmet, Jean (production, see also: Delmont)

1910 – *Het Orakel* [fiction], mute, prod. Desmet, exh. Cinema Parisien, cast: Abraham de Winter [ref. NFDB/NFM]

1913 – *Onafhankelijkheidsfeesten te Rotterdam, op Maandag 17 November 1913*, 12', 35 mm/b-w/mute [subjects: cinemas, festivities, children, music bands, independence, processions, gates, drives, city images, street images, trams; people: Hendrik van Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Wilhelmina van Oranje-Nassau]

Hofbauer, Stefan [ref. NFDB]

1898 – *Waterpartij op den Kralingschen Plas* (10th of October 1898)

1898 – *Rotterdamsche Straattypen*

1899 – *Kijkje op de Rotterdamsche Beurs op Vrijdag 19 mei 1899*

1899 – *Levend Draaiend Panorama van de Maasbrug en de Maaskade* (june 1899) (deels gelijk aan volgende twee?)

1899 – *Rotterdamsch IJsvermaak* (Levende opnamen te Rotterdam op het ijs - IJclub Kralingsche en Bergscheplassen) 1899 – *De Rotterdamsche Eerewacht*

1899 – *Rotterdamsche Opnamen*

1899 – *Het Uitzetten van Reddingsbooten, Systeem C. J. F. de Vos, aan boord stoomschip Dresden, liggende Parkkade*

1899 – *Spoorwegongeluk Station Delftschepoort*

1899 – *Parade Rotterdamsche Schutterij*

1899 – *De Kermis*

1899 – *Hogendorpsplein*

1899 – *Bezoek Koningin Wilhelmina aan Feijenoord*

1899 – *Voor de Pefferjeskraam van Koolsbergen*

1900 – *Nieuwe Stadsopnamen*

1901 – *Panorama van Coolsingel tot Feijenoord*

1901 – *Binnenwegsche brug*

1901 – *Intocht Paul Kruger te Rotterdam*

1902 – *Wandeling door Rotterdam, serie nieuwe Rotterdamsche beelden*

1902 – *Opname uitgaan der Middag-Voorstelling (van Casino Variété) van Zaterdag 21 Juni l.l.*

1902 – *Eenige stadsopname*

1903 – *Eenige Rotterdamsche Opname*

1904 – *Het Van stapel loopen van het viermast Barkschip 'Geertruida Gerarda' gebouwd op de Werf v/d. Heeren J. & K. Smit, Krimpen a/d. Lek*

1907 – *Onthulling Caland-Monument Rotterdam*

Hollandia Filmfabriek (dir. Jules Stoop)²⁰¹⁵

1913 – *Margarinefabriek Simon Van Den Bergh* [at Nassaukade, Rotterdam], 8'58" (174 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 20484 {neg.} VP1005 {VHS}]

1913 – *Laden en Lossen / De Havenwerken te Rotterdam en Amsterdam / De Amsterdamsche en Rotterdamsche Havens*, 1914 (RVD-nr. 1-4022, 15'28" (301 m), 35mm/b-w/mute, dir.: Jules Stoop, for: Gemeente Rotterdam, Amsterdam, industries en enterprises [NFM id: 3092; B&G: DOCID: 7, 20487 {neg.} VP1009 {VHS}]

Leeuw, M.A.G. (Dick) van der

1919 – *De Thee, van de plantage naar het pakje*, i.c.w. A. van Rossem, for: Van Nelle [NFM]²⁰¹⁶

Luijnen, Herman van – see: Pathé Frères

Lauste, Emile

1899 – *Feestelijk bezoek van H.M. de koningin Wilhelmina aan Rotterdam* [1899-06-09], 68mm/b-w/mute, prem.: 1899-06-14, exh. Circus Variété, prod.: Emile Lauste, Daniel Louis Uyttenboogaart / Ned. Biograaf- en Mutoscope Mij. [NFM: 20474]

Moderne Bioscope Theater Transvalia

1908 – *Een Rotterdamsch heertje, voor 't eerst op den plas*, b-w/mute/fiction, prem. 1908-12-19, exh. Moderne Bioscope Theater Transvalia [ref. NFDB/NFM]

²⁰¹⁵ Hollandia was the continuation of the Maatschappij voor Wetenschappelijke Cinematografie. The films *Laden en Lossen* might actually be related to *Onze Scheepvaart / Het Rotterdamsche Havenbedrijf* (1913, Maurits Binger).

²⁰¹⁶ In 1926 another version of this film was made by Willy Mullens; for a reference regarding the original film production, see: Dicke, 2007: 43. The original length was more than 700m (note from 1924-03-23) – GAR, 'Archief Van Nelle', toegangscode 944, inv. Nr. 2020, 'Stukken betreffende de producties van de eerste Van Nelle reclamefilms, 1919-1936.

Mullens, Albert

1900 – *Werkstaking te Rotterdam*, Albert Frères [cinemacontext]

Mullens, Willy

1901 – *Aankomst Paul Kruger te Rotterdam aop het Vredenoordplein* (1901-06-26) [NFM: id 12808 item 8 of compilation reel, VHS C179; B&G / RVD
Filmarchief: 01-2602 {Arch.nr} 231-01 {Videonr.}]

1901 – *De Maasbrug te Rotterdam* [Willemsbrug], 0'52", 35mm/b-w/mute [NFM: ID 12808, item 1 of compilation reel, VHS C179; B&G: 315; arch. nr.
01-2602; VHS 231-01 time code 5'05"-5'57"]

1913 – *Vliegdemonstratiën van Pégoud te Rotterdam / Pégoud de duikelaar* [ref. Cinema Context]

1913 – *Demonstratie met Kuhl's reddinguitrusting op de Bergsche Plas te Rotterdam*, 35mm/mute [NFM: id 1913, copy]

1917 – *De begrafenis van de Heer H. Spiekman te Rotterdam*, Alberts Frères [ref. NFDB/NFM]

1918 – *Defilée, de troepen op Woudenstein te Rotterdam*, 35mm/mute, Haghe Film, Distr. HAP & BenS Film [ref. NFDB/NFM]

Pathé Frères (presumably Herman van Luijnen)

1910 – *Rotterdam / Rotterdam vu du belvédère de la Maison Blanche*, b-w/35mm/mute, prod. in F/NL, Pathé Frères [ref. NFDB/NFM]

1912 – *Sensationeële vliegdemonstratie door den Franschen luchtacrobaat Pégoud*, 3min. [NFM]

1913 – *De Footballmatch Rotterdam – Arnhem*, 35 mm, mute [REF. NFDB/NFM]

1913 – *De wondervolle lucht-evolutiën van den beroemden aviateur Pégoud te Rotterdam*, 35 mm/mute, prem. 1913-11-12, cam.: Herman van Luijnen
[ref. NFDB/NFM]

Pfläging, Carl

1897 – *Het welgelijkende conterfeitsel van den directeur – Carl Pfläging – door den bioscope* (17th of December 1897).

1899 – *Het feestelijk bezoek te Rotterdam door H.M. Koningin Wilhelmina en H.M. Koningin-Moeder*.

Soesman, Samuel, see: Stefan Hofbauer

Stoop, Jules (see: Hollandia Filmfabriek)

Tuschinski, Abraham

1916 – *De Legerdag te Rotterdam*, 35 mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]

1917 – *Voetbalwedstrijd 'Sparta' op 16 September*, 35 mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]

1918 – *Het Ongeluk met den spoorbrug over de Koningshaven*, 35 mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]

1919 – *Groote Vliegdemonstratie op Woudenstein*, 9'29", 35mm/b-w/mute, Tuschinski [B&G: 279, 01-2086 {Arch.nr}, 20-1203 {Stocknr}, 234-01
{Videonr}, TDU75115 {DIGI-BETA}, V98654 {VHS}]

Urban Trading Company

1911 – *Amsterdam and Rotterdam*, UK, 77m/35 mm/mute [ref. NFDB/NFM]²⁰¹⁷

Weisbard, Karl

1919 – *Diergaarde*, 14', 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: W.B. Theater [GAR: BB-5011; Z899]

²⁰¹⁷ An excerpt of this film was released in the USA as *Bird's Eye View of Rotterdam* (release 1912-02-07, see: www.imdb.nl)

FILMOGRAPHY ROTTERDAM 1920s & 1930s – SELECTION

Anonymous

- 1925 – *The Chinese of Katendrecht*, 4' [NFM] {probably produced by Orion}
1931 – *Redacteuren zien u aan* [NRC], 20' [GAR: BB-1178]
1932 – *Zeppelin in Rotterdam* [NFM]

Alsem, Henk

- 1925 – *Met het SS 'Patria' der Rotterdamsche Lloyd naar Nederlandsch Oost-Indië*, 13', Hispano [ref. NFDB/NFM]
1926 – *Met de Fokker VII en de eerste luchtmail naar Marseille vanaf Waalhaven*, Hispano [NFM]
1928 – *Opening van het dameszwembad 'De Kous' te Rotterdam*, Hispano
1930 – *Het bezoek van Eisenstein aan Holland*, Hispano
1930 – *Van Nelle Fabriek* [non-edited negative: *Alsem IV*] [NFM]
1931 – *Droomen / Mode-film De Bijkenkorf*, 4'/108 m, Hispano [NFM]
1932 – *Naar Waalhaven*, Hispano

Barsy, Andor von – see also: Transfilma²⁰¹⁸

- 1929 – *Hoogstraat*, 12', 35mm/b-w/mute, Filmfabriek A. von Barsy [NFM, GAR]
1930 – *Maison Spaans* {commercial} [cinemacontext, Westhoff, 1995: 7]
1930 – *Pfaff naaimachine* {commercial} [cinemacontext, Westhoff, 1995: 7]
1931 – *Veka's chocoladestrooisel* {commercial} [cinemacontext, Westhoff, 1995: 7]
1932 – *Gebruik je verstand (Vollebregt)* {commercial} [cinemacontext, Westhoff, 1995: 7]
1932 – *Bijkenkorf aanbieding. Herfstmode* {commercial} [cinemacontext, Westhoff, 1995: 7]
1933 – *Tafeltje Dekje (Bijkenkorf)* {commercial} [cinemacontext, Westhoff, 1995: 7]
1934 – *Een moeilijk probleem (Vollebregt)* {commercial} [cinemacontext, Westhoff, 1995: 7]
1934 – *Rotterdam*, 18'14" (digital copy), 35mm/b-w/mute, Filmfabriek A. von Barsy [NFM: id 58096]
1937 – *Gilda Drop* {commercial} [cinemacontext, Westhoff, 1995: 7]
1938 – *De Nieuwe Gastarieven*, Filmfabriek A. von Barsy
1938 – *Tusschen aankomst en vertrek*, 15', 35mm/b-w/sound, music: Anton Schweizer / Rotterdamsch Philharmonisch Orkest, prod.: Tobis Film [RVD: neg/pos, NFM, GAR]²⁰¹⁹

Benno, Alex (= Benjamin Bonefang)

- 1920 – *Blaauwhoedenveem*, 35mm/b-w/mute, Actueel Film [NFM: id 7708]²⁰²⁰
1924 – *Thomsons Havenbedrijf*, 9'16", 35mm/b-w/mute, Actueel Film [B&G: id 74; digibeta: TDU75160; VHS V100361]
1925 – *Graansilo's te Rotterdam*, 35mm/b-w/mute, Actueel Film [ref. Westhoff, 1995: 12]
1926 – *Moderne Landhaaien* [fiction feature] 1856m, Actueel Film [missing]

Bergen, C.W.A. van – see: Mullens, Willy, 1932

Blum, A.V.²⁰²¹

- 1929 – *Welthafen*, 18', 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Transfilma [ref. Tode, 1997: F3]
1929 – *Welthafen*, 7'30" (206m), 35mm/b-w/mute [ref. Tode, 2005: 549]
1929 – *Rotterdam*, 7'30" (206m), 35mm/b-w/mute [ref. Tode, 2005: 549]
1929 – *Kanäle und Grachten*, 35mm/b-w/mute [ref. Tode, 2005: 549]
1929 – *Jenseits Der Straße* (dir. with Leo Mittler), 35 mm/b-w/mute/2015 m (prem: 10.10.1929), Prometheus-Film [ref.: Tode, 1997: B6, F3]
1930 – *Stadt und Hafen Rotterdam*, 25' (687m), 35 mm/b-w/sound, prod.: Prometheus-Film [ref. Tode, 2005: 549]
1930 – *Rotterdam, Der Pulsschlag des Welthandels*, 262m, 35 mm/b-w/sound, Prometheus-Film [ref. Tode, 2005: 549]
1930 – *Rotterdam, Wasserstrassen und Bruecken*, 308m, 35 mm/b-w/sound, Prometheus-Film [ref. Tode, 2005: 549]
1930 – *Rotterdam, Wunder der Technik*, 269m, 35 mm/b-w/sound, Prometheus-Film [ref. Tode, 2005: 549]
1930 – *Holländische Reise*, 9' (212m), 35 mm/b-w/sound, Prometheus-Film [ref. Tode, 2005: 549]

Carré, A. & Scheffer, S.M.

- 1932 – *Arbeid*, dir.: A. Carré, exh.: De Uitkijk.
1932 – *De Straat*, 16mm/b-w, [ref. www.rvsl.nl] 2008-07-08]

Clement, J.L.

- 1936 – *Wonderen van Schaduw en lijn* [ref. www.rvsl.nl] 2008-07-08]

Dahl-Film

- 1936 – *Affaire D-63*, produced by J. Derksen, J. van As, J. de Heer, and R. van der Leeuw (Dahl-Film), i.c.w. *Rotterdamsche Aeroclub*.

Dijk, François Henry van

- 1922 – *Herinneringen aan de kinderjaren* [children of the filmmaker visit the zoo, rec.: 1922-10-15], 8' [BB-2342, Z292]
1923 – *Stranding van SS Stuart-Star te Hoek v. Holland*, 0'45" (1923-10-04) [GAR: BB-2348] Z 293
1924 – *Sneeuwval in de Rotterdamsche Diergaarde* (1924-01-01), 3' [GAR: BB-2344] Z 293
1925 – *Het St.Franciscus-liefdewerk te Rotterdam*, 9', Filmatelier F.H. van Dijk Rotterdam [NFM: C3252]
1930 – *Billard club RFPV* [staged], 15', 35 mm, b-w/mute [GAR: BB-2341] Z 286

Electra

- 1928 – *Huizen Bouwen door Electriciteit*, Filmaatschappij Electra [ref. NFM catalogue, id 29977, according to the *Filmkeuring* (13th of August 1928).

²⁰¹⁸ Most of the title here have been mentioned by Westhoff, 1995: 6-7. For other productions on which Von Barsy worked as a cameraman, see: Transfilma, Ivens (1929 = Branding; NVV congres), Rutten (1934), Koster (1927, 1936), a.o.

²⁰¹⁹ This film is also referred to / known as: *Opgenomen in de haven van Rotterdam*; *De Haven van Rotterdam*; *Der Hafen von Rotterdam*; *Giganten der arbeit*, *Le Port de Rotterdam*.

²⁰²⁰ The date of this production is not certain. This title might possibly be (related to): 1926 – *Blaauwhoedenveem*, 2'06", 16mm [GAR: BB-0748, Z884]

²⁰²¹ These films are all recycled and modified versions of *The City That Never Rests* (1928, Transfilma).

Franken, Mannus

1930 – *Moderne Nederlandsche Architectuur*, 570 m (17'50"), De Uitkijk [NFM]

1934 – *Radiotelegrafie in dienst van de scheepvaart* [North Sea, radio stations at Maassluis, Willemsoord, IJmuiden], 12'17", 35mm/b-w/mute, cam.: Ab van Wely, prod.: Orion-Profilki, for: PTT [B&G: id 847, digi-beta TDU78831, VHS V104531, BG_33812.mpg]

Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop, see: Van der Wel, A.M.

Güsten, Theo

1927 – *Film over de Rotterdamsche haven en plaatselijke industrie en handel* [given title], Germania Filmfabriek [ref. NFDB/NFM]

Haas, Jo de

1930 – *Groei, de schepping van een warenhuis*, 35mm/b-w/mute, 15'/418m, Polygoon, for: De Bijenkorf [GAR: BB-2590]

1930 – *Stalen Knuisten*, 1945 mtr., 35mm/b-w/mute, Polygoon, for: Algemeene Nederlandsche Metaalbewerdersbond

Haas, Max de

1932 – *Fakkeltang*, Visiefilm [NFM?]

1933 – *In den tijd van...*, 123 mtr, 35mm/b-w/sound, prod. Visiefilm for: Van Nelle [B&G]

1934 – *Nederland Spreekt* [various places, a.o. Rotterdam], 1750mtr., 35mm/b-w/sound, cam.: Jo de Haas, Ab Keyzer, prod.: Visie Film, for: ANVV [B&G: 231, TDU77738 {DIGI-BETA}, V102473 {VHS}, 01-2484 {Arch.nr.}, 20-1168 {Stocknr}.

1935 – *Rotterdam* [separately released, part of the film *Nederland Spreekt*²⁰²²], 35mm/b-w/sound, cam.: Jo de Haas, Ab Keyzer, prod.: Visie Film, for: ANVV [ref. NFDB/NFM]

1937 – *Voor onze kameraden*, 250m, 16mm/sound, Visiefilm for: CBTA

1939 – *Na 100 Jaar* [100 years Dutch railways, incl. images of Rotterdam], 400 mtr./30', 16mm/b-w/sound, cam.: Emiel van Moerkerken, J. van Schoor, comp.: Cor Lemaire, prod.: Visiefilm, for: Ned. Spoorwegen [B&G: 819, 01-3292-02 {Arch.nr.}, 25-0037 {Stocknr}, 401-02 {Videonr}]

Hin, Jan

1933 – *Het Licht Inwendig*, 848m, 35mm/b-w/mute, for: St. Odilia [ref. Hogenkamp, 2004: 78]

1936 – *Maasbodefيلم*, app. 10', 35mm/b-w/sound, for: De Maasbode [ref. Hogenkamp, 2004: 79]

Holland, Filmfabriek

1937 – *Het nieuwe MS Weltevreden van de Rotterdamsche Lloyd verlaat de werf van P. Smit Jr* [ref. NFDB/NFM]

Hos, Henk

1938-1939 – *Vrouwen Vredesgang*, 16mm/b-w/mute [IISG: BG F1/705-707]

Huygen, Jos A.

1926 – *Rotterdam, een film van de stad en de havens*, 5'03", 9.5mm/b-w/mute [B&G, VHS V78529]

Icrofilm

1932 – *Kent u Hillegersberg?*, 3'48", Icrofilm Den Haag [GAR: BB-0655]

Ivens, Joris

1928 – *The Bridge / De Brug*, 12' [GAR: BB-0740]

1929 – *NVV congres*, 600mtr, 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: CAPI, for: ANBB [part of *Wij Bouwen*]

1930 – *We are Building / Wij Bouwen*, 3802 m/141', CAPI, for: ANBB [NFM]

1930 – *New Architecture*, 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: CAPI, for: ANBB [part of *Wij Bouwen*]

1930 – *Caissonbouw (Betonarbeid)*, 34'07", 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: CAPI, for: ANBB [part of *Wij Bouwen*] [B&G]

Jansen, Jan

1931 – *Triomf*, Polygoon, 2215 mtr, 35mm/b-w/mute, for: Nederlandsch Verbond voor Vakverenigingen (NVV)

Janssen, Walter

1929 – *Een lied van den Arbeid / Rotterdam, de symphonie van den Arbeid / Kampf Ums Leben*, 63'/1753 mtr., 35mm/b-w/mute, cam. Andor von Barsy, cast.: Maly Delschaft, Alexander Granach, Walter Jansen, Sybelle Morell, prod.: Transfilma, distr. Monopole [missing, in Austria ?]

Jong, André

1934 – *Cinematografische terugblik van Rotterdam in de laatste jaren*, Prod. Capitol Theater (Rotterdam) & Polygoon [ref. NFDB/NFM]

Klerk, J. de

1932 – *Rotterdam Journaal I* [a.o. Zeppelin, ms Dempo (Lloyd)], 10', 16mm/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-3317, Z185]

KLM²⁰²³

1925 – *Een Kijkje in de werkplaatsen op Waalhaven*, KLM Film [NFDB]

1925 – *Rondvlucht boven Nederland* [Amsterdam/Noord-Holland, Rotterdam/Zuid-Holland], KLM Film [NFDB]

1929 – *15 mei 1929 nieuwe luchtverbinding Rotterdam – Berlijn*, 85mtr [ref.: cinemacontext²⁰²⁴]

1930 – *Bedrijfsfilm KLM Waalhaven – Schiphol* [NFM: ID 5968]

1930 – *Luchtopnamen Rotterdam KLM*, KLM nr 10 [ref. NFDB/NFM]

1937 – *Rotterdam*, i.c.w. Rotterdamsche Diergaarde and Spido [ref. NFDB/NFM]

1938 – *Rotterdam... thans*, 310mm, 16mm/b-w [ref. NFDB/NFM]

Koelinga, Johannes (Jan) Karel Frederik

1932 – *De Steeg*, 12', 35mm/b-w/mute, distribution: De Uitkijk [GAR]

1934 – *Opgelegde schepen in crisistijd*, 2'51" [GAR: BB-763; BB-769, 0912]

1936 – *Crisisjaren 1934-1936*

²⁰²² See: Hogenkamp, 1988: 147 > *Nederland Spreekt*, note NB.

²⁰²³ One of the collaborators of KLM's film team in the 1930s was Ted de Wit (information from Bert Hogenkamp).

²⁰²⁴ www.cinemacontext.nl/id/F024798_2007-09-26 dossier 07180 • 1929-05-17, title: *15 mei 1929. De luchtverbindingen van Nederland met het buitenland werden heden uitgebreid met de luchtlijn Rotterdam – Berlijn* v.v., source: Nationaal Archief, The Hague.

Koster, Simon

1927-1928 – *Nul Uur Nul*, 11', Vereenigd Rott. Hofstad-Tooneel [NFM; B&G: 735, 01-3098 {Arch.nr.}, TDU77426 {DIGI-BETA}, V102345 {VHS}]
1936 – *Lentelied*, 75min, (cam. Andor von Barsy), Amstelfilm [NFM]

Krieger, W.

1929 – (*Panorama van*) *De Koningshaven te Rotterdam*, b-w/35 mm/mute, Hafilmi 11', for Blue-Band (?) [NFM: C2775; ref. NFDB/NFM]
1929 – *Nieuwe Koninginnebrug over de Koningshaven te Rotterdam*, 35mm, 17'3'', Hafilmi, commissioned by H.F. Boersma [GAR: BB-720; B&G]

Leeuw, M.A.G. (Dick) van der

1925 – *Familie van der Leeuw*, 1' [B&G: id 1224, VHS 681-03]

Leeuw, K.L.A. & R. van der

1932 – *Waalhaven* [rec.: 1932-06-18], 2', 16mm/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-3970, Z1241]
1932 – *Hofplein* [rec.: 1932-June-August], 7', 16mm/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-3969, Z1243]
1933 – *Episode* [fiction film], co-dir.: J. Derksen [ref.: Smits, 2002: 11]
1935 – *Kruisende Wegen* [rec.: 1933-1935, waterways, ss Statendam, a.o.], 4', 16mm/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-3973, Z1241]

Maas, H.

1938 – *Koolhovenfilm* [aircraft factory, rec.: 1938-07-17 till 1939], 11'23'', 8mm > 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: id 1227; 01-3812 {arch. nr.}, VHS 660-01]

Millecam, Ed

1938 – *Rotterdam 1925-1938*, 9', 8mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: id 1427, film nr. 08-1188]
1939 – *Rotterdam 1939*, 8'02'', 8mm/b-w/mute [B&G: VHS V78581]

Mol, Jan Cornelis

1939 – *Java, Sumatra en Bali*, Multifilm, for: Rotterdamsche Lloyd [ref. NFDB/NFM]

Mullens, Willy

1920 – *Een wandeling in 'Tuindorp' bij Rotterdam / Vreewijk*, 7'49'', 35mm, Haghe Film [GAR: BB-0738]
1920 – *Een gezicht op de groote havenwerken te Rotterdam en Schiedam*, 35mm, Haghe Film [ref. *Kunst en Amusement*, nr. 31, 1920]
1920 – *Het bezoek van Asta Nielsen aan Rotterdam*, Haghe Film [ref. NFDB/NFM]
1921 – *Steenkolen Handels Vereeniging Jubileumfilm*, 310m, 16mm/b-w, Haghe & Polygoon [SHV, Utrecht]
1921 – *Havens te Rotterdam*, 10'11'', 35mm/b-w, Haghe Film, for: Gemeente Rotterdam [B&G: id 73, RVD 01-2262, VHS 100360]
1922 – *Rotterdam* (Deel I & II), 35mm/mute, Haghe Film, distr. HAP & BenS Film [ref. NFDB/NFM]²⁰²⁵
1922 – *Bezoek Burgemeesters aan het Vliegterrein Waalhaven* [rec. 1922-03-01], 2'28'', 35mm/b-w, Haghe Film [B&G: arch. 01-2087, VHS 120-111]
1923 – *Steenkolen Handels Vereeniging*, 5'42'' Haghe [B&G: RVD 01-2200]
1923 – *Vervoer droogdok 8000 ton – dok Tandjong Priok*, 5'52'', 35mm/b-w, Haghe Film (& Tuschinski ?) [RVD: 01-2253]
1923 – *Afscheid Burgemeester Zimmerman van Rotterdam*, 1923-03, Haghe Film [ref. NFDB/NFM]
1923 – *Opmaken van burgemeester Mr. J. Wijtema van Rotterdam* [ref. *Kunst en Amusement*, nr. 39, 1923]
1924 – *Tewaterlating Van Het S.S. Sliedrecht* [1924-05-31], 2'22'', 35mm/b-w/mute, Haghe Film [B&G: 121, TDU78790 {DIGI-BETA}, V104488 {VHS}, 01-2331 {Arch.nr.}]
192x – *Het bedrijf van NV van den Bergh's Fabrieken te Rotterdam* (Margarine-industrie), Haghe Film [ref. NFDB/NFM]
1925 – *Fyffes Bananen* [NFM: id 22981, copy]
1926 – *Thee-cultuur*, for: Van Nelle [NFM]²⁰²⁶
1927 – *Müller & Co. BV Rotterdam* [rec. 1927-05] 7'23'', 35mm/b-w/mute [English Intertitles], Haghe Film [B&G: 343, digibeta TDU76157; VHS 102012] see also the related production anno 1928.
1928 – *Müller & Co. BV Rotterdam*, 18'22'', Haghe Film [B&G: id 345; Deel I=RVD 01-2634, Deel 2=RVD 01-2633, remainders=01-2635]
1928 – *NV Corns Swarttouw Stuwadoors Maatschappij Rotterdam*, 411m, 35mm/b-w/mute, Haghe [ref. NFDB/NFM]
1928 – *Koninklijke Familie op de Nenijto* [1928-09-11?], Haghe Film [NFM id 36192, digital copy]
1928 – *De Rotterdamsche Tramweg Maatschappij, 1878-1928*, 110', Haghe Film [NFM: id 58154, digital copy]²⁰²⁷
1930 – *Enka Nederlandse Kunstzijdefabriek Arnhem*, 3010 m, Haghe Film [NFM]
1930 – *Bouw van de Van Nelle Fabriek* [rec. 1926-1930], 50' Haghe Film
1930 – *Enkele snapshots uit de Blueband fabrieken*, Haghe [ref: NFDB/NFM]
1932 – *Aardolie, van put tot pomp*, 35mm/b-w/mute, i.c.w. C.W.A. van Bergen, for: Shell [NFM, digital copy]

Neijenhoff, Otto van

1925 – *Watson's Vijlenfabriek*, Hillegersberg, 35mm, 450m, prod.: VNF [GAR: BB-876]
1926 – *NV De Haas' Brandkastenfabriek, Rotterdam*, 35mm, 100m, prod. VNF [ref. NFDB/NFM]
1926 – *Het Dokken van het ss 'Paris' in het groote Wilton's Droogdok, Schiedam*, prod.: VNF [ref. NFDB/NFM]
1926 – *H. Ringers' Cacao- en chocoladefabrieken, Rotterdam-Alkmaar*, 35mm, 900m, VNF
1927 – *NV A. vd. Berg's Glashandel, Rotterdam*, 35mm, 200m, prod.:VNF
1927 – *Hollandsche Asbest Maatschappij v/h v.d. Linden & Veldhuis, Rotterdam*, 35mm, 280m, VNF
1927 – *Scholtes Advocaatfabriek*, Rotterdam, 35mm, 80m, IWA/VNF [ref. NFDB/NFM]
1928 – *NV A.J. ten Hope's Handelsmaatschappij, Rotterdam*, 13'04'', 35mm, prod. IWA [GAR: BB-0749, Z884]
1930 – *Machiefabriek Hensen, Rotterdam*, 35mm, 120m, IWA

Nelle, Van – see also: Haas, M.; Leeuw, M.A.G. van der; Polygoon; Mullens, W.; Teunissen, G.J.

1922 (app.) – *De Koffie (cultuur)* [Brasil] = Part 1; (*bewerking in de fabriek*) = Part 2, 200m, 35mm/b-w/mute, produced by Hard. Rand & Co (Brasil) and Dick van der Leeuw, for: Van Nelle [B&G: VHS 666-01; 666-02]²⁰²⁸

²⁰²⁵ This seems to be (related to) *Havens te Rotterdam* (1921) and *Een gezicht op de groote havenwerken te Rotterdam en Schiedam* (1920); it was probably part of the Haghe series 'Opmaken van Nederland', see advertisement of Hapfilm in *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 45, 1926.

²⁰²⁶ This film is a re-edited version of *De Thee, van de plantage naar het pakje* (1919, M.A.G. van der Leeuw), with additional images.

²⁰²⁷ According to NFM, this film was made in 1929.

²⁰²⁸ B&G mentions 1925 as the year of production. Both parts of the film were shown before 1922. It is likely that Dick van der Leeuw made Part 2.

Hard. Rand & Co, a Brazilian coffee company, is mentioned as the producer of the film in pencil notes by Van Nelle, on a document sent to Van Nelle by Haghe Film (Mullens), 1936-04-30; cf. letter by Van Nelle to Haghe Film (1936-05-07) – GAR, 'Archief Van Nelle', toegangscode 944, inv. Nr. 2020, 'Stukken betreffende de producties van de eerste Van Nelle reclamefilms, 1919-1936.

1935 – *Van Nelle commercials* [B&G: VHS 681-04]

Noggerath, F.A.

1920 – *Een kijkje in de fabrieken van C. Jamin*, 8'13", 35mm/b-w/mute, for: Jamin [B&G: 01-3224 {arch.}, TDU76123 {digi}, 282-01 {VHS}]

Nosseck, Max

1936 – *Oranje Hein*, Monopole Film Rotterdam [NFM]

Orion Filmfabriek NV / Orion Revue (see also: Profilti – Nederland in Klank en Beeld)

1925 – *Finsche IJsbreker Jaakarhu* [at Smit, rec.: 1925-01-10], 2'53", 35mm/b-w/mute, [B&G: id 100; Digibeta TDU 76095; VHS V100525]

1926 – *Zeilwedstrijden van de Vereniging De Maas*, 2'24", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: id 253; digibeta TDU75133; VHS V98670]

1926 – *Kruiser Sumatra – te Rotterdam* [May 1926], 0'19", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 122; digibeta TDU 78790; VHS V104488]

1927 – *Vliegen met de KLM*, 6'37", 35mm/b-w/mute, Orion [B&G: id 877; digibeta TDU 77741; VHS V102476; B&G id: 378, VPRF {wknr.}, PR0038 {neg.}]

1927 – *Vliegveld Waalhaven*, 2'32", 35mm/b-w/mute, Orion [B&G: id 323; VHS 120-14]

1927 – *Te water laten van een droogdok bij Burgerhouts Machinefabriek*, 1'22", 35mm/b-w/mute, [B&G: id 72; Digibeta TDU 78790; VHS V104488]

1927 – *Nieuwe Verkeersweg te Rotterdam* [Koningsbrug], 1'36", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: id 418; digibeta TDU75134; VHS V98671]

1927 – *Vertrek van de 'Schutivaer' van Rotterdam naar Amerika*, 1'18", 35mm/b-w/mute, Orion [B&G: id 128; digibeta TDU 75973; VHS 100416]

1928 – *Paasveertentoonstelling in Rotterdam*, 0'46", 35mm/b-w/mute, Orion [B&G: id 377; digi TDU 75132; VHS V 98669]

1928 – *De bouw van de funderingsputten voor de peilers van de Koninginnebrug Rotterdam*, 15', NV Orion Filmfabriek 's Gravenhage [GAR]

1928 – *Begraving op de Nenijto te Rotterdam (Dooptlichtigheid Senegalezen op de Nenijto Rotterdam)* [rec.: June 1928], 35mm, b/w, 3'02", Orion [B&G: arch. nr. 01-2279]

1928 – *Vliegfeesten te Rotterdam* [Waalhaven], 0'49", 35mm/b-w/mute, Orion [B&G: 357, 01-2095 {Archivenr}, 20-1109 {Stocknr}, 122-05 {Videonr}]

1929 – *Prins Hendrik bezoekt Korps Mariniers bij het 250-jarig bestaan*, 0'46", 35mm/b-w/mute, Orion [B&G: id 3400; arch. nr. 05-0794; VHS 611-17]

1929 – *Begrafenis van de bemanning van de reddingsboot 'Prins der Nederlanden' te Hoek van Holland* [rec.: 1929-02-01], 2'00", 35mm/b-w/mute, Orion [B&G: id 447; digibeta TDU 75134; VHS V98671]

1929 – *Vertrek "Statendam"*, 50 mtr., 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 386, VPRF {wknr.}, PR0041 {neg.}]

1929 – *Koninklijk bezoek aan bloemententoonstelling in Nenijto gebouw*, Orion-revue journaal [B&G: 01-3736-01]

1929 – *Luchtschip 'Graf Zeppelin' boven Nederland* [rec.: 1929-10-18], 35mm/b-w/mute, Orion-Profilti [B&G: id 947, 01-3442 {neg.}; VHS 468-05]

1929 – *Voltooiing Koninginnebrug* [June 1928], 1'53", 35mm/b-w/mute, Orion, [B&G: id 416; digi TDU 75134; VHS V98671]

1930 – *Opening Nederlandsch Paviljoen op de Wereldtentoonstelling in Antwerpen*, 2'2", Orion [B&G]

1930 – *Nederlands Eerste Aviatrice Bep Versluys* [1930-12-04], 23 mtr, 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 423, VPRF {wknr.}, PR0055 {neg.}]

1930 – *Lichtweek Rotterdam* [1930-02-22], 1'23", 35mm/b-w/mute, Orion-Profilti [B&G: id 888; digibeta TDU 77741; VHS V102476]

1931 – *Eerste reis van m.s. Dempo naar Nederlands-Indië*, 1'21", 35mm/b-w/mute, Orion/Profilti [B&G: id 920; digibeta TDU 77683; VHS V102423]

1931 – *Modern Bananentransport te Rotterdam*, 1'36", 35mm/b-w/mute, [B&G: id 4357; digi TDU 70882; VHS V95182]²⁰²⁹

Oswald, Richard

1934 – *Bleeke Bet*, 3032m, Monopole-DLS Rotterdam

Pathé Frères

1923 – *Rotterdam, la Venise du Nord*, 10m, 9.5mm 'Pathé Baby', French nr. 778²⁰³⁰

Pelt, J.A. van²⁰³¹

1938 – *De Eerste Kralingsche Zeilweek 1937*, 200m, 16mm [cinemacontext]

1938 – *Rotterdam*, 70m, 16mm [cinemacontext]

1939 – *Maaswedstrijden der Roei en Zeil Vereniging 'De Maas' Rotterdam* [cinemacontext]

1939 – *Kampioenschapswedstrijden der NN 16 M2 klasse Rotterdam* [cinemacontext]

1939 – *WSV Schieland: Ons Balmasqué*, 60m, 16mm [cinemacontext]

1939 – *Lunapark Land van Hoboken, Rotterdam* [cinemacontext]

1939 – *Onze Filmwerkkamer en naar de Rottemeren*, 75m, 16mm [cinemacontext]

Polak, N.J.

1937 – *Haven van Rotterdam*, 13', double 8mm [GAR: BB-1201, Z 1352]

Poll, Willem van der

1934 – *Reizen met de Rotterdamsche Lloyd* (1934) [ref. NFDB/NFM] Van der Poll ?

1936 – *Een reisje van Rotterdam naar Port-Saïd met de Rotterdamsche Lloyd*, W. van der Poll [ref. NFDB/NFM]

Polygoon – Hollands Nieuws (selection) – see also: Polygoon opdrachtfilm

1921-01 – *Stapelloop Liberty Glo* [!, Liberty Glo 'in Wilton's Dry Docks], 5'33", [B&G: docid: 01; 21083 {neg.} TDP1 {DIGI-BETA} VP1 {VHS}]

1921-01 – *Voetbalwedstrijd Haarlem – Sparta* [weeknr. 21-01], 1'12", Polygoon [B&G, id 03; 21146 {neg.}, TDP1 {DIGI}, VP1 {VHS}] B&G database mentions date of recording: 1921-02-28. This is actually 1921-02-27.

1922-01 – *Uitgaan Van Het Oostertheater Na Een Voorstelling Van De Lentefilm Voor De Scholen*, 35mm/b-w/mute, rec.: 1922-03-07 [B&G: docid 16; 22166 {neg.}, TDP2 {DIGI-BETA}, VP2 {VHS}]

1922-09 – *Opening Internationale Concours Aviatique Rotterdam*, 3'35, 35mm/b-w/mute, rec.: 1922-09-02, Polygoon [GAR: BB-466; B&G: 42; 22-09 {wknr.}, 22613 {neg.}, TDP4 {DIGI-BETA}, VP4 {VHS}]

1922-13 – *Zeilwedstrijden op de Maas*, 2'34", 35mm/b-w/mute, Polygoon [B&G: id 2663]

1923-18 – *Communistische Demonstratie Tegen De Vlootwet*, 1'49", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 125, 23706 {neg.}, TDP9 {DIGI-BETA}, VP9 {VHS}]

1923-19 – *Het 100-Jarig Bestaan Van De Werf Feijenoord* [1923-02-01], 1'10", 35mm/b-w/mute, [B&G: 95, 23821 {neg.}, TDP10 {DIGI-BETA}, VP10 {VHS}]

1924-03 – *Nieuw Gebouw Nationale Levensverzekeringenbank* [1924-02-07] 0'45", Polygoon [B&G: 185, 24-03 {wknr.} 24027 {neg.}, TDP11 {DIGI-BETA}, VP11 {VHS}]

²⁰²⁹ According to B&G this is Orion-Revue G14; at www.cinemacontext.nl this is indicated at 1931-03-01.

²⁰³⁰ According to: <http://infoshare1.princeton.edu/rbcs2/misc/pathe-baby.pdf> (2008-12-24).

²⁰³¹ For more title, see: www.cinemacontext.nl (2008-12-24).

- 1924-32 – *Bezoek Amerikaanse Spoorwegautoriteiten* [1924-10-16], 1'18", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 434, TDP18 {DIGI-BETA}, VP18 {VHS}]
1924-35 – *Proefvluchten Pander Babyvliegtuig* [1924-11-18], 26", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 461, 24381 {neg.}, TDP19 {DIGI-BETA}, VP19 {VHS}]
- 1925-03 – *Voetbalwedstrijd Sparta – Feijenoord* [1-0], 2'30", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 25031 {neg.}, TDP20 {digi}, VP20 {VHS}; GAR: BB-1407, Z805]
1925-13 – *Huldiging Tom Mix* [1925-04-23], 1'35", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 529, 25108 {neg.}, TDP23 {DIGI-BETA}, VP23 {VHS}]
1925-37 – *Ingevallen Pui Bij Het Hang* [rec.: 1925-12-05], 20", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 733, 25360 {neg.}, TDP29 {DIGI-BETA}, VP29 {VHS}]
- 1926-28 – *Nieuwe Brug* [1926-10-05], 1'45", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 974, 26266 {neg.}, TDP37 {DIGI-BETA}, VP37 {VHS}]
1926-32 – *Non-Stop-Rit Ford* [1926-12-07], 0'18", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 1026, 26324 {neg.}, TDP38 {DIGI-BETA}, VP38 {VHS}]
- 1927-09 – *Voetbalwedstrijd Tuschinski Elftallen* [1927-04-15], 1'38", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 1129, 27107 {neg.}, TDP41 {DIGI-BETA}]
- 1928-04 – *Aankomst Plesman* [rec.: 1928-03-04], 0'24", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 1391, 28035 {neg.}, TDP47 {DIGI-BETA}, VP47 {VHS}]
1928-04 – *De Nenijto in aanbouw*, 0'48", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 1367, 28030 {neg.}, TDP47 {DIGI-BETA}, VP47 {VHS}]
1928-14 – *Amadou Seck Het Negerjongetje Van De Nenijto* [rec.: 1928-07-08], 10", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 1520, 28175 {neg.}, TDP50 {DIGI-BETA}]
1928-15 – *Opstijgen Van Ballon* [from the Nenijto, 1928-08-11] 56", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 1544, 28188 {neg.}, TDP50 {DIGI-BETA}]
1928-xx – *Nenijto* [collected newsreels] 12', Polygoon [GAR: B&G: 28151; 28158; 28175; 28179; 28188; 28223; 28288]
1928-18 – *Begravenis Burgemeester Wytema* [rec.: 1928-07-16], 40", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 1525, 28219 {neg.}, TDP51 {DIGI-BETA}]
1928-18 – *20-jarig jubileum F.C. Feijenoord* [a fancy dress match, Kromme Zandweg] 1', 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 28228 {neg.}, TDP51 {digi}, VP51 {VHS}; GAR: BB-1439, Z806]
1928-19 – *Aankomst Auto-Giro*, 0'131", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 1558, 28-19 {wknr.}, 28238 {neg.}, TDP51 {DIGI-BETA}, VP51 {VHS}]
1928-20 – *Nieuwe Burgemeester: Mr. P. Droogleever Fortuyn* [1928-10-15], 36", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 3355, 28-20 {wknr.}, 28250 {neg.}, TDP51 {DIGI-BETA}, VP51 {VHS}; see also B&G: 1560]
1928-26 – *Vertrek Pandervliegtuigen*, 47", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 6025, 28-26 {wknr.}, 28316 {neg.}, TDP53 {DIGI-BETA}, VP53 {VHS}]
1928-29 – *Olijfantentransport Naar Engeland*, 1'40", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 3610, 28366 {neg.}, TDP54 {DIGI-BETA}, VP54 {VHS}]
- 1929-05 – *Soepuidelen* [1929-02-27], 40", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 3965, 29065 {neg.}, TDP55 {digi}, VP55 {VHS}]
1929-10 – *Opening Bloemententoonstelling* [rec. 1929-04-24], 19", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 4045, 29127 {neg.}, TDP56 {DIGI-BETA}, VP56 {VHS}]
1929-10 – *Koningin Moeder Bezoekt Bloemententoonstelling* [1929-04-25], 48", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 4042, 29-10 {wknr.}, 29124 {neg.}, TDP56 {DIGI-BETA}, VP56 {VHS}]
1929-14 – *Officiële Opening Koninginnebrug* [1929-06-14], 3'11", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 4776, 29175 {neg.}, TDP57 {DIGI-BETA}, VP57 {VHS}]
1929-16 – *Vliegfeest* [1929-06-23/1929-06-30], 1'58", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 4511, 29201 {neg.}, TDP58 {DIGI-BETA}, VP58 {VHS}]
1929-21 – *Ontvangst Mazairac*, 27", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 4966, 29273 {neg.}, TDP59 {DIGI}, VP59 {VHS}]
- 1930-04 – *Russische regisseur bezoekt ons land* [Eisenstein makes tour through the port], 58", 35mm/b-w/mute, Polygoon [B&G: 1629, 30-04 {wknr.}, 30038 {neg.}, TDP62, {DIGI-BETA}, VP62 {VHS}]
1930-12 – *Amerikaanse Vliegers Bezoeken Waalhaven* [1930-07-08], 1'04", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 1790, 30-12 {wknr.}, 30132 {neg.}, TDP65 {DIGI-BETA}, VP65 {VHS}]
1930-18 – *Bezoek Henry Ford* [October], 1'08", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 1683, 30187 {neg.}, TDP66 {DIGI-BETA}, VP66 {VHS}]
1930-33 – *Eerste Hollandse Vliegenierster* [rec.: 1930-12-04], 1'25", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 1871, 30325 {neg.}, TDP70 {DIGI-BETA}, VP70 {VHS}]
- 1931-06 – *Aankomst Eddy Polo* [1931-04-01], 52", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 2015, 31104 {neg.}, TDP73 {DIGI-BETA}, VP73 {VHS}]
1931-13 – *Macdonald Op Waalhaven* [1931-07-29], 31", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 2121, 31244 {neg.}, TDP76 {DIGI-BETA}, VP76 {VHS}]
1931-14 – *3 Km Zwemwedstrijden* [rec.: 1931-07-11], 2'22", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 2110, 31228 {neg.}, TDP76 {DIGI-BETA}, VP76 {VHS}]
1931-18 – *Concours Hippique* [Rotterdamsche Manege, 1931-09-26], 1'30", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 3404, 31292 {neg.}, TDP77 {DIGI-BETA}]
- 1932-03 – *Collecte Crisis Comite* [1932-01-15], 1'25", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 4885, 32017 {neg.}, TDP81 {DIGI-BETA}, VP81 {VHS}]
1932-25 – *Graf Zeppelin In Ons Land* [1932-06-18], 2'22", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 2214, 32117 {neg.}, TDP85 {DIGI-BETA}, VP85 {VHS}]
1932-35 – *Bedrijvigheid Bij Het Starten En Landen Voor De Europa Rondvlucht* [1932-08-29], 1'08", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 3068, 32190 {neg.}, TDP87 {DIGI-BETA}, VP87 {VHS}]
1932-43 – *Burgemeester Mr. P. Droogleever Fortuin Over De Rotterdamse Havens* [1932-11-03], 1'31", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 2291, 32239G {neg.}, TDP88 {DIGI-BETA}, VP88 {VHS}]
- 1933-04 – *Aankomst van Echtpaar de Leeuw op Waalhaven*, rec.: 1933-01-26, 2'10", 35mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 33021G {neg.}, TDP90 {digi}]
- 1934-36 – *VVV week*, rec.: 1934-09-05, 1'36", 35mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 34197 {neg.}, TDP103 {digi}, VP103 {VHS}]
1934-37 – *Aankomst van het Nieuwe Autogirovliegtuig*, 1'06", 35mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 34202 {neg.}, TDP103 {digi}, VP103 {VHS}]
1934-38 – *Parmentier spreekt over Douglasvliegtuig*, 1'44", 35mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 34209 {neg.}, TDP103 {digi}, VP103 {VHS}]
- 1936-15 – *Primavera Bloemententoonstelling*, 0'52", 35mm/b-w/-, [B&G: 36118 {neg.}, TDP116 {digi}, VP116 {VHS}]
1936-37 – *Prins Philip Van Spanje Woont De VVV-Week Bij* [1936-09-05], 1'13", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 2829, 36304 {neg.}, TDP120 {DIGI-BETA}]
1936-38 – *Riddertournooi En Wagenrennen Op Woudenstein* [VVV-week, 1936-09-12], 34", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 2833, 36308 {neg.}, TDP120 {DIGI-BETA}, VP120 {VHS}]
- 1937-10 – *Feyenoord Stadion Gereed* [1937-02-27], 0'59" (30 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 3798, 37080 {neg.}, TDP125 {DIGI}, VP125 {VHS}]
1937-13 – *De feestelijke opening van het stadion Feijenoord te Rotterdam* [1937-03-27], 3'57", 35mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 3827, 37115 {neg.}, TDP125 {DIGI-BETA}, VP125 {VHS}]
1937-25 – *Internationale Vliegemonstraties Op Waalhaven* [1937-06-12], 1'08", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 3538, 37226 {neg.}, TDP128 {DIGI-BETA}]
1937-25 – *Tunnelbouw Officieel Begonnen* [1937-06-15], 0'58", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 3536, 37224 {neg.}, TDP128 {DIGI-BETA}, VP128 {VHS}]
1937-38 – *Motorbehendigheidswedstrijden* [1937-09-11], 0'56", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 4339, 37-38 {wknr.}, 37327 {neg.}, TDP130 {DIGI-BETA}]
1937-47 – *Het Verroude Noorse Kerkje Wordt Opnieuw In Gebruik Genomen* [1937-11-14], 0'54", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 4488, 37398 {neg.}, TDP132 {DIGI-BETA}, VP132 {VHS}]
1937-50 – *"Ontdekt Uw Stad" Tentoonstelling* [1937-12-07], 1'10", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 4415, 37433 {neg.}, TDP132 {DIGI-BETA}, VP132 {VHS}]
1937-53 – *Tunnelbouw* [1937-12-29], 0'47" (27 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 4371, 37452 {neg.}, TDP133 {DIGI-BETA}, VP133 {VHS}]
- 1938-03 – *Nieuwe Beurs In Rotterdam Groeit* [1938-01-18], 1'31", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 4392, 38019 {neg.}, TDP133 {DIGI-BETA}, VP133 {VHS}]
1938-07 – *De Eerste Reis Van De 'Nieuw Amsterdam'* [1938-02-15], 1'06", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 4469, 38049 {neg.}, TDP134 {DIGI-BETA}]
1938-10 – *Tunnelbouw* [1938-03-08], 1'43" (53 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 4711, 38-10 {wknr.}, 38069 {neg.}, TDP135 {DIGI-BETA}, VP135 {VHS}]
1938-12 – *De 'Nieuw Amsterdam' Kiest Voor Het Eerst Zee* [1938-03-21], 0'32", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 4812, 38082 {neg.}, TDP135 {DIGI-BETA}]
1938-13 – *Hm De Koningin Bezoekt "Primavera"* [1938-04-08], 1'21", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 4728, 38103 {neg.}, TDP135 {DIGI-BETA}]

- 1938-17 – *Officiële Overdracht Van De 'Nieuw Amsterdam'* [1938-04-23], 2'34", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 6197, 38122 {neg.}, TDP136 {DIGI-BETA}]
- 1938-18 – *Jaarvergadering Van De Nederlandse Bioscoop Bond* [1938-05-05], 1'25", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 6199, 38127 {neg.}, TDP136 {DIGI-BETA}]
- 1938-21 – *Internationale Marathonloop Georganiseerd Door Het Weekblad 'Het Leven'* [1938-05-22], 1'13", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 5459, 38162 {neg.}, TDP137 {DIGI-BETA}, VP137 {VHS}]
- 1938-28 – *Athletiek Nederland – Duitsland* [1938-07-11], 1'31", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 6176, 38218 {neg.}, TDP138 {DIGI}, VP138 {VHS}]
- 1938-42 – *Nieuwe Onderzeer Voor De Poolse Marine Tewatergelaten*, 1'10", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 6093, 38-42 {wknr.}, 38311 {neg.}, TDP141 {DIGI-BETA}, VP141 {VHS}]
- 1938-42 – *Installatie Mr P Oud Tot Burgemeester* [1938-10-20], 2'15", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 6095, 38313 {neg.}, TDP141 {DIGI-BETA}]
- 1938-48 – *Opruimen Van Een Oud Gebouw* [1938-11-25], 1'11" (32 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 6250, 38357 {neg.}, TDP142 {DIGI-BETA}]
- 1939-07 – *Rotterdam Bouwt* [1939-01-23], 51", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 6720, 39050 {neg.}, TDP144 {DIGI-BETA}, VP144 {VHS}]
- 1939-20 – *Vrouwen Vredesgang* [1939-05-17], 35", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 6986, 39152 {neg.}, TDP146 {DIGI}, VP146 {VHS}]
- 1939-26 – *Bep Van Klaveren Wint Op Punten Van Assane Diouf* [stadion De Kuip, 1939-06-25], 1'32", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 7137, 39188 {neg.}, TDP147 {DIGI-BETA}, VP147 {VHS}]
- 1939-40 – *Bouw Van De Maastunnel* [1939-09-28], 43", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 7252, 39299 {neg.}, TDP150 {DIGI-BETA}, VP150 {VHS}]
- 1939-43 – *Militair Défilé* [1939-10-19], 54", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 7271, 39330 {neg.}, TDP150 {DIGI}, VP150 {VHS}]
- 1939-47 – *Rotterdamse Diergarde Gaat Verhuizen* [1939-11-17], 59", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 7690, 39364 {neg.}, TDP151 {DIGI}, VP151 {VHS}]

Polygoon, Filmfabriek (opdrachtfilm)

- 1920 – *Familie Swart*, 149m. [ref. Haan, 1995: 225]
- 1920 – *Werf 'Gusto'*, 26'20", 35mm/b-w/mute, for: A.F. Smulders (Gusto) [B&G: 29, 20-20 {wknr.}, 20483 {neg.}, TDP1007 {DIGI-BETA}]
- 1921 – *Huwelijk Ruys*, 49m. [ref. Haan, 1995: 225]
- 1922 – *Familie Ruys*, 64m. [ref. Haan, 1995: 225]
- 1922 – *Huwelijk Ruys-Fruyn*, 60m. [ref. Haan, 1995: 225]
- 1923 – *Werf Feijenoord*, 11'00", Polygoon [B&G: POL23-1]
- 1923 – *De Nederlandsche Noordzeevisscherij* [Scheveningen, IJmuiden, Vlaardingen, North Sea] 2151m, 35mm/b-w/mute, dir.: J. Metzelaar, A.C.P.E. Vermeulen, cam.: I.A. Ochse, Cor Aafjes, Polygoon [B&G: id 80 = 'inleiding' VP1016; id 71 = 'Deel I: Trawlervisscherij' V104448; id 79 = 'Deel II: De Haringvisscherij' V104530; id 72 = 'Deel III: De Beugvisscherij' V104448] NB: parts of the film were released before 1923
- 1923 – *Rotterdam 17 en 18 juni 1923 / Technisch filmspel in één bedrijf* [ref. NFDB/NFM]]
- 1924 – *Propagandafilm Verbruikscoöperatie In Nederland, 9'57"*, 35mm/b-2/mute [B&G: 616, 01-2942 {Arch.nr}, 20-3061 {Stocknr}, 337-05 {Videonr.}, TDU75153 {DIGI-BETA}, V98690 {VHS}]
- 1925 – *De Stoomvaartmaatschappij 'Rotterdamsche Lloyd'*, dir./cam.: Isidor Arras Ochse, Polygoon/NIFM [ref. NFDB/NFM]
- 1925 – *Familiefilm Sonneveld p/a Van Nelle*, 80m. [ref. Haan, 1995: 226]
- 1925 – *Reclame Film HAKA. Een Avontuurlijke Wasdag*, 984m, 35mm, for: HAKA [B&G]
- 1925 – *Waarom Juffrouw Pieterse lid van de coöperatie werd*, 593m, 35mm [B&G]
- 1926 – *Wegenfilm. Holland op zijn smalst, 21'28"* (433 mtr), 35mm/b-w/mute, for: Rijkswaterstaat (?) [B&G: 826, 26-05 {wknr.}, 26099 {neg.}, TDP1036 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1036 {VHS}]
- 1928 – *Huldiging van de bemanning van de Alhena* [rec: 1928-01-09], 9'14", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 27330 {neg.}, TDP46 {DIGI-BETA}]
- 1928 – *Op Voor De Coöperatieve Productie*, 16'15" (311 mtr), 35mm/b-w/mute, for: HAKA [B&G: 1070, 28-11 {wknr.}, 28310 {neg.}, TDP1047 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1047 {VHS}]
- 1928 – *Vliegfeest* [1928-07-20], 09'32", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 1527, 28-22 {wknr.}, 28272 {neg.}, TDP52 {DIGI}, VP52 {VHS}]
- 1928 – *Jubileum Sparta* [a.o. match Sparta – Feijenoord (4-3)], 8'00", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 921, 28-04 {wknr.}, 28075 {neg.}, TDP1045 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1045 {VHS}]
- 1928 – *Voetbalwedstrijd Te Rotterdam; Rotterdamsch Eftal Tegen Bondselftal* [1928-11-18], 8'29", 35mm/b-w/mute, for: Tuschinski [B&G: 391, 01-2703 {Archive}, 20-2377 {Stocknr.}, TDU78790 {DIGI}, V104488 {VHS}]
- 1928 – *Opmname voor Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1'18", 35mm/b-w/mute, for: Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad [B&G: 950, 28-01 {wknr.}, 28168 {neg.}, TDP1044 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1044 {VHS}]
- 1929 – *Het Modernste Melkinrichtingbedrijf Van Nederland*, 17'16" (322 mtr), 35mm/b-w/mute, for: Rotterdamsche Melkinrichting [B&G: 1101, 29-14 {wknr.}, 29231 {neg.}, TDP1053 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1053 {VHS}]
- 1929 – *Verkeer* [compilation of traffic recordings], 9', Polygoon [GAR]
- 1930 – *Begrafenis W.A. Heijkoop*, 7'15" (141 mtr), 35mm/b-w/mute, cam.: Jan Jansen [B&G: 1129, 29-17 {wknr.}, 30012 {neg.}, TDP1054 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1054 {VHS}]
- 1931 – *Achter Glas!, Thee*, 35mm, 22'49", Polygoon, for: Van Nelle [B&G: 01-3795-01/02, VHS 665]
- 1931 – *Achter Glas!, Koffie*, 35mm, 24'17", Polygoon, for: Van Nelle [B&G: 01-3802-01/02, VHS 665]
- 1931 – *Voetbalwedstrijd Tuschinski – Polygoon* [1931-12-26], 3'40", 35mm/b-w/mute, for: Tuschinski [B&G: 975, 31-03 {wknr.}, TDP1069 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1069 {VHS}]
- 1932 – *Voetbalwedstrijd Feijenoord – Ajax* [2-4], 1932-05-01, 6'41", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 117, TDP1087 {DIGI}]
- 1932 – *Voetbalwedstrijd Ajax – Feijenoord* [1-3], 1932-05-05, 7'07", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 118, TDP1087 {DIGI}]
- 1932 – *De Coöperatieve productie groeit, een cinematografische rondwandeling door onze nieuwe Haka-fabrieken*, 21'15", Polygoon [B&G: id121, 33001 = A neg., VP1087]
- 1933 – *Aankomst Van Filmactrice Hertha Thiele* [1933-03-17], 2'43" (78 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/co, for: Capitol Rotterdam, [B&G: 185, 33-16 {wknr.}, 33062 {neg.}, TDP1091 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1091 {VHS}]
- 1933 – *Een filmstudie* [commercial Van Nelle] [B&G: id 21153] – see also: Puvabi
- 1934 – *De VVV week*, 3'13" (92 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 374, 34-06 {wknr.}, 34015 A {neg.}, TDP1093 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1093 {VHS}]
- 1934 – *Dat Is Van Ons*, 29'12" (810 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/mute, for: HAKA [B&G: 382, 34-09 {wknr.}, 34020 A {neg.}, TDP1093 {DIGI-BETA}]
- 1935 – *Buitenopname Van Het Colosseum Theater* [1935-06-06], 29" (14 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 211, 35-07 {wknr.}, 35260 {neg.}, TDP1097 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1097 {VHS}]
- 1936 – *Reclame van Nelle* [coffee prod/cons., int. factory], 3'49", 35mm/b-w, Polygoon [B&G: docid 280, VP1102]
- 1936 – *Hou Zee!*, 18'34" (538 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/CO, for: NSB [B&G: 563, 41-03 {wknr.}, 41163 {neg.}, TDP1145 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1145 {VHS}]
- 1937 – *Nederland Bouwt Aan Zijn Toekomst* [rec. 1937-09-00], 20'28" (864 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 479, 38-10 {wknr.}, 38138 {neg.}, TDP1121 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1121 {VHS}]
- 1937 – *Door eendracht sterk! Coöperatief aan 't werk!* [HAKA/Handelskamer Propagandafilm], 5'29" (160 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 318, 37-06 {wknr.}, 37406 {neg.}, TDP1111 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1111 {VHS}]
- 1938 – *Voetbal* [Tuschinski – KLM, 1-2, 1938-05-29], 1'24", 35mm/b-w/mute, for: Tuschinski [B&G: 425, 38-01 {wknr.}, 38175 {neg.}, TDP1117 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1117 {VHS}]
- 1938 – *Colosseum Nieuws* [title for Colosseum theatre] [1938-07-00], 15" (15 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 449, 38-17 {wknr.}, 38220 {neg.}, TDP1126 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1126 {VHS}]
- 1939 – *Onze Koninklijke Marine*, 13'18" (489 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/co, for: Koninklijke Marine [B&G: 722, 47-24 {wknr.}, 47285 {neg.}, TDP1171 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1171 {VHS}]

Profilti (opdrachtfilm)

- 1932 – *Blue Band Margarine, 25% Roomboter* [commercial], 35mm/b-w/sound [NFM, digital copy]
1937 – *De Nieuw Amsterdam loopt van Stapel* [MM].
1939 – *Bescherm Uw Stad, 6'35"*, 35mm/b-w/co, for: Municipality of Rotterdam/Stichting Luchtafweer Rotterdam en Omstreken [B&G: 1177, 01-3751 {Arch.nr.}, B5-7-03 {Stocknr.}, TDU70790 Positie 03 {DIGI-BETA}, V95090-03 {VHS}]

Profilti Nieuws – Nederland in Klank en Beeld (Orion-Profilti, Profilti; see also: Orion-Revue)

- 1931 – *Ballonvaarder W. Van Pottum* (1931-08), 15 mtr, 35mm/b-w/sound (Orion-Revue 1931) [B&G: 555, VPRF {wknr.}, PR0257 {neg.}]
1932 – *De Graf Zeppelin Op Waalhaven* [1932-06-18], 2'32" meter, 35mm/b-w/opt, Orion-Revue [B&G: id 214; digibeta TDP3033, VHS VP3033]
1933 – *Zilveren Jubileum Van De Graan Elevator Maatschappij*, 21 mtr, 35mm/b-w/sound, Orion-Profilti [B&G: 600, VPRF {wknr.}, PR0267 {neg.}]
1933 – *Ingebruikneming Parksluizen Te Rotterdam*, 35mm/b-w/sound, Orion-Profilti [B&G: 606, VPRF {wknr.}, PR0269 {neg.}, PR0430 {neg.}]
1935 – *De V.V.V.-week te Rotterdam, De Rottestad in Feestdos*, 38", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 145, PR0618-4 {neg.}, TDP3032 {DIGI-BETA}]
1935 – *Brand Leuvehaven Rotterdam* [ref. NFDB/NFM]
1937 – *Groote Brand te Rotterdam* [ref. NFDB/NFM]

Puvabi²⁰³²

- 1935 – *Van Nelle reclamefilms* (o.a. *Een filmstudie; De wijsgeer*), 8'25", General Film-Corporation (Amsterdam) / Puvabi (Rotterdam) [B&G: 01-3804]

Ratté, Joannes

- 1928 – *En Gij, Kameraad?* [incl. port of Rotterdam], 74'00" (1548 mtr), 35mm/b-w/mute, cam.: Jan Jansen, Cor Aafjes, scr.: Aafjes, J. Ratté, J. Brautigam, prod.: Cor Aafjes/Polygoon for: Centrale Bond van Transportarbeiders [B&G: 1054, 28-17 {wknr.}, 28321 {neg.}, TDP1048 {DIGI-BETA}, VP1048 {VHS}]

Schoolbioscoop, see: Van der Wel, A.M.

Schuitema, Paul

- 1932 – *De Graf Zeppelin in Nederland, 1'18"* [NFM: ID 25604, digital copy]
1935 – *Betogingen* [NFM]
1937 – *De Maasbruggen*, 35mm, 385 m (14'), Multifilm [NFM, B&G: 01-3002]

Shell Nederland, Filmcentrale

- 1930 – *Shell Oil*, prod.: Shell [ref. NFDB]
1934 – *Tankinstallatie Rotterdam* [ref. NFDB], = part of: *Aardolie, van put tot pomp*, 1932, see: Bergen, C. van
1934 – *Luchtvaart en Shell* [aviation, Schiphol, Waalhaven e.a.], prod.: Shell [ref. NFDB]
1936 – *Uitbreiding installaties Pernis*, prod.: Shell [ref. NFDB]

Sierck, Detlef (Sirk, Douglas)

- 1939 – *Boefje, 92'* (2941m, 35mm), City Film Den Haag [NFM: ID 8298]

Teunissen, G.J. (Jan)

- 1930 – *The Buildings of De Erven Wed. J. Van Nelle at Rotterdam*, 35mm, 5'27", for: Van Nelle [B&G: id260, TDU 75133]

Theijssen, G.L.

- 1932-35 – *Bouw Museum Boymans, 53'*, 16mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Gemeentewerken, for Boymans [GAR: BB0759, Z567]

Transfilma – see also: Jansen, Walter; Willink, Luc²⁰³³

- 1927 – *Steenkolen Handelsvereniging*, 1500m, 35mm, dir. J. Kuzen Jr. (SHV), cam.: Von Barys, prod.: Transfilma / UFO, for: SHV²⁰³⁴
1927 – *Nederlandsche Rijnvaartvereniging*, 831m, 35mm/b-w/mute, cam.: Von Barys, prod. Transfilma, for: Ned. Rijnvaart Ver. / SHV²⁰³⁵
1927 – *Ned. Stoomsleepdienst v/h van P. Smit Jr.* [incl. Spido], 15'34", 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Transfilma, for: P. Smit Jr. [GAR: BB-687, Z201]
1927 – *Burgerhouts Machine Fabriek en Scheepswerf*, Transfilma
1927 – *Oranjeboom, Het Bierbrouwbedrijf*, 35mm, 2353m (preserved version = 50min.), Transfilma [GAR]
1928 – *NV Hygiënische Melkstel 'De Vaan' / Hygienic Milking Shed 'De Vaan'*, 1650 m, 35mm/b-w tinting/mute, cam.: Von Barys, prod.: Transfilma [NFM]
1928 – *Het Gemeente Gasbedrijf Rotterdam / Gasfabriek Keilehaven, 379m (12')*, 35mm/b-w/mute, dir.: Von Maydell, scr.: Von Reitzenstein, cam.: Von Barys, prod.: Transfilma [GAR: BB-1073] [Filmkeuring dossier 00845, 1928-06-21]
1928 – *Het Gemeente Electriciteitsbedrijf*, dir.: Von Maydell, scr.: Von Reitzenstein, cam.: Von Barys, prod.: Transfilma, 35mm, 390m [Filmkeuring dossier 00846, 1928-06-21]
1928 – *Die Ruhrkohle im Hafen von Rotterdam*, 35mm, 1156m., for: Rheinisch Westfaelische Kohlensyndikat²⁰³⁶
1928 – *Gemeente Dokken en Veren te Rotterdam*, 264m, 35mm, dir.: Von Maydell, scr.: Von Reitzenstein, cam.: Von Barys, prod.: Transfilma²⁰³⁷
1928 – *De Stad Die Nooit Rust / The City That Never Rests*, [aka: *Van Visschersdorp tot Wereldhavenstad*], 1772 = 65'²⁰³⁸, 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Transfilma [different versions: GAR; NFM]²⁰³⁹

²⁰³² For more titles of commercials made by Puvabi, see: www.cinemacontext.nl/id/R000445 (visited: 2007-09-19). The commercial *Een Filmstudie* might actually have been produced by Polygoon (1933).

²⁰³³ Cf. Hogenkamp, 1988: 146; the films made by Transfilma were recorded by Andor von Barys, see e.g. the informational booklet of Transfilma, sent with a letter of Transfilma to Burgemeester en Wethouders, 1928-04-20, dossier 'Havenfilm van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemeen Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4216: 1928, nr. 211.1, volgnr. 1., GAR.

²⁰³⁴ For the length of this film, see: 'De S.H.V.-Film', in: *Het Dagblad van Rotterdam*, 1927-04-02, and in: *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1927-04-02. The film is also known as *Steenkolen Handelsvereniging: Nederlandsch Havenbedrijf*, 1080m. Bartels & Westdijk (1990: 21) mention that material is archived by the SHV in Utrecht, but this has remained unclear after inquiry at SHV (2008). It seems that parts of this film have been released separately too: e.g. *Machinefabriek en Scheepswerf van P. Smit Jr.*

²⁰³⁵ This film is also known as *Steenkolen Handelsvereniging: Nederlandsch Rijnvaartbedrijf*.

²⁰³⁶ Mentioned in a letter by Transfilma to Burgemeester en Wethouders van Rotterdam, 1928-04-20, dossier 'Havenfilm van Rotterdam', archief: 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam afd. Algemeen Zaken: Raad; B&W (NSA), toegangsnr. 444.01, inv. nr. 4216: 1928, nr. 211.1, volgnr. 1., GAR.

²⁰³⁷ As mentioned in the article 'Een viertal Rotterdamsche films', in: *Voorwaarts*, 1928-05-11.

²⁰³⁸ This is the length of the images without the intertitles of the version that was seen by the censor on 1928-08-13; the version that was subsequently released was 1700m + 283 intertitles = 72'.

²⁰³⁹ In Germany the film has also been cut into different short films, see: Blum, A.V. In the Netherlands different versions exist of the film, a.o. under the title *Rotterdam*, which has caused confusion with other films with this title (e.g. by A.V. Blum), especially with the film that Von Barys made himself in

- 1928 – *Kijkjes in het Rotterdamsche Instituut voor fysische therapie (Zander instituut)* [ref. NFDB/NFM]
 1928 – *Modelbedrijven der Volksvoeding / De Vooruitgang*, dir.: Von Maydell, scr.: Von Reitzenstein, cam.: Von Barys, prod.: Transfilma, 35mm, 141m
 for: Coöperatieve Verbruiksvereniging 'Vooruitgang'²⁰⁴⁰

Tuschinski, Abraham

- 1920 – *Aankomst Amerikaansch Oorlogsschip te Rotterdam*, 35mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]
 1920 – *Brand in de Rotterdamsche Haven*, 35mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]
 1920 – *De Eerste trouwpartij in het nieuwe Stadhuis*, 35mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]
 1920 – *Tuschinski actualiteiten*, 35mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]
 1921 – *Stadsnieuws Rotterdam*, 35mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]
 1921 – *Langs Den Nieuwen Waterweg In Een Watervliegtuig* [1921-06-21] / alternative title: *Luchtopnamen van Rotterdam, Schiedam, Vlaardingen en Maassluis 7'18"*, 35mm/mute, Tuschinski [B&G: docid: 379, 01-2098 {Archive nr.}, 20-1109 {Stocknr}, 122-06 {Videonr}] and ref. NFDB/NFM]
 1921 – *Voetbalwedstrijd Haarlem – Sparta* [1921-02-27], 9'30", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 393, 01-2705-01 {Arch.nr}, TDU75961 {DIGI-BETA}]
 1921 – *Het Bezoek van H. M. de Koningin-Moeder aan Rotterdam*, 35 mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]
 1921 – *De Geheelen triomftocht van Carpentier in Rotterdam*, 35mm/mute, cam. John Meulkens, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]
 1922 – *Reclame-film voor het Cabaret in Theater Tuschinski*, 35mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]
 1922 – *De begrafenissen van den gevallen vlieger Saveur te Rotterdam*, prem. 1922-09-15 at Cinema Royal [ref. NFDB]
 1925 – *De Terugkomst der Hollandsche vliegeniers*, 35mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]
 1926 – *Bezoek aan het SS 'Paris' in reparatie in Wilton's dok, door Tuschinski op donderdag 26 augustus 1926* [A. Tuschinski and family visit ship, portaits] 35mm/yellow tinting/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFM: digital copy]
 1928 – *Bezoek van Josephine Baker aan Volendam*, 35mm/mute, Tuschinski [Volendams Museum]
 1928 – *Het Bezoek van de beroemde Duitse filmartiste Lil Dagover aan het Grand Theater te Rotterdam*, 35mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]
 1928 – *Aankomst van de nieuwe REO Snellast en luxewagen in Nederland*, 96m, 35mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. *Nieuw Weekblad v/d Cinematografie*, nr. 25, 1928]
 1929 – *Met de bemanning van het oorlogsschip 'Pittsburg' door onze havens*, 35mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB]
 1929 – *Zeppelinriomf boven Rotterdam*, 35mm/mute, Tuschinski [ref. NFDB/NFM]

Van Nelle, see: Nelle, Van

Vertregt, A.

- 1929-1937 – *Rotterdamsche Lloyd*, series of 41 films [MM: AV 386].

Visie Film – see: Max de Haas

Wal, Jacobus (Co) Theodorus Antonius van der

- 1929 – *Groot Rotterdam*, 35mm, 50', Pathé Cinéma [NFM: ID 26067]
 1932 – *Stuwving*, 35mm/sound, for: VARA

Weisbard, Karl (WB Theater)²⁰⁴¹

- 1920 – *De race der Jonggehuwden vanaf het Stadhuis naar Café de Witte Ballons in de Jonkerfransstraat* [ref. NFM]
 1920 – *De tocht van het Rotterdamsche R. K. vacantiëfeest* [ref. NFM]
 1921 – *Het Bezoek van Hiro-Hito aan Rotterdam* [ref. NFM]
 1921 – *Carpentier's tocht te Rotterdam* [ref. NFM]
 1921 – *De Grootste Rotterdamsche bioscoop in aanbouw* [ref. NFM]
 1921 – *De Motorclubtocht Rotterdam – Utrecht* [ref. NFM]
 1921 – *De voetbalmatch Excelsior – DHC* [ref. NFM]
 1921 – *De Vee- en Landbouwtenoonstelling te Rotterdam*, also shown at Luxor [ref. NFM]
 1921 – *De Ridderdag* [ref. NFM]
 1921 – *Het Prinselijk Bezoek* [ref. NFM]
 1921 – *Concours Hippique op het Sparta-terrein* [ref. NFM]
 1923 – *Historische optocht te Rotterdam* [festivities: folklore, procession, city images], distr. WB Theater [ref. NFM]

Wel, Abraham Melis van der²⁰⁴²

- 1921 – *Maan*, dir.: Van der Wel i.c.w. Otto van Neijenhoff, animation: George Debels [ref. NFM]
 1922 – *De Rijn Van Lobith Tot Aan Zee*, 93' (2572m), 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Polygoon [B&G: id 64; digibeta TDP 1014; VHS V1014; NFM]
 1922 – *Veluwe*, 35mm/b-w/mute, dir.: Van der Wel i.c.w. Willy Mullens [ref. *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 6, 1923]²⁰⁴³
 1922 – *De Libelle*
 1922 – *Langs Duin en Strand*, 2'57", 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop [B&G: id 1180, arch. nr 01-3758; VHS 68701, *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 6, 1923]
 1922 – *Het Ruiterfeest der bereden-politie te Rotterdam*, t.g.v. het 25-jarig bestaan der bereden-brigade op 1 juli 1922, 35mm/b-w/mute
 1923 – *Het Nederlandsche reddingswezen (Reddingswezen van Hoek van Holland)*, prod.: Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop [NFM: C2824, GAR]

1930. Confusion has furthermore been reinforced since several films were made about the port of Rotterdam in the period 1914-1938 (cf. Hollandia, Mullens, Van der Wel a.o.), of which different versions exist too.

²⁰⁴⁰ Ibid.

²⁰⁴¹ The NFDB/NFM mentions WB Theater and Witte Bioscooptheater. According to my data it is in both cases WB Theater (= Westerbioscoop, by Karl Weisbard). The newsreels by Weisbard listed here were mentioned in the film magazine *Kunst en Amusement* (1921), section 'De Films van de week'; 'Rotterdam'; 'W.B.-Theater'. See for specific numbers the database of the Nederlands Film Museum.

²⁰⁴² Some of the film that are mentioned in the catalogue of the NFM and in the Nederlandse Film Data Base have not the correct years of production. Some have been corrected here, based on the information from the documents in the collection of the GAR: archive 'Gemeentesecretarie Rotterdam, afd. Onderwijs', toegangsnr. 351.01 > Schoolbioscoop. Some of the titles that have been attributed to the Schoolbioscoop were actually bought by it from others, e.g. *Het leven der Bijen* (1921, Willy Mullens/Haghe Film), and *Djokja's Koperwerk* (1923, H.K.J. van den Bussche). Various films and film recordings are mentioned by the NFM under the label 'Gemeente Rotterdam (partij)' (the years mentioned appear to be merely indications). A number of them has been identified as films (or as material related to films) by Van der Wel that have been mentioned here; films that have not been identified (but which are most likely recordings by Van der Wel) are: 1925 – *Allerlei* (diverse); 1925 – *Bloemen*; 1925 – *Boer brengt koeien in de wei*; 1925 – *Feestelijke optocht*; 1925 – *Fietsers op bospad*; 1925 – *Hardloopwedstrijd*; 1925 – *Landweg*; 1925 – *Spittende boer*; 1925 – *Mannen bouwen*; 1926 – *Zandhopen*; 1926 – *Uitstapje RVS*; 1927 – *Optocht*; 1928 – *De pianist*; 1933 – *Landleven*.

²⁰⁴³ At B&G (a part of?) this film has been preserved: 2'02" [B&G: id 236; digibeta 75134; VHS V98671]

- 1923 – *Landbouwbedrijven / Beetwortelteelt* [sugar production, Bergen op Zoom], prod.: Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop [ref. NFM]
 1923 – *Melkproducten*, 32', prod.: Gem. Schoolbioscoop [ref: *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 6, 1923]
 1925 – *Sloot en Plas*, 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop [NFM, digital copy]
 1925 – *Met de Paardentram naar Overschie*, 10', prod.: Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop [GAR: BB-0716, Z 145]
 1925 – *Het lichtschip 'Maas'*, 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop [NFM]
 1925 – *De Haven van Rotterdam*, 18', 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop [*Deel I*, 6'15'': NFM, registered under the title: *Waterwegen naar Rotterdam; Deel II*, 10'08'' GAR: BB-0929]
 1925 – *De Stinkzwam* [ref. NFM]
 1925 – *Kaasvervaardiging*, prod.: Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop [ref: NFM/NFDB]
 1927 – *Electriciteit en haar toepassingen*, i.c.w. H. Ehrenburg, prod.: Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop [ref: p4 in: *Nieuw Weekblad voor de Cinematografie*, nr. 23, 1927]
 1927 – *Voorjaar*, 17', prod.: Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop [NFM: DK2128]
 1928 – *Boomplantdag in den Kralingerhout te Rotterdam* [1928-04-02], 6'06'', 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Gemeentelijke Schoolbioscoop [B&G: id 617; VHS 98677; GAR: BB-0725, Z 1020]
 1929 – *Winter 1929* [Jan./Feb.], 4'37'', 35mm, prod.: Gem. Schoolbioscoop [GAR: BB-0890, Z 1020]
 1930 – *Veilig Verkeer*, 24', 35mm/b-w/mute, i.c.w. B.G. Meyer, prod.: Gem. Schoolbioscoop [GAR: BB-0721, Z 171 / Z 837]
 1930 – *De Vischmarkt te Rotterdam 1881-1930*, 7'33'', 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Gem. Schoolbioscoop [GAR: BB-723]
 1930 – *Vogelleven in en om Rotterdam* [birds, locations: Hoek van Holland, Lekkerkerk, Rotterdam], 50', 35mm/b-w + tinting/mute, prod.: Gem. Schoolbioscoop [NFM, digital copy]
 1933 – *School voor vrouwenarbeid, 1908-1933*, 17', 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Gem. Schoolbioscoop [GAR: BB-0722, Z1048]

Willink, Luc

- 1929 – *The Marshal's Baton / De Maarschalkstaf*, 35mm, 1956m, Transfilma, Centrale Bond Van Nederlandsche Verbruikscoöperaties [lost, ref. Donaldson, 1997]

FILMOGRAPHY ROTTERDAM 1940s & 1950s – SELECTION

Anonymous

- 1940 – *Na de Brand van Rotterdam*, for: Dobbelmann's Ibis Shag [NFM: ID 44985]
1940 – *Het centrum na de brand* [GAR, cf. De Jong, 2005]
1945 – *Bevrijding Rotterdam*, 3'30", amateur [GAR: BB-0747]
1955 – *Wederopbouw*, 17', 16mm/b-w [GAR: BB-0693]

Arend en de Zeemeeuw (community centre)

- 1958 – [Gezinskamp], 5', double8/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-1645] Z546

Armstrong, John

- 1957 – *Song of the Clouds*, GB, 33', 35mm/cl/sound, cam. Eduard van der Enden, Ronnie Whitehouse, prod. Stuart Legg, Shell Film Unit [ref. IMDB]

Berger, Ludwig

- 1940 – *Ergens in Nederland*, Filmex S.A.

Besten, A. den

- 1954 – *Eilanden Expresse* [Rotterdam – Hellevoetsluis], 16mm/b-w/sound, co-dir.: Joop Stolk

Bollemeijer, B.J.

- 1953 – *Bouw winkelcentrum Lijnbaan*, 12', 16mm/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-0821]

Bollongino, Nol

- 1955 – *Kijk uit!*, 27', 16mm/b-w/perfo, prod. Polygoon-Profiliti [GAR: BB-0713]

Borgers, Carel G.

- 1950 – *Berke! 37'*, 16mm/b-w/opt, scr. / dir.: W.H.M. van den Hout, cam.: Hannes de Boer, Carel Borgers, editing: Willy Soudijn, prod.: Borgers
Filmproductie, for: Berke! [GAR: BB-3549] Z870

- 1951 – *Algemene Nederlandse Metaalbedrijfsbond*, NL, prod.: NV Filmproductie Rotterdam

Bosch, Wim Th. H. ten

- 1940 – *Rotterdam en hoe het bouwde* [rec.: 1938-1939], 39', double-8 [GAR: BB-1096]
1940 – *Rotterdam na Mei 1940* [GAR: BB-1095]

Bosch, P.v.d.

- 1950s – *Ahoy, E 55, Floriade*, 16', double8/cl & b-w/mute + [GAR: BB-3699] Z 553

British Commonwealth International Newsfilm Agency, see: NTS-Journal 1958-07-15

Brosens, Albert

- 1952 – *Twintig uur per dag*, 15', 16mm, b-w, assistant-dir.: George H. de Kok, sound, Wim Huender, for: M.S.A. [Filmcollectie UB, RUG]
<http://filmcollectie.ub.rug.nl/index.php?page=show&ID=2466>

Brunius, Jacques B.

- 1950 – *Somewhere to Live*, Wessex Film Productions London, 15'/464m, col./sound, for the series 'Changing Face of Europe', ECA
[www.marshallfilms.org 2009-07-30]

Brusse, Kees

- 1959 – *Volg die Vrouw*, 19', 35mm/b-w/opt, cast.: Kees Brusse, Mieke Verstraete, prod.: Polygoon-Profiliti, for: GEB [GAR: BB-1120] Z 624

Brusse, Ytzen

- 1952 – *Hij, zij, en een wereldhaven / Rhythm of Rotterdam*, 19', 35mm/b-w/mag., cast.: Kees Brusse, Mieke Verstraete, Ytzen Brusse Filmproductie
(Amsterdam), for: Stichting Havenbelangen [GAR: BB-1000] Z 137

- 1959 – *Dokbouw aan de Nieuwe Maas*, prod.: Ytzen Brusse Filmproductie (Amsterdam) [NFM: ID 16271]

Burcksen, Joop

- 1955 – *Thalia is Herrezen*, 12'39", 35mm/b-w/co, prod.: Polygoon, for: Thalia [B&G: VP1218]
1955 – *Een Wandelg door Rotterdam* (55-05), 14'33", 35mm/b-w/co, prod.: Polygoon, for: Samson/E55, cast: Mies Bouwman, Kees Brusse [B&G: 55112; GAR: BB-0820]
1955 – *Lumière Theater te Rotterdam*, prod.: Polygoon, for: Lumière (55-07), 3'58", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 55144]
1955 – *Het Groothandelsgebouw*, 7'40", 35mm/b-w/co, prod.: Polygoon-Profiliti, for: Groothandelsgebouw, 1955-09-01 [B&G: RVD 07-6101]
1957 – *Rotterdam heeft 't*, 20', 35mm/b-w/co, prod.: Polygoon, for: Bijenkorf [GAR: BB-2591]

Canadian Army Film Unit

- 1945 – *LCT's Help Relieve Holland Famine (Canadian Army Newsreels)*, 1'10", b-w, prod.: Canadian Army Film Unit [B&G: id 656, TDP 1158, VHS VP1158, time code: 46'37"-47'48"]

Capra, Frank

- 1942 – *Why we fight* (nr. 3. Verdeel en Heers) [propaganda for the US armed forces, with shots of the bombardment of Rotterdam; Dutch version: 1944], 9'10", 35mm/b-w/com, prod. US Ministry of War, Dutch comm.: A. den Doolaard (1944), for: RVD [B&G: 1740, vide nr. 205-02]

Cronkite, Walter (see: Max de Haas)

Duyvenbode, J. van.

- 1940 – *De Brand 14 mei 1940* [GAR, cf. De Jong, 2005]

Es, Wil van

1956 – *3 dagen met Monica* [fiction], 21', 70mm (Delrama cinemascope)/cl/sound, dir./cam./prod.: Wil van Es, script: Simon Carmiggelt, cast: Flip van Santpoort, Ann Hasekamp, for: *St. Havenbelangen* [GAR, NFM: 17020]

Fernhout, John

1943 – *The Dutch Tradition* [to promote the reliability of NL as an allied partner, incl. shots of bombardment Rotterdam], 10' 10", 35mm/b-w/com, prod.: National Film Board of Canada, for: Netherlands Information Bureau (New York) [B&G: 1820, V102340]

1945 – *Holland Carries On* [about the war and after, incl. shots of bombardment Rotterdam, to promote NL after WWII], 10' 14", 35mm/b-w/com, prod.: Binnenlandse Strijdkrachten (?), for: RVD [B&G: 1312, video nr. 167-03] note: several images are also part of *The Dutch Tradition*.

Foka

1940 – *Mei 1940* [GAR, cf. De Jong, 2005]

Gemeentewerken, Fototechnische Dienst

1947 – *Rotterdam herstellt zijn kademuren*, 26', 16mm/b-w/sound [GAR: BB-0703]

1950 – *Palen*, keuring 1950-06-10 [NFM: ID 63 – no print]

1955 – *De Botlekbrug*, keuring 1955-10-29 [NFM: ID 8717 – no print]

1958 – *Europoort*, 16mm/col./mute [GAR: BB-0872]

Groot, A.J.W. de & Ruygrok, Heleen

1946 – *5 Jaren, een film opgedragen aan alle Nederlanders* [Nationale Hulpactie Roode Kruis, HARK], 66'02", 35mm/b-w/co, dir./scen.: A.J.W. de Groot, ed.: Heleen Ruygrok, sound: F.P.M. Pulles, prod.: Polygoon, commissioner: Roode Kruis [B&G: id 675, VP1167]

Haan, Herman & Haan-Fischer, Hansje

1955 – *E55, 57'*, 16mm/b-w & col./mute [GAR: BB-0739]

Haas, Max de

1950 – *Woningnood*, cam.: Frits Lemaire, ed.: Lien d'Oliveyra [NFM: ID 76158]

1955 – *The Story of Rotterdam, 5'40"*, i.c.w. Walter Cronkite, cam.: Emiel van Moerkerken, prod.: Visie film, for: CBS [B&G: RVD 07-2560]

1959 – *Varen is genieten*, 13', 16mm/cl/magn, prod.: Visie Film, for: HAL [GAR: BB-0834], Z195

Haas, Alex de

1953 – *Rotterdamse Mijmeringen*, 20', dir. Alex de Haas, dir./prod.: Piet Meerburg [GAR]

Haines, Ronald

1946 – *In Rotterdam*, 20', 35mm/b-w/opt., for: British Foundation Pictures [GAR: BB-0879] Z 1021

Haren Noman, Theo van

1949 – *Het Nederlandse Vliegkampschip Hr. Ms Karel Doorman* [Northsea, Act 1: tour through the ship; act 2: take-off / landing firefly aeroplanes], 14', 35 mm/b-w/co, prod.: Polygoon-Profilati, for: Koninklijke Ned. Marine [B&G: 3629-3630, 07-0025-01+02 {arch.nr.}, 357-01+02 {VHS}]

1950 – *De Marva's, een nieuwe taak voor de vrouw*, 12', 35mm/b-w/sound, prod.: Polygoon-Profilati, for: Koninklijke Ned. Marine.

Heil, H.

1945 – *Noordereiland 8 mei 1945* [GAR, cf. De Jong, 2005]

Hollands Nieuws (see: Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws)

Hornecker, Rudi

1942 – *Zondag der Dieren / Flitsen uit Blijdorp*, prod.: Henrik Scholte / Nederland Film (The Hague) [NFM: 77650]

1954 – *Moderne Architectuur in Nederland*, 21'00", 35mm/b-w/co, prod.: RH Film, Walt Disney Productions, for: OKW [B&G: RVD 07-0015-03]

Horst, Herman van der

1946 – *Dutch aan den slag*, 9', 35mm/b-w/sound, i.c.w. Allan Penning, prod.: Nederlandsche Werkgemeenschap voor Filmproductie, Multifilm, in the series 'wederopbouwfilms' [B&G: RVD 02-0032; GAR: BB-0999]

1952 – *Houen zo! / Steady!*, 21', 35mm/b-w/sound, for: MSA [B&G: RVD 07-0400-01; GAR]

Huguenot van der Linden, Charles

1948 – *Dutch in seven lessons / Nederlands in zeven lessen*, 79', 35mm/b-w/sound (Eng.), dir./script:

Hein Josephson, Ch. H. v/d Linden, cast: Wam Heskens, Audrey Hepburn a.o., cam.: Piet Schrikker, Peter Staugaard a.o., editing: Rita Roland, prod.: Harold Goodwin, George Julsing, Jack Dudok van Heel, H. Josephson, Ch. H. v/d Linden, prod.: Rank, GB International, Eagle Lion Film [ref. <http://cultura.nps.nl/page/tv-gids/162614> 2008-08-14]

1950 – *De Bajes is zo groot* [detention, a.o. women detention in Rotterdam, 31', 35mm/z-w/com, cam. Hattum Hoving, voice: F. Thors, prod.: Multifilm [B&G: id 1829 + 1830; 02-0912 + 02-0913 {Archiefnr.}, TDU77653 {DIGI-BETA}, V102392 {VHS}]

1956 – *De Bloem der Natie*, 1402m, 35mm/b-w/mute, Multifilm Haarlem, for: NV 'Meneba' [NFM: ID 8015]

James, Henry i.c.w. Out, Rob

1948 – *Een Huis, Een Huis, Wie Helpt Ons Aan Een Huis*, 13'10", 35mm/b-w/co, Polygoon-Profilati [B&G: RVD 02-0581-01 + 02-0581-02, V102002]

Jong, M.I. de

1945 – *Voedseldroppings 29 april 1945* [B&G, cf. De Jong, 2005]

Jong, W.G. de

1940-1945 – *Herbouw Rotterdam*, 23', double 8/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-1907]

1946-1959 – *Herbouw Rotterdam*, 32', double 8/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-1908]

Josephson, Henry M. – see: Huguenot van der Linden

Klerk, J. de

1940 – *1940 Rotterdam* (= *Verbrand Rotterdam*), 10 min., 16mm/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-3316]

1945 – *Bevrijdingsfeesten* (= *Bevrijding van Rotterdam*, H. De Klerk), 5'50" [GAR: BB-3318]

Knoop, Klaas van der

1949 – *De Beer*, 45', 16mm/b-w/mute, i.c.w. Simon de Waard, for: Natuurstichting De Beer [GAR: BB-0962] Z1127 / 1128
1950 – *Tocht met Spido*, 15', b-w/mute, for Spido [GAR: BB-0959]

Koeling, Johannes (Jan) Karel Frederik

1940 – *Verwoesting in Rotterdam*, 4'02", 35mm/b-w/mute, 1940-06-00 [B&G: RVD 02-1111]
1944 – *Orchideënkwekerij in de diergaarde Rotterdam*, 1939-1944

Koenig, M.H.H.

1940 – *77-ht Lua / Zevenenzeventigste Batterij Luchtafweer* [1939-1940], 12'27", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: id 2141; VHS 442-04]

Kommer, Bob

1956 – *Coastguards for Brazil*, 33', 16mm/b-w/sound (English) [MM: AV271]

Koolhaas, Anton

1950 – *De Dijk Is Dicht*, 89'19" (2700 mtr.), 35mm/b-w/co, scen./dir.: Anton Koolhaas, cam. Piet Buis, prod.: Polygoon [B&G: 1039, 50-30 {wknr.}, 50275 {neg.}, TDP1186 {digi}, VP1186 {VHS}]

Marinevoorlichtingsdienst (Marvo) / Leger Film- en Fotodienst

1946 – *De Koningin Bezoekt de Torpedobootjager 'Tjerk Hiddes' en de Onderzeeboot 024 te Rotterdam*, 1'21", 35mm/b-w [B&G: id 1942, 02-0978 {arch. nr.}]

1946 – *Prins Bernhard Bezoekt het Vliegdekschip Hr.Ms. Karel Doorman* [Rotterdam, rec. 1946-08-06], 1'49", 35mm/b-w [B&G: id 3269, 20-3007 {stock nr.}, TDU77620 {digibeta}, V102357 {VHS}]

1947 – *Ministers en Kamerleden op Excursie met de Hr. Ms. Karel Doorman* [Rotterdam, rec. Oct. 1947], 35mm/b-w [B&G: id 4017; 08-0029 {arch.}]

1947 – *Veeftig Jarig Jubileum van de Onderzeedienst Te Rotterdam* [Waalhaven, rec. 1947-06-25], 1'18", 35mm/b-w/co: Bloemendaal, Philip [B&G: id 4015; 08-0029 {arch. nr.}]

1948 – *Overdracht en aankomst van de nieuwe Karel Doorman* [Plymouth, Rotterdam] [part of *Marinejournaal* series 1946-1948, June 1948], 1'12", 35mm/b-w/co: L. van Bruggen [B&G: id 1950, 02-0979 arch. nr.]

1948 – *Karel Doorman met Groot Verlof* [Wilton-Fijenoord, England], 0'40", 35mm/b-w/co: L. van Bruggen [B&G: id 1949, 02-0979 arch. nr.]

1951 – *Hr.Ms. Kruiser De Zeven Provinciën in Aanbouw* [RDM], 1'20", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: id 1440, arch. nr. 02-0430; digi-beta TDU76156]

Meerburg, Piet (see: Haas, Alex de)**Millecam, Ed**

1946 – *Oorlog in Nederland* [Rotterdam], 3'45", 8mm/b-w/mute [B&G: id 2200]

1948 – *De Symphonie van een grote stad*, 20'46", 16mm/b-w/perfo [B&G: id 4194, digi-beta 75611]

1949 – *CPN 1 Mei 1949*, 5'26", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: id 4229, digi-beta TD 75611]

1950 – *Rotterdam Ahoy 1950*, 4'39", 16mm/b-w/perfo [B&G: id 4213, digi-beta TD 75611]

Mol, Jan Cornelis

1953 – *Een Nieuwe Toekomst Tegemoet*, 19'05", 35mm/cl/co, Multifilm Haarlem [B&G: RVD 07-3948]

Multifilm (Batavia)

1947 – *Fort Rotterdam, Wordende Wereld 32/3* [Makassar, Celebes], 1'46", 35mm/b-w/com: P. Reyntjes, cam. Charles Breijer [B&G: id2906, 637-04 {VHS}]

Multifilm (Haarlem)

1948 – *m.s. Willem Ruys* [constr. ship, 1939-1947; Vlissingen, Rotterdam, Batavia], 44', 16mm/b-w [MM: AV33]

1950 – *Rotterdam Ahoy*, Multifilm [ref. NFDB/NFM]

1953 – *Opening Groot Handelsgebouw te Rotterdam*, 67m, 16mm/b-w/sound, prod.: Multifilm, for: NTS [ref. NFDB/NFM, cinemacontext]

1953 – *Emigranten Reizen per M.S. Sibajak*, 28'24", 16mm/b-w/co, Multifilm for: Koninklijke Rotterdamsche Lloyd, 1953-07-01; 1953-08-20 [B&G: RVD 07-3949-05]

Nederlandse Onderwijs Film

1952 – *Rotterdam als Doorvoerhaven*, 13', 16mm/b-w/sound, prod.: Nederlandse Onderwijs Film [GAR: BB-0709]

1957 – *Rijnvaart*, 45', 16mm/cl/sound, prod.: Nederlandse Onderwijs Film]

Neerlands Nieuws, see: Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws**Niestadt, C.B.H.**

1959 – *Sterk in de Storm*, cam. Jaap Swart, scen. Joh. Veeninga, prod.: C.B.H. Niestadt / Filmstudio Hooge Vuursche, for: Nationale Levensverzekering Bank [GAR, Z284]

Nieuwendijk, J.S. van de

1942 – *Electro Blijspel*, 43', prod.: Filmstudio Nieuwendijk, for: Nederlandsche Vrouwen Electriciteits Vereniging [GAR: BB-1131]

1948 – *Het Electrisch Huis*, 22', prod.: Filmstudio Nieuwendijk [GAR: BB-1129]

Nieuwenhuis, Jaap

1958 – *Circling The Globe in Comfort* [Cruise of "Willem Ruys", from Sydney to New Zealand, Peru, Panama, Bahama, Miami, Southampton, Rotterdam], 38', 16mm/cl/sound (English), prod.: Deltafilm, for: Rotterdamsche Lloyd [MM AV30]

19xx – *Passage naar de zon*, for: Rotterdamsche Lloyd [MM AV 442] status of this film is unknown

Nort, Karel

1954 – *Australië Roept*, 40', 35mm/b-w/co NL/GB, Polygoon-Profilti Productie [B&G: RVD 07-2910-01]

NSB, Filmdienst der (Nationaal-socialistische Beweging) – **Spiegel der Beweging**

1941 – *De Leider bezoekt Rotterdam* [Mussert], 1'23", 35mm/b-w/com, Filmdienst der NSB, Spiegel der Beweging nr. 8 item 3 [B&G: 1633; V100418]

1942 – *Installatie van Burgemeester Muller tot Districtshoofd*, 1'12", 35mm/b-w/com, Filmdienst der NSB [B&G: 1665; videonr: 171-01]

1942 – *Groenteteelt in Stadsparken en Stadsplantsoenen*, 1'03", 35mm/b-w/com, Filmdienst der NSB [B&G: 1712, V98678] cf. Polygoon 1942-32.

NTS

1958 – *Filmreportage* [SS Rotterdam/HAL, RDM], 1958-09-13, 14'41", 16mm/b-w/magn., Pier Tania [ed.] [B&G: 172324, 9558 {film}, V43047 {VHS}]

NTS (selection of newsreels)

1952 – *Journal* [housing shortage], 1952-02-29, 42", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 172025, K43329 {FILM}]

1953 – *Journal* [Sabena helicopter test flight], 1953-05-19, 1'14", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 172076, K43344 {FILM}]

1953 – *Journal* [Belgian Min. Spaak visits R'dam, by helicopter], 1953-10-09, 4'15", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 172102, K43367 {FILM}, V61313 {VHS}]

1955 – *Journal* [Botlekbrug], 1955-06-30, 1'40", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 101432, A1 {FILM}]

1955 – *Journal* [Speech Billy Graham in Feijenoord stadium], 1955-07-04, 5'30", 16mm/b-w/co [B&G: 101440, A1 {FILM} 147 II {bliknr.}]

1955 – *Journal* [harbour strike], 1955-08-16, 0'32", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 101496, A2 {FILM} 152 I {bliknr.}]

1955 – *Journal* [Belgian ambassador visits port/RDM], 1955-10-06 and 1955-10-14, 1'51", 16mm/b-w/-, cam.: Charles Breijer, for: EBU [B&G: 299669, 160 V {bliknr.}] [also: B&G: 101575, 160 IV {bliknr.}]

1955 – *Journal* [Restauratie St.Laurens], 1955-11-19, 1'46", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 101617, 164 IV {bliknr.}]

NTS Journal (selection) – Carel Enkelaar (editor in chief: 1956-1963, Coen van Hoewijk, Pier Tania e.a.²⁰⁴⁴)

1956 – *Journal* [launching submarine fighter, RDM], 1956-01-28, 0'32", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 101765, 168 {FILM}]

1956 – *Journal* [exhibition work clothing, Bouwcentrum], 1956-02-16, 1'09", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 101827, 270 {film}, TD95802 {digi}]

1956 – *Journal* [Queen Juliana work visit at Shell, Pernis, Bouwcentrum a.o.], 1956-05-16, 2'30", 16mm/b-w/-, cam.: Fred Romeyn [B&G: 102433, 1352 {FILM} 227 {bliknr.}]

1956 – *Journal* [minister De Bruijn, *metselwedstrijd*], 1956-07-12, 1'00", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 102624, 1914 {FILM}]

1956 – *Journal* [USSR navy, ship Sverdlov], 1956-07-21, 2'40", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 102666, 1960 {FILM}]

1956 – *Journal* [monument 'De Boeg' by Carasso], 1956-08-30, 1'30", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 102797, 2229 {FILM}]

1956 – *Journal* [opening Airport Zestienhoven; connection to Southend-on-Sea], 1956-10-02, 3'22", 16mm/b-w/CM&SM [B&G: 102903, 2438 {FILM}]

1956 – *Jaaroverzicht Journal 1951-1956* [first five years of television; speech Billy Graham] NTS, 1956-10-05, 18'19", 16mm/b-w/SM&CO [B&G: 301982, 80221 {FILM} 17928M {bliknr.}] V3021 {VHS}]

1956 – *Journal* [helicopters at ship Antietam, US navy], 1956-10-30, 3'10", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 102979, 2625 {film}]

1956 – *Journal* [US navy leaves Rotterdam for Egypt], 1956-10-31, 1'03", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 102989, 2626 {film}]

1956 – *Journal* [St.Nicholas lighting of Lijnbaan], 1956-11-29, 0'40", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 103054, 2854 {FILM}]

1956 – *Journal* [heliport, Sabena], 1956-12-04, 1'00", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 103067, 2878 {FILM} 317 {bliknr.}]

1957 – *Journal* [100,000 registered tv spectators], 1957-01-03, 3'38", 16mm/b-w/CM&SM, Coen van Hoewijk (ed.) [B&G: 103162, 3081 {FILM}]

1957 – *Journal* [book fair Bijenkorf: Dendermonde, Haasse, Blaman, A.M.G. Schmidt, Mulisch, Carmiggelt, Claus a.o.] 1957-04-09, 2'00", 16mm/b-w/CM [B&G: 103521, 3805 {FILM} 373 I {bliknr.}]

1957 – *Journal* [reveiling monument 'De Boeg'], 1957-04-11, 1'39", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 103527, 3813 {FILM}]

1957 – *Journal* [explosion boiler tug-boat Gunnard in Waalhaven], 1957-04-16, 2'35", 16mm/b-w/cm, Coen van Hoewijk (ed.) [B&G: 103548, 3854 {FILM} 376 I {bliknr.}]

1957 – *Journal* [WOII monument], 1957-05-07, 1'01", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 103609, 3975 {FILM}]

1957 – *Journal* [opening Central Station], 1957-05-21, 1'04", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 103665, 4084 {FILM}]

1957 – *Journal* [sculpture by Naum Gabo, Bijenkorf], 1957-05-23, 0'30", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 103670, 4096 {FILM}]

1957 – *Journal* [50th ann. submarine service Royal Navy, submarine Zeeleeuw], 1957-06-01, 2'35", 16mm/b-w/cm [B&G: 103705, 4165 {FILM}]

1957 – *Journal* [opening Verolme Docks, constr. tanker for Iran], 1957-06-27, 1'47", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 103803, 4395 {FILM}]

1957 – *Journal* [fire at cargo ship Tanga], 1957-06-27, 1'26", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 103805, 4393 {FILM}]

1957 – *Journal* [aircraft carrier Tarawa, US Navy], 1957-10-01, 1'06", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 104150, 5177 {FILM}]

1957 – *Journal* [Jayne Mansfield on tour in Europe, in NL, a.o. on carrier Tarawa], 1957-10-12, 1'15"; 1'54" (B-material, 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 104194, 5240 {FILM} 454M {bliknr.}, TD95772]

1957 – *Jaaroverzicht Journal 1957* [R'dam: De Boeg, mon. WOII, CS], 1957-12-31, 42'16", 16mm/b-w/co Tania/v.Hoewijk [B&G: 302395, 5664 {FILM}, V3156 {VHS}]

1958 – *Journal* [submarines Walrus, Zeeleeuw], 1958-03-08, 2'28", 16mm/b-w/co, Pier Tania (ed.) [B&G: 104744, 6279 {FILM}]

1958 – *Journal* [start constr. Europort], 1958-06-18, 1'42", 16mm/b-w/co [B&G: 105166, 7597 {FILM}, V71949 {VHS}]

1958 – *Journal* [International News Exchange, EBU] [launching of Reza Shah the Great, Verolme Rozenburg], 1958-07-15, 0'42", 16mm/b-w/-, prod.: British Commonwealth Internat. Newsfilm Agency [B&G: id 6072]

1958 – *Journal* [constr. SS Rotterdam at Heijplaat], 1958-08-13, 2'27", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 105466, 8699 {FILM}]

1958 – *Journal* [market again], 1958-08-26, 1'30", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 105572, 8879 {FILM}]

1958 – *Journal* [launching of HAL's MS Rotterdam], 1958-09-17, 1'29" (was 1'42"), 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 224679, 9217 {FILM}]

1958 – *Journal* [constr. of oil pipe line to Cologne], 1958-09-17, 2'12", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 224678, 9219 {FILM}]

1958 – *Journal* [helicopter line Zestienhoven - Schiphol], 1958-11-04, 1'19", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 106232, 10029 {film}]

1958 – *Journal* [location of future Europort, excavators and dredgers], 1958-11-19, 0'41" (was 1'07"), 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 230404, 10305 {FILM}]

1959 – *Journal* [Verolme's 'mammoetdok', tanker 'Presidente Getulio'], 1959-01-21, 1'24", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: film 11742]

1959 – *Journal* [Euromast under construction], 1959-03-25, 4'26", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 224412, 12891 {FILM} V106072 {VHS}]

1959 – *Journal* [launching of submarine 'Dolfijn'], 1959-05-21, 1'14", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 108757, 14514 {FILM}]

1959 – *Journal* [Shah of Iran & Princess Margriet launch tanker], 1959-05-22, 4'01", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 108765, 14879 {FILM}]

1959 – *Journal* [Minister Marijnen opens exhibition on farming, Bouwcentrum], 1959-06-12, 0'52", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 109232, 15170 {FILM}]

1959 – *Journal* [visit by Belgian King Boudewijn], 1959-07-09, 2'19", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 109687, 15976 {FILM}]

1959 – *Journal* [crow's nest Euromast], 1959-07-17, 1'17", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 224529, 16137 {FILM}]

1959 – *Journal* [reveiling sculpture by Verbon of Karel Doorman], 1959-07-31, 0'53", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 224547, 16469 {FILM}]

1959 – *Journal* [oil pipe line from Pernis to Ruhrgebiet], 1959-08-05, 1'32", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 110168, 16745 {FILM}]

1959 – *Journal* [Jeugdland in Energiehal], 1959-08-07, 1'35", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 224542, 16767 {FILM}]

1959 – *Journal* [test trip SS Rotterdam, Queen & Prince], 1959-08-21, 1'05"; 16mm/b-w/CM&SM [B&G: 110339/260197/260156, 17443 {FILM}]

1959 – *Journal* [princess Beatrix by HAL's SS Rotterdam to USA], 1959-09-03, 1'51", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 110596, 17614 {FILM}]

²⁰⁴⁴ For the first collaborators of the NTS-JOURNAAL, see: Scheepmaker, 1981: 28.

1959 – *Journal* [maidentrip SS Rotterdam, port of Southampton], 1959-09-11, 0'56", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 224574, 17665 {FILM}, V106080 {VHS}]
 1959 – *Journal* [opening railway post office], 1959-09-22, 1'38", 16mm/b-w/co [B&G: 110804, 17945 {FILM}]
 1959 – *Journal* [12th Femina, Ahoy'], 1959-09-25, 1'28", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 224581, 17973 {film}, V98613 {VHS}]
 1959 – *Journal* [railway post office, functioning], 1959-09-25, 1'55", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 224580, 17972 {FILM}]
 1959 – *Journal* [Queen Juliana visits Dijkzigt Hospital, Schouwburg, St. Laurens Church], 1959-10-30, 3'31", 16mm/b-w/co [B&G: 224618, 18908 {FILM} 2438M {bliknr.} V107513 {VHS}]
 1959 – *Journal* [1st KLM airplane at Zestienhoven], 1959-11-06, 2'19"; 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 224636, 18972 {FILM} 2446M {bliknr.} V106081 {VHS}]

Out, Rob (see: James, Henry)

Pathé Cinema

1940 – *Puin en wederopbouw*, 9,5mm/3min/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-3631]

Peeters, M.P. (Rien)

1951 – *Europoort*, 7", 8mm/cl/mute, Peeters Eurofilm Rotterdam, for: Rotterdamse Waterklerken Vereniging [GAR: BB-0730]

Pelt, J.A.

1943 – *De Rotterdamse Diergaarde* [ref. NFDB/NFM]

1943 – *De Rotterdamse Zeilvereniging* [ref. NFDB/NFM]

P.H.

1958 – *Reza Shah The Great, de stapelloop van de eerste tanker voor Perzië* (1958-07-14), 11', 16mm/b-w/sound (Dutch), for: Verolme US Witsel [MM, inv. nr.: AV56]

Philips

1955 – *Philips Super M* [NFM: ID 52680]

1955 – *Philips Radio* [NFM: ID 52668]

1955 – *Philips Koffiemolen* [NFM: ID 52628]

1955 – *Philips Electronische tienkamp, E55* [NFM: ID 52593]

1955 – *Philips in Nederland*, Polygram Films [NFM: ID 52612]

Philipsen, H.

1945 – *Rotterdam na het Bombardement en na de Bevrijding*, 9'3", 16mm/b-w/mute, amateur (blow-up from 8mm original), 1940-05-00; 1945-05-00; 1945-04-30; 1945-05-06 [B&G: RVD 02-1207, cf. De Jong, 2005]

Polak, N.J.

1955 – *Wederopbouw*, double 8mm/b-w/mute, amateur [GAR: BB-1205]

Polygoon – Hollands Nieuws / Tobis Hollandsch Nieuws (January 1941- April 1944) / Neerlands Nieuws (s1945)

NB 1: During the German occupation of the Netherlands the Polygoon and Profilti newsreels became Tobis Hollands Nieuws, which stood under German supervision. The newsreels were made interchangeably per week, by Polygoon and Profilti²⁰⁴⁵. The actual producer, however, is not always clear (see also: Profilti). Between May 1944 and May 1945 no newsreels were made anymore by Polygoon and Profilti²⁰⁴⁶.

NB 2: This is a selection from more than 500 news reports that deal with Rotterdam in the period between 1940 and 1960 in the Polygoon collection at B&G.

NB 3: Mentioned after the year of production is the week number (when the report was shown); in most cases the dates of recording are mentioned at the end (y-m-d). The dates of recording and screening do not always correspond to each other.

NB 4: Since Polygoon also used material from commissioned films for news reports, certain reports might be archived in the collection of 'Polygoon Opdrachtfilm', which is indicated at the end. Sometimes the reports are not stored separately, but weeknumbers might be mentioned with 'opdrachtfilms'.

NB 5: Commentator Philip Bloemendaal is indicated as PhB

1940-12 – *De Maastunnelwerken*, 1'11", 35mm/b-w/-, 1940-03-15 [B&G: 0082]

1940-15 – *Beursgebouw Nadert Haar Voltöoïng*, 56", 35mm/b-w/-, 1940-04-09 [B&G: 40102]

1940 – *Bombardement*, 2'49", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 47186] = 1947-16²⁰⁴⁷

1940-23 – *Herdensplechtigheid voor hen die bij de verdediging van Rotterdam vielen*, 2'15", 35mm/b-w/co, 1940-06-05 [B&G: 40154]

1940-31 – *Bouw van Noodwinkels en -Woningen*, 50", 35mm/b-w/-, 1940-07-22 [B&G: 40209; VP158]

1940-33 – *Opbrengst Ten Bate van Rotterdam* [Roermond], 1'06", 35mm/b-w/-, 1940-08-11 [B&G: id 5133; VP 158]

1940-41 – *Noodwinkels in Gebruik Genomen*, 46", 35mm/b-w/-, 1940-10-05 [B&G: 40293; VP159]

1940-42 – *Uitreiking van speelgoed aan geëvacueerde Rotterdamse kinderen* [1940-10-16], 1', 35mm/z-w/- [B&G: neg. 40299; VHS VP160]

1940-46 – *Bouw van De Maastunnel Vordert*, 1'02", 35mm/b-w/-, 1940-10-07 [B&G: 40344]

1940-46 – *Eerste Centrale Gaarkeuken*, 1'03", 35mm/b-w/-, 1940-11-11 [B&G: 40341; VP160]

1940-50 – *Diergaarde Blijdorp Gereed*, 43", 35mm/b-w/-, 1940-12-09 [B&G: 40363; VP161]

1941-01 – *Op Zoek Naar Oudheidkundige Schatten*, 1'13", 35mm/b-w/co, 1940-12-31 [B&G: 41001; VP162]

1941-05 – *Een Belangrijke Fase in De Tunnelbouw*, 44", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 41019]

1941-11 – *De Opbouw van Rotterdam*, 1'04" (35m), 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 41041]

1941-21 – *De laatste zomer- en strandmode* [show by German fashion houses in Riviërahazal zoo], 57" (29m), 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. 41088; VP165].

1941-29 – *Rotterdam, Drie Engelse Bommenwerpers neergeschoten* [1941-07-01], 1'13", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. 41168; VP166]

1941-42 – *Rotterdam, Gevolgen van Het Engelse Bombardement; Begrafenis van De Slachtoffers*, 1'32", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 41275] = same as Profilti 1941 (01)

1941-42 – *Rotterdam, Tentoonstelling van de Reichsarbeitsdienst*, 56", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 41275] Tobis Hollands Nieuws

1941-45 – *Tentoonstelling van De Maquette "Nieuw Rotterdam"*, 47", 35mm/b-w/co, 1941-10-22 [B&G: 43060]

²⁰⁴⁵ De Haan, 1995: 163-171.

²⁰⁴⁶ Ibid, 173.

²⁰⁴⁷ NB the box number (doos nr.) 1947-16 and the classification in the B&G file as bedrijfsfilm indicate that this material is part of a film project made after WWII – probably remainders. The material is recycled material of other films.

- 1942-14 – *Aanvoer van Spaanse Sinaasappelen*, 1'03", 35mm/b-w/co, 1942-03-01 [B&G: neg. 42078/1, Digibeta: TDP172, VHS VP172]
 1942-17 – *Een Snuifmolen bij Rotterdam* [mills 'Ster', 'Lelie', 'Kralingen'], 1'03", 35mm/b-w/co, 1942-04-13 [B&G: neg. 42092, VP172]
 1942-18 – *Opleiding voor metaalbewerker in de vliegtuigindustrie* [preparation for work in Germany, 1942-04-01], 51", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. nr. 42096; VP172]
 1942-20 – *Een bemiddelingsbureau voor Arbeid in Duitsland* [office at Coolsingel, 1942-05-01], 1'24", 35mm/b-w/co, Polygoon [B&G: neg. 42119; VP173]
 1942-32 – *Groenteteelt in de steden*, 1'04" (30m), 35mm/b-w/com, 1942-07-01 [B&G: neg. 42175, VP174]
 1943-15 – *Bombardement*, 3'25", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 43060]
 1943-16 – *Hulpaktie voor de slachtoffers van het bombardement* [charity *Nederlandsche Volksdienst*, 1943-04-13], 1'17", 35mm/b-w/co, 1943-04-13 [B&G: neg. nr. 43065]
 1943-31 – *Oogstfeest van de productieslag*, 58" (27m), 35mm/b-w/co, 1943-07-27 [B&G: neg. nr. 43118 VP181]
 1943-47 – *Jonge Dieren in Blijdorp*, 52", 35mm/b-w/co, Polygoon [B&G: neg. 43200; VP183]
 1945-39 – *H.M. de Koningin bezoekt westelijke hoofdsteden*, 4'12", 35mm/b-w/co, 1945-08-01 e.a. [B&G: neg 45024; VP191]
 1945-40 – *Aankomst van Canadese Paarden*, 1'02" (29m), 35mm/b-w/co, 1945-09-26 [B&G: 45026]
 1945-42 – *Aankomst van Iers Slachtvee voor Nederland*, 53", 35mm/b-w/co, 1945-10-10 [B&G: neg. 45042; VP192]
 1945-48 – *Plechtige Begrafenis van 14 ondergrondse strijders*, 1945-11-21], 39", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 45111; VP193]
 1945-49 – *Belgische Journalisten Bezoeken De Rotterdamse Havens*, 1'16", 35mm/b-w/co, 1945-11-25 [B&G: 45121]
 1946-03 – *Sinaasappelen op de Bon*, 49", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: 46017]
 1946-06 – *Tramdag*, 2'20", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: POL OPDR. 46271, VP1168 {VHS}]
 1946-12 – *De 0.23 weer in ons land*, 32', 35mm/b-w/-, rec. 1946-03-13 [B&G: 46076 {neg.}, TDP196 {digi}]
 1946-15 – *Aankomst van De Nieuw-Amsterdam*, 44", 35mm/b-w/co, 1946-04-10 [B&G: 46101]
 1946-23 – *Weer Bananen in Nederland*, 45", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 46140]
 1946-36 – *Herstelwerkzaamheden in De Rotterdamse Havens*, 1'05", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 46231]
 1946-46 – *Havenbedrijf in Rotterdam Herstelt Zich*, 56", 35mm/b-w/-, 1946-11-08 [B&G: 46297]
 1947-11 – *Een Nederlands Lunapark Gaat Naar Egypte*, 55", 35mm/b-w/co, 1947-03-10 [B&G: 47055]
 1947-18 – *Een Nieuwe Bus Remise*, 1'09", 35mm/b-w/co, 1947-04-19 [B&G: 47107]
 1947-23 – *Rotterdam Straks, Opbouw dag in De Maasstad*, 1'35", 35mm/b-w/co, 1947-05-18 [B&G: 47137]
 1947-26 – *Nederlandse Emigranten Naar Canada*, 1'06", 35mm/b-w/co, 1947-06-20 [B&G: 47160]
 1948-12 – *Emigranten Naar Canada*, 2'17", 35mm/b-w/co, 1948-03-11 [B&G: 48068]
 1948-18 – *De Noordam Brengt De Eerste Marshall Goederen*, 1'54", 35mm/b-w/co, 1948-04-26 [B&G: 48100]
 1948-22 – *Opbouw dag*, 1'16", 35mm/b-w/co, 1948-05-13 [B&G: 48122]
 1948-28 – *Een Nieuw Dok Voor De Rotterdamse Droogdok Maatschappij*, 51", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 48162]
 1948-31 – *Nieuwe Klokken voor het Stadhuis* (1948-07-24), 1', 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 48181 {neg.}, TDP221 {digi}]
 1948-43 – *Herstel van Rotterdam Haven*, 60", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 48237]
 1948-51 – *Emigratie Naar Australië en Nieuw Zeeland*, 1'32", 35mm/b-w/co, 1948-12-15 [B&G: 48282]
 1949-01 – *Het Bouwcentrum*, 2'03", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 49003; VP225]
 1949-20 – *Koninklijk Bezoek* [Queen Juliana, Prince Bernhard, Opbouw dag, Bouwcentrum, P.J. Oud, Van Traa, Sparta e.a.], 3'09", 35mm/b-w/opt. (co) [B&G: 49120 {neg.}; GAR: BB-0257, Z104]
 1949-23 – *Bouw van Finse Scholen*, 2'03", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 49138]
 1949-25 – *Aanleg van Pijpleidingen in De Maas*, 1'14", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 49146]
 1949-37 – *Minister Van den Brink Opent Nieuwe Chemische Fabrieken*, 46", 35mm/b-w/co, 1949-09-02 [B&G: 49234]
 1949-46 – *Rotterdam Drinkt 75 Jaar Water Uit De Maas*, 1'26", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 49317]
 1949-46 – *Het 10.000ste Schip in De Rotterdamse Haven Aangekomen*, 57", 35mm/b-w/co, 1949-11-11 [B&G: 49313]
 1950-11 – *De Duikboot 'Dolfijn' Naar Het Poolgebied* [rec.: 1950-03-13, Waalhaven], 1'29", 35mm/b-w/ [B&G: id 8143, 50058 {neg.}, TDP238 {digi}, VP238 {VHS}]
 1950-15 – *Grootste Dok van Het Continent Weer in Gebruik Gesteld*, 55", 35mm/b-w/co, 1950-03-20 [B&G: 50088]
 1950-17 – *Rotterdamse Haven Geheel Hersteld*, 1'05", 35mm/b-w/co, 1950-04-19 [B&G: 50096]
 1950-26 – *Tentoonstelling Rotterdam Ahoy*, 1'23", 35mm/b-w/co, 1950-06-16 [B&G: 50150]
 1950-29 – *Brits Vlootbezoek*, 1'03", 35mm/b-w/co, rec.: 1950-07-13 [B&G: 8244, 50177 {neg.nr.}] VP241 {VHS}]
 1950-37 – *Jaarlijks Internationaal Concours-Hippique*, 1'50", 35mm/b-w/co, 1950-09-10 [B&G: 50236]
 1951-04 – *Vertrek Van De Onderzeeboot "Tijgerhaai" Met Aan Boord Professor Vening Meinesz* [rec.: 1951-01-26], 1'56", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: id 8454, 51024 {neg.}, TDP247 {digi}, VP247 {VHS}]
 1951-13 – *Aankomst tweede contingent Ambonezen in Rotterdam*, 1'50" [1951-03-20], co PhB [B&G: TDP248 {see: www.geheugenvannederland.nl}]
 1951-23 – *De Technishow 1951* [engineering fair, Ahoy', rec.: 1951-06-04], 1'15", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 51138 {neg.}, TDP250 {digi}, VP250 {VHS}]
 1951-37 – *Internationaal Concours Hippique; Engeland Wint De Landenwedstrijd; Demonstratie Spaanse Rijsschool Uit Wenen*, 1'24", 35mm/b-w/co, 1951-09-08 [B&G: 51235]
 1952-05 – *Afscheid Burgemeester Oud*, 1'42", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: POL OPDR. 52148]
 1952-06 – *Installatie Burgemeester van Walsum*, 1'39", 35mm/b-w/co, [B&G: POL OPDR. 52127]
 1952-08 – *De Maastunnel Bestaat Tien Jaar*, 2'59", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 52047]
 1952-21 – *Restauratie van De St. Laurenskerk Begonnen, Steenlegging Door H.M. De Koningin* 35mm/b-w/co, 1952-05-19 [B&G: 52119]
 1952-33 – *Tentoonstelling van Ontwerpen voor een Nationaal Koopvaardij Monument*, 1'13", 35mm/b-w/co, 1952-08-00 [B&G: 52191]
 1952-37 – *Acht Boerenfamilies Emigreren Naar Brazilië*, 1'13", 35mm/b-w/co, [B&G: 52221]
 1953-04 – *Foto's Uit De Film 'Rotterdamse Mijmeringen'* (53-04), 3'22", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: id1627, 53189 = neg., VP1214 {VHS}]
 1953-11 – *De Opening van Het Groot Handelsgebouw. Bezoek van H.M. De Koningin Aan De Toonzalen van Dehnert & Jansen N.V.*, 1'57", 35mm/b-w/- [B&G: POL OPDR. 53147]
 1953-17 – *Amerikaanse Onderzeeboot voor de koninklijke marine*, 0'55", 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: id 13681; 53078 {neg.}; TDP269 {DIGI}]
 1953-21 – *Onthulling van Zadkine's Monument*, 1'10", 35mm/b-w/co PhB, 1953-05-15 [B&G: 53097]
 1953-21 – *Officiële Ingebruikstelling van De Helicopterdienst Brussel-Rotterdam*, 1'02", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 53098]
 1953-23 – *Officiële Ingebruikneming van Het Groothandelsgebouw*, 1'35", 35mm/b-w/co PhB, 1953-06-03 [B&G: 53109]
 1953-32 – *Opening Hefschroefvliegtuig Verbinding Brussel-Rotterdam*, 1'13", 35mm/b-w/co, 1953-08-00 [B&G: 53166]

- 1953-51 – *De Maasstad Twee Weken 'Lichthaven', 2'13"*, 35mm/b-w/co PhB, [B&G: 53267]
- 1954-12 – *Plaatsing van Iste overspanning voor de Botlekbrug over de Maas, 1'15"*, 35mm/b-w/co, 1953-03-00 [B&G: 14958]
 1954-25 – *Vlootshou van de Koninklijke Marine, 1'09"*, 35mm/b-w/co, 1954-06-12 [B&G: 15022, 541117 {neg.}] VP279 {VHS}]
 1954-25 – *De Restauratie van De St. Laurens, 1'26"*, 35mm/b-w/co PhB, cam.: Joop Burcksen, 1954-06-04 [B&G: 54119; VP279]
- 1955-07 – *De Opbouw van De E55, 1'06"*, 35mm/b-w/co PhB, cam.: Joop Burcksen, 1955-01-30 [B&G: 55032]
 1955-21 – *HM Koningin Juliana Opent E55, 2'23"*, 35mm/b-w/co PhB, cam.: Joop Burcksen, 1955-05-18 [B&G: 55116]
 1955-27 – *E55 Manifestatie van Nederlands Energie, 2'48"*, 35mm/b-w/co PhB, cam.: Joop Burcksen, 1955-06-25 [B&G: 55153; VP287]
 1955-47 – *Rotterdamse Sint Laurenkerk Vlagt, 1'37"*, 35mm/b-w/co PhB, 1955-11-11 [B&G: 55251]
- 1956-02 – *De Stadsverwarming van Rotterdam, 1'42"*, 35mm/b-w/co PhB, 1956-12-19 [B&G: 56004]
 1956-04 – *Bouw Bijenkorf* [see: *Rotterdam heeft 't (1957)*, 1'44", 35mm/b-w/co PhB, cam.: Joop Burcksen [B&G: POL OPDR. 56174, VP1226]
 1956-15 – *Enige Activiteiten van Het Bouwcentrum te Rotterdam, 1'42"*, 35mm/b-w/co PhB, 1956-02-11 [B&G: 56075; VP294]
 1956-40 – *Maasstad Heeft Weer Een Eigen Luchthaven, 1'49"*, 35mm/b-w/co PhB, 1956-08-09; 1956-09-17 [B&G: 56206]
 1956-45 – *'Grootscheeps' bezoek van Amerikaanse marine aan Rotterdam* [rec.: 1956-10-29], 2'36", 35mm/b-w/com PhB [B&G: docid 16178; 56238 {neg.}; TDP299 {DIGI-BETA}; VP299 {VHS}]
 1956-50 – *Moderne Radar-Keten Langs Nieuwe Waterweg, 2'51"*, 35mm/b-w/co PhB, 1956-11-29/30, cam.: Joop Burcksen [B&G: 56261]
- 1957-13 – *Rotterdams Centrum Nadert Voltrooiing, 2'10"*, 35mm/b-w/co PhB, rec.: 1957-03-13; 1957-03-18; 1957-03-19 [B&G: 57072 {neg.}], TDP302 {digi}, VP302 {VHS}]
 1957-22 – *Rotterdam Viert Elfde Opbouw dag, 1'37"*, 35mm/b-w/co PhB, rec.: 1957-05-20; 1957-05-21 [B&G: 57112]
 1957-24 – *Hr. Ms Onderzeedienst 50 Jaar, 1'55"*, 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: docid 16557; 57120 {neg.}; TDP303 {DIGI}; VP303 {VHS}]
- 1958-04 – *Hm Koningin Juliana verwelkomt Evacue's uit Indonesië*, rec.: 1958-01-19, 2'21", 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: 58018 {neg.}], TDP 309 {digi}, VP309 {VHS}]
 1958-07 – *Amsterdam En Rotterdam Dichter Bij Elkaar* [construction of the road A4], rec.: 1958-02-11, 1'18", 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: 58034 {neg.}], TDP310 {digi}, VP310 {VHS}]
 1958-12 – *Amerikaanse Atoomonderzeeër bezoekt Rotterdam* [rec.: 1958-03-15], 0'56", 35mm/b-w/com PhB [B&G: docid 16752; 58059 {neg.}], TDP311 {DIGI-BETA}; VP311 {VHS}]
 1958-19 – *Nederland Eert De Doden Van De Tweede Wereldoorlog*, rec.: 1958-05-03, 1'38", 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: 58089 {neg.}], TDP312 {digi}, VP312 {VHS}]
 1958-30 – *Amerikaans Smaaldeel In Ons Land*, rec.: 1958-07-19, 1'17", 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: 58149 {neg.}], TDP313 {digi}, VP313 {VHS}]
 1958-38 – *Koningin Juliana Geeft Startsein Voor Aanleg Europoort*, rec.: 1958-09-13, 2'37", 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: 58194, TDP315 {digi}]
- 1959-07 – *Het Drijvende Hotel De Rotterdam* [ss Rotterdam], 2'07", 35mm/b-w/co PhB, 1959-01-13 [B&G: 59034]
 1959-07 – *Brazilië ontvangt tanker uit Nederland* [tanker for Brazilian Navy], 31m, 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: TDP2172, VP21723]
 1959-14 – *De Euromast Te Rotterdam Bereikt Hoogste Punt*, rec.: 1959-03-28/31, 1'51", 35mm/b-w/co PhB (54 Mtr.) [B&G: 17022, 59082 {Neg.}]
 1959-21 – *Het Staatsiebezoek van ZKH de Sjah van Perzië*, see: Polygoon, opdrachtfilm, 1959.
 1959-28 – *Het Staatsiebezoek Van Koning Boudewijn*, rec.: 1959-07-08/11, 15'45", 15', 35mm/b-w/co PhB B&G: 17120, 59166 {Neg.}]
 1959-29 – *Het 'Kraaiennest' Omhoog In De Euromast*, rec.: 1959-07-09, 1'34", 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: 17121, 59168 {neg.}], VP323 {VHS}]
 1959-34 – *Proefvaart Met De 'Rotterdam'*, rec.: 1959-08-20, 1'59", 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: 17149, 59202 {Neg.}]
 1959-44 – *Hm De Koningin Bezoekt Rotterdam*, rec.: 1959-10-24, 1'41", 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: 17198, 59264 {Neg.}]

Polygoon Opdrachtfilm (Commissioned Film); see also: Polygoon-Profilti

- NB 1: Since Polygoon also used material from commissioned films for newsreels, certain reports might be archived in the collection of Polygoon Opdrachtfilm, but are listed under 'Polygoon Hollands Nieuws' (see also NB 3). Sometimes the reports are not stored separately, but weeknumbers might be mentioned here with the 'opdrachtfilms'.
- NB 2: See also: Bollongino, Nol; Burcksen, Joop; Groot, Haren Noman, Theo van; A.J.W.; Nort, Karel; James, Henry & Out, Rob; Koolhaas, Anton; Simth, Walter a.o.

- 1941 – *Uit Rotterdam's Verleden, Belangrijke Opgravingen in Het Centrum van De Maasstad (41-60), 12'22"* (370m), 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: id 592, neg. nr. 41364, VP1150 {VHS}]
- 1941 – *Bouw Maastunnel (1937-1941), 60'00"*, 16mm/b-w/-, prod. Polygoon, for: N.V. Maastunnel, presented to Gemeentewerken [GAR: BB-1119] Deel 1 t/m 5 Z 653; Deel 6 t/m 10 Z 652; Deel 11 t/m 12 Z 651²⁰⁴⁸
- 1947 – *Verwoestingen* [Rotterdam, Arnhem, Groningen a.o., rec.: 1945] (47-21), 7'12", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. 47191]
- 1948 – *De Noordam Brengt De Eerste Marshall Goederen* (48-03), 15'16", 35mm/b-w/co, 1948-04-26 [B&G: 48096]
- 1951 – *Kool voor Amerika, 6'35"*, 35mm/b-w/co, for: Centraal Bureau van de Tuinbouwveilingen Nederland [B&G: id 1982, arch. nr. 02-0998; digibeta TDU76147]
- 1953 – *Wielerronde Rotterdam, 71m, 35mm/b-w* [ref. cinemacontext, NFDDB]
- 1957 – *Opening van de nieuwe werf van Verolme op het eiland Rozenburg, 5'*, 35mm/b-w/co [MM: AV46, AV68-2]
- 1958 – *Delivery of the first Persian tanker "Reza Shah the Great"* [1958-12-29], 6', 35mm/b-w/sound (English) [Maritiem Museum, inv. nr.: AV47]
- 1959 – *Het Staatsiebezoek van ZKH de Sjah van Perzië* [a.o. tanker at Verolme, Rozenburg; rec.: 1959-05-20 till 24], 11'59", 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: neg. 59126, digi TDP 321; VHS VP321]

Polygoon-Profilti (see also: Polygoon)

- 1945 – *Diverse opnamen kort na de bevrijding* [May 1945], 4'14", 35mm/b-w/-, Polygoon/Profilti [B&G 3]
- 1945 – *De verjaardag van Prins Bernhard* [incl. navy week in Rotterdam], 6'90", 35mm/b-w/-, Polygoon/Profilti [B&G 5; VP3015]
- 1946 – *Bouw van het Lutusca Theater te Rotterdam, 272m, 35mm/b-w/sound*, Polygoon Profilti [NFM: id107, VP3035 {VHS}]
- 1948 – *Thuis* [repatriation of Dutch soldiers from Indonesia], app. 66', 35mm/b-w/com: Philip Bloemendal [B&G: id 3772, 07-0803-03 {arch. nr.}], 456-03 {videonr}] www.geheugenvannederland.nl
- 1950 – *En toch...Rotterdam – een filmsuite van journaals en documentaires uit de jaren 1925-1950, 45'*, 35/b-w/co, prod.: Polygoon-Profilti, for: Bureau Voorlichting en Publiciteit [GAR: BB-0681 version 1950]²⁰⁴⁹

²⁰⁴⁸ On 1955-10-29 the film was applied to the censor again by Gemeentewerken Rotterdam. Several 'versions' were made between 1937-1955 (e.g. 17', GAR: BB2208, Z316), including newsreels by Polygoon/Profilti, while E. Jeanmaire, working for Gemeentewerken, realized a separate series of twelve shorts.

²⁰⁴⁹ A shorter, revised version was made in 1965. The original material is preserved by B&G.

Footage was made since 1940, presumably commissioned by the *Algemeen Gemachtigde voor den Wederopbouw* (i.e. J.A. Ringers), i.c.w. the *Dienst Wederopbouw Rotterdam* (Diwero). Several rushes have been preserved by B&G as part of the Polygoon and RVD collections. Some recordings have been used for newsreels. The production history remains a subject for further investigation.

material (35mm/b-w/mute) related to this production includes (a.o.):

1940 – *Verwoesting Rotterdam / Puinruimen in Rotterdam*, 6'43" [B&G: RVD 02-0491]
1940 – *Verwoesting Rotterdam*, 5'09" [B&G: RVD 02-0833]
1940 – *Verwoesting Rotterdam* [June], 7'22", 7'21" [B&G: RVD 02-0403; 02-0398]
1940 – *Puinruimen in Rotterdam* [July], 5'56" [B&G: RVD 02-037]
1940 – *Wederopbouw Rotterdam* [Aug./Sept.] 10'49", 10'06", 11'16" [B&G: RVD 02-0829; 02-0837, 02-0844]
1941 – *Bouw van Noodwoningen in IJsselmonde*, 8'53", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G: RVD 02-0831]
1941 – *Bouw Noodwoningen in Overschie / Wederopbouw Overschie*, 11'01" + 4'24", 1940/1941 [B&G: RVD 02-0846 + 02-0832]
1941 – *Wederopbouw Rotterdam*, 7'38" [B&G: RVD 02-0836] see also: Profilti, 1941 – (41-16)
1944 – *Verwoesting Rotterdam*, 8'48" [B&G: RVD 02-0525]
1947 – *Verwoesting en Wederopbouw van Rotterdam*, 5'49" [B&G: RVD 02-0368]
1949 – *De Wederopbouw van Rotterdam*, 29'08" [B&G: PR0748 A-D]

1951 – *Ja, Zo Was 't, 60 Jaar Rerum Novarum, 20 jaar Quadragesimo Anno* [catholic event at Feyenoord stadium], May 1951, 12'46", 35mm/b-w/co, prod.: Polygoon-Profilti, for: Katholieke Arbeiders Beweging (Cultuurdienst der KAB) [B&G: id 324, neg. nr. PR0949 A]

1952 – *Bouwend Nederland*, 10'41", 35mm/b-w/co, for: Ministerie van Wederopbouw en Volkshuisvesting and RVD [B&G: id 3636, VHS V100557]

1952 – *De Les van Londen*, 8'12", 35mm/b-w/com, dir./scen.: Kees Stip, cam.: Cees Kerkhof, editing: Piet van Eekert, composer: Rudolf Karssemeyer, comm.: F. Thors, commissioner: Bescherming Bevolking [B&G: 3762]

Povel, Wim

1958 – *De Repatriëring. Een eind en een begin* [from Indonesia to the Netherlands], 10'15", 16mm/b-w/sound, prod.: Karl Noack, [B&G: 07-2907 {Arch. nr.}, TDU68594 {DIGI-BETA}; V92870 {VHS}]

Profilti (for: Tobis Hollands Nieuws)

NB: During the German occupation of the Netherlands (May 1940 – May 1945), the Polygoon and Profilti newsreels became 'Tobis Hollands Nieuws', under German supervision. Some Profilti newsreels might have been attributed to Polygoon (see: Polygoon – Hollands Nieuws). In some cases it might have been a matter of close interaction. Since the collaboration between Profilti (The Hague) and Polygoon (Haarlem) continued after the war, various Profilti productions have become part of the Polygoon collection at B&G.

1941-14 – *Rotterdam, De Maastunnel Vordert*, 1'15", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: POL 41056]

1941-16 – *Rotterdam, De Eerste Paal Geheid Voor Een Woningcomplex*, 1'44", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. nr. POL 41064]

1941-21 – *Jonge Dieren in Rivierahal Blijdorp*, 43", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 1816; V100485].

1941-42 – *Tentoonstelling van de Reichsarbeitsdienst in Rotterdam*, 54", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 1806; V100485].

1941-01 – *Gevolgen van het Engelse Bombardement op Rotterdam*, 2'01", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: RVD 02-0901-01] = same as Polygoon 1941 (42)

1944-03 – *Rotterdamse Tramconductrices*, 1'16", 35mm/b-w/co, Polygoon/Profilti [B&G: neg. 44012; VP184]

1944-11 – *Aan boord van het Opleidingsschip 'Nederlanden'*, 1'08", 35mm/b-w/co, Polygoon/Profilti [B&G: neg. 44023; VP185]

1945-11 – *En Nu Rotterdam voor de Rotterdammers*, 3'16", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: RVD 02-1053]

Rest, P.C.J.

1952 – *Opbouw Sint-Laurenskerk*, 9', b-w/mute [GAR: BB1585]

Rijken, A.

1945 – *Eindelijk vrij* [liberation], 20', 8mm/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-0085, Z706]

Ruygrok, Heleen – see: A.J.W. Groot

Ruyter, Arie de

1959 – *Ruimte, Rumor, Randstad* [congestion] (VARA, broadcasting: 1959-02-25), 16'44', 16mm/b-w/SM, VARA [B&G: 44744, 12483 {FILM}], V24863 {VHS}]

Schaper, Jan – see also: Wim van der Velde

1954 – *ROKA-film*, Skan Film

1957 – *Samenwerken*, scr. Schaper, dir. Albert Brosens?, comm. NV De Bataafsche Petroleum Mij.

1957 – *Unilever Kinderland*

1958 – *Nutriciafilm*

1958 – *Opbouwfilm NV Hoogenboom*

Scherb, Igor

1957 – *Rotterdam* [city portrait] 12'49", 16mm/b-w/CO, NCRV (1957-04-10) [B&G: 44194, 29449 {FILM}]

Schutte, Herman

1951 – *Aankomst Ambonezen* [Rotterdam, Kamp Schattenberg, busbedrijf Schutte] [Historisch Centrum Overijssel]

Slijepcevic, Vladan

1955 – *Hamburg-Hag-Rotterdam*, YU, 5', b-w/mono (Serbo-Croatian), prod.: Udruzenje Filmskih Umetnika Srbije (UFUS) [ref. www.imdb.com]

Smith, Walter (= Antonie Wouter Smit, 1894-1961)

1954 – *That most living city*, 20', b-w, Polygoon-Profilti, Bureau Voorlichting Gem. Rotterdam [B&G: PR1080; GAR]

1954 – *Land Below the Sea*, 40', 35mm/cl/sound, dir.: Walter Smith, script: Jan Schaper, for Caltex [B&G]

Soek, Jan W.

1950-1960 – *50er jaren* [reconstr. Nwe Binnenweg, Hoek v.Holland, Maassluis, wagenveer, Pernis], 12', 8mm/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-4575] Z 1170

Steggerda, Ben

1959 – *Opdat Het Woord Weer Klinkt*, 14'24", 16mm/b-w/sm, NTS-tv: 1959-10-22 [B&G: TV 18863]

Tirion, Jan

1940 – *Puinstad*, 4'21", 16mm/b-w/mute, amateur, 1940-05-14; 1940-06-00 [B&G: RVD 02-1039]

Tobis Hollandsch Nieuws (see: Polygoon Hollands Nieuws, Profilti)

Triofilm

1948 – *Bouw Voort*, for: Algemene Bouwarbeidersbond [ref. Hogenkamp, 2003: 302]

UFA (Universum Film Ag)

1940 – *Angriff Auf Rotterdam / Bombardement Rotterdam / Aanval op Rotterdam*, 6'09" + 11'45", 35mm/b-w/co D, 1940-05-10; 1940-05-13; 1940-05-14 [B&G: RVD 02-0733-01 + 02-0733-02] NB Different versions of this film have been made, under different titles, e.g. *Duitse Inval in Nederland*, 11'15", 35mm/b-w/co GB [B&G: RVD 02-0254; images are taken from 02-0733-01 + 02-0733-02]

US Army Film Service

1945 – *World War II* [unedited stock, various places in the Netherlands and abroad; Rotterdam = 3'02", time code 16:11-19:13 – Oostplein, Nieuwe Binnenweg, St. Laurenskerk], 57'36", 35mm/cl & b-w/mute, cam.: Childs, Garrel, Murphy, Scheuerman, prod.: US Army Film Service, National Archives, USA [B&G: id 4065, VHS: V95105]

Walk, Ms.

1945 – *Hongerwinter 1944-1945*, GAR [cf: De Jong, 2005]

Velde, Wim van der

1956 – *Tros* [fiction], 25', 35mm/b-w/sound, script: Jan Schaper, cam.: Eduard v/d Enden, prod.: Forumfilm (Piet van Moock) [GAR: BB-1195]

Verolme United Shipyards

1956 – *Bouw van de werf op Rozenburg* [Verolme, version of the original film], 6', 16mm/cl [Maritiem Museum, inv. nr.: AV86]

1956 – *Slaan van de eerste paal voor de nieuwe werf op het eiland Rozenburg, van Verolme*, 1', 16mm/cl [Maritiem Museum, inv. nr.: AV68-1]

1957 – *Opening van Rozenburg en de tewaterlating van de "Reza Shah the Great"*, 8', 16mm/cl/sound [Maritiem Museum, inv. nr.: AV128]

1958 – *Tewaterlating van de "Reza Shah the Great, the birth of an Iranian giant* [1958-07-15], 7' (=version), 16mm/b-w/sound [Maritiem Museum, inv. nr.: AV55]

1958 – *Tahama, een bruggentocht* [tanker from Verolme Heusden to Verolme IJsselmonde, April 1958], 7', 16mm/b-w [MM AV41]

Waard, Simon de – see: Knoop, Klaas van der

Wassenaar, Herman

1959 – *Heet van de Naald*, 25', for: Het Vrije Volk [GAR: BB-2546]

Wilton-Fijenoord

195x – *Kanonnen*, 18', sound (English) [MM: AV455]

195x – *S.A.K.T.d. 120* [instruction film on the canon Automat 12] [MM: AV479]

1952 and following years (annually): *Wilton-Fijenoord Journaal* [Gem. Archief Schiedam]

Wit, Ted de

1958 – *Steady as she goes*, 26'30", 35mm/cl/opt, prod.: Carillon, for: Leen Smit & Co's Int. Sleepdienst [GAR: BB-0842, Z 1024]

Zuylen, Van

1945 – *Straatfeesten mei 1945* [GAR, cf. De Jong, 2005]

FILMOGRAPHY ROTTERDAM 1960s & 1970s – SELECTION

Anonymous

- 1961 – *Bouw van het Corsotheater* [1959-04-15 – 1961-02-23] 10', 35mm/b-w/opt. [GAR: BB-0770] Z 1021²⁰⁵⁰
 1960 – *The Netherlands past and present* [promotion, different cities; Rotterdam: Groothandelsgebouw; Lijnbaan, Zadkine a.o.], 9'28", 35mm/cl/magn [GAR: BB-0840] DVD Z 1024
 1963 – *Locaal Journaal* [Princess Beatrix inaugurates Dijkzigt; market Binnenrotte, metro works, restauration Laurenskerk, Jeugdland with Surinamese children a.o.] 16', 16mm/b-w/mute [BB-3789]
 1969 – *Filevorming* [Europort, Van Brieneoordbrug, Kleinpolderplein, Hofplein, Maastunnel], 4', 16mm/b-w/mute, for: Regiopolitie Rotterdam Rijnmond [GAR: BB-3924]
 1970 – *Vorkheftruckparade* [C'70], 7', 16mm/cl/mute [GAR: BB-1076] DVD Z 1073, Z 631, Z 480
 1970 – *Rotterdam II* [C'70 a.o.], 30', double8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-3928] Z 543
 1973 – *Bouw van Europort* [1971-1973] [Europort towers], 20', super8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-3988] DVD Z 1016
 1977 – *Demonstratieve stakingsoptocht FNV* [1977-02-16], 17', 8mm/cl/mute [GAR: BB-4014] DVD Z 1015

Aarden, Ton & Odufré, Joes

- 1969 – *Openbaar Kunstbezit; Kunst En Techniek Deel I* [Van Brieneoordbrug, ir. Allaart, fragm. Ivens' *The Bridge*], NTS: 1969-04-06, 14'03", 16mm/b-w/magn., eds.: T.H. Velzen, K. Vollemans, cam.: J. van Dijk [B&G: 152312, 3/3556 {FILM}], V65668 {VHS}}

Akkermans, Leo – see also: AVRO, 1960

- 1972 – *Eene Woning Voor Den Werkman* [Tuindorp Vreewijk, a.o.] (broadcast: 1972-04-10, 54'20", 16mm/cl/magn, prod.: KRO [B&G: 25953, G45905 {FILM}] V29795 {VHS}) [GAR: BB-0069] Z 202

Alsemgeest, Peter Simon Gerardus²⁰⁵¹

- 1963 – *Leven in de Bouwerij*, 16'30", 35mm/b-w, com., Polygoon Profilti [B&G id: 48; Digi-Beta: TDU69469; online: www.geheugenvannederland.nl]
 1965 – *Metro* [constr. / sinking tunnel elements] 22', 35mm, scen.: Paul Rondel, cam.: Peter Alsemgeest, Lajos Kalános, prod.: Polygoon-Profilti, for: Gemeentewerken Rotterdam [GAR]²⁰⁵²
 1966 – *Rotterdam Metropolis* [constr. Coolsingel], 22', 35mm/b-w/opt, scen.: Paul Rondel, prod.: Cinecentrum, for: Gemeentewerken Rotterdam [GAR]
 1968 – *Metro* {aka: *Metro Finale*} [construction from CS to Zuidplein, contains parts of *Metro*, 1965, and *Rotterdam Metropolis*, 1967], 30', 16mm/b-w/, Dutch and English versions, for: Gemeentewerken Rotterdam [GAR]²⁰⁵³
 1975 – *Samenspel*, 20', 35mm/cl/magn, Profilti, for: RET [GAR: BB0799; NFM: ID 58873] Z 118 / Z 204
 1976 – *Bouwen tussen de Mensen* [metro], 19', 35mm/cl/magn [versions in Dutch, German, English] Profilti, for: Gemeentewerken Rotterdam [GAR: BB-0862] Z 768
 1977 – *Metro Hoogvliet*, prod.: Cinecentrum, for: Gemeentewerken Rotterdam (Polygoon, see also Polygoon Neerlands Nieuws, 1974: *Opening van het metrotraject naar Hoogvliet*
 1979 – *Afscheid directeur Gemeentewerken Plantema*, 26', 16mm/cl/sound, prod.: Peter Alsemgeest, for: Gerrit Plantema [BB-2072] Z 338

Ammon, Renate von

- 1964 – *Zum Tor Europas*, 25', co-dir: Luy Briechle, Rudolf Pollak, for: Bayerische Rundfunk [GAR: BB-0741] Z 127

Amstel, C.W.

- 1970 – *C'70* [1970-09-12], 5', 8mm/cl/mute [GAR: BB-3378] Z 196

Anstadt, Milo

- 1961 – *Een Mens Leeft Niet Bij Brood Alleen* [culture policy; street interviews in A'dam/R'dam], 1961-04-30, 22'32", 16mm /b-w/sound, prod.: VARA [B&G: 46861, 34323 {FILM}], V52861 {VHS}]
 1968 – *De Bezetting; Afl. 20: De Hongerwinter* [WWII], 1968-02-13, prod.: Ben Klokman, for: NTS, ed.: Lou de Jong, 59'57", 16mm /b-w/magn. [B&G: 157397, G42013 {FILM}], V2702 {VHS}]
 1970 – *Rotterdam C'70*, 11', 16mm/cl/neg. + 16mm/cl/magn perfo tape [GAR: BB-3670] Z 1073
 1971 – *Uit Puin en As: Rotterdam nu* [reconstruction of Rotterdam] (broadcasting: 1971-01-18, 39'56", 16mm/cl/sound, prod.: VARA [B&G: 22868, G78578 {FILM}])
 1971 – *De Sociale Woningbouw Eist Een Omwenteling* [Bouwcentrum Rotterdam a.o.] (Broadcasting: 1971-12-21, 44'35", 16mm/cl/sound, prod.: VARA [B&G: 25155, G44937 {FILM}])

AVRO – general (television)

- 1960 – *Flits* [reconstruction/'Opbouw Rotterdam', also: Floriade] (broadcasting: 1960-05-14, dir.: Leo Akkermans, 8'20", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 45847, 25849 {FILM}] 3622 {bliknr.})
 1967 – *Vjoew* [4. Brandersbuurt Schiedam, expl. by Hans de Ridder, 3'34", Jan Schaper {cam}, Christine van Roon {sound}], AVRO, 1967-05-26 [B&G: 56058, V24897 {VHS}] GAR: Open Studio, kaart 90/481
 1967 – *Literaire Ontmoetingen; Alfred Kossmann*, 1967-10-18, dir. Rense Royaards, Con Nicolai [ed.], cam.: Joop Willemsen, pres.: Adriaan v/d Veen, 45'54", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 176785, V57796 {VHS}]
 1967 – *Regiovizier* [4: shopping centres, a.o. Lijnbaan, Koperwiek (= Capelle a/d IJssel)], 1967-11-11, 10'40", Fred Hagenaar {dir.}, Jan Schaper {cam} [B&G: 56914, G27629 {film}], V24903 {vhs}] ref. Open Studio, 90/533
 1968 – *Techniek, Je Vriend Of Je Vijand* [containerization, a.o.], 1968-01-20, 28'10", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 57486, M28924 {FILM}]

²⁰⁵⁰ The second part includes Fox Movietone footage.

²⁰⁵¹ At the time of writing this book, the film collection of Gemeentewerken, including various films by Alsemgeest, was transferred to the Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, and not yet ready for consultation, so that this list is not complete, and subject to further investigation (i.e. the different editions of the film project ROTTERDAM METROPOLIS).

²⁰⁵² Mentioned in the article 'Metro in Film', p24 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 3/3, 1965. It is said that every year a film will be made on a different chapter of the construction, with the construction under the Coolsingel as the next one, which will be brought together in an 'omnibus film' (neither the article nor NFDB mentions Alsemgeest); cf. the film *Metro Finale* mentioned in the NBF Bulletin, nr. 5, 1965, p44.

²⁰⁵³ It is most likely that extracts have been shown as Polygoon newsreels: 1960-1968 *Bouw Metro*, see the different entries in chronological order under Polygoon, including: *Bouw van de metro begonnen* (1960-47); *Eerste paal voor aanleg metro* (1960-47); *Rotterdam bouwt aan zijn metro* (1961); *Engelse studenten bezichtigen de metro* [1962-04]; *Rotterdamse metro vordert* [1963-12]; *Bouw metro* [1965-02-01]; *Rotterdamse metro vordert, Proefrit op het traject ten zuiden van de Maas* [1967-02-10]; 1968 – *Metro officieel in gebruik* [1968-02-09].

- 1968 – *Voor Miljarden Weg* [a.o. Beneluxtunnel, Van Brieneoordbrug, road plan Rotterdam, minister J. Bakker], 1968-04-01, interv.: C. Meijer, 46'43", 16mm/ - /sound [B&G: 57986, G29503 {FILM}], V24954 {VHS}]
- 1970 – *Vandaag of Morgen, Afl. 7: Wonen* (AVRO, 1970-05-08) [housing in the Netherlands, special attention to innovative projects], 48'35" [B&G: 42887, G39697 {FILM}]
- 1970 – *Rotterdam Sinds Mensenheugenis* [stories about the city before WWII], broadcasting: 1970-05-10, 39'53", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 2127, G74577 {FILM}]
- 1970 – *Sportpanorama* [new Ahoy'], AVRO, 1970-06-19, 1'42", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 21368, G39580 {FILM}]
- 1970 – *Doebiedoe* [a.o. initiator Popfestival Kralingen 26/27/28 of June], 1970-05-22, 20'01", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 21180, M38674 {FILM}]
- 1971 – *Sportpanorama* [cycling, Ahoy'] (AVRO, 1971-01-23) 23'41", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 22894, M41135 {film}]
- 1971 – *Voor de Vuist Weg* [interview with Cornelis Verolme], broadcasting: 1971-02-12, 1'03", 16mm/b-w & cl/sound, pres.: Willem Duys [B&G: id 85598; digi TD54984; VHS V6928]
- 1972 – *Dag Nederland, Kinderen In Vakantietijd*, 1972-07-22, 14'15", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 26598, M46479 {film}]
- 1975 – *Weet Je Wel 2, De Rotterdamse Haven* [Havenvakschool], 1975-12-06, 14'40", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 34815, M54692 {FILM}], V42229 {VHS}]

- AVRO – Televisier** (television; Marcel de Groot, Wibo van de Linde, Jaap van Meekren, Vic Sniekers, Fons van Westerloo e.a.)
- 1964 – *Televisier* [item 2: bombardment Rotterdam, item 4: air pollution Nieuwe Waterweg, a.o.], 1964-04-17, eds.: L. van Bunge, P. Fock, S.M. Pruys, 8'30 + 8'18", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 13860, 69387 {FILM}]
- 1964 – *Televisier* [interviews with minister Ynso Scholten and Cornelis Verolme on REM], dir.: Gerard van der Meyden, pres.: Ferry Hoogendijk, 26'43", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: id 175124; V65024]
- 1964 – *Televisier: Zeesleepvaart*, 1964-06-18, 9'02", 16mm/b-w/sound, dir./cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: id 13865; VHS V24765]
- 1965 – *Televisier* [sound archive], 1965-12-24, rep.: Sniekers, 2'54", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 52991, 90653 {film}]
- 1966 – *Televisier* [underground parking], 1966-05-13, rep.: Sniekers, 5'56" [B&G: 53806, 95735 {film}]
- 1967 – *Televisier* [metro], 1967-03-25, 7'32", 16mm/b-w/sound, rep.: Marcel de Groot [B&G: 55647, 106940 {film}]
- 1968 – *Televisier* [harbour, air pollution], 1968-09-24, 14'03", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 59060, M31605 {FILM}]
- 1969 – *Televisier* [interviews with Cornelis Verolme, at Parliament], 1969-09-23, interv.: Marcel de Groot, 3'30", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: blik nr. M36916; VHS V42335]
- 1970 – *Televisier Nr. 24* [housing shortage, 'Oude Westen'], 1970-03-10, rep.: Marcel de Groot, 8'02", 16mm/ - /sound [B&G: 20671, M39700 {FILM}], TDU89904 {digi}, V114804 {VHS}]
- 1971 – *Televisier* [25 years Verolme engineering, Hilton], 1971-09-07, 1'45", 16mm/ - /sound [B&G: blik nr. G43876]
- 1971 – *Televisier III 14* [prostitution, Katendrecht], 1971-12-27, rep.: Fons van Westerloo, 10'35", 16mm/ - /sound [B&G: 25190, M45457 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Televisier III/26* [transportation of chemicals, 'poison'], 1972-03-20, rep.: Ria Bremer, 8'43", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 25822, G45971 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Televisier* [gastarbeiders], 1972-03-27, rep.: De Groot, 9'00", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 25869, G46688 {film}]
- 1972 – *Televisier III/37* [Zestienhoven], 1972-06-19, 8'12", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: M46904 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Televisier III/45* [Turk riots, Afrikaanderbuurt] (broadcasting: 1972-08-14, rep.: Jaap van Meekren, 10'39", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 26688, G47547 {FILM}], V92880 {VHS}]
- 1972 – *Televisier III 48* [call girls], 1972-09-11, rep.: Fons van Westerloo 14'05", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 26795, G47676 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Televisier IV/9* [gastarbeiders], 1972-11-20, rep.: Marcel de Groot, 5'50", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 27264, G48176 {FILM}], V93255 {VHS}]
- 1974 – *Televisier V/36* [Surinamese in Rotterdam], 1974-07-01, rep.: Jan Scholtens, 9'07", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G, M51007 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Televisier-Supplement III/1: Vrouwengevangenis Rotterdam* [women detention], 1972-10-04, rep.: Marcel de Groot, 27'53", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 26940, M47912 {FILM}], V42259 {VHS}]
- 1974 – *Televisier VI-3* [prostitution at Katendrecht], 1974-10-18, rep.: Marcel de Groot, 8'02", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 31755, M51855 {FILM}]
- 1976 – *Televisier VII/48* [Surinamese in Rotterdam] (broadcasting: 1976-08-13, interv. by: B. Hammelburg, 8'08", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 36554, M56726 {FILM}]
- 1978 – *Televisier X/10* [civil servants protest at Central Station, a.o.], 1978-12-07, 15'19", 16mm /cl/sound [B&G: 41857, G61990 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Televisier X/47* [harbour strike, interv. J. Bax a.o.], 1979-08-30, 18'00", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 3057, G63474 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Televisier X/48* [harbour strike], 1979-09-06, 8'36", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 3092, G64083 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Televisier* [interv. mayor v/d Louw about harbour strike], 1979-09-13, 7'57", cl [B&G: 16535]

BBC (television)

- 1961 – *Land of Dew* [Europoort, Lijnbaan, metro constr.], 25', 16mm/b-w/magn, by: BBC [GAR: BB-0714] Z 503

Berg, Rudolf van den

- 1977 – *De Vrede van Rotterdam* [F. Swartouw & L. Pieters on SVZ & ECT], 53'29", camera: Jules van de Steenhoven & Jochgem van Dijk, 16mm/col./magn., prod.: Ireen van Ditschuyzen for: VPRO 06/11/1977 [B&G: 39470, G58713 {FILM}]; GAR: BB-0807: Z876]

Besson, Bernard

- 1973 – *Binnenhavenbrug*, 17'59", video [NIMK]

Besten, Aad den

- 1965 – *Vreewijk*, i.c.w. Rien Kroon, com.: Ms. Huiskens, 14', >>VHS/cl/sound [GAR: BB-3783] Z 506
- 1966 – *Vreewijk in 't goud* [compilation], com.: Ms. Huiskens, 8'25", 16mm/b-w/perfo tape [GAR: BB-0777]

Blokker, Jan

- 1966 – *Joris Ivens over Rotterdam-Europoort*, VPRO [NFM: ID 33356]

Bolhuis, Philip

- 1969 – *Vracht In Blik; Groei Containervervoer* [containerization; New York, Rotterdam], 50'41", 16mm/b-w/perfo, pres.: Frans van Houtert, broadcasting: AVRO 1969-03-03 [B&G: 60169, G34505 {FILM}], V42410 {VHS}]

Boek, Wim de

- 1970s-1980s – *Straatbeelden in Rotterdam* [Oude Binnenweg, St.-Jacobsplaats, Coolsingel, Zalm- Leuvehaven], 32', = compilation 10 x 8mm films/cl/mute [GAR: BB-2747] Z 704
- 1970s – *Rodenrijseleaan en omgeving*, 3' + 4' + 9' + 3', super8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-1749-1751 / 1757] Z 557
- 1978 – *Reparaties aan de Hef*, 10', super8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-1758] Z 613
- 1978 – *Oude Binnenweg*, 4' + 3', super8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-1753 / 1755] Z 557

Booth, Harry

- 1973 – *Going Dutch*, 97', 35mm/cl/sound, script: Alan Hackney, cam.: Eduard van der Enden, montage: Robert Kruger, prod.: Wim Lindner, cast: Wim Sonneveld, Joop Doderer, Adèle Bloemendaal e.a.

Bos, Mathieu van den

1970 – *Kaap de Goede Hoop* [Katendrecht], 26' [GAR: BB-3161]

Bosch, P.v.d.

1975 – *Sluiking van de kerk* [St. Franciscuskerk], 17', super8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-3688] Z 558

Bosdriesz, Jan

1977 – *58 Miljoen Nederlanders en de Zeevaart* [incl. harbour Rotterdam] broadcasting: 1977-03-13, script: G. Soeteman, prod.: K. v. Langeraad, for: NOS, 42'50", cl [B&G: 109955, V18385 {VHS}]

Bostan, Ion

1977 – *De Rijn Zoekt Zijn Weg Naar De Zee; De Rijndelta* (rec.: 1977-06-01, producer: Studiul Alexandra Sahia, Bucuresti, 20'02", cam.: Ion Bostan, mont.: Jeana Craiciun, music: Theodor Mitache, 35mm/cl/CO, for: Rumenian Gov. [B&G (RVD): 4296, 07-3000 {Archiefnr} V95175 {VHS}]

Braggaar, Dirk Jan

1971 – *Thomsen* [pipes to USSR for construction of gas line], 16', 16mm/cl/opt, for: Thomsen/Internatio-Müller NV [GAR: BB-3625] Z 771

Brusse, Ytzen

1962 – *Poort van Europa*, 19', 16mm/b-w/magn, cam: Eduard van den Enden, script: Jan Blokker, prod. Piet van Moock, Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij, for: Gemeentelijk Havenbedrijf [GAR: BB-0717] Z 137

Burcksen, Joop

1961 – *Slechts een paar regels*, co-dir.: Ruud Herblot, Mundofilm, for: Veilig Verkeer Nederland

1965 – *Verkeer op televisie* [tv-spots VVN], 10' [total]/16mm/b-w/opt, co-dir.: Ruud Herblot, Mundofilm, for: Veilig Verkeer Nederland [GAR: BB-3922]

1970 – *Gateway for Giants/Mond voor Mammoets*, 27'37", 16mm/col./opt., co-dir. Ruud Herblot, Mundofilm Hilversum, for: Min. Verkeer & Waterstaat, ENCI, CH3 [GAR: BB-0771] Z 629

1971 – *Erop of eronder* [constructing Kleinpolderplein], i.c.w. Ruud Herblot, 15', 16mm/cl/magn, Mundofilm, for: Van Hattum en Blankevoort Beverwijk [GAR: BB-0780] Z 642

1972 – *Poort van Europa*, 23', 16mm/cl/opt, co-dir.: Ruud Herblot, Mundofilm, for: Min. Verkeer & Waterstaat, ENCI, CH3 [GAR: BB-0775] Z 772

1972 – *Europoort*, app. 10', 35mm/cl/sound, co-dir.: Ruud Herblot, Mundofilm, for: Min. Verkeer & Waterstaat, ENCI, CH3 [NFM: id. 19399]

1975 – *Botsende Meninge*n [traffic], co-dir.: Ruud Herblot, Mundofilm, for: Veilig Verkeer Nederland [NFM: ID 8723]

1978 – *Dunlin-A* [construction of oil-rig, Europoort], co-dir.: Ruud Herblot, Mundofilm, for: Shell (??)

Citroen, Hans

1979 – *There's no business like no business* [collection of shorts], co-dir: Bob van Persie, 24', super8/cl/magn, for: De Lantaren [GAR: BB-3800] Z 355

Corver, Jos

1970 – *Kralingen Popfestival 1970 en uitstapje Drunen* [Drugteam Release], 16', -cl/mute [GAR: BB-0964] Z 638

Cowan, Dody M.

1964 – *Rotterdam: a city resurrected*, 13', 16mm/b-w/opt, narration: Jerry Cowan, cam.: Jochgem van Dijk, Ducan productions [GAR: BB-0737] Z 127

Crama, Nico

1968 – *Het Oponthoud / The Delay* [fiction], 27', 35mm/b-w, script: Hubert Lampo, prod.: Nico Crama [ref. NFDB, ref. *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 4/2, 1966 – p21].

Deelder, Jules (see also: Visser, Bob – 1977; Schippers, Wim T. – 1979; Ockersen, Thijs – 1979)

1972 – *Jules Deelder*, 12', video [NIMK Vie.3463]

Dijk, Gerrit van

1976 – *Our House* [opening Shell building Rotterdam], 3'27", 16mm/cl/sound, for: Shell [NFM: ID 125624]

Dijk, Jan Wybe van (see: ECT, 1970)

Dinter, Bertus van

1970 – *Rijnvaart III* [1960-1970], 10', 16mm/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-0708] Z 144 / Z 287

ECT – see: Europe Container Terminus

Eijk, Kees van – see: Jansen, Werner

Elenga, Henk – see: LBC Videogroep, 1975

Enden, Eduard van (cinematographer, see a.o. Brusse, ECT, Huguenot v/d Linden, Ivens, Kruidhof, Orthel, Sluizer, Tholen)

1960s – *Bouw Metro*, prod.: Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij

EO (television)

1975 – *Holland Ze Zeggen: Rijnmond* [expl. Ivo Blom], 1975-12-10, 19'54", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 34845 G55384 {FILM}]

1977 – *Nader Bekeken* [prostitution Katendrecht, Poortgebouw, protest], 1977-10-04, 16'29", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 39211, G58728 {FILM}]

1977 – *Nader Bekeken* [prostitution Katendrecht, Poortgebouw], 1977-10-18, 16'21", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 39307, G58727 {FILM}]

1979 – *Tijdsein* [harbour strike, prof. A. van Doorn], 1979-09-11, 6'00", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 17731, K64451 {FILM}]

Erends, Ronny

1962 – *Werkers aan de Havenkant*, 14'13", 16mm/b-w/sound, prod.: Ted de Witt/Carillon, for: SVZ [GAR: BB-0787]

Essen, Max van

1977 – *Demonstratieve stakingsoptocht* [1977-02-16], 7'22", 16mm/cl/mute, prod. GAR [GAR: BB-0893] Z 203

Europe Container Terminus (ECT)

- 1970 – *Move*, 19', 35mm/col./sound, dir.: Jan Wybe van Dijk, prod.: Reprofilms, for: ECT [NFM: 44148; GAR: BB-3158] Z 769
- 1970s – *Point of Impact*, 20', 35mm/kl/co, cam.: Eduard van der Enden, prod.: Albert Tromp / All Art Production Amsterdam [GAR, BB-3617, Z 769/770]
- 1970s – *The third way* [container transport to Switzerland], 8', 16mm/cl/opt, cam.: Eduard van der Enden, prod.: Albert Tromp / All Art Production Amsterdam, for: ECT [GAR: BB-3620] Z 767
- 1970s – *Focus on Daf-trucks* [container transport a.o.], 3', 16mm/cl/opt, for: DAF Trucks [GAR: BB-3621] Z 767
- 1972? – *Container Umschlag mit Technik von Siemens*, 17', 16mm/cl/opt, prod.: Siemens-Film [GAR: BB-3622] Z 771
- 1974? – *Strong links*, 22', 16mm/cl/opt, cam.: E. van der Enden, prod.: Albert Tromp / All Art Production Amsterdam, for: ECT [GAR: BB-3619] Z 767
- 1978 – *Portrait of a young man* [slides on film], 14', 16mm/cl/magn, for: ECT [GAR: BB-3616] Z 769

European Broadcasting Union, see: NTS Journaal, Visnews

Fenenga, Ruurd

- 1978 – *P.D. De Recherche-Film, Recherche Politie III P.D.*, 23'12"/16mm/cl/co, Ruurd Fenenga Production B.V., [B&G:4301, 07-0523 RVD nr]

Fernhout, John

- 1967 – *Sky over Holland*, 70mm/cl/sound, script: Simon Koster, shown at the World Exhibition in Montreal

Fox Movietone News

- 1960 – *Fox Movietone News* [Floriade, a.o.] [NFM: ID 22176]
- 1961 – *Nieuwe pier voor de Holland Amerika Lijn in New York*, 1', 35mm/b-w/opt [GAR: BB-0839]
- 1961 – *Bouw van het Corsotheater*, 2', 35mm/b-w/opt [GAR: BB-0770] Z 1021²⁰⁵⁴

Fresnel, Michel

- 1973 – *Zadkine* {given title}, cam.: André Schoeller, prod.: ORTF (France) [ref. *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1, 1973 – p27].

Gasteren, Louis van (1922)

- 1961 – *Alle vogels hebben nesten*, 25', 16mm/b-w/opt, Spectrum Film, for: Dura Coignet N.V. [NFM, GAR: BB-1004] Z 493

Geesink, Joop (production)

- 1963 – *Koers Amerika met de Holland Amerika Lijn* [travel to NY by SS Rotterdam], 16mm/cl/magn, prod. Starfilms, for: HAL [GAR: BB-0837] Z 139
- 1965 – *Your safety our concern*, 8'3", 16mm/cl/opt, Starfilm, for: HAL [GAR: BB-0825] VHS Z 481
- 1965 – *Pier 40* [HAL, New York], 15', 16mm + 35mm/cl/opt., dir.: Bob Chrispijn, Starfilm, for: HAL [GAR: BB-0841] Z121

Gelder, Han van

- 1964 – *Wijd en Zijd* [Rhine shipping], 20', cl, for: NV Phs. van Ommeren

Gemeentearchief (production), see: Essen, Max van

Gemeentewerken Rotterdam, see: Vrijmoet, Henk

Gijzen, Wim

- 1971 – *Verwisseling van de namen van de steden Rotterdam en Den Haag*, 2', video/b-w [NIMK]

Gols, Albert

- 1973 – *Leven met Olie; Deel I De Wereld Loopt op Olie*, KRO: 1973-04-09, 48'33 and 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: G48058 {blik}]
- 1973 – *Leven met Olie; Deel II De Wereld driuvt van olie*, KRO: 1973-04-16, 49'25, 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: G48518 {blik}]

Griekspoor, Aad

- 1972 – *Zuidplein*, 13', 16mm/cl/magn., prod.: Aad Griekspoor, Aart Brouwer/Target Films Amsterdam [GAR: BB-078]

Groeneveld, Ary

- 1965 – *Havenfilm*, 9', 16mm/cl/mute [GAR: BB-0856] Z 639, Z 527
- 1975 – *Bevrijdingsdag* [1975-05-05], 7'43", 16mm/cl/mute [GAR: BB-0627] Z 201
- 1976 – *Reconstructie Coolsingel en Binnenstadsgedag*, 17', 16mm/b-w/mute, for: HIC [GAR: BB-0852] Z 1074

Guikink-Visser, Cornelia

- 1965 – *Brienoordbrug* [1962-1965, building/opening], 10', double8/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-3635] Z 552

Gyn, René van

- 1978 – *De Vormgevers; Het Dak Van De Stad* [Piet Blom] (broadcasting: 1978-12-17, cam.: Henk Gulikers, 54'50", 16mm /cl/sound, prod.: TROS [B&G: 102461, G62057 {FILM} V10424 {VHS}]

Haanstra, Bert

- 1966 – *De stem van het water*, 82' (2630m), 35mm/cl./sound, Bert Haanstra Films [NFM: ID 63644]

Haas, Max de

- 1967 – *Bestaansbronnen Van Het Nederlandse Volk*, music: F. Mijts, cam.: R. Klinkert, 46', 35mm/b-w/co, prod.: Visie Film [B&G (RVD): 3929-3932, 07-2556 {Archiefnr} V94280]

Hagedoren, Harry

- 1964 – *EEG-Documentaire* [gas production; a.o. Cokes Gas factory in Rotterdam] (broadcasting: 1964-11-11, 30'10", 35mm + 16mm/b-w/magn., prod.: NTS [B&G: 50651, 75530 {FILM}]

HAL, see: Holland Amerika Lijn

²⁰⁵⁴ This record concerns a film that made use of Fox Movietone footage = second part.

Harmsma, J.

1965 – *Rotterdam, My Home Port* [docu], 11', 16mm [collection NOVA: www.filmotheek.demon.nl/2007-08-17]

Heerkens, Noud

1979 – *Re-act-ion in A*, 6', 16mm/b-w/sound [NFM]

Heijningen, Jacques van

1973 – *Het Leven in het Oude Westen*, 20', video, i.c.w. Aktiegroep Het Oude Westen, prod.: Lantaren Video Workshop [missing]

1975 – *Grotekerklein Herleeft* [manifestation by Initiatief Groep, 1975-10-11], 15'/Umatic/b-w/sound, for: RKS/Initiatief Groep (IG) [GAR: BB-2646 & BB-2584 & BB-2658] Z 227, Z 229

1975 – *Er is wat aan de hand op Charlois*, 6', video/b-w/sound, for: RKS [GAR: BB-2582] Z 229

1977 – *Ba Anansi Woi! Woi! Woi!* [Surinamese theatre in L/V], 27', Umatic/b-w/sound, for: RKS [GAR: BB-4065]

1978 – *Bernisse journaal 1978* [recreation area Bernisse, Han Goan Lim], 28', video/cl/sound, cam.: JvH and Ger Feijen, com.: Raymond Campfens, for: RKS [GAR: BB-2888] Z 244

197x – *Rolstoelen*, fund raising film commissioned by Rotary Club Rotterdam [missing].

Hellinga, Gerben

1975 – *Liefde en Lange Vingers* [fiction], 55'10", 16mm/cl/sound, dir/scri.: Gerben Hellinga, cam.: Mat van Hensbergen, act. Maarten Spanjer, Cina Timisela, prod.: NOS (1975-12-17) [B&G: 15003, TD822 {DIGI-BETA}, V4148 {VHS}]

Herblot, Ruud – see: Burcksen, Joop

Heijden, Jef van der

1961 – *De laatste passagier* [youth feature on emigration], 73', 35mm/b-w, prod.: CEFA Film [NFM: ID 36940]

Hillo, Jan van

1963 – *Weg naar de wereld*, 30', 16mm/cl; by Jan van Hillo, Jan Schaper & Kálmán Gáll, for: Havenvakschool/Stichting Vakopleidingen Havenbedrijf (SVH) [GAR: BB-0731, Z 135, Z 506]

1970 – *Wij Stinken Erin* (1) [pollution, a.o. Botlek, Gulf, Barry Commoner e.a.], 52'18", 16mm/cl/magn., Jan van Hillo {dir.}, Jan Schaper {cam.}, Wim Gomes {cam.}, NCRV 1970-10-26 [B&G: 22239; GAR: BB-0765] Z 690

1975 – *Interview met Elisabeth van Dop-Hufkens* [WWII], 8'10", 16mm/cl/magn [B&G, GAR: BB-0810]

1978 – *De Tijd Stond Even Stil: Rotterdam – 14 mei 1940* (rec.:1978-04-11, broadcasting: 1978-04-24), 58'48", 16mm/b-w/sound, prod.: NCRV [B&G: 40750, M60095 {FILM}] [GAR: BB-2069] Z 228

1978 – *Interview met dr. W.B. van Staveren* [physician, tells about bombardment 1940-05-14], 10'39", 16mm/cl/magn [B&G, GAR: BB-0811]

Hock, Richard

1973 – *Anno 1973* [social housing in NL], Schmeink Filmproductie [NFM: ID 3554]

Hofman, Willy – see: Wagt, Gabri de

Holland Amerika Lijn (HAL) – see also: Geesink, Joop

19xx – *Holland America Liner tests 1/2/3/4* [M.I.T. Towing Tank], resp. 10'"/10'5", 16mm/b-w, [MM, AV8/9/10/11]

1963 – *Schepen van de Holland America Lijn*, 80', by: Polygoon, for: HAL [GAR: BB-3379] Z 157

1965 – *Rotterdam V*, 22", 16mm/cl/magn, for: HAL [GAR: BB-0886] Z 523

1970? – s.s. *Rotterdam* [a.o. New York], 3'57"/16mm/b-w & cl/mute, for: HAL [GAR: BB-0831] Z 514

1970? – *The best food afloat*, 13', 16mm/cl/magn, PCS Film Productions [GAR: BB-0863] Z 195

1970? – *Statendam* [ship interior/exterior], 6'6", 16mm/b-w/mute, for: HAL [GAR: BB-0832] Z 514

1975? – *Welcome Aboard / Welkom aan boord*, 24', 16mm/cl/opt, for: HAL [GAR: BB-0918] Z 135 / Z 506

1975? – *The Memorymaker* [Statendam to South-America], 27', 16mm/cl/opt Eng, for: HAL [GAR: BB-0917] Z 195

Hooghoudt, Ton E.H.

1975 – *Adieu Oude Gasthuis* [old and new St. Franciscusgasthuis], 32'36", 16mm/b-w/opt [GAR: BB-0812] Z 630

Huguenot van der Linden, Charles

1963 – *Bouwspelement / The Building Game*, 17', 35mm/col., Gezamenlijke Bouwbedrijven

1964 – *Oktobervaart*, 35mm/cl/sound, cam.: Eduard van der Enden, prod.: Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij, for: Shell [NFM: ID 48304]

1967 – *The Restless port*, 28'20", 16mm/cl/opt, cam. Jaap van Ry, prod.: Polygoon, for: Pakhuismeesteren [B&G, GAR: BB-0746] Z 527 – NB: a new version of the film was made in 1969 for 'Pakhoed'.

HV (television)

1973 – *Samenlevings-Opbouwweek* [Ommoord, Pendrecht, Dijkzigt, Katendrecht], 1973-09-30, pres.: Ilse Wessel, 22'16", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 29311, M49530 {FILM}]

Ieperen, Ab van

1978 – *Heb je Jetta wel 'ns gehad?*, script/dir.: Ab van Ieperen, cast.: Eric Beekes, Marjon Brandsma, Leontien Ceulemans, Elias van Zanden, prod.: Bob Visser.

IKOR/IKON – general (television)

1971 – *Linkerwang - Rechterwang Iv. Rotterdamse Havenstaking en Arbeidsethiek* (broadcasting: 1971-06-13, interv. by P. Hofstede, Suzanne Piët, 23'25", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 23912, M42358 {FILM}])

1974 – *De Kleine Aarde* [ecology, van brienenoordbrug on 'carless Sunday'] (BROADCASTING: 1974-01-04, 38'21", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 30031, G49640 {FILM} AR42114 {BCN} V42114 {VHS}])

1979 – *Een Van Mijn Beste Vrienden*, Afl. 4. Turken [Afrikaanderwijk] (broadcasting: 1979-05-09) 25'22", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 42524, M62905 {FILM} V93927 {VHS}])

IKOR/IKON – Kenmerk (television)

1963 – *Kenmerk* [women detention], 1963-04-15, 9'49", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 14353, 57340 {film}, V60305 {VHS}])

1967 – *Kenmerk* [catholic concilium, at 'De Doelen'], 1967-01-23, 6'47", 16mm/b-w/magn., Jan Schaper {cam.}, [B&G: 55319, 104862 {FILM}] ref. Open Studio, kaart 96

- 1971 – *Kenmerk* [plan demolition Koninginnekerk], 1971-10-20, 67", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 24701, M43654 {film}]
- 1973 – *Kenmerk – Kort; Het Oude Westen* [demolition old houses], 1973-04-04, 6'48", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 28289, M48006 {FILM}]
- 1974 – *Kenmerk* [labour in harbour], 1974-03-13, 14'41", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 30515, M50399 {FILM}]
- 1976 – *Kenmerk* [boycot Chilean fruit], 1976-04-14, 5'09", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 35805, M55521 {FILM}]
- 1977 – *Kenmerk* [protest Chilean fruit import], 1977-03-23, 4'25", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 38166, M57397 {FILM}]
- Ivens, Joris**
- 1966 – *Rotterdam Europort*, 20', 16mm/cl/opt, cam.: Etienne Becker, Eduard van der Enden, sound: Tom Tholen, cast: Willeke van Ammelrooy, Carel Kneulman, comm.: Gerrit Kouwenaar, prod.: Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij / Argos Films, for: Gemeentelijk Havenbedrijf [NFM: 58113; GAR: BB-0752] Z 153
- Jansen, Werner** – see also: Lievense, Freddy
- 1974 – *Runway 06-24* [renovation runway Zestienhoven], 30', cl, prod.: Capricornus, for: Koninklijke Wegenbouw Stevin [GAR: BB-1624]
- 1979 – *Kruispunt Rotterdam / Crossroad Rotterdam*, co-dir: Kees van Eijk, script: Bert Kroon, 17', 35mm/cl./opt., Multifilm (Tom Schoemaker) for: Stichting Havenbelangen, Gemeente Rotterdam / Havenbedrijf, Ministry of Foreign Affairs [GAR: BB-0845] Z 637
- 1979 – *Aan de orde is...* [1977-1979] [spatial planning in Zuid-Holland] 20', super8/cl/magn, for: Adviesbureau Stad en Landschap BV & Ver. Dorp, Stad en Land, prod.: Capricornus [GAR: BB-3986] DVD Z 1017
- Jongh, Chris de**
- 1977 – *Wonen en Spelen, Oude Westen*, 35', Umatic/cl/sound, prod.: SKVR [GAR: BB-4457]
- Kalános, Lajos**
- 1964 – *It's more than just a ship*, 16', 16mm/b-w/magn, Polygoon-Profilti, for: Verolme [B&G, GAR: BB-0745] Z 127, Z 486
- Kálman Gáll, Ferenc** (see: Jan van Hillo, 1962)
- Kamp, Manus van de**
- 1960 – *Het Huis Voor God En Ons; Afl. 1: Een eeuw Nederlandse kerkenbouw* [a.o. 'Dominicuskerk'], KRO: 1960-07-14, 10'06", 16mm/b-w/sound, ed.: C. Peters, com.: H. Teeuw, cam.: M. Bosboom, prod.: Nic Notten [B&G: 46022, V42091 {VHS}]
- 1960 – *Het Huis Voor God En Ons; Afl. 3: De ideale rooms-katholieke kerk* [a.o. St. Bavo Church, Pendrecht], 1960-09-08, ed.: J. Joosten, com.: H. Teeuw, 9'05", 16mm/b-w/magn., prod.: KRO [B&G: 46164, V42091 {VHS}]
- Keers, Ruud**
- 1960 – *Ritme* [city symphony: harbour, construction, architecture, street images], 8'42", music: Frans Mijts, 16mm/b-w/sound, for: NCRV broadcasting [B&G: 139357, M78144 {FILM}]
- Kendrick, Alex**
- 1963 – *Where We Stand*, production by CBS London, for CBS USA [ref. p22 in *Rotterdam, officieel tijdschrift van de gemeente Rotterdam*, vol 1/4, 1963]
- Kiers, Roelof**
- 1967 – *Cornelis Verolme, Scheepsbouwer*, 37'58", 16mm/b- w/B1, for: AVRO (1967-09-17) [B&G: 2077, G76306 {FILM}] V42083 {VHS}]
- Klapper, Walter**
- 1964 – *Rotterdam*, cam: Peter Alsemgeest, 25'15", 16mm/b-w/opt, for: ÖRF (Austria) [B&G: 47679, 50868 {FILM}], V71953 {VHS}] [GAR: BB-0736] Z 123, Z 142, Z 294
- Kleinen, Elvira**
- 1970 – *Nog Niet* [montage film on housing], 10', 16mm/b-w/sound (com., mont.: Elvira Kleinen, prod.: Polygoon-Profilti, for: Min. Volkshuisvesting & Ruimtelijke Ordening [B&G: 4520, TDU71873 digi, VHS V96089]
- 1974 – *De dorst van de Rijnmond*, cam.: Pim Heytman, sound: Henk van Aggele, 20'9", 16mm/cl/opt, Multifilm for: Drinkwaterleiding Rotterdam (DWL) (centenary) [GAR: BB-0796] Z 626
- Koedijk, Ko**
- 1973 – *Geen Paniek / No Panic* [feature film, Amsterdam; rec. 1972], script: Kees van Kooten, 83', 35mm/cl/sound
- Koekoek, Hans**
- 1971 – *Op Leven en Dood* [interviews Lijnbaan, a.o.], 15'20", 16mm/cl/sound, for: Bureau Voorlichting Levensverzekering (The Hague) [NFM: ID 49308; IISG: BG F1/664]
- Könings, Joep**
- 1974 – *Rotterdam en zijn achterland / Rotterdam and its hinterland / Rotterdam und sein Hinterland*, 24', 16mm/cl/opt, prod.: NIAM & SFW under the auspices of the Council of Europe [GAR: BB-0891] Z 625 = Dutch version [see also: BB-1003 for the German version]
- Korver, Pim** (see also: NOS Journaal, AVRO-televisier, 1964-06-18)
- 1968 – *Van Uur Nul Tot 24* [police: A'dam, R'dam, The Hague], cam.: P. Groeneveld, H. de Boer; comm.: T. v. Duinhoven, 26', 16mm/b-w/co [B&G: 4209 & 4210; 07-1684 {Archiefnr}], V95136 {VHS}]
- 1971 – *Skill against Peril*, for: L. Smit & Co.'s Internationale Sleepdienst My. [GAR]
- 1972 – *Euromast*, prod.: Pim Korver Filmproducties [ref. NFDB: 19364]
- 1974 – *The Smit Lloyd story*, 14', 16mm/cl/sound, for: Smit-Lloyd [GAR: BB-3801]
- 1976 – *Zeesleepvaart*, 25', cl, for: Smit
- 1978 – *Rotterdam maritiem* 78, 15', 16mm/cl/magn [GAR: BB-0882] Z 571
- 1979 – *Soms Wint de Zee* [towing operations by Smit Internationale and Wijsmuller], 48'36", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Pim Korver, prod.: Pim Korver, for: AVRO: 1979-01-08 [B&G: 108233; digi TD49934; VHS V13862]
- 1979 – *Giant Cargo*, 24', 16mm/magn. [ref. *Film en TV maker*, p47, nr. 188 June 1979]
- Kraat, Cor** (and Staal & De Jong)
- 1979 – *The Sinking of the Stolwijk* [art video on melting cheese] 8', video/cl/sound [GAR: BB-3026] Z 470

KRO – general (television)

- 1962 – *Kijk op Kunst* [Part I = architects V/d Broek & Bakema/housing] (broadcasting: 1962-11-01, dir.: Tom v. Huustee & Joost Tholens, 5'27", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 48669, 54127 {FILM}])
- 1964 – *Huis, Thuis, Wonen* [series on housing; exh. at *Bouwcentrum* on the occasion of the one-millionth dwelling in NL after WWII], 1964-02-08, 26'40", b-w/telerec., dir.: Guus Kristel, pres.: H. Eckardt, J. Riemers, prod.: KRO i.c.w. Inst. voor Gezondheidstechniek TNO, Kon. Ned. Mij. v. Tuinbouw & Plantkunde [B&G: 169584]
- 1965 – *De Nieuwe Stad, Leefbaar?* [25 yrs later; a.o. planner C.v.Traa, arch. Rein Fledderus; critic J.J. Vriend] (broadcasting: 1965-05-10, 24'58", 16mm/b-w/magn.[B&G: 51742, 84016 {FILM} V24901])
- 1965 – *Galerij* [constr. 'De Doelen'], 1965-10-25, 3'51", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 52624, 90324 {FILM}])
- 1966 – *Ridders Van De Grote Weg* [transportation, containers a.o.] (broadcasting: 1966-03-08, 47'33", 16mm/b-w/magn., dir.: Peter Pennarts, Manus van de Kamp [B&G: 53445, 103122 {FILM} 24249G I {bliknr.} V24773 {VHS}])
- 1966 – *Parochie In Een Grote Stad* [churches; aerial view new housing area near Capelle a/d IJssel; Alexanderpolder] (broadcasting: 1966-09-06, 31'36", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 54369, 99760 {FILM}])
- 1967 – *Neem Liever De ...* [tram, metro in Rotterdam-Zuid, a.o.], 1967-01-20, 29'36", 16mm/b-w/magn., 4565MII [B&G: 55301, 104016 {FILM}, V24635 {VHS}])
- 1968 – *Klokke Vier* [satire metro] (broadcasting: 1968-01-13, 4'24", 16mm/b-w/magn., Jan Schaper {cam.}, Christine van Roon {sound}, (KRO, 1968-01-13) [B&G: 57437, M28239 {FILM}]) ref. Open Studio kaart 105, nr. 429
- 1976 – *Wat Heet Oud* [service centre for elderly people], 1976-12-29) 28'16", 16mm/cl/magn., [B&G: 37539, M56760 {FILM}])

KRO – Brandpunt (television, editor in chief: Richard Schoonhoven 1962-1968; Willibrord Fréquin, Aad van den Heuvel, Ad Langebent, Joost Middelhoff, Fons Peters, Ed van Westerloo, e.a.²⁰⁵⁵)

- 1966 – *Brandpunt* [air pollution Gulf; alderman De Vos, new BP refinery Rozenburg] 1966-02-24, 6'54", 16mm/b-w/magn., Ad Langebent {reporter}, Jan Schaper {cam.} [B&G: 53363, 92282 {FILM}]) ref. PS
- 1967 – *Brandpunt* [rol II: 1. Brandersbuurt Schiedam, youth protesting, speech C. Egas], 1967-04-20, 11'56", 16mm/b-w/sound, Jan Schaper + Hans Visser {cam.} [B&G: 55828, 108373 {FILM}]) ref. Open Studio 65/456
- 1968 – *Brandpunt* [strike, Verolme], 1968-09-21, 6'39", 16mm/b-w/sound, rep.: Ed v. Westerloo, [B&G: blik G31339]
- 1969 – *Brandpunt* [strike tug-boats], 1969-01-03, interv.: Aad v/d Heuvel, 7'45", 16mm/-/sound [B&G: 59826, K32277 {FILM}])
- 1969 – *Brandpunt* [homeless, Salvation Army, a.o.], 1969-04-05, ed.: Ad Langebent, 10'56", 16mm/b-w/sound, D2 [B&G: 17361, K33543 {FILM} V59631 {VHS}])
- 1970 – *Brandpunt* [Popfestival Kralingen], 1970-06-30, 14'48", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 15469, G38989 {FILM}]) V42416 {VHS}])
- 1970 – *Brandpunt* [harbour strike, mayor Thomassen], 1970-09-08, 6'22", 16mm/-/sound [B&G: 21890, G39559 {film}])
- 1970 – *Brandpunt – Special* [situation in the harbour], 1970-10-27, dir.: Piet Franse, 13'16", 16mm/b-w/magn.[B&G: 22249, M40049 {FILM}])
- 1970 – *Brandpunt – Special* [general 1 hour strike, a.o. Rotterdam CS], 1970-12-15, 10'02", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 22611, K40611 {FILM}])
- 1971 – *Brandpunt* [inhabitants Oude Westen against *gastarbeiders*], 1971-09-10, 9'20", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 24419, M43176 {FILM}])
- 1972 – *Brandpunt* [Turk riots, Afrikaanderbuurt], 1972-08-11, interv.: Fons Peters, 4'37", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 61050, K46348 {FILM}], TDU68400 {DIGI }, V92880 {VHS}])
- 1972 – *Brandpunt* [limitation of 'gastarbeiders' per neighbourhood], 1972-09-30, pres.: Willibrord Fréquin, 6'10", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 26914, M46707 {FILM}], V93494 {VHS}])
- 1973 – *Brandpunt* [Film Festival, Huub Bals], 1973-02-17, 8'22", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 27908, M47809 {FILM}])
- 1974 – *Brandpunt* [homeless in Rotterdam], 1974-02-16, 7'45", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 30321, M50023 {FILM}])
- 1974 – *Brandpunt* [Surinamese occupy meeting place], 1974-09-28, interv.: Willibrord Fréquin, 8'23", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 31601, G51446 {FILM}])
- 1975 – *Brandpunt* [funeral taxi driver Hartman], 1975-04-16, interv.: Willibrord Fréquin, 11'03", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33215, M52462 {FILM}])
- 1975 – *Brandpunt* [murder on taxi driver Hartman], 1975-05-03, 7'01", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33325, G53048 {FILM}])
- 1979 – *Brandpunt* [Poortgebouw, prostitution], 1979-03-30, 9'31", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 42389, G62396 {FILM}], V58286 {VHS}])
- 1979 – *Brandpunt* [harbour strike], 1979-08-24, dir.: Joost Middelhoff, 11'22", cl [B&G: 15750]
- 1979 – *Brandpunt* [harbour strike], 1979-08-31, dir.: W. Fréquin, Ton Verliind, 10'01", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 3060, M63425 {FILM}], V58643 {VHS}])
- 1979 – *Brandpunt* [harbour strike], 1979-09-07, 14'14", 16mm/cl/sound, dir.: J. Middelhoff [B&G: 3094, M63462 {film}])
- 1979 – *Brandpunt* [harbour strike, family Sjef Lang], 1979-09-14, dir.: Joost Middelhoff, 16'42", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 3120, G63463 {FILM}])

Kroon, Rien – see: Besten, Aad den

Kroonenberg, A.C.

- 1975 – *Rotterdamse Brandweer*, 38', 16mm/cl/magn (com.: by F. Stellingwerf) [GAR: BB-0808] Z 526

Kruidhof, Eimert

- 1962 – *Rotterdam* [English family visits the city by occasion], 19', 16mm/cl/opt, script: Jan Blokker, cam.: Eduard van der Enden, prod. Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij [GAR: BB-0735] Z 147

Labro, Philippe

- 1976 – *L'Alpagueur / De Premiejager* (F), 110', 35mm/cl/sound, cast.: Jean-Paul Belmondo, prod. Alain Belmondo, for: Cerito Films

Lafaille, Claude

- 1960 – *La Parole est au fleuve* [river Rhine towards Rotterdam], co-dir: Marianne Oswald, 20', 16mm/b-w/opt, for: St. Havenbelangen [GAR: BB-1001]

Langeraad, Kees van

- 1960 – *Havenarbeid: Een Vak!* [port education] (NCRV broadcasting: 1960-06-24, 20h30, com.: Goos Kamphuis, 32'20", 16mm/b-w/magn., prod. NCRV [B&G: 173557, 3/120 {FILM} V104518 {VHS}])
- 1960 – *Het Besluit* [emigration to Canada; a.o. liberation WWII] (NCRV broadcasting: 1960-12-25 1964-08-18; 1976-08-31, 55'07", 16mm/b-w/magn., prod.: NCRV [B&G: 46438, 30657 {FILM} V34985 {VHS}])

LBC Videogroep (Lijnbaancentrum) / Rotterdamse Kunststichting (RKS), see also: Videocentrum

- 1971 – *Multi Use Spaces*, video [NIMK Vie.3474]
- 1971 – *Man Ray* [Sept.], 40', video/b-w, interv. Jan Donia
- 1971 – *Toneelgroep Sater op de Lijnbaan*, 18', dir./cam.: Wink v. Kempen, Umatic/b-w [GAR: BB-2073, Z 338]
- 1971 – *K. Schippers (Gerard Stigter), schrijver, dichter* ['Barbarbar-procédé'] 20', video/b-w
- 1971 – *Lindenhof, Schiedam* [orphanage], 30', video/b-w, interv.: Jan de Grouw
- 1972 – *Mr. Johan Huijts* [Jan.], 30' (original), 3'58", video/b-w, interv. Jan Donia [NIMK Vie.3487]

²⁰⁵⁵ [http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brandpunt_\(televisie\)](http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brandpunt_(televisie)) (2008-03-21)

1972 – *Open and Closed Structures*, 17'11", video [NIMK Vie.3481]
 1972 – *Lob tv*, video [NIMK Vie.3478]
 1972 – *Rekonstruktieplan Centraal Station/Weena*, 30', video/b-w, realization: studenten Academie van Bouwkunst
 1972 – *Portret nr. 1 Cafezanger* [café Timmer], 40', video/b-w, interv.: Jan Donia
 1972 – *Afrikaanderwijk* [reportage], 30', video/b-w, realization: Werkgroep Rob Maas
 1975 – *Kunst in Rotterdam*, Umatic/cl/sound, for: RKS [GAR: BB-3933] Z 528
 1975 – *Jim Nutt* [art exh. Lijnbaancentrum] 20', Umatic/cl/mute, for: RKS [GAR: BB-3938] Z 517
 1975 – *Bezetting van VHBO de Wentelwiek*, 15', video/b-w/sound [GAR: BB-3934] Z 518
 1975 – *Townpainting / De wijk krijgt een nieuw kleurtje* [murals], 12', video/cl/sound [GAR: BB-3936] Z 533
 1975 – *Gemeentelijk Energiebedrijf (GEB)*, 25', umatic/cl/sound, dir.: Henk Elenga, for: GEB [GAR: BB-3937] Z 533
 1975 – *Lee Friedlander* [Lijnbaancentrum RKS], 10', video/cl/sound, dir.: Henk Elenga, for: RKS [GAR: BB-3806]
 1977 – *Holland at its most broad-minded*, 29'30" [NIMK Vie.3460]
 1977 – *Interview met regisseurs* [Film festival, L/V], 18', Umatic/b-w/sound, for: RKS [GAR: BB-4061] Z 249
 1977 – *Akademie-bulletin*, 13', Umatic/cl/sound, for: RKS [GAR: BB-2889] Z 331
 1977 – *Groep Nieuw Rotterdams Peil* [art], 6', Umatic/b-w/mute, for: RKS [GAR: BB-2876] Z 310
 1977 – *Juryvrije tentoonstelling* [art at Lijnbaancentrum], 22', Umatic/cl/sound, prod.: RKS [GAR: BB-3932] Z 532
 1977 – *Spelen in Bloenhof*, 26', video, dir./cam.: Hein Reedijk, prod: RKS [GAR: BB-2599, Z232]
 1977 – *Woningstichting Onze Woning* [Sportdorp], 11', umatic/cl/sound, Hein Reedijk, prod.: RKS [GAR: BB-2887] Z 244
 1978 – *Volkswoningbouw 1920 – 1940* [Bergpolderflat, Spangen, Vreewijk, Witte Dorp], 32', Umatic/cl/sound, Hein Reedijk, prod: RKS [GAR: BB-2872] Z 248

Lievensse, Freddy

1966 – *Rotterdam toen, Rotterdam nu*, prod.: Studio Freddy Lievensse [ref. NFDB]
 1972 – *11/19/1971*, dir./script: Werner Jansen, cam.: Pim Korver, cam./mix/prod.: Freddy Lievensse, sound: Tom Poederbach, prod.: Studio Freddy Lievensse, for: Hoogheemraadschap van Rijnland [ref. NFDB]
 1972 – *Structofors* [for reinforcing and sealing asphalt] dir./script/animation: Werner Jansen, cam./prod./sound: Freddy Lievensse, sound: Wim van Holstein, comm.: Joop Daalmeijer, prod.: Studio Freddy Lievensse [ref. NFDB]
 19xx – *Ook wij gaan uit... en doen gewoon*, prod.: Studio Freddy Lievensse [ref. NFM]

Linden, Henk van der

1964 – *De avonturen van Pietje Bell* [youth feature], 85', 35mm/b-w/sound, script: Henk van der Linden, based on the story by Chris van Abkoude

Lopez Clemente, José

1974 – *Naranjas de España* [Sp, documentary on fruit cultivation, incl. shots in Rotterdam], cam.: Joaquín Hualde, Peter D. Kaufner, 17min, 35mm/cl/sound, prod.: No-Do

Lucas, J.A.

1970 – *GEB Hulpcentrale* [1970-1980], 20', double 8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-3993] DVD Z 1008

Luyken, Edward (see also: Peeters, M.P.)

1979 – *Inside Out* [railways, experimental], 10', 16mm/cl/sound [NFM: 129891]
 1979 – *De Hejbrug* [Koningsbrug, artistic impressions of the city] 16mm/cl/sound [NFM]

MacNeill, Ian

1963 – *Lewis Mumford on the City* [based on Mumford's book *The City in History*, 1961], 6 x 28', b-w, narrated by Mumford, script/prod.: Ian MacNeill, for: National Film Board of Canada, US release by Sterling Educational Films, 1964. Part 1. *The City: Heaven and Hell*; 2. *The City: Cars or People?*; 3. *The City and Its Region*; 4. *The Heart of the City*; 5. *The City as Man's Home*; 6. *The City and the Future* [www.nfb.ca]

Mariouw Smit, Rob (see also: NTS – Openbaar Kunstbezit, 1963[1], 1969)

1962 – *Ondergronds Personenvervoer* [metro, compared to London], NCRV: 1962-11-09, 29'45", 16mm/b-w/magn., prod.: NCRV [B&G: 48692, 51602] {FILM} V24875 {VHS}

Mastricht, T. van

1970 – *Popfestival Kralingen*, 20', 16mm/cl/sound, for: VARA [GAR: BB-1736] Z 785

Mediafront, see also: Staal, Adriaan & Verheijen, Frans Peter

1975 – *Schiedam 700 / Inspraak in Zuid en Oost-Schiedam*, 31min, b-w/sound, prod. Lantaren, for: Gemeente Schiedam [Gemeentearchief Schiedam, beeld en geluid, inv.nr. 27]
 1977 – *Te huur aangeboden* [staged docu about rent problems, action against lack of maintenance] 30', 16mm/b-w/opt + /perfo, music: Bots, prod. St. Mediafront [GAR: BB-0851] DVD (scan) Z 1075, Z 625

Meekren, Jaap van – see also: AVRO – Televizier

1975 – *Op Zoek Naar De Wereld Van Morgen; De Verstedelijking Van De Aarde*, (AVRO, 1975-06-02, dir: Jaap van Meekren, 41'54", 16mm/cl/magn., AVRO [B&G: 33578, G55256] {FILM} V55391 {VHS})

Middelhof, Joost

1979 – *Rotterdamse Haven Nu / Brandpunt* [harbour after the strike], 1979-11-27, 39'20", 16mm/cl/sound, dir.: Joost Middelhoff, cam.: Ad Braamhorst, prod.: KRO [B&G: 3516, G63930] {FILM}, V591 {VHS}

Moen, Leo – see also: Jan Schaper, 1966 *Renesse*, 1967 *Toekomst...*

1966 – *Ping An* [shipwreck of Ping An, Ter Heijde], 41'53", 16mm/b-w/aound, Leo Moen [dir.], Pim Korver [cam.], (NCRV, 1966-09-27) [B&G: 54466, 99980] {FILM}, V55836 {VHS} ref. Open Studio
 1968 – *Nieuwesluis Van De Kaart* [port of Rotterdam; demolition village Nieuwesluis], NCRV: 1968-09-30, 44'12", 16mm/b-w/sound, Leo Moen [reg.], Jan Schaper + Rob Collette + Bob Buitink [cam.], [B&G: 59103, G31082] {FILM}, V24893 {VHS} ref. Open Studio, kaart 69

Mollinger, Max

1975 – *Kun je hier nog leven?* [urban renewal Oude Westen], co-dir: Adriaan Monshouwer, 35', video/cl/sound, Academie v. Beeldende Kunsten [GAR: BB-2530] Z 286

Monshouwer, Adriaan – see: Mollinger, Max 1975

Moonen, Jan

1961 – *Key to World Traffic, Pakhuismeesteren*, 26'15", 16mm/b-w/opt., Polygoon-Profil, for: PHM [GAR: BB-0710]

Murai, Makato

1973 – *Preventing Water Pollution* {given title}, presenter: Kumiko Torikai [ref. *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1, 1973 – p26].

NCRV – general (television)

1960 – *Memo* [metro model, ir. Brouwer, ir. Plantema], 1960-11-14, interv. by: P.v.Campen, 7'43", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 46344, 30198 {FILM} V60830]
1962 – *Morgen Is Het Zondag* [AMVJ-centre, Pauluskerk, architect B. van Veen a.o.], 1962-11-03, Ruud Keers, 12'10", 16mm rev./ - /sound [B&G: 48673, 51596 {FILM}]
1965 – *Attentie* [taxi strike], 1965-04-01, 8'43", 16mm/b-w/magn., Jan Schaper {cam.}, [B&G: 51535, 81468 {FILM}] ref. Open Studio, kaart 43
1965 – *Attentie* [300 years *Korps Mariniers*], 1965-11-17, 10'21", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 52768, 89309 {FILM}, V42082 {VHS}]
1967 – *Onderweg* [ecumenic youth congress, at 'De Doelen'] (broadcasting: 1967-03-04, interview by N. van Gelder, 9'30", ", Jan Schaper {cam.}, Christine van Roon {sound}, [B&G: 55521, 106245 {FILM} V24791 {VHS}] ref. Open Studio, kaart 106, nr. 464
1968 – *Rotterdam Te Deum* [re-opening St. Laurenskerk], 1968-12-14, music: B. Schuurman, 20'19", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 172757, 3/3351 {FILM} V66104 {VHS}]
1969 – *Kerkbouw* [Verrijzeniskerk, Rotterdam-Alexander], 1969-09-29, 21'47", 16mm/ - /sound [B&G: 19483, M35908 {FILM}]
1970 – *Pauszefilm NCRV: Popfestival Rotterdam* [Kralingen], 1970-06-29, 6'19", Film: A1/cl/A1 [B&G: 21440, G38995 {FILM} V42325 {VHS}]
1970 – *Aktie; Omnoord* [new quarter], 1970-12-19, 35'42", 16mm/ - /magn. [B&G: 22644, G41278 {FILM}]
1971 – *Ander Nieuws* [Het Oude Westen], 1971-05-10, interv. by: N. van Gelder, 8'06", 16mm/ - /magn. [B&G: 23681, K41962 {FILM}]
1973 – *Alles Op Zijn Tijd* [Van Brienenoordbrug on 'Carfree Sunday', trains a.o., city images], 1973-12-31, Rol I 11'06", Rol II 29'49", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 30002, M49663 {FILM}]

NCRV – Hier en Nu (television)

1967 – *Hier en Nu* [container transport], 1967-10-10, interv.: Theo Leeuwenburgh, 19'57", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 56697, M27179 {FILM}, V42108 {VHS}]
1968 – *Hier en Nu* [docks of NDSM, Verolme, Wilton Fijenoord, ADM], 1968-07-04, 1'26", 16mm/b-w/sound, prod: NCRV [B&G: id 58546]
1968 – *Hier en Nu* [Czechs meeting, Ahoy], 1968-08-23, 10'10", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 58859, M30658 {FILM}]
1969 – *Hier en Nu* [Rijnmond, pollution], 1969-02-17, 18'20", 16mm/b-w/sound, Theo Leeuwenburgh {rep.} [B&G: 60102; M32889 {blik}]
1969 – *Hier en Nu* [explanation Verolme about losses and NDSM], 1969-09-11, 14'38", 16mm/b-w/sound, prod: NCRV [B&G: blik nr. M35814]
1969 – *Hier en Nu* [workers of Verolme], broadcasting 1969-09-25, 4'35", 16mm/b-w/sound, reporter: Theo Leeuwenburgh, prod: NCRV [B&G]
1970 – *Hier en Nu* [harbour strike], 1970-08-31, 7'49", 16mm/ - /sound [B&G: 21840, G39503 {FILM}]
1970 – *Hier en Nu* [harbour strike], 1970-09-04, 5'41", 16mm/ - /sound [B&G: 21864/21865, M39565 {FILM}]
1970 – *Hier en Nu* [harbour strike, sociologist prof. P.J.A. ter Hoeven], 1970-09-07, interv.: Theo Leeuwenburgh, 7'48", 16mm/ - /sound [B&G: 21887, K39566 {FILM}]
1970 – *Hier en Nu* [harbour strike], 1970-09-12, interv.: Theo Leeuwenburgh, 9'30", 16mm/ - /sound [B&G: 21924, M39628 {FILM}]
1970 – *Hier en Nu* [Verolme's 70th anniversary, Verolme and his wife], broadcasting 1970-09-04, 5'17", 16mm/b-w/sound, interv.: Niek Heizenberg, prod: NCRV [B&G: blik nr. M39565]
1971 – *Hier en Nu* [strike tug-boats], 1971-02-01, interv.: Niek Heizenberg, 19'00", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 22960, M41111 {FILM}]
1971 – *Hier en Nu* [Verolme's memoirs], 1971-02-13, 9'48", 16mm/b-w/sound, interv.: Niek Heizenberg, prod: NCRV [B&G: blik nr. M39565]
1971 – *Hier en Nu* [Turkish 'guestworkers' buy houses in 'Wijk 20'], 1971-06-14, 5'47", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 23929, M42355 {FILM}]
1972 – *Hier en Nu* [Koninginnekerk to be demolished], 1972-01-11, 7'07", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 25311, M44767 {FILM}]
1972 – *Hier en Nu* [protests against road construction, shots Kleinpolderplein], 1972-03-21, 7'22", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 25832, G45292 {FILM}]
1972 – *Hier en Nu* [after the Turk riots in Afrikaanderbuurt], 1972-08-18, 3'10", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 26705, M46413 {FILM}, V42432 {VHS}]
1973 – *Hier en Nu* [traffic threshold, Charlois], 1973-05-02, interv.: Theo Leeuwenburgh, 8'50", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 28481, M48198 {FILM}]
1973 – *Hier en Nu* [prostitution Katendrecht], 1973-08-21, interv.: Hans Sleenhoek, 7'04", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 29086, M48905 {FILM}]
1978 – *Hier en Nu* [women detention], 1978-11-13, 28'49", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: M61279 {blik}, V57708 {VHS}]

Nederlandse Onderwijsfilm

1960 – *Rotterdam krijgt metro* [traffic problems, metro: map and model], 5', 16mm/b-w/opt. [GAR: BB-0793] Z 721
1960 – *Floriade*, 4', 16mm/b-w/opt [GAR: BB-792]

Neijenhoff, Otto van

1960s – *Eso Journal* [since 1954], prod.: Bob Kommer
1964 – *Zuid-Holland*, prod.: Studio Bob Kommer [NFM: ID 77795]

Neuman, Frits & Noordam, Bruin

1968 – *Zienderogen* [for youth: district post-office] NCRV 1968-02-03, pres.: S.v. Proosdij, 45'57", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 177095, 6/3306 {FILM} V65983]

Nieuwenhuis, Jaap

1960 – *Onder Goed Gesterne*, 50min, 16mm/cl/sound, Deltafilm, for: Trans-Ocean [GAR: BB-0843]
1960 – *Wie vaart mee over zee*, Deltafilm, for: Koninklijke Rotterdamsche Lloyd [ref. NFDB/NFM]
1964 – *Brons in Beweging* [sculpture Wessel Couzijn for Unilever], for: Unilever [NFM: ID 9320]

Nierop, Hans van

1974 – *De Santekraam*, 21', -/cl/sound [GAR: BB-2304] Z 329

Nivon Smalfilmgroep Rotterdam

1970 – *Internationaal Sportfeest I + 2* [C 70], 31 + 27', double8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-3233 + 3234] Z 550

NTS / NOS – general

1960 – *Landbouwjournaal*, 1960-04-05 [a.o. Floriade = 6'26" 28'00", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 45747, 23864 {FILM}]
1961 – *Van Stael tot Stad* [series on housing presented by J.B. Bakema, 1961-1963], 28'45", broadcast by NTS: 1961-10-22, 16mm telerec./b-w/sound [B&G: id 61583; 3/627 {FILM}; V30906 {VHS}]
1968 – *Opening Metro Rotterdam*, 1968-02-09, 14'01", -/b-w/ - [B&G: 57623, V24903 {VHS} M28441 {FILM}]

1968 – *Open Oog* [policy of cultural distribution, alderman Reehorst] (broadcasting: 1968-05-24, 30' interview by Gerard Soeteman, 16mm/-/sound [B&G: 58333, M29979 {FILM}])

1968 – *Open Oog* [ANWB harbour route; Eurorama exhibition, a.o.] (broadcasting: 1968-08-02, 29'05", Film: A1/ - /magn. [B&G: 58726, M31350 {FILM}])

1968 – *Open Oog* [theatre play by 'Nieuw Rotterdams Toneel' in 'Piccolo Theater'; Carol van Herwijnen, Martine Crefcoeur, Aart Staartjes a.o.], 1968-08-30, 3'09", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 58912, M31354 {FILM}])

1968 – *Scala* [St. Laurenskerk], 1968-11-28, 6'02", 16mm/-/sound [B&G: 59546, G31878 {FILM}])

1969 – *Scala* [New Ahoy'], 1969-11-19, 5'07", K. Verhoef {ed.}, 16mm [B&G: 19919, K36480 {FILM}])

1970 – *Holland Festival Magazine* [announcement Pop Festival], 1970-06-23, 7'45", 16mm/-/magn. [B&G: 21404, K39048 {FILM}])

1970 – *Holland Festival Magazine* [Pop Festival], 1970-07-07, 11'34", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 21492, K39050 {FILM}])

1970 – *Vrij Uit* [Zestienhoven] (broadcasting: 1970-07-17, 23'39", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 21571, M39097 {FILM}])

1970 – *Vrij Uit* [Eurorama, Rozenburg], 1970-12-30, 18'54", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 22713, M40774 {FILM}])

1972 – *Holland Festival 1972; Poetry International*, 1972-06-25, dir.-ed.: Jan Venema, 62'24", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 85170, TD34036 {DIGI-BETA} V17997 {VHS}])

1973 – *Werkwinkel* [helping elderly people, Rotterdam-Zuid] 1973-09-30, 22'05", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 29312, M49182 {FILM}])

1974 – *Uit De Kunst* [Film International, a.o.], 1974-03-01, 30'26", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 30424, M50089 {FILM}])

1974 – *Den Haag Vandaag* [zestienhoven], 1974-04-24, 8'10", 16mm/b-w/magn.[B&G: 30778, G50434 {FILM}])

1974 – *Vraaggesprek met André van der Louw* [1974-11-21], 12'54", 16mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0795] Z 484

1974 – *Panoramiek* [HAL], 1974-12-01, 23'30", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 32138, TD46106 {DIGI}], V32905 {VHS}])

1975 – *Prostitutie op Katendrecht* [1975-02-13], 25'14", 16mm/cl/magn [B&G, GAR: BB-0797]

1976 – *Beeldspraak, Huub Bals En Het Maken Van Een Festival*, 1976-02-22, 23'47", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 35379, M54844 {Film}])

1976 – *TV-Informatie Voor Surinamers* [Alderman Schmitz about social housing], 1976-02-09, 3'54", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 35281, M55834 {FILM}])

1976 – *Paspoort: Turks* [mayor v/d Louw on Grey Wolves], 1976-11-14, interv.: İlhan Karavaş, 1'55", 16mm/-/magn. [B&G: 2308, G74782 {FILM}])

1977 – *Paspoort: Joegoslavisch* [Wijkcentrum Middelland] (broadcasting: 1977-10-06, 1'10", 16mm/-/magn. [B&G: 39235, G76704 {FILM}])

1978 – *Kortweg* [a.o. Film International], 1978-02-07, 10', 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 61219, K59316 {Film}])

1979 – *Markant: Wim Thomassen* [former mayor], 1979-10-04, 59'21", 16mm/cl/magn., interv.: Jan Rogier [B&G: 42741, G76669 {FILM}]) [GAR: BB-4109] Z 711 (see: BB-1005; -BB 1021 & BB 997)

NTS / NOS – Van Gewest tot Gewest

1974 – *Van Gewest Tot Gewest* [Zestienhoven], 1974-09-11, 4'17", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 31516, G51340 {FILM}])

1974 – *Van Gewest Tot Gewest* [renovation of houses], 1974-10-23 2'59", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 31798, G51674 {FILM}])

1975 – *Van Gewest tot Gewest* [ornaments, houses Feijenoord], 1975-08-13, 4'35", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 34016, G53626 {FILM}])

1975 – *Van Gewest Tot Gewest* [Tuindorp Heijplaat], 1975-11-19, interv. by: Jan de Roode 6'32", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 34694, G54219 {FILM}])

1979 – *Van Gewest Tot Gewest* [water company Rotterdam], 1979-03-28, interv. by Mieke Lamers, 7'22", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 42386, G62318 {FILM}])

1979 – *Van Gewest Tot Gewest* [De Rotte], 1979-05-02, dir.: Jan Gerritsen, 11'55", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 42505, G62474 {FILM}])

NTS / NOS – Journaal (television, editor in chief: Carel Enkelaar 1956-1963, Dick Simons 1963-1974, Ed van Westerloo 1974-1985²⁰⁵⁶ – reporters: Lars Andersson, Erik Boshuizen, Jan Gerritsen, Rien Huizing, Marijn de Koning, Wibo van de Linde, Peter Meyers, Alexander Munninghoff, Harmen Roeland, Harmen Siezen, Herman van der Spek, Fred Verbakel e.a.; correspondent-cameramen: Pim Korver, J. van Rhijn, Jacques de Gier, Hans Koekoek, Drost e.a.)

NB 1 NTS (*Nederlandse Televisie Stichting*) changed into NOS (*Nederlandse Omroep Stichting*) on 1969-05-29.

NB 2 since 1970-04-01 the NOS-Journaal began shooting on colour stock.

1960 – *Journaal* [preparations Floriade], 1960-03-23, 1'25", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 114544, 23066 {FILM}])

1960 – *Journaal* [Floriade], 1960-03-25 3'39"/b-w/ , prod. NTS/Visnews, for: EBU [B&G: 114580, 24659 {FILM}])

1960 – *Journaal* [opening Floriade], 1960-03-25, 1'22"/b-w/ , prod. NTS/Visnews, for: EBU [B&G: 11458, 123575 {film}])

1960 – *Journaal* [Floriade, interv. Kleijboer], 1960-03-31, Jan Gerritsen {ed.}, 3'00", 16mm/b-w/ [B&G: 114724, TDU75145 {DIGI} V98682 {VHS}])

1960 – *Journaal* [opening Floriade], 1960-04-01 3'10", 16mm/b-w/CM [B&G: 171699, 23303 {FILM}])

1960 – *Journaal* [departure mail-coach Floriade from Istanbul], 1960-04-02, 72", b-w/ [B&G: 114844, 23626 {FILM}])

1960 – *Journaal* [mail-coach Floriade in Thessaloniki], 1960-04-13, 1'16", 16mm/b-w/ [B&G: 115052, 23710 {FILM}])

1960 – *Journaal* [mail-coach Floriade in Spielfeld, Austria], 1960-04-20, 87", b-w/ [B&G: 115185, 24254 {FILM}])

1960 – *Journaal* [mail-coach Floriade, Yugoslavia–Austria], 1960-04-29, 1'11", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 171784, 24089 {film}])

1960 – *Journaal* [arrival mail-coach Floriade], 1960-05-07, 1'55"/b-w/-, NTS/Visnews, for: EBU [B&G: 115603, 24660 {film}])

1960 – *Journaal* [arrival mail-coach Floriade], 1960-05-13, 1'12", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 171758, 24572 {FILM}]; V108830 {VHS}])

1960 – *Journaal* [catapult installation at aircraft-carrier 'Minas Gerais' for Brazil, Verolme], 1960-06-24, 0'56", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: film nr. 25709]

1960 – *Journaal* [Queen Juliana visits Floriade], 1960-07-21, 1'39", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 116988, 26460 {FILM}])

1960 – *Journaal* [Europoort], 1960-09-02, 1'21", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 27531 {FILM}])

1960 – *Journaal* [royal visit from Thailand], 1960-10-25, 8'40", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 117815, 28895 {Film}, TDU77791 {Digi} V106093 {VHS}])

1960 – *Journaal* [royal visit from Thailand], 1960-10-28, 3'53", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 171909, 28919 {Film}, V98665 {VHS}])

1960 – *Journaal* [metro, model], 1960-10-28, 1'07", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: TDU75127 {digi}; 28924 {film}; V98665 {VHS}])

1960 – *Journaal* [tanker ship, test Europoort], 1960-12-16, 1'08", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 30181 {film}])

1961 – *Journaal* [unloading containers from US ship 'Warrior'], 1961-01-04, 53", b-w [B&G: 118544, 30670 {FILM}])

1961 – *Journaal* [models metro stations, constr. at Weena], 1961-02-24, 1'19", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 32173 {film}])

1961 – *Journaal* [metro, models of the stations, construction at Weena], 1961-09-29, 0'30", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: TDU75188 {digibeta}; 38553 {film}; V100390 {VHS}])

1961 – *Journaal* [youth land in Ahoy'], 1961-07-27, 75"/b-w/ [B&G: 120665, 36739 {FILM}])

1961 – *Journaal* [Femina fair in Ahoy'] NTS, 1961-10-01, 2'55", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 171594, 38573 {FILM}])

1962 – *Journaal* [metro, first part tunnel ready], 1962-01-04, 1'00", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: TDU77628 {digi}; 41252 {film}; V102365 {VHS}])

1962 – *Journaal* [tree cut for metro and other work], 1962-03-08, 1'03", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 43316 {film}])

1962 – *Journaal* [launching of tanker 'Esso Hampshire' at Verolme, Rozenburg], 1962-03-18, 0'54", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: film 43584]

1962 – *Journaal* [inauguration of two docks by minister De Pous, Verolme, Rozenburg], 1962-05-10, 0'37", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: film 45278]

1962 – *Journaal* [metro, model + constr. station Leuvehaven], 1962-06-10, 1'09", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 46286 {film}])

1962 – *Journaal* [tanker Esso Libya, Verolme], broadcasting: 1962-08-26, 1'23", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: film 48646]

²⁰⁵⁶ See: Scheepmaker, 1981: 5, 82.

- 1962 – *Journal* [exh. on ship building in Ahoy], 1962-11-25, 0'55", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 246777, 51819 {FILM}]
- 1962 – *Journal* [metro, first element sunk], 1962-11-27, 0'52", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 51970 {film}]
- 1962 – *Journal* [Capelle aan den IJssel, drift ice obstructs ships], 1962-12-19, International News Exchange, European Broadcasting Union (EBU, cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: id 16023; 56675 {film}]
- 1963 – *Journal* [Mexican president López Mateos visits NL, a.o. Verolme Rozenburg], 1963-04-04, 2'37", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: film 56052]
- 1963 – *Journal* [bakery fair NEBATO, Ahoy], 1963-05-13, 1'28", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 52559, 57536 {FILM}]
- 1963 – *Journal* [metro, excursion construction works], 1963-05-19, 0'49", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 57602 {film}]
- 1963 – *Journal* [Van Brieneoordbrug] 1963-05-22, 0'49", 16mm/b-w/-, [B&G: 247439, 57848 {FILM}] week overview
- 1963 – *Journal* [fire at the metro under construction], 1963-05-28, 0'36", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 58057 {film}]
- 1963 – *Journal* [beneluxtunnel] 1963-06-09, 0'40", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 247537, 58290 {FILM}] week overview
- 1963 – *Journal* [christening 'Esso Den Haag' by Princess Beatrix, Verolme], 1963-07-04, 1'13", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: film 59199]
- 1963 – *Journal* [Van Brieneoordbrug], 1963-10-04, 33"/b-w/ [B&G: 131842, 62177 {FILM}] 12069II {FILM}]
- 1963 – *Journal* [dog show in Ahoy], 1963-10-20, 60"/b-w/ [B&G: 54858, 62865 {FILM}]
- 1963 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1963-10-26, 68", 16mm/b-w/CM [B&G: 132087, 62910 {FILM}] 12299I {FILM}]
- 1963 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1963-10-27, 4'18", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 250228, 62932 {FILM}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [relocation market Maashaven for metro], 1964-02-15, 0'39", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 66773 {film}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [metro works, traffic rerouted], 1964-02-18, 1'22", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 66948 {film}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [Zestienhoven], 1964-02-20, 2'38", 16mm/b-w/CM, Pim Reijntjes (ed.) [B&G: 133289, 66962 {film}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [bird exh. in Ahoy], 1964-02-20, 1'09", 16mm/-/mute [B&G: 56787, 66963 {FILM}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [airport zestienhoven], 1964-02-23, 0'55", 16mm/b-w/ [B&G: 254057, 67011 {FILM}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [rijksweg Den Haag – Rotterdam], 1964-03-18, 78"/b-w/ [B&G: 57157, 67891 {FILM}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [rijksweg 15, R'dam – Ruhrgebied], 1964-03-22, 0'58", 16mm/b-w/ [B&G: 254293, 67949 {FILM}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [education exh. in Ahoy], 1964-04-05, 1'00", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 254461, 68398 {FILM}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [collapse REM platform, Verolme, Cork to Rozenburg], 1964-05-24, 28", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: film 70131]
- 1964 – *Journal* [Austrian week in Ahoy], 1964-06-21, 2'08", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 256001, 71115 {FILM}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [airport zestienhoven, lunar eclipse], 1964-06-28, 0'45", 16mm/b-w/ [B&G: 256221, 71345 {FILM}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [van brieneoordbrug] (1964-07-03, 50"/b-w/ [B&G: 135118, 71566 {FILM}] 14334IV {FILM}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [metro, last element to be sunk], 1964-10-17, 1'22", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 75038 {film}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [farewell Van Traa], 1964-11-23, 1'22", 16mm/b-w/ [B&G: id 138507; 76213 {FILM}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [decision metro type, alderm. Jettinghof], 1964-12-05, 0'30", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 76541 {film}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [Van Brieneoordbrug, junction] (1964-12-01, 71"/b-w/ [B&G: 138749, 76505 {FILM}]
- 1964 – *Journal* [REM, explanation Verolme], broadcasting: 1964-12-16, 1'16", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: film 77038]
- 1965 – *Journal* [Van Brieneoordbrug], 1965-01-30, 1'00", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 118771, 78650 {FILM}]
- 1965 – *Journal* [opening Van Brieneoordbrug], 1965-02-06, 4'07"/b-w/ , 16mm/b-w/CM [B&G: 140559]
- 1965 – *Journal* [Van Brieneoordbrug, traffic jam], 1965-02-07, 37"/b-w/ [B&G: 140608, 78963 {FILM}]
- 1965 – *Journal* [christening "Harry C. Webb" by Ms. Webb =100th ship at Verolme Rozenburg], broadcasting: 1965-02-10, 1'41", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: film nr. 79035]
- 1965 – *Journal* [taxi, strike], 1965-02-12, 58"/b-w/ [B&G: 140743, 79021 {FILM}] 17546III {FILM}]
- 1965 – *Journal* [Beneluxtunnel, Pernis], 1965-03-05, 65"/b-w/ [B&G: 141389, 79782 {FILM}] 17772III {FILM}]
- 1965 – *Journal* [explosion tanker 'Rona Star', Verolme], 1965-06-16, 2'19", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: film 83538]
- 1965 – *Journal* [Beneluxtunnel, Vlaardingen], 1965-08-11, 80"/b-w/ [B&G: 145968, 85595 {FILM}]
- 1965 – *Journal* [metro works], 1965-10-19, 0'50", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 87954 {film}]
- 1965 – *Journal* [Korps Mariniers, 300 years], 1965-11-17, 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 302455]
- 1966 – *Journal* [metro, constr. aboveground station], 1966-01-24, 0'57", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 91321 {film}]
- 1966 – *Journal* [deconstruction of Ahoy], 1966-01-28, 0'44", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 150567, 91397 {FILM}]
- 1966 – *Journal* [metro car exhibited], 1966-05-17, 1'00", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 95505 {film}]
- 1966 – *Journal* [Doelen, car park], 1966-05-18, 2'30", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 153741, 95525 {FILM}]
- 1966 – *Journal* [Holland Festival, Doelen], 1966-06-14, 1'50", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 154520, 96547 {FILM}]
- 1966 – *Journal* [temporary Ahoy', constr. Med. Faculty], 1966-08-10, 2'12"/b-w/ [B&G: 155998, 98455 {FILM}]
- 1966 – *Journal* [Belgian ship: mine in fishing net, HvH], 1966-08-10, 0'57", 16mm/b-w/ , cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 98456 {film}]
- 1966 – *Journal* [containers, Nedex 66, Ahoy], 1966-10-25, 1'37", 16mm/b-w/ [B&G: 157818, 100972 {FILM}]
- 1966 – *Journal* [metro fly-over], 1966-11-11, 0'48", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 101562 {film}]
- 1966 – *Journal* [metro, new ticket service], 1966-11-18, 0'49", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 101834 {film}]
- 1966 – *Journal* [opening Beneluxtunnel], 1966-12-02, 0'53", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 158829, 102255 {FILM}]
- 1967 – *Journal* [metro, interv. Plantema, constr. works], 1967-05-16, 1'46", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 108570 {film}]
- 1967 – *Journal* [metro test ride], 1967-06-03, 1'41", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: K27983 {film}]
- 1967 – *Journal* [Beneluxtunnel], 1967-06-05, 1'13", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 59989, 109474 {FILM}], TDU76015 {DIGI}, V100449 {VHS}]
- 1967 – *Journal* [Beneluxtunnel] 1967-06-05, 4'29", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 59994, TDU76015 {digi}, V100449 {VHS}]
- 1967 – *Journal* [Min. Luns opens BP refinery, Europoort], {EBU} 1967-07-24, 1'11", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: id 61022, 111048 {film}]
- 1967 – *Journal* [container trains], 1967-09-05, 1'17", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 62044, 112393 {FILM}], TDU76037 {DIGI} V100467 {VHS}]
- 1967 – *Journal* [Verolme about plans yards Nieuwe Waterweg], 1967-09-22, 2'18", 16mm/b-w/sound, interv.: Wibo v/d Linde [B&G: blik K27045]
- 1967 – *Journal* [Femina fair in Ahoy'], 1967-09-28, 102"/b-w/ [B&G: 62516, K27052 {FILM}]
- 1967 – *Journal* [explosion in factory at Europoort], 1967-10-16, 0'36", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K27250 {blik}]
- 1967 – *Journal* [Hippy-Happy fair at Ahoy'], 1967-11-10, 1'39", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 63608, TDU77673 {DIGI}, V102413 {VHS}]
- 1967 – *Journal* [mutiny at Liberian carrier "African Monarch", Dutch Navy; 1967-12-24], 1'41", 16mm/b-w/sound, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: blik nr. K27831]
- 1968 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1968-01-02, 0'52", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 64756, K32264 {FILM}]
- 1968 – *Journal* [Verolme about plans, Rozenburg], 1968-01-02, 1'43", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: blik nr. K27982]
- 1968 – *Journal* [Zestienhoven, aviation school], 1968-01-04, 1'05", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 64794, K27984 {film}]
- 1968 – *Journal* [interior exh. 'Binnenhuis '68' in Ahoy], 1968-02-00, 1'00", C7/b-w/- [B&G: 65509, K28484 {FILM}]
- 1968 – *Journal* [metro, construction of the railways], 1968-02-09, 0'50", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: K28484 {blik}]
- 1968 – *Journal* [explosion at Shell, Pernis], 1968-02-28, 0'45", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K28674 {blik}]
- 1968 – *Journal* [constr. collapse], 1968-03-06, 42", D11/b-w/-, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 66456, K28802 {FILM}]
- 1968 – *Journal* [constr. of 'Mammoetdok', Verolme], 1968-04-26, 1'26", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: blik nr. K29446]

- 1968 – *Journalnaal* [exhibition by rural women], 1968-05-06, 1'33", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 67866, K29482 {FILM}], TDU77396 {DIGI}, V102025 {VHS}]
1968 – *Journalnaal* [exhibition on oil-rigs in Ahoy'], 1968-05-20, 75", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 68118, K29700 {FILM}]
1968 – *Journalnaal* [theft of police car], 1968-06-02, 40", 16mm/b-w/-, cam.: Pim Korver / Open Studio [B&G: 68437, K29863 {FILM}] ref. Open Studio, prod. nr. 621
1968 – *Journalnaal* [about merging Verolme + NDSM.], 1968-06-26, 0'50", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: blik K30106]
1968 – *Journalnaal* [metro, town hall, wedding], 1968-06-28, 44", 16mm/b-w/-, Korver [B&G: 68939, K30176 {film}]
1968 – *Journalnaal* [Verolme about new docks for the combined Verolme-NDSM], broadcasting: 1968-07-09, 2'23", 16mm/b-w/sound, interv.: Jan Gerritsen [B&G: blik nr. K30266; digi TDU77704, VHS V102439]
1968 – *Journalnaal* [Heineoordtunnel], 1968-07-10, 0'49", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K30267 {blik}]
1968 – *Journalnaal* [Czechs, Ahoy'], 1968-08-22, 4'32", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 70081, K30685 {FILM}], TDU77662 {digi} V102401 {VHS}
1968 – *Journalnaal* [water exhibition in Ahoy'], 1968-09-17, 66", A2/b-w/- [B&G: 70643, 31001 {FILM}]
1968 – *Journalnaal* [strike at Verolme, Rozenburg], 1968-09-20, 0'39", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: blik nr. K31046]
1968 – *Journalnaal* [strike at Verolme, Rozenburg], 1968-09-23, 0'51", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: blik nr. K31054]
1968 – *Journalnaal* [strike at Verolme, Rozenburg], 1968-09-24, 1'00", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: blik nr. K31058]
1968 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1968-11-11, 63", 16mm/b-w/ [B&G: 71792, K31662 {FILM}]
1968 – *Journalnaal Jaaroverzicht: Fusies in de Scheepsbouw* [Verolme + NDSM, construction 'mammoetdok', Botlek], broadcasting: 1968-12-29, 2'44", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: id 302182; digi TD18426; VHS V6263]
- 1969 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1969-01-03, 2'46", 16mm/b-w/magn., Wibbo van de Linde {ed.}, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 72973, K32346 {FILM}], TDU77667 {DIGI}, V102407 {VHS}]
1969 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike] 1969-01-04, 3'28", 16mm/b-w/sound, rep.: v/d Linde [B&G: 72988, K32348 {film}]
1969 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1969-01-07, 13", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 73025, K32351 {FILM}]
1969 – *Journalnaal* [Airport Zestienhoven], 1969-02-11, 67", A2/b-w/- [B&G: 73700, K32865 {FILM}]
1969 – *Journalnaal* [Thomassen, press conference *Plan 2000*], 1969-02-20, 1'47", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 73870; TDU77672 {DIGI}; V102412 {VHS}]
1969 – *Journalnaal* [Tulpenrally], 1969-04-28, 1'24", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: K33901 {blik}]
1969 – *Journalnaal* [C'70, A. Fibbe, Model], 1969-08-20, rep.: v/d Linde, 110", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 165549, K35341 {Film}]
1969 – *Journalnaal* [Zestienhoven, traffic tower under const., alderm. Polak], 1969-09-16, 1'49", 16mm/b-w/magn., Wibbo van de Linde {ed.} [B&G: 166109, K35700 {FILM}]
1969 – *Journalnaal* [broken crane, Medical Faculty], 1969-10-21, 0'44", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K36124 {blik}]
1969 – *Journalnaal* [first use of Kleinpolderplein] 1969-11-11, 38", 16mm/b-w/ [B&G: 167233, K36363 {FILM} = lost]
1969 – *Journalnaal* [Airport Zestienhoven, Martinair aircraft brings 'Pipers' to Tunisia] 1969-12-05, 53", A1/b-w/magn. [B&G: 167551, K36729 {FILM}]
1969 – *Journalnaal* [fire at Gulf refinery, 1969-11-15], 1'07", 16mm/b-w/sound, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: blik K36450]
- 1970 – *Journalnaal* [model for C'70], 1970-01-22, 54", /b-w/ [B&G: 168100, K37173 {Film}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [hopperzuiger against pollution], 1970-04-08, 1'07", 16mm, cam.: Korver, De Gier [B&G: blik K38074]
1970 – *Journalnaal* (1970-04-25) [Protest Against C'70] 106", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 168741, K38279 {Film}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [opening container terminal], 1970-04-27, 81", 16mm/cl/magn. (B&G: 168754, K38284 {FILM})
1970 – *Journalnaal* [airport zestienhoven], 1970-04-28, 0'11" (0'44"), 16mm/cl/mute [B&G: 168763, K38287 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* (1970-05-05) [Opening C'70] 95", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 168844, K38350 {Film}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [preparations Pop Festival], 1970-06-11, 100", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 169181, K38747 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [Holland Pop Festival], 1970-06-26, 1'42", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 169354, K38952 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [Holland Pop Festival], 1970-06-27, 106", 16mm/cl/magn., [B&G: 169364, K38971 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [Holland Pop Festival], 1970-06-29, 80", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 169385, K38956 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [launching of world's largest tanker 'Esso Europoort', Verolme, Rozenburg], 1970-07-11, 0'55", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: K39080 = lost]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike] 1970-08-02, 0'29", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 169841, K39548 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [new Ahoy' complex], 1970-08-04, 72", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 169855, K39296 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike] 1970-08-26, 50", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 170089, K39484 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike] 1970-08-28, 111", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 170128, K39535 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1970-08-29, 98", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 170139, K39540 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1970-08-31, 1'06", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 170164, M39542 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [HAL, harbour, strike], 1970-09-02, 2'00", 16mm/cl/sound, rep.: Harmen Siezen [B&G: 170190, K39547 {film}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1970-09-03, 0'30", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 170197, K39548 {FILM}], film is lost
1970 – *Journalnaal* [Verolme's 70th anniversary, guests a.o. Prince Bernhard, minister Luns, Zwolsman], 1970-09-04, 2'02", 16mm/-/sound [B&G: blik nr. K39611]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [Arbeidersmacht, harbour, strike], 1970-09-05, 82", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 170217, K39612 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [Arbeidersmacht, harbour, strike], 1970-09-07, 92", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 170230, K39617 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1970-09-08, 141", 16mm/cl/sound, rep.: Verbakel [B&G: 170237, K39618 {film}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [Arbeidersmacht, strike], 1970-09-09, 1'05", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 170246, M39619 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [Odeon, strike], 1970-09-14, 47", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 10569, K39675 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1970-09-14, 55", 16mm/cl/sound, inter.: v/d Spek [B&G: 10567, K39675 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [Arbeidersmacht, strike], 1970-09-15, 1'18", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 10584, K39677 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [Airport Zestienhoven], 1970-09-26, 67", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 10657, K39797 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [metro, opening metro to Slinge], 1970-11-25, 0'45", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: K40386 {film}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1970-12-11, 1'48", 16mm/cl/sound, Rien Huizing {interv.} [B&G: 11581, K40586 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [general strike], 1970-12-15, 6'21", 16mm/cl/magn., [B&G: 11625, K40594 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [taxi, strike], 1970-12-23, 35", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 11723, K40651 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [taxi, funeral], 1970-12-26, 58", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 11754, K40695 {FILM}]
1970 – *Journalnaal* [new taxi model], 1970-12-31, 31", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 11804, K40704 {FILM}]
- 1971 – *Journalnaal* [fire at Turkish boarding-house], 1971-01-01, 77", 16mm/cl/-, cam.: Korver & v. Rhijn [B&G: 11841, K40753 {film}]
1971 – *Journalnaal* [safety at Kleinpolderplein], 1971-01-14, 42", 16mm/cl/magn., [B&G: 11932, K40836 {FILM}]
1971 – *Journalnaal*, 1971-01-15, 1'32", 16mm/cl/mute [B&G: 11941, K40896 {FILM}]
1971 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1971-01-31, 70", 16mm/cl/sound, Siezen {interv.} [B&G: 12082, K41030 {FILM}]
1971 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1971-02-01, 93", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 12097, K41032 {FILM}]
1971 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1971-02-03, 32", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 12116, K41038 {FILM}]
1971 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1971-02-04, 72", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 12130, K41040 {FILM}]
1971 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1971-02-05, 87", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 12140, K41092 {FILM}]
1971 – *Journalnaal* [memoires Verolme, signing at Parkhotel; interview], 1971-02-11, 3'07", 16mm/cl/sound, interv.: Hans v/d Werf [B&G: blik K41103]
1971 – *Journalnaal* [exhibition "Binnenhuis 71" in Ahoy'], 1971-02-19, 0'49", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 12277K41238 {FILM}]
1971 – *Journalnaal* [harbour, strike], 1971-03-01, 3'10", 16mm/cl/sound, Herman v/d Spek {interv.} [B&G: 12400, K41309 {FILM}]

- 1971 – *Journal* [Moroccan celebration in Ahoy], 1971-03-06, 51", 16mm/b-w/magn., [B&G: 12466, K41366 {film}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [airport zestienhoven], 1971-03-08, 105", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 12492, K41358 {FILM}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1971-03-12, 50", 16mm/cl/ - [B&G: 12537, K41414 {FILM}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [explosion at Gulf, El Fatah], 1971-03-15, 1'09" [B&G: K41419 {blik}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [Winsemius about merging RSV], 1971-03-23, 1'15", 16mm/b-w/sound, rep.: Siezen [B&G: blik M41493]
- 1971 – *Journal* [Chrysler, strike], 1971-04-01, 32", 16mm/cl/ - [B&G: 12762, K41567 {FILM}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [committee Winsemius about merger Verolme and Rijn-Schelde], 1971-04-07, 0'31", 16mm/ - /sound [B&G: blik nr. K41606]
- 1971 – *Journal* [interview with Hofstra and Verolme on merger Rijn-Schelde-Verolme], 1971-04-08, 2'13", 16mm/-/sound, interv.: Fred Verbakel [B&G: blik nr. K41608]
- 1971 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1971-04-13, 91", 16mm/cl/sound, Siezen [rep.] [B&G: 12905, K41674 {FILM}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [airport zestienhoven], 1971-06-04, 32", A1/cl/ - [B&G: 13495, K42326 {FILM}] [film is lost]
- 1971 – *Journal* [post stamp exhibition in Ahoy], 1971-06-10, 1'19", 16mm/cl/mute [B&G: 13550, K42336 {FILM}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [opening of Kleinpolderplein], 1971-06-23, 0'29", 16mm/cl/mute [B&G: 13671, K42478 {FILM}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [water problems Kleinpolderplein], 1971-07-21, 30", A2/cl, [B&G: 13971, K42746 {FILM}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [still C'70], 1971-08-04, 16mm/cl/ - [B&G: 14135, K42864 {Film}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [newspapers], 1971-08-25, 2'15", 16mm/cl/ -, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 14360, K43035 {FILM}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [accident Norwegian ship "Tatra", Waalhaven], 1971-08-28, 39", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: blik nr. K43091]
- 1971 – *Journal* [city council + college dispute environment measures] 1971-09-02, 1'06", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: blik nr. K43102]
- 1971 – *Journal* [pop show in Ahoy] 1971-09-11, 91", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 14560, K43210 {FILM}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [airport zestienhoven] 1971-09-14, 15", 16mm/cl/ - [B&G: 14599, K43213 {FILM}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [pollution Rijnmond] 1971-09-20, 1'22", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: blik nr. K43275]
- 1971 – *Journal* [1-hour strike against air pollution, Gusto], 1971-09-21, 0'30", cam.: v. Rhijn [B&G: K43277 {blik}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [min. Stuyt, on environment Rijnmond, 1971-09-24], 1'29", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Korver [B&G: blik K43393]
- 1971 – *Journal* [oil pollution, 4th Petroleumhaven, 1971-10-01], 0'33", 16mm/cl/sound, Korver [B&G: blik K43473]
- 1971 – *Journal* [fire at Shell, Pernis], 1971-10-13, 0'25", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K43566 {blik}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [farewell 'Nieuw Amsterdam'], 1971-11-08, 63", 16mm/cl/ -, v. Rhijn [B&G: 15251, K43837 {film}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [Airport Zestienhoven] 1971-11-30, 99", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 15503, K44037 {FILM}]
- 1971 – *Journal* [International News Exchange, EBU] [transfer of "Intal" from Hapag-Lloyd to Austria, 1971-12-04], 1'22", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: blik nr.]
- 1972 – *Journal* [homeless accommodation] 1972-01-02, 31", 16mm/cl/ -, Korver [B&G: 15891, K44335 {film}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [Koninginnekerk], 1972-01-03, 38", A2/cl/ -, Cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 15901, K44338 {film}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [Koninginnekerk], 1972-01-06, 50", A1/cl/ -, Cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 15944, K44345 {film}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [Koninginnekerk], 1972-01-14, 38", A1/cl/ -, Cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 16037, K44505 {film}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [industry, strike], 1972-02-03, 15", 16mm/cl/ - [B&G: 16280, K44667 {film}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [harbour strike, R' dam/A' dam] 1972-02-04, 3'17", Gusto & RDM + interv. Fred Verbakel = cam.: Korver; Wilton-Fijenoord = Van Rhijn; NDSM interv.: Siezen, cam.: Panhuise [B&G: 16287, M44720 {film}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1972-02-07, 0'17", 16mm/cl/mute [B&G: 16308, M44720 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [metal industry, strike], 1972-02-07, 1'25", 16mm/cl/mute [B&G: 16307, M44727 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [strike RDM/WF/RSV], 1972-02-10, 42", 16mm/cl/magn., v. Rhijn [B&G: 16347, K44735 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [harbour, metal, strike], 1972-02-14, 15", 16mm/cl/ - [B&G: 16400, K44841 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [metal industry, strike], 1972-02-16, 30", 16mm/cl/ - [B&G: 16433, K44846 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [harbour, metal strike], 1972-02-16, 60", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 16430, K44848 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [strike, Gusto/RDM/WF], 1972-02-21, 35", 16mm/cl/ -, v. Rhijn [B&G: 16480, K44917 {film}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [Koninginnekerk] 1972-03-22, 0'29", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Korver [B&G: 16768, M45149 {film}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [parliament committee visits Rijnmond], 1972-04-16, 16mm/cl/ - [B&G: K45350]
- 1972 – *Journal* [dead whale in port], 1972-05-07, 33", 16mm/cl/ -, cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: 17150, K45584 {film}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [dead whale in port], 1972-05-08, 47", 16mm/cl/ -, cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: 17156, K45588 {film}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [container ship Nitron], 1972-06-03, 0'36", 16mm/cl/ -, cam.: P. Korver [B&G: 17348, K45720 {film}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [Zestienhoven], 1972-06-14, 1'35", 16mm/cl/sound, rep.: F. Verbakel [B&G: 17414, M45841 {film}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [Zestienhoven, kidnapping], 1972-06-23, 68", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 17464, K45927 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [Turk riots], 1972-08-10, 0'53", 16mm/cl/ -, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 17740, M46291 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [Turk riots], 1972-08-12, 0'37", 16mm/cl/ -, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 17755, M46291 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [Turk riots], 1972-08-12, 0'39", 16mm/cl/ -, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 17754, M46291 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [Turk riots], 1972-08-13, 1'06", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 17757, K46297 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [Turk riots], 1972-08-14, 75", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 17766, K46358 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [port show], 1972-10-06, 0'26", 16mm/cl/ -, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 18044, M46661 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [port show], 1972-10-09, 0'40", 16mm/cl/ -, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 18059, G46718 {FILM}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [ship Birte Oldendorff, Chilean copper], 1972-10-16, 1'43", cam.: JvRhijn [B&G: K46764 {blik}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [bumb, Bank of America], 1972-10-16, 1'20", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K46763 {blik}]
- 1972 – *Journal* [protest Vietnam war], 1972-12-30, 40", 16mm/cl/sound, v. Rhijn [B&G: 18513, K47239 {film}]
- 1973 – *Journal* [fire tanker Hallanger, Botlek], 1973-01-20, 0'47", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K47535 {blik}]
- 1973 – *Journal* [harbour, strike, Suriname] 1973-02-17, 55", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 18790, K47651 {FILM}]
- 1973 – *Journal* [harbour, metal strike] 1973-03-22, 28", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 18988, K47900 {FILM}]
- 1973 – *Journal* [start metro east-line], 1973-05-21, 1'26", 16mm/cl/sound, Korver [B&G: 19343, K48370 {film}]
- 1973 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1973-06-09, 2'21", 16mm/cl/sound, rep.: Siezen [B&G: 19475, K48464 {film}]
- 1973 – *Journal* [fire Cindu-Key & Kramer, Maassluis], 1973-08-15, 32", cam.: JvRhijn [B&G: K48879A1 {blik}]
- 1973 – *Journal* [fog, car crashes], 1973-11-11, 56", cam.: v. Rhijn, v/d Heuvel [B&G: K54164 {blik}]
- 1973 – *Journal* [fire chemical industry, Waalhaven], 1973-11-26, 0'50", 16mm/cl/ -, v. Rhijn [B&G: 20545, K47949 {film}]
- 1973 – *Journal* [drug smuggle from Persia], 1973-12-24, 0'39", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K52044 {blik}]
- 1974 – *Journal* [occupied Portuguese consulate] 1974-01-23, 36", 16mm/cl/ -, v. Rhijn [B&G: 20892, K49836 {film}]
- 1974 – *Journal* [leisure: harbour round-trip a.o.], 1974-04-14, 0'51" cam. J. van Rhijn [B&G: K50360 {blik}]
- 1974 – *Journal* [airport zestienhoven] 1974-04-19, 25", A3/cl/ - [B&G: 21378, K50364 {FILM}]
- 1974 – *Journal* [municipal elections], 1974-05-29, 0'24", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K50635 {blik}]
- 1974 – *Journal* [fire at Oxirane, Botlek], 1974-05-29, 0'24", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K50969 {blik}]
- 1974 – *Journal* [arrival of fans Tottenham], 1974-05-29, 0'47", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K50636 {blik}]
- 1974 – *Journal* [vandalism Tottenham fans, *De Kuip*], 1974-05-30, 0'31", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K50638 {blik}]
- 1974 – *Journal* [subsidized truck with fenol] 1974-07-19, 0'22", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K50974 {blik}]

1974 – *Journal* [oil cleaning at Petroleumhaven] 1974-08-16, 0'55", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K51188 {blik}]
1974 – *Journal* [train accident] 1974-08-29, 0'33", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K51285 {blik}]
1974 – *Journal* [subsidied fuel truck, Spijkenisse] 1974-08-30, 0'24", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K51287 {blik}]
1974 – *Journal* [airport zestienhoven, maintenance] 1974-09-02, 55", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 22236, K51303 {film}]
1974 – *Journal* [fire at Shell, Pernis] 1974-10-14, 1'24", cam. v. Rhijn / v. Eyndhoven [B&G: K51567 {blik}]
1974 – *Journal* [no demolition Veerhuis, Overschie], 1974-10-25, 30", cam.: v. Rhijn [B&G: 22583, K51628 {film}]
1974 – *Journal* [hospital for N-Vietnam] 1974-11-04, 36", 16mm/cl/magn., Korver [B&G: 22648, K51741 {film}]
1974 – *Journal* [traffic issues, parking] 1974-11-09, 40", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K51834 {blik}]
1974 – *Journal* [train accident, Rotterdam-Zuid] 1974-11-21, 0'42", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K51835 {blik}]
1974 – *Journal* [drug smuggle arrested] 1974-12-24, 29", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K52044A2 {blik}]

1975 – *Journal* [crane collapse on railways, Berkel], 1975-01-02, 0'28", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: M52092 {blik}]
1975 – *Journal* [funeral taxi driver] 1975-04-08, 1'01", 16mm/cl/sound, van Rhijn [B&G: 23757, K52867 {FILM}]
1975 – *Journal* [taxi, police investigation] 1975-04-29, 48", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 23894, K52903 {FILM}]
1975 – *Journal* [flood in city], 1975-06-24, 42", cam.: J. van Rhijn, Drost [B&G: K53279 {blik}]
1975 – *Journal* [flood in city, Rotterdam, Gouda] 1975-06-24, 1'27", cam.: Drost / v. Rhijn [B&G: K53279 {blik}]
1975 – *Journal* [prostitution to Wijnhaven], 1975-06-27, 27", 16mm/cl/-, v. Rhijn [B&G: 24280, K53286 {film}]
1975 – *Journal* [Smit towing oil-rig] 1975-07-05, 40", 16mm/cl/magn., cam.: Korver [B&G: 24345, K53343 {film}]
1975 – *Journal* [nocturnal fire at Transmarinde] 1975-07-25, 0'38", cam.: v. Rhijn [B&G: K53448 {blik}]
1975 – *Journal* [summer in NL, a.o. Kralingse Plas, flats, fountain], 1975-08-04, 3'47", cam.: Lokker, v. Rhijn, Hartendorf [B&G: K53509 + K53510 {blik}]
1975 – *Journal* [summer in NL, Hoek v. Holland 22' = v. Rhijn], 1975-08-05, 1'30" [B&G: K53512 {blik}]
1975 – *Journal* [relocated 'D'Olipphant', Charlois], 1975-08-12, 0'49", cam.: v. Rhijn [B&G: 24629, K53584 {film}]
1975 – *Journal* [flooded city], 1975-08-21, 0'27", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: K53634 {blik}]
1975 – *Journal* [protest against dead sentences Spain], 1975-09-26, 21", v. Rhijn [B&G: 24967, K53846 {film}]
1975 – *Journal* [airport zestienhoven, kidnapping] 1975-10-10, 43", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 25101, K53944 {FILM}]
1975 – *Journal* [airport zestienhoven] 1975-10-11, 34", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 25106, K53945 {FILM}]
1975 – *Journal* [airport zestienhoven, kidnapping] 1975-11-08, 140", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 25344, K54117 {film}]
1975 – *Journal* [Traffic Ring Rotterdam] 1975-11-06, 35", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 25329, K54113 {FILM}]

1976 – *Journal* [airport Zestienhoven, protest against closing] 1976-01-27, 30", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 25844, K54629 {FILM}]
1976 – *Journal* [International News Exchange, EBU: train traffic obstructed by tanker Andromeda jammed under bridge], 1976-02-12, 2'00", cam.: J. van Rhijn [B&G: id 170934; K54696 {blik}]
1976 – *Journal* [protest against Europoint] 1976-04-29, 42", 16mm/cl/sound, De Gier [B&G: 26439, K55236 {film}]
1976 – *Journal* [harbour, strike] 1976-07-01, 3'02", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: De Gier [B&G: 26857, K55721 {film}]
1976 – *Journal* [demonstrations *gastarbeiders* for mosque] 1976-12-25, 55", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Drost [B&G: 27683, M56736 {blik}]

1977 – *Journal* [general strike] 1977-02-07, 116", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 27875]
1977 – *Journal* [general strike, public transport] 1977-02-08, 46", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 27876, K57025 {FILM}]
1977 – *Journal* [general strike] 1977-02-09, 262", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 27880, K57027 {FILM}]
1977 – *Journal* [strike, interv. with Kok, Van Veen] 1977-02-10, 16mm/cl/- [B&G: ?, TD14410 {DIGI} V9 {VHS}]
1977 – *Journal* [strike, interv. Kok, Van Veen] 1977-02-11, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: TD14410 {DIGI} V9 {VHS}]
1977 – *Journal* [strike, interv. Kok, Van Veen] 1977-02-12, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: TD14410 {DIGI} V9 {VHS}]
1977 – *Journal* [strike, interv. Kok, Van Veen, v/d Meulen / CNV], 1977-02-14, 4'01", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: TD14410 {DIGI} V9 {VHS}]
1977 – *Journal* [harbour, public transport strike] 1977-02-19, 1'39", 16mm/cl/-, Harmen Siezen {interv.} [B&G: 76249, TD14410 {DIGI} V9 {VHS}]
1977 – *Journal* [strike, interview with Kok] 1977-02-21, 19", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 27936, V9 {VHS}]
1977 – *Journal* [harbour, strike] 1977-02-21, 41", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 27934, K57107 {FILM}]
1977 – *Journal* [harbour, strike] 1977-02-25, 2'42", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 76257, TD14410 {DIGI-BETA} V9 {VHS}]
1977 – *Journal* [harbour, strike] 1977-02-28, 18", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 27969, K57159 {FILM}]
1977 – *Journal* [harbour, strike] 1977-02-28, 31", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 27967, K57160 {FILM}]
1977 – *Journal* [Schouwburgplein, Herzberger] 1977-03-30, 27", 16mm/cl/-, Korver [B&G: 28123, K57347 {film}]
1977 – *Journal* [Surinamese occupy Euromast] 1977-04-15, 37", 16mm/cl/-, Korver [B&G: 28209, K57442 {film}]
1977 – *Journal* [Zestienhoven] 1977-07-26, 170", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 28770, K58141 {FILM}]
1977 – *Journal* [declining shippyards] 1977-08-23, 106", 16mm/cl/magn., Korver [B&G: 28888, K58288 {film}]
1977 – *Journal* [Chile conference, Willy Brandt] 1977-08-29, 116", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Drost [B&G: 28913, K58338 {FILM}]
1977 – *Journal* [football vandalism], 1977-09-17, 1'56", cam.: Drost, v. Rhijn [B&G: K58421A1 {film}]
1977 – *Journal* [airport Zestienhoven] 1977-10-13, 25", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 29195, K58585 {FILM}]

1978 – *Journal* [prisons for women, demonstrations for improvements, Rotterdam, Amsterdam], 1978-02-04, 2'44", 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Hans Koekoek [B&G: K59292A1 {film}]
1978 – *Journal* [Ferro, strike], 1978-05-15, 20", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 30277, K59909 {FILM}]
1978 – *Journal* [Ferro, strike], 1978-05-17, 14", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 30297, K59909 {FILM}]
1978 – *Journal* [Ferro, strike], 1978-05-17, 29", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 30295, K59910 {FILM}]
1978 – *Journal* [Cube Houses, Piet Blom], 1978-05-29, 86", 16mm/cl/magn., rep. v/d Spek, cam.: Korver [B&G: 30376, K60026 {FILM}]
1978 – *Journal* [accident Eco Marino], 1978-06-08, 44", 16mm/cl/-, cam.: Korver [B&G: 30455, K60075 {FILM}]
1978 – *Journal* [action bargemen], 1978-08-17, 88", 16mm/cl/magn., cam.: De Gier [B&G: 30859, K60578 {FILM}]
1978 – *Journal* [Europoort], 1978-09-26, 4'26", 16mm/cl/-, cam.: Pim Korver [B&G: 171090, K62039 {FILM}]
1978 – *Journal* [city cleaning, strike], 1978-12-08, 34", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 31622, K61474 {FILM}]
1978 – *Journal* [cleaning, strike], 1978-12-08, 24", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 31621, K61474 {FILM}]
1978 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1978-12-15, 34", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 31674, K61514 {FILM}]

1979 – *Journal* [strike bargemen], 1979-01-02, 90", 16mm/cl/magn.cam.: Drost [B&G: 31809, K61647 {FILM}]
1979 – *Journal* [traffic jams Van Brieneoordbrug, a.o.], 1979-01-08, 40", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 31839, K61699 {film}]
1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-01-08, 120", 16mm/cl/magn., rep. Alexander Munninghoff [B&G: 31842, K61698 {FILM}]
1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-01-09, 16", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 31850, K61699 {FILM}]
1979 – *Journal* [shipping of material UN troops to Lebanon], 1979-02-13, 37", cam.: Drost [B&G: K61956 {blik}]
1979 – *Journal* [VDSM-yard Verolme, strike], 1979-04-06, 2'04, 16mm/cl/sound, Korver [B&G: film M62331A1]
1979 – *Journal* [housing, Fennis], 1979-05-16, 1'27", 16mm/cl/sound, rep. Marijn de Koning {ed.}, cam.: Drost [B&G: 32697, K62603 {FILM}]
1979 – *Journal* [oil crisis, Maasvlakte], 1979-05-18, 30", 16mm/cl/-, cam.: Korver, [B&G: 32712, K62606 {film}]

- 1979 – *Journal* [dredging island “Camel” chained by protesting workers, possible closing VDSM, Rozenburg], broadcasting: 1979-06-12, 24”, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Jacques de Gier [B&G: film nr. M62832A1]
- 1979 – *Journal* [maintenance rig Seafox-1], 1979-06-16, 41”, 16mm/cl/sound, Drost [B&G: 32911, K62844 {film}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [Van Brieneoordbrug], 1979-08-23, 26, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Drost/De Gier [B&G: 33195, K63297 {film}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-23, 14”, 16mm/cl/ - [B&G: 77585, TD14422 {DIGI-BETA} V67 {VHS}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-23, 24”, 16mm/cl/ - [B&G: 33200, K63293 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-23, 1’21”, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Korver, Drost, Koekoek, De Gier [B&G: 33199, K63294 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-25, 29”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33209, K63300 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike, reaction Kok (FNV)], 1979-08-27, 2’18”, 16mm/cl/ -, Boshuijzen {interv.} [B&G: 77592, TDU14423 {DIGI}, V68 {VHS}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-27, 2’50”, 16mm/cl/sound, rep. M. de Koning, cam.: Drost [B&G: 33221, K63341 {film}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-27, 53”, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Drost [B&G: 33219, K63340 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-28, 3’18”, 16mm/cl/sound, rep. Boshuijzen [B&G: 33228, K63343 {film}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-28, 151”, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Drost [B&G: 33225, K63342 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-28, 31”, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Drost [B&G: 33224, K63341 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-29, 2’42”, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Koekoek [B&G: 33237, K63346 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-29, 36”, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Koekoek [B&G: 33233, K63344 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-30, 2’57”, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Drost [B&G: 33241, K63348 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-31, 1’11”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33248, K63349 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-08-31, 33”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33246, K63348 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [GEM, harbour, strike], 1979-09-03, 30”, 16mm/cl/sound, Koekoek [B&G: 33271, K63384 {film}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-03, 2’09”, 16mm/cl/ -, rep. Boshuijzen, cam.: Koekoek [B&G: 33269, K63385 {film}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-04, 1’02”, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: De Gier, Drost [B&G: 33274, K63386 {film}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-05, 39”, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: De Gier [B&G: 33286, K63387 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [ECT, harbour, strike], 1979-09-05, 2’42”, 16mm/cl/sound, rep.: Peter Meyers, cam.: Jacques de Gier [B&G: 33285, K63388 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-06, 40”, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: De Gier [B&G: 33292, K63390 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-06, 5’34”, 16mm/cl/sound, rep. Boshuijzen, cam.: De Gier [B&G: 33290, K63391 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-07, 134”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33297, K63392 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike, Afrikaanderplein], 1979-09-07, 34”, a2/-/ - [B&G: 33296, K63392 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-10, 128”, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Koekoek, De Gier [B&G: 33313, K63426 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-11, 2’, 16mm/cl/ -, cam.: Wollmann [B&G: 33330 / 33331]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike, Afrikaanderplein, march to Town Hall], 1979-09-12, 32”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33342, K63430 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike, Afrikaanderplein, march, Town Hall, interv. Pieters], 1979-09-12, 151”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33341, K63431 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-14, 2’53”, 16mm/cl/sound, Erik Boshuijzen {interv.}, cam.: Hans Koekoek, Jacques de Gier [B&G: 33354, K63436 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-14, 45”, 16mm/cl/magn., cam.: Koekoek [B&G: 33353, K63435 {film}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-16, 1’55”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33361, K63477 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-17, 3’53”, 16mm/cl/sound, rep.: Roeland [B&G: 33366, K63477 {film}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-18, 0’51”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33369, K63477 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [ECT, harbour, strike], 1979-09-19, 4’30”, 16mm/cl/sound, rep. Harmen Roeland, Lars Andersson, cam.: Kalanos, Rutten, Wollmann [B&G: 33383, K63482 {FILM}, TDU77392 {DIGI}, V102021 {VHS}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [ECT, harbour, strike], 1979-09-19, 1’02”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33378, K63479 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour strike, Van der Louw], 1979-09-20, 1’35”, 16mm/cl/sound, Erik Boshuijzen {interv.} [B&G: 171122, K63483 {FILM}] TDU77392 {DIGI-BETA} V102021 {VHS}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [Shell, strike, interviews Scheele (employees), Schwarz (Shell)], 1979-09-20, 1’40”, 16mm/cl/sound, Erik Boshuijzen {interv.} [B&G: 33387, K63482 {FILM} TDU77392 {DIGI-BETA} V102021 {VHS}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-21, 131”, 16mm/cl/sound, rep. Roeland [B&G: 33393, K63485 {film}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-22, 159”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33405, K63489 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-22, 34”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33402, K63487 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-24, 55”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33425, K63503 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-09-26, 271”, 16mm/cl/sound, rep.: Boshuijzen, Roeland [B&G: 33445, K63508 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [Shell, harbour, strike], 1979-09-27, 52”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33453, K63508 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [Shell, harbour, strike], 1979-09-29, 102”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33462, K63512 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-10-02, 87”, 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: De Gier [B&G: 33485, K63518 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [Smit, harbour, strike], 1979-10-03, 40”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33489, K63521 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-10-04, 92”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33497, K63522 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-10-08, 32”, 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33507, K63603 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [Smit, harbour, strike], 1979-10-11, 3’16”, 16mm/cl/sound, rep. Boshuijzen, cam.: Koekoek [B&G: 33515, K63607 {FILM}]
- 1979 – *Journal* [harbour, strike], 1979-10-13, 27” + 174”, 16mm/cl/sound, rep.: Harmen Roeland [B&G: 33525 / 33526, K63610 {FILM}]
- NTS – Monitor** (television)
- 1966 – *Monitor* [Dave Brubeck, ‘De Doelen’], 1966-11-13, 5’35”, [B&G: 54741, 102181 {FILM}]
- 1967 – *Monitor* [metro, metro directors A. W. Manser, A.H. Grainger, R. Hainault, P. Weil], 1967-03-26, 3’39” [B&G: 55654, 106994 {FILM}]
- 1967 – *Monitor* [New Port All Star Jazz Festival, ‘De Doelen’], 1967-10-22, 4’15”, 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 56779, G27476 {FILM}]
- 1967 – *Monitor* [binnenstad Amsterdam > Luud Schimmelpennink, Den Haag, Haarlem, Schiedam > Jan Schaper over Brandersbuurt = 1’37”], 11’18”, NTS (1967-10-22) [B&G: 56776, G27476 {FILM} V24865 {VHS}]
- 1967 – *Monitor* [Amsterdam city council visits Rotterdam; mayors Ivo Samkalden and Wim Thomassen] (broadcasting: 1967-10-29, 6’39”, 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 56823, K27490 {FILM} V24870 {VHS}]
- 1967 – *Monitor* [metro, building accessibility for the disabled] (broadcasting: 1967-11-19, interviews by Hans Zoet, 12’13”, 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 56974, G27652 {FILM} V24906 {VHS}]
- NTS / NOS – Openbaar Kunstbezit** (television)
- 1963 – *Openbaar Kunstbezit: Moderne architectuur* [for Rotterdam: Lijnbaan] (broadcasting: 1963-10-07, pres.: J.J. Vriend, 4’52”, 16mm/ b-w/sound [B&G: 144404 & 178421, 3/1562 {FILM} V64136]
- 1964 – *Openbaar Kunstbezit: Beelden in de stad Rotterdam* (broadcasting: 1964-11-02, dir.: Lies Westenburg, ed.: H. van Haaren, 10’21”, 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 152285, 1/2278 {FILM} V66840]
- 1968 – *Openbaar Kunstbezit: Het gat in de beeldhouwkunst deel I* [Ossip Zadkine, a.o.] (broadcasting: 1968-06-19, eds.: H.J.A.M. van Haaren; R.W.D. Oxenaar; P.H. Hefting, 14’01”, 16mm/b-w/magn., prod.: NTS [B&G: 152234, 6/3389 {FILM} V63645 {VHS}]

1969 – *Openbaar Kunstbezit; Kunst En Techniek Deel I* [Van Brienoordbrug] 1969-04-06, see: Aarden, Ton &

Odúfré, Joes

1970 – *Openbaar Kunstbezit: Doen En Zien; Mens, Beeld En Ruimte Deel I* [sculpture Ossip Zadkine] 1970-01-25, 15'20", dir. Emily Werner, pres./ed.: Christa van Santen, 12'02", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 152326, 3/3559 {FILM}, TDU78780 {digi}, V104478 {VHS}]

NTS, NOS (since 1969) – **Sport In Beeld** (television)

1963 – *Voetbalwedstrijd Feyenoord – Benfica* [0-0, Stadion De Kuip] (broadcasting: 1963-04-10, 20h15, com.: H. Kuiphof, 01:34:55, 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 159764, 6/1330 {FILM} V55555 {VHS}]

1964 – *Feyenoord – Ajax* [9-4], 1964-11-29, 5'19", 16mm, b-w/sound [B&G: film 100672]

1970 – *Aankomst elftal Feyenoord en huldiging op het stadhuis* [1970-05-06 & 07], 6'47", 16mm/cl/magn [B&G, GAR: BB-0554] Z 201

1970 – *Voetbal: Feyenoord - Estudiantes de la Plata*, 1970-09-09, 107'31", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 168673, TD94238 {digi}, V54666 {VHS}]

1970 – *Studio Sport* [new Ahoy' complex], 1970-12-30, 4'18", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 22716, M40809 {FILM}]

NTS – Verrekijker

1960 – *Verrekijker* [a.o. Nieuwe Waterweg], 1960-06-01, 10'05", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 45903, 26849 {FILM}]

1960 – *Verrekijker* [a.o. Floriade = 5'50"], 1960-08-17, 12'00", 16mm/b-w/- [B&G: 46104, 27235 {FILM}]

1963 – *Verrekijker* [harbour, Euromast], 1963-07-31, 10'19", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 49516, 61577 {FILM}]

1970 – *Verrekijker* [Europoort], 1970-07-06, 9'45", 16mm [B&G: 21482, K42814]

Ockersen, Thys

1975 – *1000 kilo vurenhout, of hoe Kees Franse appels maakt*, 20', 16mm/cl/sound, cam.: Albert Vanderwildt, cam. ass. Adri Monshouwer, sound: Jan Wouter van Reyen, sponsor: RKS

1979 – *Aan de deur* [based on a story by J. Deelder], 5', 35mm & 16mm/cl/opt, sponsor: RKS [GAR: BB-1811] Z 635

Orthel, Rolf – see also: Rijnke, Dick 1979

1968 – *Bridges in Holland*, cam.: Eduard van der Enden e.a., prod.: Bert Haanstra, 20', 35mm/cl/opt, for: British Petroleum Company Holland [NFM: ID 9391, Video C731]

Oster, Fred

1961 – *Water* [uses of water; harbour], AVRO, 1961-07-14, 15'00", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 47100, V24847 {VHS}]

1966 – *Het Museum Van De Straat* [poster exhibition at 'De Nieuwe Doelen' and RKS], broadcasting: AVRO, 1966-09-06, interv. by Alex de Haas, 31'10", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 175420, V104540 {VHS}]

Oswald, Marianne (see: Lafaille, Claude)

Ottow, Bouke Th.

1970 – *De Wijze Werelt Otterloo* [Chinese festivities, neighbourhood centre], 7', 16mm/cl/opt [GAR: BB-1313-2] Z 634

1970 – *Trefpunt* [youth club], 6', 16mm/cl/opt [GAR: BB-1313-1] Z 634

1970 – *Woningrenovatie* [renovation Vreewijk], 22', 16mm/cl/magn. [GAR: BB-4070] Z 873

Peeters, M.P. (Rien)

1970 – *Pietermel, Kerst 1970*, 8', 8mm/cl/mute, i.c.w. Jou Patinot [GAR: BB-5067] Z 1249

1971 – *Opening Winkel Henk Wichers* [Witte de Withstraat, fashion show], 10', 8mm/cl/mute [GAR: BB-5086] Z1215

1974 – *Afscheid Thomassen*, 16mm/cl/sound [GAR]

1979 – *Kunst op Straat*, 7', 8mm/cl/sound, i.c.w. Edward Luyken {cam.}, for: Galerie Keerweer [GAR] Z1215

Persie, Bob van (see: Citroen, Hans)

Pohland, Jason (= Hans Jürgen Pohland) – see: Sluizer, George

Polygoon Journaal – Neerlands Nieuws – commentator / editor: Philip Bloemendal
reports marked by **: status is uncertain (part of collection GAR, absent at B&G)

1960-09 – *Postkoets Rijd in Den Haag*, rec.: 1960-02-19, 1'14", 35mm/b-w/CO [B&G: 17377, TDP329 {DIGI}]

1960-13 – *Prinses Beatrix Opent De Floriade*, rec.: 1960-03-25, 1'53", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 17314, TDP330 {DIGI}]

1960-17 – *Floriadekoets Trekt Door Zuid-Slavie*, 34m, 35mm/b-w [B&G: 12713, TDP2183 {DIGI}]

1960-20 – *Floriade-Postkoets Weer Thuis*, rec.: 1960-05-07, 1'13", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 17394, TDP331 {DIGI}]

1960-24 – *Mode Op Hoog Niveau* [Euromast], rec.: 1960-06-02/03, 1'28", 35mm/b-w/CO [B&G: 17376, 60130 {neg.}]

1960-31 – *Bloeschikken Op Floriade*, rec.: 1960-07-25, 1'16", 35mm/b-w/CO [B&G: 17433, TDP333 {DIGI}]

1960-33 – *Bouw van de metro begonnen*, 1'30", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0332] Z 105

1960-33 – *Het Internationale Concours Hippique in Rotterdam*, 1'35", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. 60195; TDP334 {digi}]

1960-34 – *De Europoort Groeit* [construction works at Rozenburg, a.o. Verolme's dockyards, ship for Esso; 1960-08-19], 1'27", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. nr. 60204; digi TDP 334, VHS VP334]

1960-44 – *Het Vorstelijke Bezoek Uit Thailand* (rec.: 1960-10-24/25/26/27), 4'44", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 17526, 60275 {neg.}] TDP336 {Digi }

1960-50 – *Braziliaans Vliegdekschip na Verbouwing in Dienst Gesteld* [1960-12-06], 2'15", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. 60322; TDP337 {digi}]

1961-39 – *Tewaterlating van Mammoettanker op Rozenburg* [tanker 634 for British Oil, at Verolme, 1961-09-15], 2'08", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. 61266; TDP346 {digi}]

1961-39 – *Prinses Beatrix opent Dijkzigt ziekenhuis in Rotterdam* [1961-09-18], 2'2", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0456] Z 108

1961-26 – *Rotterdam bouwt aan zijn metro*, 2'38", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0336] Z 105

1961-37 – *Concours Hippique in Rotterdam*, 1'43", 35mm/b-w/com [B&G: neg. 61251; digibeta TDP345]

1962-08 – *Rotterdams jeugd ontmoet prominenten in de sport* [in Ahoyhal], 1'25", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0462] Z 108

1962-13 – *Doop van Mammoettanker* [christening of "Esso Hampshire" by Ms. Elliot (Standard Oil) at Verolme, Rozenburg], 2'08", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. nr. 62085; TDP352, VP352]

1962-21 – *Nieuwe Reuzendokken* [minister Jan de Pous inaugurates two new docks at Verolme, Botlek], 1962-05-11, 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. 62131; digi TDP353; VHS VP353]

1962-36 – *Het Grootste Schip Ooit in Nederland Gebouwd* [launching Esso Libya, Verolme Rozenburg, 1962-08-23], 1'14", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. nr. 62220; digi TDP356; VHS VP356]

- 1962-37 – *Internationaal Springconcours*, 1'22", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. 62228; digi-beta TDP356]
1962-16 – *Grootse ontvangst van Cliff Richard* [Ahoy'], 2'04", 35mm/b-w/mute [B&G, GAR: BB-0460] Z108
1962-16 – *Engelse studenten bezichtigen metro*, 1'33", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0459] Z 108
- 1963-15 – *Feyenoord - Benfica (0-0)* [1963-04-10], 2'29", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0491] Z 109
1963-19 – *Met Feyenoord naar Lissabon* [1963-05-04 / 1963-05-08, supporters by ship to Benfica - Feyenoord (3-1), 4'50", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0493 Z 109]
- 1963-21 – *Opbouw dag 1963* [1963-05-18], 1'27", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0494] Z 109
1963-22 – *Bouw Van Nieuwe Oeververbinding* [Van Brieneoordbrug] rec.: 1963-05-22, 1'32", 35mm /b-w/co [B&G: 17720, TDP362 {DIGI}]
1963-28 – *Prinses Beatrix doopt reuzentanker* [launching "Esso Den Haag" at Verolme] 1962-08-23], 1'42", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. nr. 63112; TDP363 {digi}]
- 1963-36 – *Jaarlijks Hippisch Festijn*, 1'24", 35mm/b-w/com [B&G: neg.nr. 63152; digibeta TDP364]
1963-50 – *Internationale kattenshow* [cats, Ahoy'], 1'10", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 17794; TDP366 {DIGI}]
1963-50 – *Rotterdamse metro vordert*, 1'08", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0499] Z 109
- 1964-06 – *Amerikaans Circus* [circus Ringling Bros and Barnum & Bailey in Ahoy'], 1964-02-00, 2'22", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 17821, TDP367 {DIGI}]
1964-34 – *Conflict om Pier Prijs* [delivery 4th part Scheveningse Pier, built at Verolme], 1'14", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. 64122; TDP371 {digi}]
1964-50 – *Bouw van de Brieneoordbrug*, rec.: 1964-12, 1'31", 35mm/cl/co [B&G: 17958, TDP373 {DIGI}]
- 1965-06 – *De Van Brieneoordbrug*, rec.: 1965-02-01, 1'54", 35mm /b-w/co [B&G: 18047, TDP374 {DIGI}]
1965-07 – *Bouw van de metro* [1965-02-01, H.M. Juliana], 2'29", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0508] Z 110
1965-09 – *Afscheid burgemeester Van Walsum* [1965-02], 1'42", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0510] Z 110
1965-40 – *Havendag* [1965-09-24], 2'03", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0513] Z 110
1965-41 – *Vliegfeest op Zestienhoven* [1965-10-02], 1'05", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0514] Z 110
1965-51 – *Korps Mariniers bestaat 300 jaar* [1965-10-12, Oostplein; defilé Coolsingel] 1'20", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0517] Z 110
- 1966-21 – *Schouwburg "De Doelen"*, rec.: 1966-05-18, 1'36", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 18240, TDP382 {DIGI}]
1966-45 – *Medische Faculteit* [construction] (1966-11-00), 1'55", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G: 18344, TDP385 {DIGI}]
- 1967-04 – *Uitbreiding Europort* [1967/01] 2'41", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0522] Z 110
1967-07 – *Drijvende havenvakschool Jan Backx*, 2'15", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G: digi TDP 387; GAR: BB-0523] Z 110
1967-** – *Rotterdamse metro vordert. Proefrit op het traject ten zuiden van de Maas* [1967-02-10], 2'03", 35mm/cl/opt. [B&G, GAR: BB-0524] Z 110
1967-24 – *Benelux-Tunnel In Gebruik*, rec.: 1967-06-05, 1'46", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 18433, TDP389 {DIGI}]
1967-31 – *Opening BP-raffinaderij door Minister Luns* [1967-07-24], 1'50", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0528] Z 110
1967-43 – *Verkeerschaos in Rotterdam ten einde, Coolsingel heropend door Tom Manders* [rec.: 1967-10-13], 2'11", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0529] Z 110
1967-47 – *Hippy-Happy Beurs* (recording, 1967-11-10, 1967-11-14, Philip Bloemendal (com., 1'32" (44 mtr., 35mm/b-w/CO [B&G: 18532, TDP392 {DIGI}], GAR: BB-0537; Z 110
- 1968-08 – *Metro officieel in gebruik* [1968-02-09], 3'11", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0533] Z 110
1968-49 – *St. Laurenskerk gereed*, 2'23", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0538] Z 110
- 1969-35 – *Nieuwe bestemming Sint-Josephkerk*, 54", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, TDP403; GAR: BB-0546 > Z111]
1969-20 – *Tewatrlating Mammoettanker* [launching 'Esso Gambria', Verolme Rozenburg], 2'24", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: neg. 69071; digi TDP401; VHS VP401]
- 1969-24 – *Uitbreiding haven*, 2'33", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0543] Z 111
1969-** – *Waarschuwingnet Rijnmond*, 2'28", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0558] Z 111
1969-32 – *Ingebruikstelling Heineoordtunnel* [1969-07-22], 3'25", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0545] Z 111
- 1970-12 – *Euromast wordt 78m hoger*, 1'02", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G, GAR: BB-0562] Z 111
1970-20 – *Europacup voor Feyenoord* [1970-05-06], 4'59", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G, 70069 {neg.}, TDP408 {digi}, VP408 {VHS}]
1970-24 – *Uitbreiding bedreigt Kasteel 'Huize D'Olivant'*, 1'16", 35mm [B&G: 70084 {neg.}, TDP408 {digi}, VP408 {VHS}]
1970-26 – *Manifestatie C'70*, 2'31", 35mm/cl/co [B&G: 19020, GAR: BB-0566; Z 111]
1970-27 – *Holland Pop-Festival*, 2'21", 35mm/cl/CO [B&G: 19002, 70097 {neg.}] GAR: Z 111
1970-37 – *Feyenoord – Estudiantes (Argentinië) 1-0* [Feyenoord world champion], 1970-09-09, 5'06", 35mm/b-w/opt. [GAR: BB-0569, Z111]
1970-39 – *Nieuw Hart Voor Zuidelijk Stadsdeel* [new Ahoy' complex] (Polygoon, rec.: 1970-09-00, 1'21" (39 mtr., Philip Bloemendal (com., 35mm/b-w/CO [B&G: 19074, TDP410 {DIGI}]) [GAR: BB-0570] Z 111
- 1971-04 – *Sportpaleis Ahoy Geopend*, rec.: 1971-01, 1'41", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 19129, 71010 {neg.} TDP412 {DIGI} VP412 {VHS}] [GAR: BB-0575] Z 111
1971-13 – *Stapelloop Mammoettanker* [1971-03-20, tanker Chevron Kentucky at Verolme, Rozenburg], 1'14", 35mm/b-w/com: PhB [B&G: neg. nr. 71043; digi TDP413; VHS VP413]
1971-15 – *Pasar-Malam In De Ahoy Hal, Optreden Hofdansers Van De Sultan Van Djokjakarta* (Polygoon, rec.: 1971-04, 3'35"., 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: 19168, TDP413 {DIGI}])
1971-** – *Europort toegankelijk voor mammoettankers* [1971-06-11] 1'38", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0581] Z 112
1971-30 – *Groot Verkeerscircuit* [kleinpolderplein], 1'04", 35mm/b-w/CO, Philip Bloemendal, Philip (comm.) [B&G: 19315, 71111 {neg.nr.} TDP415 {DIGI-BETA} VP415 {VHS}] [GAR: BB-0582] Z 112
- 1972-21 – *Grootste Taxicentrale van Europa*, 1'38", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0586] Z 112
1972-18 – *Oriëntatiebezoek Kamercommissie aan Rijnmond* [Gulf refinery, protest, neighbourhood], 2'13", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0585] Z 112
1972-42 – *Centrum De Lantaren Heropend*, 1'41", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G: 72154 {neg.}; GAR: BB-0587] Z 112
1972-51 – *Italiaan Turrini Europees Sprintkampioen Wielrennen* [cycling in Ahoy], 1'19", 35mm/b-w/co PhB [B&G: 19501, 72190 {neg.} TDP424 {DIGI-BETA} VP424 {VHS}]
- 1973-13 – *IJshockey Om De Wereldtitel* [in Ahoy'] (Polygoon, rec.: 1973-03-00, 1'07", 35mm/b-w/co PhB (B&G: 19554, 73-13 {wknr.} 73043 {neg.} TDP426 {DIGI} VP426 {VHS})
1973-52 – *Nieuw orgel in de St. Laurenskerk*, 2'3", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G, GAR: BB-0597] Z 112
- 1974-35 – *Kangeroeschip Tillie Lykes*, 2'32", 35mm/b-w/opt, for: ECT [B&G, GAR: BB-0600] Z 112

- 1974-42 – *Kasbah Project Van Pieter Blom* [Hengelo] 2'17", 35mm/cl/co [B&G: 20018, 74140 {neg.}, VP436 {VHS}]
 1974-45 – *Opening van het metrotraject naar Hoogvliet* [1974-10-25], 3'10", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G; GAR: BB-0601] Z 112
- 1975-46 – *Terugkeer Van Dr. Tiede Herrema Na 36 Dagen Gijzeling In Ierland*, 1'33", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 20239, 75128 {neg.}, TDP443 {DIGI-BETA}] VP443 {VHS}]
- 1976-06 – *De Paalwoningen Van Pieter Blom* [Cube Houses Helmond], 2'15", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 19774, 76012 {neg.}] VP444 {VHS}]
- 1977-16 – *Museum de Keikdoos* [R'dam CS: Van Persie/Citroen], 1'24", 35mm/cl/opt [B&G; GAR: BB-0611] Z 113
 1977-08 – *Stakingsacties op vele plaatsen, Onderhandelingen leiden tot gedeeltelijke overeenstemming*, 3'18" (94 mtr., 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 20353, 77017 neg.]
 1977-09 – *Haven- En Bouwstakingen Duren Voort, Solidariteitsmars In Rotterdam*, 2'54", 35mm/b-w/co [B&G: 20354, 77020 neg.]
- 1978-25 – *Vliegtuigshow op Zestienhoven* [1978-06-03], 1'05", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G; GAR: BB-0616] Z 113
 1978-27 – *Optreden van Bob Dylan* [1978-06-23], 1'23", 35mm/b-w/opt [B&G: 78068 neg.; digi-beta TDP460]
 1978-38 – *Gratis Popfestival Trekt 80.000 Bezoekers* [Zuiderpark], 2'36" (74 mtr., 35mm/b-w/com.: Philip Bloemendal [B&G: 20640, 78-38 wknr., 78094; GAR: BB-0619]
- Polygoon-Profiliti** (see also: Alsemgeest, Peter; HAL, 1963; Kalános, Lajos; Moonen, Jan e.a.)
 1960s – *When the trigger falls, a film about Verolme U.S.*, 18', 16mm/b-w/sound (English) [MM: AV24; short version of 9' = AV68-5]
 1965 – *En toch...Rotterdam – Documentair verhaal van een stad gesterkt door strijd* [revision of the version from 1950], 26', 35/b-w/co, com.: Philip Bloemendal, text: Jaap Bax, cam: Huib de Ru, scen.: Nol Bollongino, prod.: Polygoon-Profiliti, for: Bureau Voorlichting en Publiciteit [B&G: PR0737 A-F]
 1968 – *Tijd om te werken / Time to Work*, 12', 16mm/b-w & cl/co [MM: AV100 + AV103 = Dutch; AV104 = English]
 1969 – *Mammoettanker – Mammoethelling* [1968-1969], 11', 16mm/cl/sound (Dutch) [MM: AV88]
- Prigent, Yves**
 1976 – *Le Feu au Cul / La Grande Culbute*, F, dir.: Yves Prigent, Laszlo Renato, 91', 35mm/cl/sound [ref. IMDB]
- Raucamp, Gerard**
 1962 – *Holland Today* [div. cities, inc. Rotterdam/Pernis; Amsterdam], cam.: Prosper de Keukeleire, H. Frimel, 96', 35mm/cl, prod.: Carillon Films [B&G (RVD): 3730, 07-0131-08 {Archiefnr} 702-03 {Videonr}]
 1963 – *Hemelsbreed / D'horizon à horizon* [industry, infrastructure in NL], prod.: Carillon Films [ref. nfdb]
 1967 – *...en zij noemden het Holland / ...And They Called It Holland*, 10', prod.: Carillon Films [ref. nfdb]
 196x – *Mensen, schepen en olie / Man, ships and oil*, prod. Carillon Films [ref. nfdb/NFM]
- RDM, see: Rotterdamsche Droogdok Maatschappij**
- Reede, Joop van**
 1975 – *Gas*, 13', 16mm/cl/opt, for: GEB [GAR: BB-1113] Z 800
- Reedijk, Hein** – see: LBC Videogroep
- Reinboud, Joop**
 1962 – *Shopping Centra* [a.o. Lijnbaan], 4'22", 16mm/cl/-, for: KRO [B&G (RVD): 3885, 07-2397 {arch.}, V104526 {VHS}]
- Rhijn, J. van** (see also: NTS/NOS Journaal)
 1970 – *Demonstratie tegen vestiging hoogovenbedrijf*, 4', 16mm/cl/mute [GAR: BB-0782] Z 203
 1972 – *Oude Noorden*, 12', 16mm/cl/mute, for: Gemeentelijke archiefdienst [GAR: BB-0784] Z 203
- Ridder, Hans de** (see also: Rijnke, Dick – 1971, 1973)
 1976 – *'t Is gewoon niet mooi meer (Urban Renewal Rotterdam)*, 49', 16mm/cl/opt, cam./prod.: Dick Rijnke/Rotterdam Films [GAR: BB-0887] Z200
- Riet, J.M. van**
 1962 – *CEFA Film presenteert* [Lijnbaan, moped race, int. Ter Meulen & Van Vorst, shops], 25', 16mm/cl & b-w/mute, for: community centre 'de Brandaris', Schiebroek [GAR: BB-3792] Z 298
 1963 – *Vakantiebesteding Zomer 1963* [Schiebroek, youth activities], 13', 16mm/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-3791]
 1965 – *Centrum van Rotterdam* [Lijnbaan, Coolsingel, Beurs e.a.], 6', 16mm/b-w/mute, for: community centre 'de Brandaris', Schiebroek [GAR: BB-3793]
- Rijneke, Dick** (see also: Ridder, Hans de – 1976)
 1969 – *Escalating Egg* [experimental short], 3', 16mm/b-w/mute, distr.: International Art Film
 1971 – *Ik weet nog steeds niet of ik beter ben / Feeling better you can never tell* [drug addicts], 35', 16mm/b-w, cam./prod.: Dick Rijnke; sound/editing: Hans de Ridder, broadcast by KRO, BRT, shown at youth centres e.a.
 1973 – *Ik hou het wel voor gezien / I take it for granted*, co-dir. Hans de Ridder, 30', 16mm/b/w, cam./prod.: Dick Rijnke/Rotterdam Films
 1979 – *'t Is gewoon leven / Living One's Life*, 49', 16mm/b-w/magn., prod.: Rolf Orthel, sponsored by CRM [GAR: BB-0848] Z 628
 1979 – *RAR-spot* [Rock Against Religion, Kaasee], 8', 16mm, i.c.w. Mildred van Leeuwen, for: VPRO's Neon, 1979-12-23 [B&G: V5365]
- RKK** (television)
 1968 – *St. Clara Ziekenhuis Rotterdam-Zuid* [aerial shots R'dam-Zuid, new hospital], KRO/RKK broadcasting: 1968-12-01, 4'11", Film: A1/ - /B1 [B&G: 59577, K33159 {FILM}]
- Robinson, Peter**
 1971 – *Gehavende Steden: Havens van Rotterdam en Londen* [incl. interv. D. Perkins, dir. Port of London, F. Posthuma, dir. Port of R'dam], BBC, NCRV: 1971-02-15, 58'58" [B&G: 23081, V42228]
- Rombouts, Fred**
 1968 – *Namen die je nooit vergeet; Koos Speenhoff* [singer] (broadcasting: 1968-01-05, pres.: Wim Ibo, prod.: Rens van Dorth, for: KRO, 22'07", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 57377, G78672 {FILM}])

Ronteltap, Ferri

- 1970 – *Richard* [fiction: marriage disturbed by arrival of young man], 20', 16mm, prem. IFFR [Ronteltap Film]
1971 – *Drie Fasig* [fiction: women discuss Hollywood image of women], 25', 16mm, prem. IFFR [Ronteltap Film]
1971 – *Verwachtingen* [fiction: husband/wife work in a firm where he strikes and she not, causing tensions], 25', 16mm, prem. IFFR [Ronteltap Film]
1978 – *If You Know The End* [fiction: missing industrialist and wanderer], 35', 16mm [Ronteltap Film]

Rosinga, John

- 1960 – *Dig those Dutch* [R'dam a.o. cities]; consists of: *A dog's life* [high-rise, Lijnbaan, Maastunnel, Euromast]; *Flying high* [airport, kitchen H.A.L. ship]; *Fish and Ships* [bridges, Koningshaven, shipbuilding], 3 x 12', 35mm/cl/opt, co-dir.: Gerard Trebert, prod.: Telefund Holland, for: Ned. Bureau voor Toerisme [GAR: BB-0827, 0828, 0829] Z 1023

Rotterdamsche Droogdok Maatschappij (RDM)

- 1960 – *Samen werken aan de toekomst* [shipping, education], dir: Bob Schrijvers, 18', 16mm/cl/magn, for: RDM [GAR: BB-1137] Z 1076
1960 – *Bouw van een 90 tons kraan*, 16mm/b-w/mute, for: RDM [GAR: BB-3914] Z 376
1960 – *Bouw Ondina*, 35', 16mm/b-w/mute, for: RDM [GAR: BB-1150] Z 373
1968 – *Bouw van de Arriva*, 44', 16mm/cl/magn, for: RDM [GAR: BB-1136]
1970 – *Opbouw en proefschieten M 114* [1960-1970], 14', 16mm/cl/mute, for: Defensie RDM [GAR: BB-1166] Z 348
1975 – *Het booreiland Petro Baltic*, 25', 16mm/cl/magn (English, for: RDM [GAR: BB-1159] Z 347
1975 – *Tewaterlating Fina Italia*, 14', 16mm/cl/magn, for: RDM [GAR: BB-1167] Z 346
1977 – *75 jaar RDM 1902-1977*, 15', 16mm/cl/ magn, for: RDM [GAR: BB-1138] Z 1076
1979 – *RDM Jaarboek 1979*, 20', 16mm/cl/magn, for: RDM [GAR: BB-1144] Z 341

Rotterdamse Kunststichting – RKS (see: LBC Videogroep, Videocentrum)**Rueb, H.**

- 1960 – *De Diergaarde* [Blijdorp Zoo, 1950-1960, animals in-/outside], 26', double8/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-0946-1/2] Z 437 – NB Rueb was zoo attendant.

Ruiter, C.Th. de

- 1970 – *Een bezoek aan C'70*, 10', super8/cl/mute, [GAR: BB-1691] Z 639

Rusinov, Irv

- 1971 – *Rotterdam-Europoort, Gateway to Europe*, 20', 16mm/cl/neg; perfo, pos: opt, for: Encyclopaedia Britannica Educational Corp., Chicago, i.c.w. The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs [GAR: BB-3157] Z 1075

Schaper, Jan (see also: Hillo, Jan van)

- 1963 – *Weg naar de wereld*, 30', 16mm/cl; by Jan van Hillo, Jan Schaper & Kálman Gáll, for: Havenvakschool/Stichting Vakopleidingen Havenbedrijf (SVH) [GAR: BB-0731, Z 135, Z 506]
1963 – *Toekomstmuziek: in Zaken* [youth tv-series on professions; Wilton-Fijenoord, Verolme, port, city, high-risebuildings], 28'02", 16mm/b-w/magn, Jan Schaper {dir. + cam.}, Ferenc Kálman Gáll {cam.}, prod.: NCRV (1963-01-04) [B&G: 48909] ref. Open Studio, kaart 11, nr. 34
1963 – *Toekomstmuziek* (5) [clergymen], 29'10", 16mm/b-w/magn., Jan Schaper {dir. / cam. in Rotterdam}, Ferenc Kálman-Gáll {cam.}, Jan van Hillo {prod.}, NCRV: 1963-02-01 [B&G: 49017] ref. Open Studio, kaart 2
1963 – *Toekomstmuziek, Glamour* [photo models, Amst./Den Haag/Rott.], 29'24", 16mm/b-w/magn., Jan Schaper {dir. + cam.}, Ferenc Kálman-Gáll {cam.}, NCRV (1963-03-29) [B&G: 49191] ref. Open Studio, kaart 4, nr. 7
1964 – *4 December 1964 – 12,5 jaar N.J.F.* [Luxaflex], 59', 16mm/b-w; for: Nederlandse Jaloezieën Fabriek / Hunter Douglas [GAR: AJS, p3/4], ref. Open Studio, kaart 43
1965 – *De Tros* [short fiction for children, Rott. + Vlaardingen], 21'49", 16mm/b-w/perfo, Tom Hakbijl {act.} [GAR]
1965 – *De Pier* [short fiction for children: pier Hoek v. Holland], 15'23", 16mm/b-w/perfo, Tom Hakbijl {act.} [GAR]
1965 – *Aardgas wat koop ik ervoor*, 34'22", 16mm/b-w/opt, prod.: Open Studio, for: NAM [GAR]
1966 – *Het Proces Renesse*, 34'38", 16mm/b-w/perfo, (rec. 1965-1966, for: NCRV (not broadcasted) [GAR]
1966 – *Stad zonder hart/Town Without a Heart*, 46'54"/16mm/b-w/opt [GAR: BB-0751] (filmed 1964-65, Jan Schaper + Ferenc Kálman Gáll + Hans Visser {cam.}, Christine van Roon + Martin van Dalen {sound}, prod. Open Studio, NCRV 1966-05-14 [GAR: BB-0751 (= Z 140, DVD Z 1027) ref. Open Studio, kaart 70, prod. 254
1967 – *De Toekomst Wordt Dichtgebouwd* [urbanism, a.o. Polak (alderman city dev.), Fokkinga (city planner), Van Leeuwen (RET)], NCRV, 1967-04-03, 18'36", 16mm/b-w/magn., Jan Schaper + Leo Moen {dir.}, Hans Visser {cam.} [B&G: 55712, 106968 {FILM}] [GAR: BB-0750]
1967 – *Havenbedrijf Vlaardingen Oost*, 21'57", 16mm/b-w/?, for HVO [GAR]
1967 – *Commercial Havenvakschool* [in Amsterdam & Rotterdam], 30', 35mm/b-w/opt, for: Reclamebureau Keuzenkamp [GAR] ref. Open Studio, kaart 65, nr. 599
1969 – *Tegenspel* [Arnhem, Rotterdam a.o.], 23', 16mm/cl; for: SALCO (also English version) [GAR]
1969 – *Weg van de haven*, 48'22", 16mm/cl/magn., Jan Schaper {dir. + cam.}, Hans de Ridder + Christine van Roon {sound}, for: Havenvakschool, NCRV (1970-02-02) [B&G: 20420]
1970 – *HVS C70* [short version of *Weg van de Haven*], 10'45, 16mm/cl/opt; for: Havenvakschool [GAR: AJS nr.41, p31] ref. Open Studio, productiekaart HVS C70
1970 – *De Laatste Man / Der letzte Mann* [Jan van Beveren, keeper Sparta/NL], 43'04", 16mm/b-w/perfo [GAR]
1970 – *Topsport Zonder Tribune* [C'70, hefrucks], 16', 16mm/cl/opt, Open Studio, for: Havenvakschool [GAR: BB-3546, Z669]
1971 – *Vreemde vogels over je land*, 45', 16mm/cl, for: Gasunie (also English version, 53min) [GAR]
1972 – *Meer mannen minder/Port of Grain*, 50', 16mm/cl/magn. + perfo, prod.: Open Studio, for: Graan Elevator Maatschappij (GEM, ook Engelse versie: *Port of Grain* [GAR BB-5080 (= Z916)])

Schippers, Wim T.

- 1979 – *Verhagencadabra (1)* [fireman Kooijmans, boxer Van Klaveren, F. Rost v. Tonningen, widow NSB-er, at Theater Zuidpl.] VPRO 1979-06-17, prod.: Ellen Jens; ed.: J. Deelder; pres. Hans Verhagen, 57'06", cl [B&G: 105864, TD54202 {DIGI-BETA} V5359 {VHS}]

Scottish Television

- 1960 – *Sparta-Glasgow Rangers* [begins with Lijnbaan, Coolsingel, Stadhuispl., port, Euromast under con., Dijkzigt Ziekenhuis, Drooglever Fortuynplein, Spartakasteel], 23'9", 16mm/b-w/magn [GAR: BB-0817] Z 133, Z 199

Shell

- 1970 – *Growth* [sound and vision play], on the occasion of the C'70.

Simon, Wil

1968 – *Europoort-Oliepoort* [Pernis, a.o. Mr. Martin/Gulf, Mr. D. Rodenburg/Shell, Mr. Claessens/Esso, Mr. Posthuma/Port Auth.], 29'14", 16mm /b-w/magn., dir.: W. Simon, interv.: Frans van Houtert, cam.: Piet ter Laag, AVRO: 1968-11-11 [B&G: 59412, M32040 {FILM}]

SKVR, see: Jongh, Chris de

Sluizer, George

1961 – *De Lage Landen / Hold back the sea*, 29', 35mm/cl/opt, cam.: Eduard van der Enden, Prosper Dekeukeleire, Henk Haselaar, prod.: Shell [GAR: BB-0701] DVD Z 1019

1971 – *Love and Music / Stamping Ground* [Popfestival Kralingen], co-dir: Jason Pohland, 90', Planet Film, Berlin [GAR: BB-4471]

Smit, Pieter Jan

1979 – *Zwaanshals*, 5', 16mm/b-w/sound

1979 – *Botlek Blues*, 32', 16mm/sound, music by De Rondos

Soek, Jan W.

1958-1971 – *Zeekastelen*, 16', double8/cl & b-w/mute [GAR: BB-3894] Z 542

1960-1962 – *Alexanderpolder en Brabantse Dorp*, 46', double 8/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-4564] Z 1170

1961-1967 – *Metro Rotterdam deel I*, 30', 8mm/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-4563] Z 1166

1964-1984 – *Rotterdam, havens en bruggen*, 26', double 8/cl & b-w/mute [GAR: BB-4560] Z 1166

1970 – *Reconstructie Laurenskerk*, cam.: Jan Soek, editing/sound: Ron Corbet, 18'23", 16mm (blow up)/b-w/magn = GAR: BB-0789] Z 122 [made from the recordings (a.o.): GAR: BB-4561 and 4566 = resp. Z1169 and Z 1167]

1970-1971 – *Capitol Stadsnieuws 1971* [C70 a.o.] 30', double8/cl & b-w/mute [GAR: BB-3895] Z 542

1974-1983 – *Metrobouw* [Schiedamseweg a.o.], 20', double 8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-3987] Z 623

1975-1985 – *Stadsvernieuwing, Metrobouw en Spoortunnel*, 40', double 8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-4571] Z 1169

1978 – *Bouw van de metro oost/westlijn* [Coolhaven to Capelsebrug], 20', super 8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-3897] Z 566

1978 – *Wandeling door Rotterdam* [>1982, Hofdijk, Peperklip a.o., protests], 20', 8mm/cl/mute [GAR: BB-3898] Z566

1979 – *Impressies van Rotterdam* [1956-1979, protests, Heliport a.o.], 20', 8mm/b-w+cl/mute [GAR: BB-3896] Z 542

SP

1976 – *Socialistische Partij*, 25', 16mm/cl/negatief + magn. perfo tape, for: SP [GAR: BB-1807] DVD (scan) Z 1074

Span, Joop

1975 – *Werken om water*, 20', 16mm/cl/opt, Joop Span Filmproducties, for: Kon. Wegenbouw Stevin [GAR: BB-0801]

Sprongers, Peter

1972 – *Voor morgen en overmorgen* [bouw, electriciteitscentrale, maasvlakte], 23', 16mm/cl/magn, for: GEB [GAR: BB-1074] Z 117 / Z 205

1975 – *Centrale Maasvlakte, bron voor energie*, 40'57", 16mm/cl/magn, prod.: Ned. Laboratorium voor Filmtechniek, for: GEB [GAR: BB-0813] Z 631

Staal, Adriaan (see: Verheijen, F.P.; see also: Mediafront)

STV

1975 – *Havens Voor Europa Deel 3. Antwerpen/Rotterdam*, broadcasting: 1975-03-17, 20'01", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 32974, M52709 {FILM}]

Sunagawa, Tatsuo

1973 – *World's Energy* {given title} [Botlek a.o], cam. Nagaoka, prod.: Kajima Films, Tokyo [ref. *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1, 1973 – p27].

Tania, Pier

1965 – *Niet Bekend* [air pollution Rijnmond, Port of Rotterdam], 22'26", 16mm/b-w/magn., Pier Tania {dir.}, Jan Schaper, Hans Visser, Mat van Hensbergen {cam.}, VARA: 1965-05-19 [B&G: 51788, 84004 {FILM}, V24725 {VHS}] ref. Open Studio, kaart 55

Tati, Jacques

1971 – *Trafic* [F], 96', 35mm/cl/mono, scen.: Jacques Tati, Jacques Lagrange, Bert Haanstra, cam.: Eduard van der Enden, Marcel Weiss, montage: Maurice Laumain, Jacques Tati, Sophie Tatischeff, music: Charles Dumont, sound: Alain Curvelier, Ed Pelster, prod.: Les Films Corona (a.o.)

TELEAC (television)

1972 – *Beton, Les 1. Inleiding* [housing, Van Brieneoordbrug a.o.], 1972-01-15, 1972-01-18, 14'19", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 25342, M46041 {FILM}]

1978 – *Tijd Voor Geschiedenis, les 3. De Randstad Holland*, 1978-01-26, 14'09", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: id 40053]

Tholen, Tom

1967 – *Toets / Touch*, 18', 16mm/cl/opt & 35mm/cl/opt + perfo tape, cam.: Eduard van der Enden, Robert Müller, Anton van Munster, prod.: NFM, for: St. Havenbelangen [GAR: BB-0758] DVD Z 1072, VHS Z 638, Z 119

1967 – *Bacher*, 20', cl/sound, Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij, for: Adriaan Volker

Tholens, Joost

1979 – *3 Dagen bij de Vreemdelingenpolitie in Rotterdam*, KRO, broadcasting: 1979-01-15, 70'00", 16mm/cl/sound, prod. KRO [B&G: 94765, G62230 {FILM}], V11523 {VHS}]

Timp, Leen

1961 – *Wie Wat Bewaart* ['het Schielandshuis'] (broadcasting: 1961-10-06, pres.: Pierre Janssen, 14'45", 16mm /b-w/magn., prod.: AVRO [B&G: 1800, M74080 {FILM}] V58643 {VHS}]

Tjepkema, Almar

1963 – *Navigare Necesses Est IV. Lading? Passagiers!* [life and work at HAL ships], cam.: Wim Smits, com.: B. Steinkamp, 28', 16mm/b-w/opt, prod. VPRO [B&G; GAR: BB-0867]

Tomeï, Tonko

1972 – *Omnoord 1972* [script: Weenink, Hans], 26'54", 16mm/b-w/magn, St. Wijkgemeenschap Omnoord & AV afd. Erasmus Universiteit [GAR: BB-0790] Z 493, Z 027 = new comment, 2002

Toonder Studio's

1975 – *Sterspot Rotterdam* [tourism promotion] 1', 16mm/cl/magn [GAR: BB-0798] Z 144 / Z 287

Trebert, Gerard – see: Rosinga, John

TROS – general (television)

1967 – *Kompas* [metro Rotterdam; metro in New York, Kiev, Montreal, London, Milano], 1967-06-29, 9'54", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 56253, 110339 {FILM}] 263061 {FILM}}

1970 – *Ziezo Zomer* [C'70], 1970-09-03, 4'28", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 21854, M39556 {FILM}]

TROS – **Aktua** (television)

1975 – *Aktua* [gambling houses], 1975-01-20, 5'56", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 32509, M52267 {FILM}]

1978 – *Aktua* (171) [women detention], 1978-02-07, interv.: A. Horvers, 3'44", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 40156/40152, G59480 {FILM}], V57569 {VHS}}

1978 – *Aktua* (172) [crime victims], 1978-02-14, 6'22", Peter Dillen {ed}, 16mm/cl/ [B&G: 40213, G59689 {FILM}]

1979 – *Aktua* (251) [tug boat strike], 1979-08-25, 4'07", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 3037, G64294 {FILM}]

1979 – *Aktua* (253) [harbour strike], 1979-09-08) 7'37", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 3096, M63753 {FILM}]

1979 – *Aktua* (256) [strike, Shell Chemie], 1979-09-29, 8'25", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 3162, M64179 {FILM}]

Tso Nam Lee

1974 – *Chinese Kung Fu Against Godfather*, HK/NL, 93', 35mm/cl/sound (Chinese/English), cam.: Len Wen Yin, mus.: Chow Fok Leung, cast.: Kam Tong, Jan Willem Stoker, Ine Veen e.a., prod.: Yung Nin Yuen, Tso Pak Kuen.

Tuscan Cinematic Ltd.

1974 – *Rijn Schelde Verolme / Rhine Schelde Verolme*, 21', 16mm/cl/sound (Dutch / English), for: Rijn Schelde Verolme [MM: AV82 = English, AV459 > II, see also: AV457 and AV458]

VARA – general (television)

1960 – *Anders dan Anderen: Cornelis Verolme* [NB preserved are only inserts: launching of "Jacob Verolme", Ablasserdam; Verolme and Kubitschek, tanker "Kubitschek" = from Polygoon 'Hollands Glorie op Rio's rede'], 1960-01-15, pres.: Bert Garthoff, prod.: Pier Tania/VARA [B&G: 45511]

1960 – *Espresso* [a.o. Japanese flower art, Floriade], 1960-07-23, 2'17", pres.: Arie Kleijwegt, Netty Rosenfeld, Jan Leijendekker, 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 158752, 3/121 {FILM}] V54367 {VHS}}

1961 – *Espresso* [Zestienhoven], 1961-08-19, 8'25", 16mm/b-w/sound, interv.: Jan Leijendekker [B&G: 47182, 37727 {film}]

1963 – *Signalement: Anna Blaman* [writer], 1963-10-06, dir.: Alfred Kossmann & Henk de By, 23'12", 16mm /b-w/magn. [B&G: 172733, 6/1680

{FILM}] V53787 {VHS}}

1967 – *Waar Een Wil Is, Is Een Weg* [spatial planning, infrastructure, metro a.o] 1967-11-28, 33'58", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 57036, M27723 {FILM}] V24890 {VHS}}

1968 – *Signalement: Willem de Kooning*, 1968-09-15, 37'02", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 59013, V42177 {VHS}]

1969 – *Zo Maar Een Zomeravond* [greetings from R'dam, Euromast] (broadcasting: 1969-08-29, 4'11", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 19295, M35713 {FILM}]

1970 – *Goed Leven* [a.o. arch. Verhoeven in Hoevelaken, housing Rotterdam], 1970-01-07, 27'43" [B&G: 20262, M45813 {FILM}]

1973 – *Signalement: Dick Elffers* [artist], 1973-11-04, 35'55", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 29596, G49356 {FILM}]

1974 – *De Ombudsman* [a.o. law-shop 'Bloemhof' in R'dam about minimum wage], 1974-03-02, 3'31", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 30427, M50082 {FILM}]

1975 – *Koning Klant (Item: Deltakabel-Sternet)* [large tv-antenna], 1975-10-09, 2'42", 16mm/cl/sound, dir.: Jan Versteegh [B&G: 34389, M54311

{FILM}], V45160 {VHS}}

1978 – *Koning Klant* [North Sea Ferries, a.o.], 1978-06-22, 4'09", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 41121, M60634 {FILM}]

1979 – *Randy Newman* [concert at Ahoy'], 1979-10-12, 78', cl/sound [B&G: 97617 / 97618, V7850 / V7851]

VARA – **Achter het Nieuws** (television, editor in chief: Arie Kleijwegt, Herman Wigbold, Pier Tania e.a.; eds. Wim Bosboom, Koos Postema a.o.²⁰⁵⁷)

1961 – *Achter het Nieuws* [traffic, metro constr.], 1961-07-28, 1'52", 16mm/b-w/mute [B&G: 47133, 36847 {FILM}]

1964 – *Achter het Nieuws* [homeless], 1964-09-24, rep. Koos Postema, 16'37", [B&G: 50429, 74719 {FILM}]

1966 – *Achter het Nieuws* [work of the police Rotterdam], 1966-05-14, 10'23" [B&G: 53825, 95480 {FILM}]

1966 – *Achter het Nieuws* [Crooswijk, housing shortage, mayor Thomassen], 1966-10-25, dir.: Wim Bosboom, com.: Koos Postema, ed.: Herman Wigbold, 5'29", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 54634, V42537 {VHS}]

1967 – *Achter het Nieuws* [harbour] (broadcasting: 1967-08-31, 7'47", [B&G: 56493, 112893 {FILM}]

1968 – *Achter het Nieuws* (1968-08-10) [arch. Verhoeven in Hoevelaken] 9'55" [B&G: 58778, M31388 {FILM}]

1969 – *Achter het Nieuws* [interview with Verolme on prospects], 1969-09-18, 3'21" [B&G: id 19403]

1969 – *Achter het Nieuws* [parliament about Verolme], 1969-09-26, 13'23" [B&G: blik M35823; VHS V42776]

1970 – *Achter het Nieuws* [on housing, 'Oude Westen'], 1970-03-28, dir.: Siem Suurhoff, com.: Pier Tania, 22'58", 16mm/b-w/opt [B&G: 20816, M38507 {FILM}]

1970 – *Achter het Nieuws* [General Kurt Student, WWII], 1970-04-20, 27'26", 16mm/b-w/opt, interv. Hans Jacobs [B&G: 20965, M38776 {FILM}]

1970 – *Achter het Nieuws* [C'70, protest], 1970-04-25, 7'56", 16mm [B&G: 21004, K38241 {FILM}] V24971 {VHS}}

1970 – *Achter het Nieuws* [harbour strike], 1970-09-07, 10'16", 16mm [B&G: 21884, M39584 {FILM}]

1971 – *Achter het Nieuws* [strike tug-boat service], 1971-02-03, 13'11", 16mm [B&G: 22967, K41069 {FILM}]

1971 – *Achter het Nieuws* [protest 'Oude Westen'], 1971-11-30, interv.: Pier Tania, 7'22", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 24997, M44118 {FILM}]

1972 – *Achter het Nieuws* [strike at Verolme a.o.], 1972-02-04, 4'53", 16mm/cl/sound, prod.: VARA [B&G: id 25493]

1972 – *Achter het Nieuws* [Oude Westen], 1972-06-20, 4'30", 16mm/cl/sound, prod.: VARA [B&G: V42432]

1972 – *Achter het Nieuws* [mayor Thomassen on riots and housing 'gastarbeiders'], 1972-10-07, interv. by: Trix Betlem, 6'12", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 26961, M46705 {FILM}]

1974 – *Achter het Nieuws* [program city college] 1974-05-21, 8'12", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 30976, G51195 {FILM}]

1974 – *Achter het Nieuws* [mayor Van der Louw], 1974-11-21, interv. Hans Polak, 12'48", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 32049, G52241 {FILM}]

1975 – *Achter het Nieuws* [boycott Chilean fruit], 1975-03-27, 5'01", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 33072, M52465 {FILM}]

1976 – *Achter het Nieuws* [harbour strike], 1976-05-20, 4'01", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 36080, M55973 {FILM}]

1976 – *Achter het Nieuws* [harbour strike], 1976-07-01, 3'56", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 36355, G55860 {FILM}]

1977 – *Achter het Nieuws* [harbour strike], 1977-02-07, 10'13", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 37826, G57051 {FILM}]

²⁰⁵⁷ http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Achter_het_Nieuws_%28Nederland%29 (2008-03-21)

VARA – Visie (television, editor in chief: Joop Daalmeijer a.o.)

- 1977 – *VARA-Visie* [speculation, Fennis], 1977-12-09, 12'28", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 39709, G59088 {FILM}]
1978 – *VARA-Visie* [prostitution Katendrecht, Poortgebouw], 1978-01-21, rep.: Joop Daalmeijer, 16'25", 16mm/cl/- [B&G: 40009 + 40011, M59388 {FILM}]
1978 – *VARA-Visie* [closing Gusto, Schiedam], 1978-11-28, 8'48", 16mm/cl/magn, rep.: Joop Daalmeijer [B&G: K61606 {blik}; GAR: BB-0850]
1978 – *VARA-Visie* [film festival], 1978-06-09, 10'02", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 41055, G60386A1 {Film}, V57462 {VHS}]
1978 – *VARA-Visie* [city problems], 1978-11-14, 20'18", 16mm/cl/magn [B&G: 41720] [GAR: BB-0849]
1979 – *VARA-Visie* [harbour strike, Wim Kok FNV], 1979-08-28, 32'07", cl [B&G: 15793, B727 {UMATIC}]
1979 – *VARA-Visie* [harbour strike, Shell], 1979-09-25, 14'41", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 3149, G63575 {FILM}]

Velde, Wim van der

- 1961 – *Polders voor industrie* [Europoort], 40', 16mm/b-w/magn, co-dir.: Wim Smits, prod.: VPRO [GAR: BB-0730] Z 772
1965 – *Ruimte Voor Miljoenen* [economics, refineries a.o.], VPRO: 1965-10-27, 29'13" [B&G: 52634, 93563 {FILM}]

Verheijen, Frans Peter – see also: Mediafront

- 1974 – *Wijk 20* [Feijenoord], 29', 16mm/b-w/opt, co-dir: Adriaan Staal [GAR: BB-1817] Z 626
1975 – *Zorgvuldig Afgestoft*, co-dir: Adriaan Staal
1978 – *Binnenstadsdag 1978* [town hall discussions a.o.], 60', umatic/cl/sound, for: Gemeente Rotterdam [GAR: BB-2605] Z 215, 218 [also: GAR: BB-2603/2604/2605/2606/2607; BB-2607 (13') = Z 232]

Verhoeven, Paul

- 1965 – *Het Korps Mariniers* [navy, at Texel a.o.], 22', 35mm/cl/sound, cam.: Peter Alsemgeest, prod.: Multifilm
1973 – *Turks Fruit / Turkish Delight*, 112', 35mm/cl/sound, story: Jan Wolkers, script: Gerard Soeteman, cast: Monique van de Ven, Rutger Hauer, cam.: Jan de Bont, prod.: Rob Houwer
1977 – *Soldaat van Oranje*, 167', 35mm/cl/sound, story: Erik Hazelhoff Roelfzema, script: Gerard Soeteman e.a., cast: Rutger Hauer, Jeroen Krabbé, Susan Penhaligon, cam.: Jost Vacano, prod.: Rob Houwer

Vermeulen, Wessel

- 1963 – *Aanleg Metro*, 10', double8/b-w/mute [GAR: BB-3990] dvd Z 1003

Verolme United Shipyards (see also: Kalános, Lajos; Polygoon-Profiliti; Tuscan e.a.)²⁰⁵⁸

- 1960 – *The Sea trials of the "Minas Gerais"*, 22', 16mm/cl/sound (English), dir.: M. Bosboom, prod.: Polygoon Profiliti [MM: AV28 and AV69-2; Dutch version: *Verolme bouwt vleugels voor de Braziliaanse Marine*, inv. nr.: AV81; Portuguese version: *Marinha..Asas para a Marinha. "Minas Gerais"*, AV78]
1962 – *Oiltanker for the Netherlands*, 15', 16mm/cl/sound (English) [MM: AV27]
1962 – *Past meets present. The christening of the "Esso Lybia"*. *Verolme United Shipyards* [1962-08-23], 5', 16mm/cl/sound (English) [MM: AV69-1, AV23]
1964 – *Verolme verlichting bij de Van Brienoordbrug*, 17', 16mm/cl/magn. (Dutch) [MM: AV95]
1965 – *Bouwfilm*, 31', 16mm/b-w/ [MM: AV65]

Veronica (television)

- 1977 – *Tulpenrally* [start & finish in Rotterdam] 1977-06-01, 20'24", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 2387, M63716 {FILM}]
1978 – *Info* [housing agencies], 1978-04-05, 7'13", 16mm/cl/sound, dir.: Paul Boots [B&G: 2447, M63888 {FILM}]
1979 – *Countdown* [a.o. New Pop, Zuiderpark] 1979-09-12, 32'38", cl [B&G: 90299, V4099]

Veugelers, Jan

- 1975 – *Operateur in Thaliatheater*, 20', 16mm/cl/sound [GAR: BB-1257] Z 484

Videocentrum – see also: LBC Videogroep / RKS, Bob Visser

- 1976 – *Hart voor de stad* [Binnenstadsdag, 1976-05-22] 30', video/b-w/sound, RKS [GAR: BB-3805] Z 314
1977 – *Cool, woonwijk?* [1977-1980, call for urban renewal], slides on video/cl/sound, RKS [GAR: BB-2610] Z 231
1977 – *Ouders op herhaling* [urban renewal Delfshaven], 37', video/b-w/sound, RKS [GAR: BB-2865] Z 249
1977 – *Aankondiging wijkorgaan vergadering*, 5', video/b-w/sound, RKS [GAR: BB-2848] Z 241
1977 – *Moet je zelf weten* [Oude Westen, by school children] 18', umatic/b-w/sound, for: RKS [GAR: BB-2845] Z 237
1978 – *De Basischool* [introduction of the concept], 23', video/cl/sound, RKS [GAR: BB-2884] Z 245
1978 – *Crooswag wijkvergadering* [Crooswijk], 16', video/b-w/sound, RKS [GAR: BB-2854] Z 242
1978 – *Crooswag* [children / education], 12', video/b-w/sound, RKS [GAR: BB-2886] Z 244
1978 – *Leven in de wijk Cool*, 25', dir.: Henk van Bruggen, video/cl/sound, RKS [GAR: BB-0008] Z 208
1979 – *Actiedag Nieuwe Westen/Middelland*, dir.: H. van Bruggen, 20', video/cl/sound, RKS [GAR: BB-2917] Z 321
1979 – *Huren aan de haven*, 32', video/cl/sound, RKS [GAR: BB-0029] Z 307
1979 – *Werken aan 't bestemmingsplan, met z'n allen als het kan*, 18', video, RKS [Aelbrechtskade, Middelland, Nieuwe Westen] [GAR: BB-0028] Z 207 / Z 228
1979 – *Renovatie, puur renovatie* [Walravenstraat, Hillesluis], 25', video/cl/sound, for: RKS [GAR: BB-2910] Z 336
1979 – *De Toekomstbouwers* [Kinderopvang], 25', video, RKS [GAR: BB-0031] Z 207
1979 – *Wonen in Landzicht*, 20', video/cl/sound, for: RKS [GAR: BB-2974-1] Z 321

Viktor, Herbert

- 1960 – *Ich will leben*, 11', Internationale Fernsehagentur (IFAG, Wiesbaden) / Multifilm [GAR: BB-0686, VHS Z 201]

Visnews (UK) / European Broadcasting Union

- 1960 – *Visnews* [Floriade] EBU: 1960-03-25, 3'39", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: id 114580; 24659 {film}]
1960 – *Visnews* [Floriade] EBU: 1960-03-25, 1'22", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: id 114581; 23575 {film}]
1960 – *Visnews* [arrival Louis Lourmais, Rhine swimmer] EBU: 1960-03-26, 0'44", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: id 114608; 23424 {film}]
1960 – *Visnews* [Istanbul, Floriade coach] EBU: 1960-03-30, 1'10", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 114591; 23519 {film}]
1960 – *Visnews* [reconstructed city; construction works, St. Laurens church, Dijkzigt hospital] EBU: 1960-04-28, 9'11", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: id 115353; 24446 {film}]
1960 – *Visnews* [ballooning] EBU: 1960-05-05, 1'18", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: id 115575; TDU83629 {digi}]

²⁰⁵⁸ More titles related to Verolme can be found in the Maritiem Museum, Rotterdam (a.o.).

1960 – *Visnews* [arrival Floriade coach] EBU: 1960-05-07, 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: id 115603; 24660 {film}]
 1960 – *Visnews* [navy ship Karel Doorman prepares for departure to New Guinea]; EBU: 1960-05-24, 1'20", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: id 115925; 25278 {film}]
 1960 – *Visnews* [navy ship Karel Doorman leaves for New Guinea] EBU: 1960-05-31, 1'20", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: id 116029; 25279 {film}]
 1960 – *Visnews* [meat transport] EBU: 1960-09-28, 1'07", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 28191 {film}]
 1966 – *Visnews* [transport of oil rig 'Ile de France' from Rotterdam to Senegal] EBU: 1966-01-06, 1'19", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: id 150011; 90939 {film}]
 1967 – *Visnews* [parliament elections] EBU: 1967-02-14, 0'48", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 105149 {film}]
 1967 – *Visnews Background Feature* [port], EBU: 1967-11-01, 4'37", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 63387, K28152 {blik}]
 1968 – *Visnews* [new shipping line Hull – R'dam] EBU: 1968-01-30, 0'29", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: K28296 {blik}]
 1970 – *Visnews* [damaged 'Pacific Glory'] EBU: 1970-11-13, 1'02", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 11263; K40268 {blik}]

Visser, Bob – see also Videocentrum, Rotterdamse Kunststichting

1976 – *Crooswijk, daar woon ik*, 23', Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2847] Z 241 [8' version: BB-2877] Z 246
 1976 – *Crooswijk Journaal, nr. 1* [Aktiegroepen, Bewonersorganisaties Crooswijk], 11', video/b-w/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2855]
 1976 – *Crooswijk Journaal, nr. 2* – *Sloop Schutting* [protest Rubroekstr.], 4', video/b-w/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2878] Z 246
 1976 – *Kinderen in Crooswijk*, 12', video/cl/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2860 = BB-3872 (?)] Z 334
 1976 – *Wat doen we met Crooswijk* [urban renewal, alderman Van der Ploeg], 18' + 10', video/b-w/sound, RKS [GAR: BB-2851 / 2881] Z 242 + Z 246
 1977 – *De straat* [Hillesluis youth], 10', video/b-w/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2861] Z 334
 1977 – *Kinderen in Ommoord*, 15', video/cl/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2859] Z 334
 1977 – *Spelen in Zuidwijk*, 11', video/b-w/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-3809] Z 334
 1977 – *Witte Dorp & Bergpolderflat*, i.c.w. Kees Breedijk, 21', video/b-w/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2891] Z311
 1977 – *Oude Noorden* [or: 'Aan de Oever van de Rotte, wonen of verkrotten']: (I) *Sociaal*, (II) *Wonen*, (III) *Aktie*, co-dir: Kees Breedijk, 18', 17', 12', video/b-w/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2873, 2874, 2875] Z 247/Z 206
 1977 – *Journaal Dienstencentrum* [Crooswijk, elderly], 8', video/b-w/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2880] Z 246
 1977 – *Wijk 26* [Nieuw IJsselmonde] 18', video/cl/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2609] Z 231
 1977 – *Slopen; Aktie sloop poortgebouw Klosstraat*, 11', video/b-w/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2611] Z 250
 1977 – *Spangen 77*, 25', video/b-w/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2608] Z 231
 1977 – *Verkeer Walravenbuurt*, 15', video/b-w/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2863] Z 250
 1977 – *Buffelstraat in Beweging* [dramatized docu], 25', video/b-w/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2871] Z248
 1977 – *J.A. Deelder's Stadsgezicht (in: Het Gat Van Nederland)*, broadcasting: VPRO 1977-12-25, 16'03", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 84778, G59975 {FILM}] V4972, 4973 {VHS}]
 1978 – *Delfshaven verbeterd*, co-dir: K. Breedijk, 17', video/cl/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2894] Z 228
 1978 – *Tilt*, 26', video/cl/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2907] Z 326 / Z 320
 1978 – *Zonder bruggen zijn we nergens* [Willemsbrug, Noordereiland, 1978-1984], 35', video/b-w/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2846] Z 237
 1978 – *Rotterdam senior: Théé dansant*, 10', video/b-w/sound, Videocentrum [GAR: BB-2849] Z 241
 1979 – *Videocentrum Presentatietape*, 38', video/cl/sound [GAR: BB-2899] Z 309
 1979 – *Neon* [television program] 42', pres.: Jules Deelder, for: VPRO-television, e.g. editions 1979-11-25 and 1979-12-23 [B&G: V5365]

Visser, J.A.

1975 – *Rotterdam in de zeventiger jaren* [C'70, manifestatie Kleinpolderplein, Manifestaties Technikon] [1968-1975], 24', double8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-3633] Z 551

VPRO (television)

1960 – *Omniibus* [fashion show in Rotterdam, Euromast], 1960-07-13), Heleen van Meurs & Ton Hasebos, 8'02", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 179077, 6'308 {Film}] V54937 {VHS}]
 1962 – *Vernissage* [C.B. Vaandrager opens exhibition Niels Hamel], 1962-04-19, 7'55", 16mm/b-w/sound 7992II [B&G: 48083, 46311 {FILM}]
 1965 – *Extra* [airport 'Zestienhoven'] 1965-11-04, 9'34", 16mm/b-w/magn. [B&G: 52682, 89267 {FILM}]
 1966 – *Vorm En Functie; Bruggen* [Van Brieneoordbrug a.o.] 1966-11-10, 17'34", 16mm/b-w/sound [B&G: 54715, 78729 {FILM}] 17378 I {bliknr.}] 101740 {FILM}] 23867MI {FILM}]
 1967 – *Niet Bekend* ['pauzefilm'; Van Brieneoordbrug], 1967-10-16, 3'42", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 56744, K27188 {FILM}]
 1971 – *Was Er Nog Wat* [taxi drivers on Surinamese clients], 1971-01-14, 6'57", 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 22833 K40850 {FILM}]
 1971 – *Berichten Uit De Samenleving, geluidshinder* [airport zestienhoven], 1971-03-25, 8', 16mm/cl/magn. [B&G: 60978, K41511 {FILM}]
 1971 – *Berichten Uit De Zomer: Gastarbeiders In Rotterdam*, 1971-09-16, 26'05", 16mm/cl/magn [B&G: 24449, M44627 {FILM}] V53531 {VHS}]
 1976 – *Droomland, Afl. 3: Ongeveer 10 Procent* [Film in NL] 1976-01-29, 36'23", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 35185, G54907 {Film}]

Vrijhof, J. A.

1976 – *Binnenstadsdag* [1976-05-22], 8'34", 16mm/cl/mute [GAR: BB-0625] Z 113

Vrijmoet, Henk M. (Gemeentewerken)

1965 – *Metroviaduct "Balkenfabricage"* [Rotterdam-Zuid], 11', 16mm/b-w/perfo comm., prod.: Gemeentewerken [GAR: BB-0903-2] Z 895
 1966 – *Rotterdam metro balkentransport* [viaduct zuid], 9', 16mm/b-w/perfo, prod.: Gemeentewerken [GAR: BB-0903-3] Z895
 1967 – *Bouw Prins Alexanderpolder*, 4'12", 16mm/b-w/magn., prod.: Gemeentewerken – series *Rotterdams Journaal* [GAR: BB-0556-3] Z 636
 1967 – *Aanleg van de Maasvlakte*, 4'45", 16mm/b-w/magn., prod.: Gemeentewerken – series *Rotterdams Journaal* [GAR: BB-0556-4] Z 636
 1967 – *Luchthaven Rotterdam* [building airport], 3'56", 16mm/b-w/magn., prod.: Gemeentewerken – *Rotterdams Journaal* [GAR: BB-0556-2] Z 636
 1967 – *Lentiade* [1967-03-15, Ahoyhal Heliport] 2'40", 16mm/b-w/magn., prod.: Gemeentewerken – *Rotterdams Journaal* [GAR: BB-0556-1] Z 636

Waardenburg, W.B.

1970 – *Stella Maris, Zeemanshuis* [1960 – 1970], 24', double8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-3056] Z 609

Wagt, Gabri de

1970 – *Klank- & Lichtspel Rotterdam*, dir.: Willy Hofman, Gabri de Wagt, scr.: Bob den Uyl, for: Gemeente Rotterdam, on the occasion of the C'70.

Wemelsfelder, Mr.

1960-1970 – *Kris-Kras door Rotterdam* [C70 a.o.], 15', super8/cl/mute [GAR: BB-1207] Z 544 / Z 491

Wiegel, Jan

1968 – *Een bewoonbaar land* [planning], 21', 16mm/cl, dir.: Jan Wiegel, cam.: Pim Heytman, ed.: Elvira Kleinen, sound: Cor Koenders, prod.: Multifilm, for: Min. of Housing & Planning, Min. of Foreign Affairs [nfd]b

1970 (?) – *Maasvaart*, 20', cl

1970 (?) – *Waterweg* [Rotterdam > Würzburg], 20', cl, for: Nederlandse Particuliere Rijnvaart Centrale

Wilton-Fijenoord Journaal (Schiedam)

annually 1952-1982, app. 35' each, 16mm/b-w/opt [Gemeentearchief Schiedam]²⁰⁵⁹

Zwart, Eelco

1974 – *Laurensorgel in Rotterdam*, 56', 16mm/cl/sound, for: EO [B&G, GAR: BB-2598] Z 212

Zwartjes, Frans

1979 – *Pentimento* [fiction; DWL complex / Utopia], 78', 16mm/cl/opt, dir./cam./ed./prod.: F. Zwartjes [ref. Filmbank]

²⁰⁵⁹ [www.schiedam.nl/archief/toegangen/552\(originele%20films\).htm](http://www.schiedam.nl/archief/toegangen/552(originele%20films).htm) (2009-01-06). The film collection of the Gemeentearchief Schiedam includes various other titles related to Wilton Fijenoord.

FILMOGRAPHY ROTTERDAM SINCE 1980 – SELECTION

Abrahams, Anna

1991 – *Bouwen voor het licht* [partly made with footage from the film *Bouw van de Van Nelle Fabriek*, 1930, Willy Mullens], 26', prod.: Rongwong.

Alsengeest, Peter

1982 – *Metro Oost-West*, 19', 16mm/cl/versions with NL and GB comm., cam.: Pim Heytman, sound: Nick Meijer, prod.: Multifilm, for: Gemeentewerken [GAR]

1989 – *Een Goed Lopende Stad*, 17', 16mm/kl/com, for: Gemeentewerken [GAR]

AVRO

1980 – *Televizier Magazine* (XI/24) [on mortgages, Housing Hofdijk as an illustration] (AVRO, 1980-03-24) [B&G: 4252, G65181 {FILM}]

1983 – *Televizier Magazine* [on Fennis, auction of his belongings; 1983-09-03] [B&G: 110443, 110445]

Brummelen, Han van, see: Dullaart, Karel

Campfens, Raymond

1981 – *Uitzending Regionale Omroep Rotterdam Rijnmond* [discussion on local broadcasting and district council election], 60', video/cl/sound [GAR: BB-0035-1, Z337]

Chan, Jackie

1998 – *Who am I?*, HK, 108', cast.: Jackie Chan, dir.: Jackie & Benny Chan, prod.: Barbie Tung

Dullaart, Karel

1982 – *Groeten uit Rotterdam* [housing in Feijenoord, Peperklip], i.c.w. Han van Brummelen, 20 min, video/cl/sound, Arena Video Workshop [GAR: BB-3811]

Elenga, Henk

1980 – *Popzien*, 17', video/cl/sound, dir./prod.: Henk Elenga, Joop de Jong, for: RKS [GAR: BB-0021, Z 321]

Gogh, Theo van

1989 – *Loos*, 90', 35mm/cl, cast.: Tom Jansen, Renée Fokker, scr.: Guus Luyters, cam.: Tom Erisman, prod.: Dave Schram

Greenaway, Peter

1985 – *A Zed and Two Noughts*, NL/UK, 115', cast: Brian & Eric Deacon, Andréa Ferréol, prod.: Peter Sainsbury, Kees Kasander.

Herblot, Ruud – see: Burcksen, Joop

Hout, André van der

2003 – *De Arm van Jezus*, 71', mus.: De Kift, prod.: André van der Hout, Adri Schrover

Jong, Joop de (see: Elenga, 1980)

Keller, Hans

1981 – *Over de Brug*, prod.: Rijnke & Van Leeuwaarden [B&G: V13985]

Korst, Harm (*Vergeten Verhalen*)

2005 – *Vergeten Verhalen: Promotiefilms*, 20', DVD, comments: Paul van de Laar, TV Rijnmond [GAR: BB 4493] Z1081

2005 – *Vergeten Verhalen: Kunst en Vaarwerk*, 20', DVD, TV Rijnmond [GAR: BB-4613] Z1097

2005 – *Vergeten Verhalen: Havenstaking 1970*, 20', DVD, TV Rijnmond [GAR: BB-4619] Z1098

2005 – *Vergeten Verhalen: De Beer*, 20', DVD, TV Rijnmond (2005-11-08) [GAR: BB-4616] Z1098

Leeuwaarden, Mildred van (see: Rijnke, Dick)

NCRV

1985 – *Bokkesprongen* (1985-05-15), interview with Piet Blom by Louis Kockelmann, 11'15" [B&G: 12212, M75684 {FILM}]

NOS

1981 – *Van Gewest Tot Gewest* [Piet Blom, cube houses, Helmond, Rotterdam], 12'48", interv.: Jan Gerritsen (1981-12-02) [B&G: bliknr. = G68329, V108026 {VHS}]

Orthel, Rolf (producer)

1984 – *Rotterdam*, triptych of fiction shorts on urban renewal consisting of: *Rinus* (dir.: Joost Kraanen), *Turkse Video* (dir.: Otakar Votocek), *Het Wonder van Rotterdam* (dir.: Gerrard Verhage), prem.: De Lantaren, 1984-10-17.

Pannekoek, Jop

1989 – *Roets 14* [rough material, interview with Jan Schaper], Jop Pannekoek {dir.} [GAR: Z 1027]

Peeters, Floor

1982 – *Landscapes* [Honingerdijk. DWL-terrein / Utopia], 8'26", 16mm/cl/perfo [GAR: BB-0076, Z 1073]

Peeters, M.P. (Rien)

Artist portraits, made for Peeter's Galerie Keerweer, 4 to 8 minutes each, 8mm/cl/sound, collection GAR.

1980 – *Joop Moelenaar* [GAR: BB-5054, DVD Z 1215]

1980 – *Teo Gootjes* [BB-5055, Z 1215]

1980 – *Gijs Voskuyl* [BB-5056, Z 1215]

1980 – *Henk de Vos* [BB-5057, Z 1215]

1980 – *Gust Romein* [BB-5059, Z 1215]

1980 – *Adriaan Meijers* [BB-5060, 1215]
1980 – *Helene van Stralen* [BB-5061, Z 1249]
1980 – *Rien Bout* [BB-5062, 1249]
1980 – *Katrijn Bagijn* [BB-5063, Z 1249]
1980 – *John Wouda* [BB-5065, Z 1249]

Rijneke, Dick

1980 – *Groeten uit Rotterdam*, 180', co-dir.: Mildred van Leeuwaarden, for: VPRO [ref. NFDB]
1982 – *Pinkel*, 70', co-dir.: Mildred van Leeuwaarden
2005 – *Nou, dat was het dan!*, 80', co-dir.: Mildred van Leeuwaarden

Scholten, Peter

1993-2004 – *Het Was* [historical footage], 400 editions x 10', prod.: NEON, for: Stads TV Rotterdam / TV Rijnmond (since 1997)
2005 – *Jan Schaper – de stad, het licht en de film* [life and work of Jan Schaper, a.o. interv.], 53', Peter Scholten {reg.}, prem.: IFFR 2005, prod.: Radar Media (broadcast by TV Rijnmond).

Tromp, Albert

1981 – *It's In the Cards*, 22', cl, cam.: Eduard van der Enden, mont.: B. Morgan, prod.: Allarts, premiere: 1981-01-08, for: ECT

Tros

1982 – *Tros Aktua 408*, 1982-09-10, 7'48", rep.: Marcel Bruyns [B&G: bliknr. = M69779]

Verbong, Ben

1989 – *De Kassière*, 112', cast.: Marion van Thijn, Thom Hoffmann, Coen van Vrijberghe de Coningh, prod.: Haig Balian, Chris Brouwer

Verhoeven, Paul

1980 – *Spetters*, 120', cast: Maarten Spanjer, Renée Soutendijk, scr.: Gerard Soeteman, cam.: Jost Vocano, prod.: Joop van den Ende

Visser, Bob

1983 – *Klassestrijd*, cam.: Jules van den Steenhoven

VPRO

2001 – *Andere Tijden* [SP, Daan Monjé], 24'36", dir.: Merel de Geus, pres.: Hans Goedkoop, editorial: Matthijs Cats, research: Karin van den Born, VPRO, 2001-09-11 & 2002-06-25 [B&G: 163847, TD65009 {digibeta}]
2004 – *Andere Tijden* [introduction of the VUT, 1970s], 27'17", dir.: Merel de Geus, pres.: Hans Goedkoop, editorial: Ad van Liempt, Carla Boos, Gerda Jansen Hendriks, prod.: Maja Cesnovar, Laura Kaandorp / VPRO (2004-10-05) [B&G: 176375; digibeta TDU 77251]

FILMOGRAPHY – GENERAL

references to films that do not deal with Rotterdam

Aafjes, Cor

1923 – *Beton en Woningbouwfilm / Gemeente Betonwoningbouw* ['Betondorp', Amsterdam], NL, 1200m, 35mm/b-w/mute, Polygoon [B&G]

Abrahams, Anna

1995 – *Sotsgorod, Cities for Utopia*, NL, 92', prod.: Studio Nieuwe Gronden

Arzner, Dorothy – see: Fitzmaurice, George - 1934

AVRO

1976 – *Drie Maal Twintig* [cube houses Helmond, P. Blom], NL, 1976-11-17, 50'49", 16mm/cl/sound [B&G: 37220]

Bacon, Lloyd

1928 – *The Singing Fool*, USA, 105', 35mm/b-w/sound, prod.: Warner Bros.

Berger, Martin – see: Rutten, Gerard

Bergmann-Michel, Ella

1932 – *Wo wohnen alte Leute*, D, 13', 35mm/b-w, script: Ella Bergmann-Michel, Mart Stam

Borgers, Carel

1951 – *Suiker en wat er aan vooraf gaat*, NL, 35', 16mm/b-w/opt., prod.: NV Filmproductie Rotterdam, for: VCS Dinteloord [Gemeentearchief
Roosendaal: F16-0007, DVD-011]

1952 – *De ASV groeit* [ref. NFM]

1956 – *Een Verkiezingsfilmpje van de PvdA* [The Hague] NL, 4'03", prod.: NV Filmproductie Rotterdam, for: PvdA [B&G, VHS V98615]

195x – *Rijker Leven*, Borgers Filmproducties / Haghe Film, NL [ref. NFDB]

195x – *Key & Kramer*, NL [Maassluis]

Boyle, Joseph C.

1929 – *Times Square / Elaine* (NL title), USA, 78', 35mm/b-w/sound, prod.: Gotham Productions

Burcksen, Joop

1966 – *Elements facing Elements* [Zeelandbrug], NL, dir.: Joop Burcksen, Ruud Herblot, for: Van Hattum & Blankevoort

Cavalcanti, Alberto

1926 – *Rien que les heures* [Paris], F, 45', 35mm/b-w/mute

Cocteau, Jean

1946 – *La Belle et la Bête*, F, 96', 35mm/b-w/mono

Collande, Volker von

1943 – *Das Bad auf der Tenne*, D, 88', 35mm/cl/sound, prod.: Tobis Filmkunst

Dudow, Slatan

1934 – *Seifenblasen*, D/F, Davis Films S.A.

Dupont, Frans

1951 – *Nijmegen, Stad aan de Rivier*, NL

Eggeling, Viking

1921-1923 – *Horizontaal-vertikalorcheser*, D, 10', 35mm/b-w/mute

1924 – *Symphonie Diagonale*, 7'30", D, 35mm/b-w/mute

Eisenstein, Sergei

1929 – *The General Line*, USSR, 131', prod.: Sovkino

Fitzmaurice, George

1928 – *Lilac Time*, USA, 80', 35mm/b-w/mono, prod.: First National Pictures

1934 – *Nana*, USA, 90', 35mm/b-w/mono, prod.: Samuel Goldwyn Company

Franken, Mannus – see: Joris Ivens

Frenkel Sr., Theo

1928 – *Bet naar de Olympiade*, NL, 1749m, prod.: Adriëne Solser / Studio Eureka (Schiedam)

Gasteren, Louis van

1954 – *Bruin Goud*, NL, for: Van Houten cocoa factory

1960 – *Een nieuw dorp op nieuw land*, NL, 30', 35mm/b-w/sound, for: Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting en Bouwnijverheid

Godard, Jean-Luc

1967 – *Deux ou Trois Choses Que Je Sais d'Elle*, F, 87', 35mm/cl/mono, prod.: Argos Films

Gormley, Charles

1975 – *If Only we had the space*, GB, for: Glasgow Corporation.

1975 – *Places or People*, GB, for: Glasgow Corporation.

Güsten, Theo

1927 – *De Zaanstreek*, NL, prod.: Germania [NFDB]
1928 – *Bruynzeel*, NL, [Westhoff, 1995: 25]
1929 – *De PTT in dienst van de wereldvrede*, NL, for: PTT [Westhoff, 1995: 25]
1929 – *Telegraaf en Telefoon in Dienst*, NL, for: PTT [Westhoff, 1995: 25]
1930 – *Alle Zeven Dagen* (aka *Amsterdam-Batavia door de lucht*), NL, graphics: Piet Zwart, for: PTT

Haas, Max de

1957 – *Amsterdam, Stad van het Water*, NL

Hemert, Willy van

1951 – *De Toverspiegel / The Magic Mirror* [fantasy], NL, 90' (app.), b-w/sound, script: Pieter Koen, Evert Werkman, cast: Albert van Dalsum, Louis Bouwmeester, Hetty Blok, Johan de Meester, Ad Hooykaas, Ank van der Moer, broadcast: NTS, 1951-10-02.

Herblot, Ruud – see: Burcksen, Joop

Hillo, Jan van

1971 – *Abu Dhabi; Aan de Perzische Golf*, NL, cam.: Joop Burcksen, prod: Mundofilm/NCRV, broadcasting: 1971-12-04 [B&G: Docid 25022]

Hin, Jan

1932 – *Kentering*, NL, 60', 35mm/b-w/mute, prod.: Hinfilm, for: RK Werkliedenverbond [NFM]

Hornecker, Rudi

1954 – *Ouverture Den Haag*, NL

Hoving, Hattum

1958-1974 – [recording of the Deltawerken:] *De Sluiting Van Het Veerse Gat* (1958-1961); *Delta Ypsilon* (1969); *Spuisluizen in het Haringvliet* (1974), NL, dir. Hattum Hoving, cam. Peter Alsemgeest, Pim Heijtmans, Charles Breijer.

Hirsh, Hy

1958 – *Gyromorphosis* [New Babylon], NL, Hirsh i.c.w. Constant.

Huguenot van der Linden, Charles

1961 – *Big City Blues*, NL, cam.: Peter Alsemgeest

Ivens, Joris

1929 – *Branding*, NL, dir.: Joris Ivens, Mannus Franken
1929 – *Rain*, NL, dir.: Joris Ivens, Mannus Franken
1932 – *Song of Heroes*, USSR
1933 – *Nieuwe Gronden* [Zuiderzee], NL

Kaarna, Kalle – see: Von Maydell

Kazan, Elia

1951 – *A Streetcar Named Desire*, USA, 122', 35mm/b-w/mono, prod.: Charles K. Feldman Group

Keuken, Johan van der

1975 – *De Palestijnen*, NL, 45', prod.: Chris Brouwer, cl/sound

Kiljan, Gerrit

1930 – *Scheveningen*, NL, 24', 35mm/b-w/mute

Kleinman, Henk

1928 – *Een filmreis door Nederland: Amsterdam*, NL, 35mm, 857m, (cam. Andor von Barsy), Kleinman Filmfabriek
1930 – *Zeemansvrouwen* [Amsterdam], NL, (cam. Andor von Barsy), Filmfabriek Holland [NFM]

Kleiser, Randal

1978 – *Grease*, USA, 110', Paramount Pictures

Korporaal, John

1962 – *Rijffī in Amsterdam*, NL, cam.: Eduard van der Enden, prod.: Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij
1963 – *De vergeten medeminnaar*, NL, cam.: Eduard van der Enden, prod.: Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij

Lang, Fritz

1927 – *Metropolis*, D, 153', prod.: UFA

Maydell, Friedrich von

1924 – *Zwischen Morgen und Morgen*, D
1931 – *Eraamaan Turvissa*, FI, Von Maydell & Kalle Kaarna
1932 – *Die Tundra*, FI

McTiernan, John

1988 – *Die Hard*, USA, script: Steven E. De Souza, 131', prod.: Silver Pictures / Gordon Company

Moholy-Nagy, László

1930 – *Lichtspiel: Schwarz-Weiß-Grau*, D, 6', 35mm/b-w/mute
1932 – *Großstadt Zigeuner*, D, 11, 35mm/b-w/mute
1932 – *Impressionen von Alter Marseille Hafen*, D, 10', 35mm/b-w/mute

Mol, Jan Cornelis

1931 – *Van Bol tot Bloem*, NL, 66', Multifilm [NFM]

Mohaupt, Willi

1952 – *Europa Ruft Uns* [Loreley, *Begegnung Europäischer Jugend*, 1951], D, 717m, 35mm/b-w/sound, cam.: Andor von Barys, prod.: Hans Abich, Rolf Thiele / Filmaufbau GmbH (Göttingen) – A shorter version was released under the title Loreley (394m) [ref. www.filmportal.de]

Mullens, Willy

1928 – *Heemaf's Motorenfabriek*, NL

Multifilm Batavia

1947 – *Het fort Rotterdam* / in: *Wordende Wereld* 32/3, NL, 1'46", 35mm/b-w/com., cam. Charles Breijer [B&G: id 2906, video 637-04]

Neijenhoff, Otto van

1926 – *C. Bruynzeel & Zoon, Parket- en Hardhoutvloeren, Zaandam*, NL, dir./cam./prod.: Van Neijenhoff/IWA/VNF [NFDB]

1929 – *Waar de blanke top der duinen – Den Haag als woonstad*, NL, 35mm, 1000m [B&G]

1956 – *Tilburg, Harmonie van een Gemeenschap*, NL

Nie, Rene van

1978 – *In gesprek*, NL, script: J. Schaper, 29min/16mm/cl/opt, NL, Burgwalfilms, for: PTT [GAR: BB-1937] Z 635

Noldan, Svend

1930 – *Die Stadt von Morgen – Ein Film vom Städtebau*, D, dir.: Maximilian von Goldbeck, Erich Kotzer, prod.: Atelier Svend Noldan (Berlin).

Ochse, B.D.

1930 – *Begräfnis P.J. Troelstra*, NL, cam.: Jo de Haas, Jan Jansen, I.A. Ochse, prod.: Polygoon.

Oertel, Curt

1927 – *Hoppla, Wir Leben*, D, i.c.w. Walter Ruttmann, Erwin Piscator, prod.: Piscator-Bühne GmbH [www.filmportal.de]

Oranje Lijn

1954 – *De Achtste Zee* [introduction to the new St. Lawrence Seaway & Power Project, Canada/USA], NL, 16mm/cl/sound, made for: Oranje Lijn (Dutch/English) [MM DB2949 = folder accompanying the film]

Oswald, Richard

1934 – *Bleeke Bet*, NL, 3032m, Monopole-DLS Rotterdam

Pelerin, J.

1923 – *Per aspera ad astra*, D, cam.: Andor von Barys, prod.: Pelerin-Film

Polygoon-Profilti

1921 – *Lentefilm*, NL, 713m. [ref. Haan, 1995: 225]

1926 – *Pinksterfeest AJC*, NL, 1700m, cam.: Cor Aafjes, for: AJC [B&G]

1954 – *Hengelo*, NL, 3'37" (103m), 35mm/b-w, prod.: Polygoon, for: Gemeente Hengelo [B&G: 1645; VP1218]

1956 – *Zaandam, Onze Stad*, NL, 20', 35mm/b-w/com, for: Gemeente Zaandam [B&G: 4081; V95108]

1966 – *De Werf in de wildernis / A Wharf in the wilderness*, NL, 17', 16mm/cl/sound (Dutch & English versions) [MM: AV84 = Dutch, AV87 = English]

Rademakers, Fons

1958 – *Dorp Aan de Rivier*, NL, 92', cam.: Eduard van der Enden, prod. Bobby Rosenboom

1960 – *That Joyous Eve / Makkers Staakt uw Wild Geraas*, NL, 97', cam.: Eduard van der Enden, cast.: Ank van der Moer, Jan Teulings, prod.: Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij

1961 – *The Knife*, NL, 89', script: Hugo Claus, prod.: Nederlandse Filmproductie Maatschappij

Rhoden, Hans

1918 – *Tiefeland*, AT, 1927m, i.c.w. Friedrich Rosenthal, prod. Wiener Kunstfilm GmbH [ref. www.filmportal.de]

Richter, Hans

1921 – *Rhythmus 21*, D, 3'22, 35mm/b-w/mute

1936 – *From Thunderbolt to Television Screen*, NL, cam.: Andor von Barys, for: Philips [NFM]

Riefenstahl, Leni

1938 – *Olympia 1. Teil, Fest der Völker*, D, 121', b-w, Tobis Filmkunst

1938 – *Olympia 2. Teil, Fest der Schönheit*, D, 96', b-w, Tobis Filmkunst

Rutten, Gerard

1929 – *Sturmflut der Liebe*, D, dir.: Martin Berger, Gerard Rutten, prod.: Mondo Film Vertrieb

1932 – *Terra Nova*, NL, 67', 35mm/b-w/sound, 1885m, cam.: Andor von Barys, prod.: Electra [NFM]

1934 – *Dood Water*, NL, 106', 35mm/b-w/sound, scr.: Simon Koster, cam.: Andor von Barys, prod.: Nederlandsche Filmgemeenschap [NFM]

1936 – *Rubber*, NL, 106', 35mm/b-w/sound, cam.: László Schäffer, prod.: Nederlandsche Filmgemeenschap

1940 – *Rembrandt*, NL, 35mm/b-w/sound, cam.: Andor von Barys, Theo Güsten/Werkgemeenschap Nederlandse Cineasten

1957 – *De Vliegende Hollander*, NL/D, 90', 35mm/b-w/sound, cam.: Andor von Barys, prod.: Corona

Ruttmann, Walter

1927 – *Berlin, die Sinfonie einer Grossstadt*, D, 79', Deutsche Vereins-Film

Schaper, Jan

1955 – *Vlaardingen Koerst op Morgen*, NL, 35mm/b-w/sound, Skan Film, prem. 1955-11-05

1958 – *Vlaardingen Koerst op Morgen (revised)*, NL, 35mm/b-w/sound, Skan Film

1959 – *Ertshaven H.V.O.*, NL, 24', 16mm/b-w/sound, for: Havenbedrijf Vlaardingen-Oost [GAR]

1961 – *350 jaar in touw*, NL, 50', 16mm/b-w, Skanfilm, for: Oude Lijnbaan N.V. Vlaardingen [Stadsarchief Vlaardingen]

1966 – *Schiedam kiest voor het water*, NL, 58', 16mm/b-w /magn. (filmed 1962-1965) (first version: '*Stad tegen de tijd*'), Open Studio, for: Gemeente Schiedam [GAR and Gemeentearchief Schiedam: inv.nr.32]

Schnell, Hermann

1969 – *Anatomie des Liebesakts*, D, 90', 35mm/cl/mono, prod.: Planet Film [www.filmportal.de]

1970 – *Psychologie des Orgasmus*, D, 93', 35mm/cl/mono, prod.: Planet Film [www.filmportal.de]

Schuitema, Paul

1931 – *Rusland*, NL, 35mm, 13', Multifilm [NFM]

Scott, Ridley

1982 – *Blade Runner*, USA, 117', 35mm/cl/dolby, writer (novel): Philip K. Dick, prod.: The Ladd Company

Sewell, Vernon & Ucicky, Gustav

1933 – *Morgenrot*, D, 85', prod.: UFA

Siodmak, Robert

1951 – *The Whistle at Eaton Falls*, USA, 96', b-w, Columbia Pictures Corporation

Smith, Walter

1960 – *Gouda Album*, NL, cam.: Taede van Manen, prod.: Polygoon

Tati, Jacques

1967 – *Playtime*, 155', F/It, 70mm/cl/70mm 6 track, Jolly Film, Specta Films

Teunissen, Jan

1930 – *Bouw Flatgebouw Willemspark* [The Hague, arch. H. Wegerif], NL, for: the 'collective of residents' [B&G]

Venema, Jan

1965 – *Openbaar Kunstbezit: Constant, een kunstenaar van deze tijd* [Constant Nieuwenhuys: Cobra, 'New Babylon' e.a.], NL, 9'25", 16mm telerec. /b-w/sound, cam.: William Vogler, NTS: 1965-07-12 [B&G: id 152265, 1/2557 {FILM}, 2/5 {bliknr.}, V66839 {VHS}]

Verhoeff, Pieter

1978 – *Strijd om de Stad* [urban renewal; fiction], NL, script: Bernlef, for: Dienst Volkshuisvesting, Gemeente Amsterdam

Vertov, Dziga

1929 – *The Man with the Movie Camera*, USSR, 80'(68'), 35mm/b-w/mute, cam.: Mikhail Kaufman, prod.: VUFKU

Vigo, Jean

1930 – *À propos de Nice*, F, 25', 35mm/b-w/mute, cam.: Boris Kaufman

Vinkenoog, Simon

1962 – *Atelierbezoek; Met Simon Vinkenoog naar Het Nieuw Babylon van Constant*, NL, VPRO 1962-04-02.

VPRO

1966 – *Poëzie in Carré*, NL, 1966-03-21 [B&G: docid: 53531]

Wel, A.M. van der (see: filmography Rotterdam 1920s & 1930s)

Weisz, Frans

1970 – *Expo '70* [Osaka], NL, prod.: Jan Vrijman [NFM: ID 19699]

WHAS-TV

1964 – *Small talk* [Phyllis Knight talks to Cornelis Verolme], USA, 16mm/b-w/sound, prod.: WHAS-TV [MM: AV105].

Zinnemann, Fred

1950 – *The Men*, USA, 85', 35mm/b-w/mono, prod.: Stanley Kramer Productions

Zito, Joseph

1999 – *Delta Force One: The Lost Patrol*, USA, 93', prod.: Yoram Globus

LITERATURE

- Aasman, Susan; *Ritueel van Huiselijk Geluk; Een Cultuurhistorische Verkenning van de Familiefilm*, Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 2004.
- Abrahams, Anna; 'Dutch architecture as Siberian firewood', pp52-59 in: *Archis* 7, 1994.
- Adrichem, Jan van; Bouwhuis, Jelle; Dölle, Mariette (eds.), *Beelden in Rotterdam*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2002.
- Akkermans, Leo; 'Amerikaanse toestanden, de eerste slag in de strijd om commerciële televisie', pp93-101 in: *Tijdschrift voor Mediatgeschiedenis*, vol. 1/0, 1998.
- Albers, Rommy & Baeke, Jan & Zeeman, Rob; *Film in Nederland*, Amsterdam: Nederlands Filmmuseum / Ludion, 2004
- Albrecht, Donald; *Designing Dreams: Modern Architecture in the Movies*, New York: Harper & Row / MoMA, 1986.
- Alexander, E.; 'In Memoriam: Alexander de Haas', pp153-156 in: *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, Reeks 8, jrg. 2., Rotterdam: Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, 1974.
- Anderson, Joseph. D.; *The Reality of Illusion: an ecological approach to Cognitive Film Theory*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1996.
- Andriessen, Joost; 'Jeugd, tussen Lijnbaan en Binnenweg', pp497-498 in: *Algemeen Handelsblad* magazine nr. 20, September 1957.
- Appadurai, Arjun (ed.), *The Social Life of Things, Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986.
- Appadurai, Arjun; 'Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination', pp1-21 in: *Globalization*, (Appadurai, ed.), Durham / London: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Arias, Santa & Warf, Barney (eds.); *The Spatial Turn, Interdisciplinary perspectives*, London / New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Arnheim, Rudolf; *Film als Kunst*, Berlin: Ernst Rowohlt, 1932.
- Askew, Kelly & Wilk, Richard; *The Anthropology of Media*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- ASRO (Adviesbureau Stadsplan Rotterdam); *Het Nieuwe Hart van Rotterdam; toelichting op het Basisplan voor den herbouw van de binnenstad van Rotterdam*, Rotterdam: Nijgh & Van Ditmar, 1946.
- Augé, Marc; *Non-places, Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*, London: Verso, 1995 [1992].
- Backer, Anne Mieke; Camp, D'Laine; Dicke, Matthijs (eds.); *Van Nelle, Monument van de Vooruitgang*, Rotterdam: De Hef, 2005.
- Bacon, Edmund B. 'Stedebouw – van puur verstandelijke prestatie tot artistieke schepping', p6 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 3/2, 1964.
- Baeten, Jean-Paul; *Een Telefooncel op de Lijnbaan, de traditie van een architectenbureau; M. Brinkman, Brinkman en Van der Vlugt, Van den Broek en Bakema*, Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1995.
- Bakema, Jaap; *Van Stoel tot Stad, een verhaal over mensen en ruimte*, Zeist / Antwerpen: De Haan, 1964.
- Bakkeren, Lonke; *Architecture Diary 2002; Reconstruction, Architecture in the Netherlands, 1940-1960*, Rotterdam: NAI, 2001.
- Balázs, Béla; *Der Geist des Films*, Halle (Saale): Knapp, 1930; reprint in: *Schriften zum Film* (Helmut H. Diederichs e.a. eds.), Munich: Hanser, 1984.
- Barbieri, S. Umberto e.a.; *Stedebouw in Rotterdam, plannen en opstellen 1940-1981*, Rotterdam: Stadsontwikkeling / Amsterdam: Van Genneep, 1981.
- Barbieri, S. Umberto (ed.); *Architectuur en Planning, Nederland 1940-1980*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1983.
- Barsy, Andor von; 'Die Anwendung des Laufbildes in Busonis „Doktor Faust“', p13 in: *Bühnentechnische Rundschau*, 11/2, 1927.
- Barsy, Andor von; 'Trickvorrichtung für kombinierte Wasser- und Wolkenaufnahmen', pp22-23 in: *Die Kinotechnik*, 1935-01-20.
- Barsy, Andor von; 'Die Grundtypen der Szenenbeleuchtung', pp133-134 in: *Filmtechnik* heft 11 (31.VII), 1936.
- Bartels, Rolf & Diana Westdijk; *75 jaar haven in zicht: een inventarisatie van films en video's over de Rotterdamse haven*, Rotterdam: Fac. Historische en Kunstwetenschappen, Erasmus Universiteit, 1990. [GAR: coll. RB: XXIXB47]
- Barthes, Roland; 'The Photographic Message' [1961], in: *The Responsibility of Forms: Critical Essays on Music, Art, and Representation* (transl. Richard Howard), Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Bateson, Gregory; 'Form, Substance, Difference', pp. 448-465 in: *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*, New York: Ballantine, 1972.
- Bax, Koos & Edzes, Harry (eds.); 'Open Boek, volop voorlichting en informatie voor de Rotterdamse burgerij – en voor groepen uit binnen- en buitenland', pp16-17 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 8/3, 1970.
- Bax, Koos; 'Wet laat probleem liggen', pp3-5 in: *Rondvraag*, 1973/1 – *Lokale Radio en Televisie*, appendix to *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1, 1973.
- Bazin, André; *What is Cinema?*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005 – translation of *Qu'est-ce que le cinéma?*, 1958-1962.

- Bednarik, Karl; *De Jonge Arbeider van deze Tijd, een Nieuw Type*, Utrecht: erven J. Bijleveld, 1955 [1950].
- Beeld, Henk de; 'Duizendpoot Max Vis vijftig jaar operateur', in: *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1969-11-14
- Beeren, Wim & Dettingmeijer, Rob (e.a.); *Het Nieuwe Bouwen in Rotterdam, 1920-1960*, Delft: Delft University Press, 1982.
- Behlil, Melis; *Home Away from Home: global directors of New Hollywood*, Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, 2007 – electronic document at the university library (UB): <http://dare.uva.nl/document/48664> (2008-09-14).
- Beller, Jonathan; *The Cinematic Mode of Production: Attention Economy and the Society of the Spectacle*, Hanover (MA): Dartmouth College / University Press of New England, 2006.
- Benjamin, Walter; 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' [1935, first published in French in: *Zeitschrift Für Sozialforschung*, 1936; elaborated by Benjamin in German, 1939: 'Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit'], pp219-253 in: *Illuminations* (H. Arendt ed.), New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968; web version: www.colorado.edu/envd/courses/ENVD4114-001/Spring%2006/Theory/Benjamin.pdf (2008-10-15).
- Berg, Henk; *Over Stalles en Parket, Rotterdam en het Witte Doek, een populair-historisch overzicht van de Rotterdamse en Schiedamse bioscopen (1896-1996)*, Rotterdam: Ad. Donker, 1996.
- Bergfelder, Tim & Harris, Sue & Street, Sarah; *Film Architecture and the Transnational Imagination, Set Design in 1930s European Cinema*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007.
- Bertina, Bob; 'De fascinatie van Favre le Bret', in: *Herman van der Horst, cineast* (Herman de Wit, ed.), pp26-30, Utrecht: Nederlands Film Festival / Amsterdam: International Theatre & Film Books, 1994.
- Besselaar, Herman (text); Jonker, Henk (photographs); *Rotterdam*, Utrecht: Bruna & Zn, 1960.
- Beusekom, Ansje van & Chamuleau, Ivo; 'Programma-overzicht', pp279-299 in: *Het Gaat Om De Film! Een Nieuwe Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Filmliga, 1927-1933*, Amsterdam: Bas Lubberhuizen / Nederlands Filmmuseum, 1999.
- Bijhouwer, Roy & Van Egeraat, Erick & Gall, Stefan & Engel, Henk; 'De vorm van de herhaling; Amsterdam, Rotterdam, 1930-1960; de woning en haar verkavelingsvorm', in: Barbieri, S. Umberto; *Architectuur en Planning, Nederland 1940-1980*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1983.
- Binneveld, J.M.W.; Vleesenbeek, H.H.; *Medische Faculteit Rotterdam, analyse van een experiment*, Leiden: Stenfert Kroese, 1976.
- Bishoff, Ruud; 'De Zwijgende speelfilm', pp53-104 in: *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Film en Bioscoop tot 1940*, (ed. Dibbets K. & Van der Maden, F.), Houten: Het Wereldvenster, 1986.
- Bishoff, Ruud; *Hollywood in Holland: de geschiedenis van de Filmfabriek Hollandia, 1912-1923*, Amsterdam: Thoth, 1988.
- Blijstra, Reinder (ed.); *Beeld en Verbeelding; bijzonder nummer van Critisch Bulletin*, The Hague: D.A. Daamen's Uitgeversmij., 1948.
- Blijstra, Reinder; *Rotterdam, stad in beweging*, Amsterdam / Rotterdam: De Arbeiderspers, 1965.
- Blok, Frans; *Rotterdamse Bioscopen voor 1940*, scriptie architectuurgeschiedenis TH-Delft, Bouwkunde, 1985 (unpublished: library GAR, nr. XVI B41).
- Blokker, Jan; 'Twee Nieuwe Documentaires over Nederlandse Bedrijfsleven', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 1960-03-26.
- Blokker, Jan; 'Louis van Gasteren bouwt huizen', *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 1961-10-20.
- Blom, Ivo; *Jean Desmet and the Early Dutch Film Trade*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2003.
- Boele, Cora; 'Familie Nijgh', pp165-169 in: *Rotterdamse Ondernemers, 1850-1950* (J. Visser, M. van Jaarsveld, P. van de Laar, M. Dicke eds.), Centrum voor Bedrijfsgeschiedenis EUR, Rotterdam: Uitgeverij De Hef, 2003.
- Boer, Niek de; *De Randstad bestaat niet. De onmacht tot grootstedelijk beleid*, Rotterdam: NAi Publishers, 1996.
- Bohannon, Paul; *How Culture Works*, New York: Free Press, 1995.
- Bolbrinker, Niels-Christian; 'Von Emulsionen, Objektiven und Tonlampen. Anmerkungen zur Entwicklung der Filmtechnik', pp301-321, in: K. Kreimeier (e.a.), *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in deutschland: 1919-1933*, Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005.
- Bollerey, Franziska; *Mythos Metropolis, The City as a Motif for Writers, Painters and Film Directors*, Berlin / Delft: Gebr. Mann Verlag, IHAAU Delft, 2006.
- Bolter, Jay David & Grusin, Richard; *Remediation: Understanding New Media*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000.
- Bomans, Godfried e.a.; *Wij Bouwen*, photographs by Kees Scherer e.a., Utrecht: Bruna & Zoon, 1963.
- Bonabeau, Eric; 'Editor's Introduction: Stigmergy', pp95-96 in: *Artificial Life*, vol. 5/2, Spring 1999. http://www.stigmergicsystems.com/stig_v1/stigrefs/article1.html (2008-11-25)
- Bonabeau, Eric & Dorigo, Mario & Theraulaz, Guy; *Swarm Intelligence; From Natural to Artificial Systems*, Santa Fe Institute – Studies in the Sciences of Complexity, Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Boode, Arij de & Oudheusden, Pieter van; *De 'Hef', biografie van een spoorbrug*, Rotterdam: Uitgeverij De Hef, 1985.
- Bool, Flip; 'Rotterdam is geen illusie', pp109-116 in: *Rotterdam, Het Vijfentwintigste Jaarboek voor het Democratisch Socialisme*, Amsterdam: Mets & Schilt / Wiardi Beckman Stichting, 2004.

- Boomgaard, Jeroen & Rutten, Bart (eds.); *De Magnetische Tijd, Videokunst in Nederland, 1970-1985*, Rotterdam/Amsterdam: Nai/NIMK, 2002 [English translation: *The Magnetic Era*].
- Boon, Timothy; *Films of Fact, a history of science in documentary films and television*, London: Wallflower Press, 2008.
- Boonstra, Rommert; 'Architectuur; Prof. Dr. Weeber over de Nieuwe Truttigheid', pp16-17 in: *Hard Werken*, nr. 3, July 1979.
- Boost, Charles; 'Nederland Filmt', *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 1960-04-16.
- Boost, Charles (ed.); *Dutch Film 66/68*, Government Publishing Office, The Hague, 1969.
- Bordewijk, Ferdinand; *Blokken*, Utrecht: De Gemeenschap, 1931.
- Bordewijk, Ferdinand; *Karakter: roman van zoon en vader*, The Hague: Nijgh & Van Ditmar, 1938.
- Bordewijk, J. L.; 'Kabeltelevisie alleen is niet voldoende', pp5-7 in: *Rondvraag*, 1973/1 – *Lokale Radio en Televisie*, appendix to *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1, 1973.
- Born, Karin van den; 'Daan en zijn onderdanen. Een portret van de grondlegger van de SP', 2001: <http://geschiedenis.vpro.nl/programmas/2899536/afleveringen/4065772/items/4068733/> (2010-01-21)
- Bordwell, David; *On the History of Film Style*, Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Bordwell, David & Thompson, Kristin; *Film Art, An Introduction* (International Edition), New York: McGraw-Hill, 2004.
- Bos, Alexander (e.a.); *De Stad der Toekomst, De Toekomst der Stad: een stedenbouwkundige en sociaal-culturele studie over de groeiende stadsgemeenschap*, Rotterdam: A. Voorhoeve Uitgever, 1946.
- Bosma, Adriaan; '25 jaar na de Rotterdamse havenstaking – En niet vergeten, de solidariteit...', in: *Internationale Socialisten*, #162, August 2004.
- Bouw; Rotterdam Stad in Beweging*, special edition (*overdruk*) of *Bouw*, nr. 20, 1965-05-15.
- Bouw*; 'Hergebruik' (special quire in the magazine), pp53-62 in: *Bouw*, nr. 20, 1983-10-01.
- Boyd, Robert & Richerson, Peter J.; *The Origin and Evolution of Cultures*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Braak, Menno ter; 'Is de Film een Gemeenschapskunst?', pp6-8 in: *Filmliga*, nr. 3, November 1927.
- Brederoo, Nico; 'De Invloed van de Filmliga', pp183-228 in: *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Film en Bioscoop tot 1940*, (K. Dibbets & F. van der Maden, eds.), Houten: Het Wereldvenster, 1986.
- Brentjens, Yvonne; *Piet Zwart, 1885-1977, Vormingenieur*, Zwolle: Waanders, 2008.
- Brinkman, Els; 'Naum Gabo', in: *Beelden in Rotterdam* (Van Adrichem, Bouwhuis, Dölle, eds.), Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2002.
- Brinkman, J. & Van den Broek, J. & Maaskant, H. & Van Tijen, W.; *Woonmogelijkheden in het Nieuwe Rotterdam*, Rotterdam: W.L. & J. Brusse N.V., 1941.
- Britton, John; 'Path dependence and cluster adaptation: a case study of Toronto's new media industry', pp272-297 in: *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management* [Inderscience Publishers], vol.7/2-5, 2007.
- Broek, Joop van den & Bakema, Jaap; 'English Summary' (of the article 'Rotterdam Ahoy'), p60 in: *Forum, Maandblad voor Architectuur en gebonden kunsten*, special edition Ahoy' Rotterdam, June-August 1950.
- Bromberg, F.J.; 'Mundo-Film: 13 Jaren Kleine Zelfstandigen; Opdrachtfilmen in stilte', p2 in: *Het Binnenhof*, 1973-08-17.
- Broos, Kees; *Architekt, Letters van Architecten* (ed. Wim Crouwel), Eindhoven: Lectoris, 1989.
- Brouwer, Aleid & C. Boone, F. de Vor, A. van Witteloostuijn; 'Organizational diversity and the growth and economic performance of cities: An empirical study in Zwolle, the Netherlands, 1850-1914' [unpublished paper], Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 2006 www.ecomod.org/files/papers/1296.doc (2010-01-21).
- Brouwers, Simone; 'Herman van der Horst, cineast', in: *Herman van der Horst, cineast* (Herman de Wit, ed.), pp46-51, Utrecht: Nederlands Film Festival / Amsterdam: International Theatre & Film Books, 1994.
- Bruin, Dick de & Guusje Bendeler & Fred Allers (e.a.); *Nat & Droog, Nederland met andere ogen bekeken, Rijkswaterstaat 200 jaar*, Amsterdam: Architectura & Natura / Rijkswaterstaat, 1998.
- Bruno, Giuliana; *Streetwalking on a Ruined Map, Cultural Theory and the City Films of Elvira Notari*; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Bruno, Giuliana; *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture and Film*, London / New York: Verso, 2002.
- Brusse, H.J.; 'De bioscoop Vreeburg te Utrecht', pp3-5 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 9/1, 1938.
- Brusse, M.T.; *Ons Huis Rotterdam, 1909-1959*, Rotterdam: Ons Huis / W.L. & J. Brusse N.V., 1960.
- Burke, Gerald; *Greenheart Metropolis- Planning the Western Netherlands*, London / New York: Macmillan & Co / St. Martin's Press, 1966.
- CALResCo; 'Self-Organizing Systems (SOS) FAQ', www.calresco.org/sos/sosfaq.htm, version 3, September 2008.

- Capra, Fritjof; 'Complexity and Life' pp33-44 in: *Special Issue on Complexity* (John Urry, ed.), *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 22/5, October 2005, Sage Publications.
- Casetti, Francesco; *Eye of the Century: Film, Experience, Modernity*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.
- Castells, Manuel; *The Rise of the Network Society*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000 [1996].
- Certeau, Michel de; *The Capture of Speech and Other Political Writings*, (transl. Tom Conley), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Choay, Françoise; 'Semiotik und Urbanismus', pp43-60 in: *Die Stadt als Text, Konzept 3* (Carlini & Schneider, eds.), Tübingen: Wasmuth.
- Claassen, Tonny; *A. Bodon (1903-1993); Lichtheid en transparantie – architectuur als dienend ambacht*, Rotterdam: Stichting Bonas / NAI, 2001.
- Clarke, David B. (ed.); *The Cinematic City*, London / New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Colomina, Beatriz; *Architectureproduction*, New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1988.
- Colomina, Beatriz; *Privacy and Publicity: Modern Architecture as Mass Media*, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 1994.
- Conley, Tom; *Cartographic Cinema*, Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 2007.
- Conti, Sergio; 'A systemic perspective on local development', pp19-45 in: *Learning from Clusters, A Critical Assessment from an Economic-Geographical Perspective*, Ron A. Boschma & Robert Kloosterman, The GeoJournal Library Vol. 80, Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Cornelisse, K.; 'Witla was een verre voorganger van Rotterdam', pp1-5 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 9/3, 1971
- Coul, Paul op de; 'Busonis Doktor Faust als Monument künstlerischer Selbstrepräsentation', pp193-205 in: *Busoni in Berlin. Facetten eines kosmopolitischen Komponisten* (A. Riethmüller, H. Shin, eds.), Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004.
- Cox, George L.; 'Der Industriefilm – Gestern und Heute', pp322-329 in: *Filmische Mittel, Industrielle Zwecke, Das Werk des Industriefilms* (V. Hediger & P. Vonderau, eds.), Berlin: Verlag Vorwerk 8 (Band 11, Texte zum Dokumentarfilm hrs Dokumentarfilminitiative im Filmbüro NW), 2007.
- Creel, George; *How we advertised America: the first telling of the amazing story of the Committee on public information that carried the gospel of Americanism to every corner of the globe*, New York: Harper, 1920 [UvA, UB 125: FTTW C71]
- Crimson; *Re-Arch, Nieuwe Ontwerpen voor oude gebouwen*, Rotterdam: 010/Stimuleringsfonds voor architectuur, 1995a. English version: 'Re-Arch, New designs for old buildings', pp65-80 in: *Too Blessed to be depressed; Crimson Architectural Historians, 1994-2002*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2002.
- Crimson; 'Leegte', in: *50 jaar wederopbouw* (Martin Aarts, ed.), Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1995b. www.crimsonweb.org/spip.php?article16 (2009-09-16) English version: 'Emptiness', pp33-52 in: *Too Blessed to be Depressed; Crimson Architectural Historians, 1994-2002*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2002.
- Crimson; *Too Blessed to be Depressed; Crimson Architectural Historians, 1994-2002*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2002.
- Cubitt, Sean; *The Cinema Effect*, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 2004.
- Daalder, R.; 'De Witte Stad', pp 327-350 in: *Rotterdams Jaarboekje 1990 – VIII* (C.O.A. Schimmelpenninck van der Oije, ed.), Rotterdam: Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst Rotterdam, 1990.
- Damen, Hélène & Devolder, Anemie (eds.); *Lotte Stam-Beese, 1903-1988*, Rotterdam: Uitgeverij De Hef, 1993.
- D'Andrea, Jeanne (ed.); *Kazimir Malevich, 1878-1935*, Los Angeles: The Armand Hammer Museum of Art and Cultural Center, 1990.
- Debord, Guy; *La Société du spectacle; l'extrémisme cohérent des Situationnistes*, Paris: Buchet Chastel, 1967; English translation: *Society of the Spectacle*, <http://www.bopsecrets.org/SI/debord/index.htm> (2010-01-21)
- Debray, Régis; *Media Manifestos, on the Technological Transmission of Cultural Forms*, London / New York: Verso, 1996 [1994].
- Dekker, Ariëtte; *Cornelis Verolme, opkomst en ondergang van een scheepsbouwer*, Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2005.
- Deleuze, Gilles; *Cinema 1, The Movement Image*, London: The Athlone Press, 1992 [translation of *Cinéma 1, L'Image-Mouvement*, Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1983].
- Deleuze, Gilles; *Cinema 2, The Time-Image*, London: The Athlone Press, 1989; transl. of *Cinéma 2, L'Image-Temps*, Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1985.
- Dench, Ernest A.; *Advertising by motion pictures*, Cincinnati: The Standard Publ. Co., 1916 [UvA, UB 125: FTTW D23, available at <http://www.archive.org/details/advertisingbymot00dencmiss> (2008-02-04)]
- Derksen, Lisette; *Festivals in de culturele industrie; van alternatief naar commercieel?* [MA thesis], Maatschappijgeschiedenis / Media & Cultuur, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam, 2001. www.ethesis.net/festivals/festivals.htm (2008-07-29)
- Dibbets, Karel; 'Het bioscoopbedrijf tussen twee wereldoorlogen', pp229-270 in: *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Film en Bioscoop tot 1940* (K. Dibbets & F. van der Maden, eds.), Houten: Het Wereldvenster, 1986.
- Dibbets, Karel; *Spreekende films: de opkomst van de geluidsfilm in Nederland 1928-1933*, Amsterdam: Otto Cramwinckel, 1993.
- Dicke, M. & Jaarsveld, P. & Laar, P. van de & Visser, J. (eds.); *Rotterdamse Ondernemers, 1850-1950*, Centrum voor Bedrijfsgeschiedenis EUR, Rotterdam: De Hef, 2003.

- Dicke, Matthijs; 'Cornelis Hendrik van der Leeuw', pp130-134 in: *Rotterdamse Ondernemers, 1850-1950* (J. Visser, M. van Jaarsveld, P. van de Laar, M. Dicke eds.), Centrum voor Bedrijfs geschiedenis EUR, Rotterdam: De Hef, 2003.
- Dicke, Matthijs; *Hoe komt wie vliegt ooit tot bedaren, M.A.G. van der Leeuw, ondernemer in het interbellum*, Rotterdam: De Hef Publishers, 2007.
- Dierikx, Marc L.J.; 'Swarttouw, François (1932-1997)', in: *Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland*, The Hague: ING, 2005.
www.inghist.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/BWN/lemmata/bwn6/swarttouw (2005-06-20)
- Dijkstra, Jan; *De Watermakers*, Rotterdam: Historisch Genootschap Rotterdamum / Gemeente Drinkwaterleiding, 1974.
- Dingemans, Ralph & Romme, Rian; *Nederland en het Marshall-plan; een bronnenoverzicht en filmografie, 1947-1953*, The Hague: Algemeen Rijksarchief, 1997.
- Dirks, Iris; 'Kees van der Leeuw', p154 in: *Interbellum Rotterdam, kunst en cultuur 1918-1940* (M. Halbertsma & P. van Ulzen, eds.), Rotterdam: NAI, 2001.
- Dittrich, Kathinka; 'De Speelfilm in de jaren dertig', pp105-144 in: *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Film en Bioscoop tot 1940* (K. Dibbets & F. van der Maden, eds.), Houten: Het Wereldvenster, 1986.
- Dittrich, Kathinka; *Achter het doek: Duitse Emigranten in de Nederlandse Speelfilm in de Jaren Dertig*, Houten: Het Wereldvenster, 1987.
- Doane, Mary Ann; *The Emergence of Cinematic Time: Modernity, Contingency, the Archive*; Cambridge (MA): Harvard UP, 2002.
- Doesburg, Theo van; 'Abstracte filmbeelding', pp71-75 in *De Stijl*, vol. 4/5 (May) 1921.
- Donald, James; *Imagining the modern city, Minneapolis* (MN): University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Donaldson, Geoffrey; 'Film in Rotterdam, de eerste jaren', pp 36-41 in: *Skrien* 98, 1980.
- Donaldson, Geoffrey; *Of Joy and Sorrow, A Filmography of Dutch Silent Fiction*, Amsterdam: Nederlands Filmmuseum, 1997.
- Driel, Hans van; 'Oude Nieuwe Media', in: *E-view*, nr. 1999-1, Universiteit van Tilburg, <http://comcom.uvt.nl/e-view/99-1/driel.htm> (2010-01-21)
- Driel, Hugo van & Goey, Ferry de, *Rotterdam Cargo Handling Technology 1870-2000*, Eindhoven: Walburg Pers/Stichting Historie der Techniek, 2000.
- Duiker, Johannes; 'Naar aanleiding van de filmvoordracht van Prof. Moholy Nagy...', pp106-112 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 4/12, 1933a.
- Duiker, Johannes; 'De heropening van het filmtheater "De Uitkijk" [by Merkelbach & Karsten] p174 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 4/20, 1933b.
- Duivenbode, Ossip van; 'Keurmeesterproject 1979, Terugblik', in: AIR, *Reviewing Rotterdam*, article from 2006-11-27, http://airfoundation.nl/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=99&Itemid=73 (2007-04-12).
- Edzes, Harry; 'Ruit: Autoweg om Rotterdam heen', pp1-3 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1, 1973.
- Edzes, Harry; 'Rotterdam, meer theaters dan ooit tevoren', pp1-5 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/3, 1973.
- Edzes, Harry; 'Ritje met de metro een toeristische attractie', pp1-7 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 12/3, 1974.
- Edzes, Harry; "'Video-centrum' voor peilen meningen van wijkbewoners', p17 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 14/4, 1976
- Eesteren, Cornelis van; 'De modelwoning in de "Bijenkorf" te Rotterdam', pp241 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol.3/25, 1932.
- Elfferich, Loek & Edzes, Harry & Matthijsse, Richard; *Rondvraag, 1973/1* – [issue on:] *Lokale Radio en Televisie*, appendix to *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1, 1973.
- Elsaesser, Thomas; *European Cinema, Face to Face with Hollywood*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005a.
- Elsaesser, Thomas; 'Die Stadt von Morgen; Filme zum Bauen und Wohnen', pp 381-409 in: K. Kreimeier (e.a.), *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland: 1919-1933*, Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005b.
- Elsaesser, Thomas; 'Archive und Archäologien: der Ort des nich-fiktionalen Films in Feld der Zeitgenössischen Medien', pp34-53 in: *Filmische Mittel, Industrielle Zwecke, Das Werk des Industriefilms*, Hediger & Vonderau (eds.), Berlin: Verlag Vorwerk 8, 2007.
- Elton, Arthur; 'How we use films in Shell', published as a booklet under that title together with the article 'Shell Film Unit: Twenty-one years' by Stuart Legg, London: Shell/Chappel Press, 1957 – reprint from *Film User*, vol. 10n1 18, August 1956. [collection Nederlands Filmmuseum F765.Elto]
- Emous, Kirsten; 'Appel's raam: 25 meter lang, 6 meter hoog', pp10-14 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 8/2, 1970.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland; 'Beyond platitudes of globalisation; a review of Ulf Hannerz: *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, spring 1997. <http://folk.uio.no/geirthe/Hannerz.html> (2010-01-21)
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland; 'Some analytical dimensions of cultural complexity' (version 0.9), published by Culcom, University of Oslo, 2005-11-22, <http://folk.uio.no/geirthe/Complexity.pdf> (2010-01-21)
- Essers, G.; 'Van Pacificatie tot Vernieuwing. Het lager onderwijs in Rotterdam tijdens het interbellum', pp401-424 in: *Rotterdam's Jaarboekje*, Rotterdam: Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, 1993.

- Estourgie, A; 'Loghem, Johannes Bernardus van (1881-1940)', in *Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland*, The Hague: ING, 2008-08-25 www.inghist.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/BWN/lemmata/bwn6/loghem (2008-10-10).
- Ettinger, Jan van; 'Film over het werk van het Bouwcentrum', p389 in: *Bouw*, vol. 7. issue 21, 1952.
- Ettinger, Jan van; *Towards a Habitable World: Task, Problems and Methods, Acceleration*, Bouwcentrum Rotterdam, Amsterdam / London / New York / Princeton: Elsevier Publishing Company, 1960.
- Ex, Sjarel; *Lajos d'Ébneh en de avant-garde, 1923-1933*, Utrecht: Centraal Museum, 2002.
- Eyck, Aldo van; 'Bij het teken van de tentoonstelling', pp14-15 in: *Forum, Maandblad voor Architectuur en gebonden kunsten*, special edition Ahoy' Rotterdam, June-August 1950.
- Fear, Bob; *Architecture and Film II (Architectural Design, 70/1)*: pp6-96, London: Academy Editions, 2000.
- Fitzmaurice, Tony & Shiel, Mark (eds.); *Cinema and the City: Film and Urban Societies in a Global Context* (Studies in Urban and Social Change), Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Fitzmaurice, Tony & Shiel, Mark (eds.); *Screening the City*, London / New York: Verso, 2003.
- Fleener, M. Jayne e.a. (eds.); *Chaos, Complexity, Curriculum, and Culture; a Conversation*, New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2005.
- Fountain, Clarke; 'L'Alpagueur', *All Movie Guide; New York Times* > movies http://movies2.nytimes.com/gst/movies/movie.html?v_id=126354 (April 2006)
- Friedberg, Anne; 'Urban mobility and cinematic visuality: the screens of Los Angeles – endless cinema or private telematics', pp183-204 in: *Journal of Visual Culture*, Vol. 1/2, 2002.
- Gaag, Stef van der & Hans Hazenak & Enneke Sixma & Uwe Sörensen (eds.); *Het Oude Westen Rotterdam, laboratorium van de stadsvernieuwing*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1993.
- Gaemers, Carin; *Achter de schermen van de kunst: de Rotterdamse Kunstsichting, 1945-1995*, Rotterdam: De Hef, 1996.
- GAR (Gemeente Archief Rotterdam); *De Werkende Mens, deel 2 – gezien door F.H. van Dijk, 1920-1960*, GAR/Fotobiënnale, Rotterdam, 1988.
- Gargiani, Roberto; *Rem Koolhaas/OMA*, Lausanne: EPFL Press, 2008.
- Gast, Koos de; 'Rotterdam door Hilversum en Bussum achtergesteld', pp9-10 in: *Rondvraag, 1973/1 – Lokale Radio en Televisie*, appendix to *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1, 1973.
- Gelder, Henk van; *Abraham Tuschinski*, Amsterdam: Nijgh & Van Ditmar, 1996.
- Gelderen, W. van; 'Over de Opbouw-tentoonstelling', pp103-104 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 5/12, 1934.
- Gelderen, W. van; 'Scholenbouw; School voor Vrouwenarbeid, Koningsveldstraat te Rotterdam; Architect: Ir. J.B. van Loghem', pp95-97 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 6/9, 1935.
- Gelderen, W. van; 'Rotterdams Boulevard De Coolsingel', p100 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol.7/9, 1936.
- Gelderen, W. van; 'Tentoonstelling "Ontdek uw stad" te Rotterdam', pp203-206, in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 9/21, 1938.
- Gell, Alfred; *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Gellner, Ernest; *Postmodernism, Reason and Religion*, London: Routledge, 1992.
- Ghirardo, Diane; *Architecture after Modernism*, London: Thames & Hudson, 1996 [UvA, UB]
- Giersbergen, Wilma van; 'De collecties van de Topografisch-historische Atlas van het Gemeentearchief Rotterdam (GAR)', in: *RKDBulletin*, bulletin van het Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague: December 2005. [digital publication by the Vereniging 'De Topografisch-Historische Atlas', www.vtha.nl] > publicaties (visited: 2008-07-10)
- Goey, Ferry de; 'Hendrik Hubertus de Klerk', pp124-126 in: *Rotterdamse Ondernemers, 1850-1950* (J. Visser, M. van Jaarsveld, P. van de Laar, M. Dicke eds.), Centrum voor Bedrijfsgechiedenis EUR, Rotterdam: Uitgeverij De Hef, 2003.
- Goey, Ferry de; 'De Haven van Rotterdam in de periode 1945-1970', pp42-55, in: *Kranen over de wal. De grote Rotterdamse metaal- en havenstaking van 1970* (Sjaak van der Velden, ed.), Amsterdam: Aksant / Vakbondshistorische Vereniging, 2005.
- Gold, John R. & Ward, Stephen V.; 'Of plans and Planners: Documentary Film and the Challenge of the Urban Future, 1935-52', pp59-82 in: *The Cinematic City* (David B. Clarke, ed.), London: Routledge, 1997.
- Graadt van Roggen, Coen J.; 'Rotterdam en de Film', in: *Het Boek van Rotterdam, wat niet in Baedeker staat* (H.A. Meerum Terwogt & H. Vlug, eds.), Amsterdam: Strengholt Uitgeverij, 1931.
- Graaff, Chris de; "'Wij Bouwen" van Joris Ivens', p41-43 in: *Filmliga*, 1930, vol. 3/3-4 (January).
- Groenendijk, Paul; *Gemeente Rotterdam > Architectuur*, Rotterdam: City Informatiecentrum (CIC) (www.cic.rotterdam.nl), Architectuur Instituut Rotterdam (AIR), Rotterdam Marketing, 2004. <http://www.wonen.rotterdam.nl/smartsite2041457.dws> (2010-01-21)
- Groenendijk, Paul & Vollaard, Piet; *Guide to Modern Architecture in the Netherlands*; 010 Publishers, Rotterdam, 1998.

- Groenendijk, Paul & Vollaard, Piet; *Architectural guide to Rotterdam*; Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2004.
- Groenendijk, Paul & Vollaard, Piet / photography Rook & Nagelkerke; *Architectural Guide to Rotterdam*, Rotterdam: 010, 2007.
- Groenewegen, J.H.; 'Die Stadt von Morgen', film van Svend Noldan, p154 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 3 issue 14, 1932.
- Gunning, Tom; 'Ontmoetingen in verduisterde ruimten, De alternatieve programmering van de Nederlandse Filmliga', pp217-263 in: *Het Gaat Om De Film! Een Nieuwe Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Filmliga, 1927-1933*, (Gunning, Linssen, Schoots, eds.), Bas Lubberhuizen / Filmmuseum, 1999.
- Haan, Jitze de, *Polygoon spant de kroon, de geschiedenis van filmfabriek Polygoon, 1919-1945*, Amsterdam: Cramwinckel, 1995.
- Hagener, Malte; *Avant-Garde Culture and Media Strategies; The Networks and Discourse of the European Film Avant-Garde, 1919-1939* [dissertation], Amsterdam: ASCA / Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2005.
- Hagener, Malte; 'Licht, Kamera, Reflektion; Das Wunder von Jena und die Industriefilmproduktion ber Carl Zeiss', pp281-292 in: *Filmische Mittel, industrielle Zwecke* (Vinzenz Hediger, Patrick Vonderau eds.), Berlin: Vorwerk 8, 2007.
- Hajema, Lucas Heling; *De glazenwassers van het bestuur: lokale overheid, massamedia, burgers en communicatie, Groningen in landelijk perspectief 1945-2001* [dissertation], Groningen: RUG, Faculty of Arts, 2001. <http://dissertations.ub.rug.nl/faculties/arts/2001/l.h.hajema/> (2008-07-08)
- Hajer, Maarten & Reijndorp, Arnold; *Op Zoek Naar Nieuw Publiek Domein* [English edition: *In Search of a New Public Domain*], Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2001.
- Halbertsma, Marlite & Ulzen, Patricia van (eds.); *Interbellum Rotterdam, kunst en cultuur 1918-1940*, Rotterdam: NAI, 2001.
- Halbertsma, Marlite; 'Retourtje Blijdorp via Antwerpen en New York. Rotterdam op reis', pp203-234 in: *Interbellum Rotterdam* (M. Halbertsma & P. van Ulzen, eds.), Rotterdam: NAI, 2001.
- Hammel, Pietro; *Unsere Zukunft: die Stadt*, Frankfurt a.M: Suhrkamp Taschenbuch, 1972.
- Hannerz, Ulf; *Exploring the City, Inquiries toward an urban anthropology*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Hannerz, Ulf; *Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Hannerz, Ulf; *Transnational Connections, Culture, People, Places*, London: Routledge, 1996.
- Harbord, Janet; *The Evolution of Film, Rethinking Film Studies*, Cambridge (UK) / Malden (MA): Polity Press, 2007.
- Hasselt, Laura van (e.a.); 'De geboorte van de VUT', *Andere Tijden*, VPRO television/website, 2004-10-05. <http://geschiedenis.vpro.nl/attachment.db/19367062/>
- Havenherstel Rotterdam; *Het Herstel der Kademuren in de Rotterdamsche Zeehavens / Herstel Kademuren Rotterdamsche Zeehavens*, photographs by Jan Kamman, design by Thijs Mauve, production by 'Clichéfabriek Gravura' (The Hague) and Drukkerij Trio (The Hague), Rotterdam: Havenherstel Rotterdam, 1949.
- Hazewinkel, Fernande & Schaaf, Ben van der (eds.); *De Stad aan de man gebracht, vijftig jaar Gemeenteverlichting in Rotterdam*, Rotterdam: Verlichting Bestuursdienst Rotterdam, 1996.
- Hediger, Vinzenz & Vonderau, Patrick (eds.); *Filmische Mittel, Industrielle Zwecke, Das Werk des Industriefilms*, Berlin: Verlag Vorwerk 8 (Band 11, Texte zum Dokumentarfilm hrs Dokumentarfilminitiative im Filmbüro NW), 2007.
- Heer, Jan de; 'Architectuur en serie, stroken – stempels – plekken', in: *Architectuur en Planning, Nederland, 1940-1980* (Umberto Barbieri ed.), Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010, 1983.
- Heijs, Jan; *Filmliga 1927-1931* [fascimile reprint], Sun, Nijmegen, 1982.
- Heijs, Jan & Westra, Frans; *Que le Tigre Danse. Huub Bals een biografie*, Amsterdam: Otto Cramwinckel, 1996.
- Heijs, Jan; 'Column: Bijenkorf', *Filmkrant*, nr. 274, February 2006. www.filmkrant.nl/av/org/filmkran/fk274/heijs274.html
- Helderman, Coen; 'Familie Veder', pp247-251 in: *Rotterdamse Ondernemers, 1850-1950* (J. Visser, M. van Jaarsveld, P. van de Laar, M. Dicke, eds.), Centrum voor Bedrijfsgechiedenis EUR, Rotterdam: Uitgeverij De Hef, 2003.
- Hellweg, Claudine; 'Pablo Picasso', pp186-187 in: *Beelden in Rotterdam*, (Jan van Adrichem, Jelle Bouwhuis, Mariette Dölle, eds.), Rotterdam: CBK, 010 Publishers, 2002.
- Henderson, Susan R. (ed.); 'Architecture and Theosophy, An Introduction' in: *Architronic, The Electronic Journal of Architecture*, V8/1 January, 1999 – <http://architronic.saed.kent.edu>.
- Hendriks, Annemieke; 'Eva Besnyö over Leni Riefenstahl', in: *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 2002-08-17, http://www.groene.nl/2002/0233/ah_besnyo.html
- Hendriks, Annemieke; *De pioniers. Interviews met 14 wegbereiders van de Nederlandse cinema*, Amsterdam: Uitegeverij International Theatre & Film Books, 2006.
- Herpen, J.J. van; Jordaan, Leendert Jurriaan (1885-1980), in: *Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland 2*, The Hague: ING, 1985 – www.inghist.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/BWN/lemmata/bwn2/jordaan (2008-03-13).
- Heuvel, Dirk van den & Steigenga, Madeleine & Triest, Jaap van; *Lessons: Tupker-Risselada, a double portrait of architectural education, 1953/2003*, Nijmegen: SUN, 2003.

- Heuvel, Wim van; *Structuralism in Dutch Architecture*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1992.
- Heynen, Hilde; *Architecture and Modernity, a critique*, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 1999.
- Heynen, Hilde; 'Gender en architectuur', pp715-722 in: '*Dat is architectuur*', *sluutelteksten uit de twintigste eeuw* (Hilde Heynen e.a., eds.), Rotterdam: 010, 2001.
- Hillebrecht, Rudolph; 'Synthese tussen nieuwe vormen en eigen bouwkundige traditie', pp2-5, in: in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 3/2, 1964.
- Hinte, Ed van (ed.); *Henk Elenga / Index*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2000.
- Hoekstra, Hans; 'Vijftig Jaar Televisie', in: *Het Parool*, Dossiers: <http://www.parool.nl/dossiers/tv/>, 2001 (visited: 2007-05-27).
- Hofstede, Bart; *De Nederlandse Cinema Wereldwijd: De Internationale Positie van de Nederlandse Film*, Amsterdam: Boekmanstudies, 2000.
- Hogekamp, Bert; 'De Schoolbioscoop', pp42-45 in: *Skrien 140*, Feb. / Mar. 1985.
- Hogekamp, Bert; 'De Russen komen! Poedowkin, Eisenstein en Wertow in Nederland', pp46-49 in: *Skrien 144*, Nov. / Dec. 1985.
- Hogekamp, Bert; 'De documentaire Film in Opkomst', pp145-182 in: *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Film en Bioscoop tot 1940*, (K. Dibbets & F. van der Maden, eds.), Houten: Het Wereldvenster, 1986.
- Hogekamp, Bert; *De Nederlandsche documentaire film, 1920-1940*, Amsterdam: St. Film en Wetenschap / Van Genneep, 1988.
- Hogekamp, Bert; 'Staveren, David van' pp208-211 in: BWSA 6, 1995. <http://www.iisg.nl/bwsa/bios/staveren.html> (2008-11-02).
- Hogekamp, Bert; *De Documentaire Film 1945-1965, de bloei van een filmgenre in Nederland*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2003.
- Hogekamp, Bert; *Jan Hin, filmmaker van het verlangen*, Hilversum: Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid, 2004.
- Holsappel, Eveline; *Ida Falkenberg-Liefrinck. De Rotanstoel als opmaat voor een betere wooninrichting*, Rotterdam: Bonas, 2000.
- Homma, Harry & Hoeksema, Bram; *Doorbraak aan de Maas, de havenstaking 1979*, Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Pegasus, 1979.
- Hoogstad, Jan; *Ruimtetijdbeweging, prolegomena voor de architectuur*, The Hague: SDU Uitgeverij, 1990.
- Hoogstraten, Dorine van; *Villa's in Nederland, onder architectuur gebouwde huizen 1900-2000*, Rijswijk: Atrium, 2000.
- Hooiring, Ed; Oosterwijk, Bram; Regt, Wim de; Soeters, Hans; *Dwalers en Dweilers, Verslag van wilde staking Rotterdam 1979*, Rotterdam: Rotterdams Nieuwsblad [book publication], October 1979.
- Houwen, Paula van der; *Stimuleren van ontwikkeling; Stichting Bevordering van Volkskracht, 1923-1998; De Geschiedenis van een Rotterdams Particulier Fonds*, Rotterdam: Stichting Bevordering van Volkskracht, 1998.
- Huijts, Johan; 'Film als Gemeenschapskunst', pp9-10 in: *Filmliga*, nr. 6, February 1928.
- Huijts, Johan; 'Filmliga Rotterdam (1927-1933)', p264-288 in: *Rotterdams Jaarboekje 1975*, Rotterdam: W.L & J. Brusse, 1975.
- Huygens, G.W.; 'Willem Adriaan Wagener', pp203-207 in: *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde* [1970], online publication by Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren (dbnl.nl), 2005 – http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/_jaa003197001_01/_jaa003197001_01_0022.htm (2008-03-20)
- Idsinga, Ton & Schilt, Jeroen; *Architect W. van Tijen, 1894-1974*, The Hague: Staatsuitgeverij, 1988.
- Jacobs, Steven; *The Wrong House; The Architecture of Alfred Hitchcock*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2007.
- Jameson, Fredric; *The Geopolitical Aesthetic, Cinema and Space in the World System*, Bloomington / London: Indiana University Press / BFI, 1992.
- Janssen, Rob; 'Interview dominee Hans Visser; De Kerk moet ook de straat op om een vuist te maken', in: *Tribune*, vol. 1999/7 www.sp.nl/nieuws/tribune/9907/interview.stm (2010-01-21)
- Jarvie, Ian; *Philosophy of the Film; Epistemology, Ontology, Aesthetics*; New York & London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.
- Jenkins, Henry; *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*, New York: New York University Press, 2006.
- Johnson-Marshall, Percy E.A.; 'Belangrijk, dat Rotterdam zijn ervaringen met anderen deelt', pp5-6, in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 3/2, 1964.
- Jong, Anouk de; 'Witteveen, Willem Gerrit', p233 in: *Interbellum Rotterdam* (M. Halbertsma & P. van Ulzen, eds.), Rotterdam: NAi, 2001.
- Jong, Joop de; *Rotterdam 1940-1945, in foto's en amateurfilms* [including DVD], Haarlem: Focus, Rotterdam: Historisch Museum Rotterdam, 2005.
- Jongkoen, C. & Creveld, S. van (e.a.); *Gedenkboek; Geschiedenis van de Nationale hulppactie Roode Kruis, H.A.R.K.; haar ontstaan, haar groei, haar inrichting, haar werkzaamheid*, Rotterdam: Stichting Nationale Hulppactie Roode Kruis H.A.R.K. [Wageningen: N.V. Drukkerij Vada], 1948.
- Jonker, Leonor; 'Worden, niet zijn', het verhaal Wim 'Oscar' Langenhoff en The New Electric Chambre Music Ensemble [student thesis, supervision: Geraldien von Frijtag], Faculteit Geesteswetenschappen, Geschiedenis, Universiteit Utrecht, 2008-06-27. <http://207.234.238.87/upload/pdf/Worden-niet-zijn-ultracorrect.pdf> (2008-11-04).

- Kamphuis, Fred & Ole Schepp; *George Pal in Holland, 1934-1939*, The Hague: Holland Animation / Kapsenberg, 1983.
- Kappert, Hinke; *Stageverslag naar aanleiding van onderzoek naar het Lijnbaancentrum en de LBC-collectie bij MonteVideo/TBA* [study report], Kunstgeschiedenis en Archeologie, Vrije Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2001 (?). [Nederlands Instituut voor Mediakunst (NIMK) / Montevideo, Amsterdam – collection Lijnbaancentrum]
- Keller, Hans; 'Voetnoten bij een oeuvre', in: *Herman van der Horst, cineast* (Herman de Wit, ed.), pp16-23, Utrecht: Nederlands Film Festival / Amsterdam: International Theatre & Film Books, 1994.
- Kessler, Frank & Masson, Eef; 'Schichtkäse, Zur Problematik des Industriefilms als Genre', pp73-82 in: *Filmische Mittel, industrielle Zwecke* (Vinzenc Hediger, Patrick Vonderau eds.), series: Texte zum Dokumentarfilm, Berlin: Vorwerk 8, 2007.
- Kézdi-Kovács, Zsolt; *Magyar filmesek a világban - Hungarians in Film*, Budapest: Magyar Filmunió, 1996 [ISBN 963-04-7134-5]
- Kijzer, P; 'Tusschen Aankomst en Vertrek', p124 in: *Lichtbeeld en Cultuur*, 15/8, August 1938.
- Kingma, Jur; [review] 'Hugo van Driel en Ferry de Goey, Rotterdam Cargo Handling Technology 1870-2000', *Historisch Huis*, 2002. <http://www.historischhuis.nl/recensies/recensie37.html> (2006-04-03)
- Klein, Aart (photography); Besselaar, Herman (text); *Amsterdam Rotterdam, Twee Steden Rapsodie*, Baarn: Eerste in den Toren, 1959.
- Klein, Norman & Manovich, Lev; 'The Freud-Lissitzky Project', 2003. www.artmargins.com/content/eview/manovich4.html
- Klein, Norman, *Scripted Spaces: The Chase and The Labyrinth*, Exhibition by Norman Klein at Haus.0 / Künstlerhaus Stuttgart (1999-06-08 – 07-25). www.haussite.net/set.php?page=http://www.haussite.net/haus.0/PROGRAM/INFO_1999/klein.htm (2010-01-21)
- Kleinknecht, A. & C.W.M. Naastepad; 'Opties voor de vakbeweging in een kleine open economie. Loonkosten en internationaal concurrentievermogen', pp87-97 in: S. van der Velden (ed.), *Kranen over de wal. De grote Rotterdamse metaal- en havenstaking van 1970*, Amsterdam: Aksant / Vakbondshistorische Vereniging, 2005.
- Kleppe, Martijn; *Tot Icoon Verheven; Een onderzoek naar de verheffing van maatschappelijke gebeurtenissen tot fotografische iconen van de recente Nederlandse geschiedenis*, master thesis, Faculteit der Historische- en Kunstwetenschappen, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam, 2004. www.ethesis.net/icoon/icoon_hfst_4.htm
- Klerk, Len de; *Particuliere Plannen; Denkbeelden en initiatieven van de stedelijke elite inzake de volkswoningbouw en de stedenbouw in Rotterdam, 1860-1950*, Rotterdam: Nai Uitgevers, 1998.
- Klerk, Len de & Moscoviter, Herman; 'En dat al voor de arbeidende klasse'; *75 jaar Volkshuisvesting Rotterdam*, Rotterdam: 010, 1992.
- Kloos, Maarten; *Jan Versnel*, Amsterdam: Focus, 1997.
- Kloppers, A.G.; 'In simpele metalen kast: stemmen en geluiden voor de toekomst', pp7-10 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 3/2, 1964.
- Knabb, Kenn (ed.); *Situationist Anthology*, Bureau of Public Secrets, Berkeley, 1981.
- Knegtmans, Peter Jan; 'Albarda, Johan Willem', pp1-7 in: BWSA 5, 1992 – www.iisg.nl/bwsa/bios/albarda.html (2008-11-02)
- Koch, André; 'W. H. Gispen' (e.a.) pp59-60 and pp170-193 in: *Van Nelle, Monument van de Vooruitgang*, (Backer, Anne Mieke & Camp, D'Laine & Dicke, Matthijs, eds.); Rotterdam: De Hef Publishers, 2005.
- Koolhaas, Rem & Garrel, Betty van; 'De stad van de toekomst. HP-gesprek met Constant over New Babylon', pp 14-15 in: *Haagse Post*, 1966-08-06.
- Koolhaas, Rem & Mau, Bruce; *S, M, L, XL*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1995.
- Koolhaas, Rem; 'Junkspace', in: *OMA@work* (Nobuyuki Yoshida, ed.), Architecture and Urbanism, Special Issue, May 2000 (Tokyo: A+U Publishing).
- Koot, Roman; 'De Hef en het imago van de modernste stad van Nederland', pp21-44 in: *Interbellum Rotterdam* (M. Halbertsma & P. van Ulzen, eds.), Rotterdam: NAi, 2001.
- Kopytoff, Igor; 'The cultural biography of things: commoditization as process', pp64-91 in: *The Social Life of Things, Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (Arjun Appadurai, ed.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- Kraayvanger, H.M.; *Hoe zal Rotterdam Bouwen?*, nr. 2 from the series "Hoe Bouwen Wij Rotterdam", Rotterdam: Rotterdamsche Gemeenschap, 1946.
- Kramer, B.J.K.; 'Particuliere woningbouw in Rotterdam-Zuid', pp188-189 in: *Bouwbedrijf*, vol 6/10, 1929.
- Kreiken, H.G.C.; *Toelichting Onderwijs Film, Vogellevens in en om Rotterdam* (37pp), Rotterdam: Gemeente Drukkerij, 1930. [library GAR: XXII F54]
- Kühnel, Klaus (ed.); 'Der Mensch ist ein sehr seltsames Möbelstück'. – *Biographie der Innenarchitektin Liv Falkenberg-Liefrinck* [= Autobiographien, Bd. 24], Trafo Verlag, 2006.
- Laar, Paul van de; 'Bouwen, breken en dempen om te bewegen', pp175-195 in: *Op de groei Gemaakt; "Gerieflijkheden voor een wel-ingerichte stad"* (H. Moscoviter, ed.), Rotterdam: Gemeentewerken Rotterdam, 1996.
- Laar, Paul van de; *Stad van Formaat, Geschiedenis van Rotterdam in de negentiende en twintigste eeuw*, Zwolle: Waanders Uitgevers, 2000.
- Laar, Paul van de; 'Recensie 156' [review of *Kranen over de wal. De grote Rotterdamse metaal- en havenstaking van 1970*, by S. van der Velden, ed.], *Kroniek 151*, Rotterdam: Roterodamum, 2005.

- Lambla, Ken; 'Abstraction and Theosophy: Social Housing in Rotterdam, The Netherlands', in: *Architecture and Theosophy* (S. Henderson, ed.), *Architronic, The Electronic Journal of Architecture* V8/1 January, 1999 – <http://corbu2.caed.kent.edu/architronic/v8n1/> (2008-07-08).
- Lammers, A.; 'Brusse, Marie Joseph (1873-1941)', in: *Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland 2*, The Hague: ING, 1985/2008. www.inghist.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/BWN/lemmata/bwn2/brusse
- Lamster, Mark; *Architecture and Film*, New Jersey: Princeton Architectural Press, 2000.
- Landré, Joop; *Joop Landré vertelt, een anekdotische autobiografie*, Cadier en Keer: Uitgeverij 60+ Vof, 1994.
- Lange, G.C.; 'Ruim baan voor Rotterdam/Randstad', pp11-15 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 3/2, 1964.
- Latour, Bruno; 'On Recalling ANT', published by the Department of Sociology, Lancaster: Lancaster University, July 1997, www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Latour- (2006)
- Lauwerier, Hans; *Fractals, meetkundige figuren in eindeloze herhaling*, Aramith Uitgevers, Amsterdam, 1987.
- Law, John; 'Topology and the Naming of Complexity', published by the Centre for Science Studies, Lancaster: Lancaster University, July 1997 www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Law-Topology-and-Complexity.pdf
- Lebas, Elizabeth; 'The Clinic, the Street and the Garden: Municipal Film-making in Britain Between the Wars', pp138-151 in: *Spaces in European Cinema*, M. Kostantarakos (ed.), Intellect, Exeter, 2000.
- Lebas, Elizabeth; 'Sadness and Gladness: The Films of Glasgow Corporation, 1922-1938', pp27-45 in: *Film Studies*, issue 6, 2005.
- Lebas, Elizabeth; 'Glasgow's Progress: the Films of Glasgow Corporation, 1938-1978', pp34-53 in: *Film Studies*, issue 10, 2007.
- Lebbink, Jan (ed.); Molkenboer, Kees (photography); Schmidt, L.W. (text); *De Stad van Erasmus; Tijdsbeeld van Rotterdam*, Amsterdam: Bezige Bij, 1952.
- Legg, Stuart; 'Shell Film Unit: Twenty-one years', published as a booklet under that title together with the article 'How we use films in Shell' by Sir Arthur Elton, London: Shell/Chappel Press, 1957 – reprint from *Sight and Sound*, vol. 23n4, April-June 1954. [collection Nederlands Film Museum F765.Elto]
- Lenoir, Timothy; 'All But War Is Simulation: The Military Entertainment Complex', *Configurations*, Vol 8 (2000), pp 289-335 www.stanford.edu/dept/HPST/TimLenoir/Publications/Lenoir_AllButWarIsSimulation.pdf
- Lichtenauer, W.F.; 'Veder, Anthony (1914-1967)', in: *Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland*, The Hague: 2007. www.inghist.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/BWN/lemmata/bwn2/vedera (last visited: 2008-07-31)
- Lichtenauer, W.F.; 'Ringers, Johannes Aleidis (1885-1965)', in *Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland*, The Hague: 2008. <http://www.inghist.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/BWN/lemmata/bwn1/ringers> [2008-03-13]
- Lier, Frans van; 'Televizier Exclusief: Alle namen en feiten rondom het TV-eiland', in: *Televizier*, AVRO, October 1963. www.schriel.nl/radio/artikelen/zeezender/RTVnoordzee/televizier/196310xx/index.htm (2008-04-03)
- Limperg, K.; 'Het nieuwe bouwen zonder steen, staal en glas, maar door middel van lichtprojecties', pp126-128 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 10 issue 12, 1939-06-10.
- Linssen, Céline; "Unaniem Rot Stop Hedenavond Vergaderen." De geschiedenis achter de schermen van de Nederlandsche Filmliga', pp15-147 in: *Het Gaat Om De Film! Een Nieuwe Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Filmiga, 1927-1933*, (Gunning, Linssen, Schoots, eds.), Bas Lubberhuizen / Nederlands Filmmuseum, 1999.
- Livesey, Graham; 'The Van Der Leeuw House: Theosophical Connections With Early Modern Architecture', in: *Architecture and Theosophy* (Susan R. Henderson, ed.), *Architronic, The Electronic Journal of Architecture* V8/1 Jan. 1999. <http://corbu2.caed.kent.edu/architronic/v8n1/> (2008-07-08).
- Loghem, Han van; 'Brugontwerp voor Rotterdam', p197-208 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 6/19, 1935.
- Loghem, Han van; 'De Maastunnel te Rotterdam', p128-131 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 7/11, 1936.
- Loghem, Han van; 'Brug of tunnel; Rotterdamsch oeververbinding', in: *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 1936-11-28.
- Loghem, Han van; 'De stad zonder Kunst', p103-105 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 7/9, 1936.
- Luhmann, Niklas; 'Globalization or world society: how to conceive of modern society?', *International Review of Sociology* 7(1), pp67-79, March 1997 – www.generation-online.org/p/fluhmann2.htm (visited 2010-01-21)
- Luhmann, Niklas; *Art as a Social System*, Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press, 2000a [transl. of *Die Kunst der Gesellschaft*, 1995].
- Luhmann, Niklas; *The Reality of Mass Media*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000b [1995].
- Luhr, William & Lehman, Peter; 'Experiment in Terror: Dystopian Modernism, the Police Procedural, and the Space of Anxiety', pp176-193 in: *Cinema and Modernity* (Murray Pomerance, ed.), New Brunswick, New Jersey, London: Rutgers University Press, 2006.
- Lunenfeld, Peter (organiser); *Scripted Spaces, An ITA Conference on Entertainment Design, Narrative Architecture, and Virtual Environments* [review by Tara McPherson; 'Making Space', *Convergence*, vol. 5/2, 1998], Institute for Technology and Aesthetics (ITA) / Art Center College of Design, Pasadena (CA), 1998.
- Maan, Dick; *Paul Schuitema, Visual Organizer*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2006.

- Mackenzie, Adrian; 'The Problem of the Attractor, A Singular Generality between Sciences and Social Theory', pp45-65 in: *Special Issue on Complexity* (J. Urry, ed.), *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 22/5, October 2005, Sage Publications.
- Maden, Frank van der; 'De Komst van de Film', pp11-52 in: *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Film en Bioscoop tot 1940*, (ed. Dibbets K. & Van der Maden, F.), Het Wereldvenster, Houten.
- Magnée, R.; *Willem M. Dudok*, Amsterdam: G. van Saane Lectura Architectonica, Bussum: F.G. Kroonder, 1954
- Man, Hanneke de; 'Ossip Zadkine, De Verwoeste Stad', pp200-2001 in: *Beelden in Rotterdam* (Adrichem, Jan van; Bouwhuis, Jelle; Dölle, Mariette, eds.), Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2002.
- Manners, Robert A.; 'Julian Haynes Steward', in: *Biographical Memoirs*, Vol. 69, 1996, National Academies Press / National Academy of Sciences; <http://www.nap.edu/readingroom/books/biomems/jsteward.html> (2007-08-05)
- Manovich, Lev; 'The poetics of augmented space', in: *Visual Communication*, vol. 5/2, 219-240, Sage Publications, 2006. <http://vcj.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/5/2/219> (2010-01-21)
- Marlet, Gerard (Atlas voor Gemeenten); Woerkens, Clemens van (Atlas voor Gemeenten); Mulder, José (SEO); Poort, Joost (SEO); *Het Economisch Belang van Reclame* (SEO-rapport nr. 853, ISBN 90-6733-312-3), Amsterdam: Centrum Merk en Communicatie; Amsterdam: Stichting Economisch Onderzoek (SEO); Utrecht: Stichting Atlas voor Gemeenten, 2006.
- Marquette, Catherine; 'Cultural Ecology', in: *Theory in Anthropology* (Richard Wilk, ed.), website of the 'Proseminar in Sociocultural Anthropology' [since 1996], Indianapolis (IN): Indiana University, <http://www.indiana.edu/~wanthro/eco.htm> (2006-09-07)
- Marks, Laura U.; *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses*, Durham / London: Duke University Press, 2000.
- Marshall, Stephen; *Cities, Design & Evolution*, New York / London: Routledge, 2009.
- Matthijssse, Richard; 'Rotterdam Communicatie C'70; Feestelijke ontmoeting van mens en stad', pp1-5 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 7/4, 1969.
- Matussek, Matthias & Kronsbein, Joachim; 'Spiegel Interview with Dutch Architect Rem Koolhaas; "Evil Can also Be Beautiful"', *Der Spiegel* (13), 2006-03-27 – Spiegel Online International www.spiegel.de/international/spiegel/0,1518,408748,00.html (2010-01-21)
- McLeod, Mary; 'Everyday and "other" spaces', pp1-37 in: *Architecture and Feminism* (D. Coleman, E. Danze, C. Henderson, eds.), New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.
- McGrath, Stacy; 'Ecological Anthropology', *Anthropological Theories: A Guide Prepared By Students For Students* (M. Murphy, ed.), Dept. of Anthropology, College of Arts and Sciences, Univ. of Alabama [since 2001] www.as.ua.edu/ant/Faculty/murphy/ecologic.htm (2007-08-09)
- Meijer, Jan; 'In een kooi omhoog naar de Tellem-grotten; het tweede leven van architect Herman Haan', pp20-21 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 2/3, 1964.
- Meijer, Jan & Van Oosten, Annemiek; 'Wijk 20, boeiende film over onzekere toekomst Feijenoord', in: *Het Vrije Volk*, 1974-09-05.
- Merkelbach, Ben; 'Tentoonstelling in de "Bijenkorf" te Rotterdam', p323 in *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol.3/23, 1932;
- Meurs, Paul & Verheijen, Marc (eds.); *In Transit; Mobiliteit, stads cultuur en stedelijke ontwikkeling in Rotterdam*, Rotterdam: NAI Uitgevers, 2003.
- Meeus, Tom-Jan; 'Kameraden Onder Elkaar', *Zaterdags Bijvoegsel, NRC-Handelsblad*, 1999-02-20. www.nrc.nl/W2/Nieuws/1999/02/20/Vp/z.html (2008-07-31).
- Miller, Daniel; 'Appropriating the State on the Council Estate', pp353-372 in: *Man* 23(2), 1988.
- Miller, Daniel; *Material Culture and Mass Consumption*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1994 [1987].
- Miller, William H.; *Going Dutch, The Holland America Line Story*, London: Carmania Press, 1998.
- Moerkerken, Emiel van; 'In Memoriam Andor von Barys', pp13-15 in: *NBF Bulletin*, nr. 6, 1966.
- Moerkerken, Emiel van; 'Herinneringen aan Dood water en Lentelied', pp54-56 in: *Skoop* IV, 9/10, August, 1967.
- Moholy-Nagy, László; 'Dood Water' [review], p334 in: *Filmiga*, issue 11/12, 1934.
- Moran, Emilio F. (ed.); *The Ecosystem Approach in Anthropology, From Concept to Practice*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1990.
- Moscoviter, Herman; 'Een civieltechnische supermarkt van alle tijden', pp17-49 in: *Op de groei Gemaakt; "Gerieftijkheden voor een wel-ingerichte stad"* (Herman Moscoviter, ed.), Rotterdam: Gemeentewerken Rotterdam.
- Mul, Ronella; 'Van Havenstad tot Filmdecor, Rotterdam in 31 fragmenten', *Cinema.nl* (VPRO, Volskrant, NL), January 2001, <http://www.cinema.nl/artikelen/2175682/van-havenstad-tot-filmdecor> (2010-01-01).
- Mulvey, Laura; *Death 24 x a second: Stillness and the Moving Image*, London: Reaktion Books, 2005.
- Mumford, Lewis; 'The Sky Line' [Dutch], pp1198-1201 in: *Bouw*, 1957 – originally published in: *The New Yorker*, 1957-10-12.
- Mumford, Lewis; *The Urban Prospect*, New York: Harcourt Brace & World Inc., 1968.

- Nas, Dik; 'Streven naar Verbetering', Amsterdam: Vakbondshistorische Vereniging, www.vakbondshistorie.nl/havenwerkers.html (www.vakbondshistorie.nl > vakbonden > havenwerkersbond 'streven naar verbetering', 2000-12-12 (visited: 2008-07-31)).
- Nas, Dik; 'Algemene Nederlandsche Metaalbewerkerbond (ANMB)', Amsterdam: Vakbondshistorische Vereniging, www.vakbondshistorie.nl/metaalindustrie_anmb.html (www.vakbondshistorie.nl > vakbonden > metaalindustrie ANMB), published 2001-07-05 (last visited: 2008-07-31).
- Netting, Robert McC.; Links and Boundaries: Reconsidering the Alpine Village as Ecosystem, pp229-246 in: *The Ecosystem Approach in Anthropology, From Concept to Practice* (Moran, E., ed.), Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1990.
- Neumann, Dietrich; *Film Architecture: Set Designs from Metropolis to Blade Runner*, Munich, New York: Prestel, 1996.
- Nibbeling, Simone; *Film International, analyse van een bewogen periode 1972-1989* [MA thesis], Utrecht: RUU, Theaterwetenschappen, 1989.
- Nicolaï-Chaillat, C.; 'In de fabriek vervaardigde keukens', pp344-346 in: *Goed Wonen*, vol. 13/11, 1960.
- Niegeman, Johan; 'De "Nieuw Amsterdam"', pp128-129 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 9/12/13, 1938.
- Nieman, Richard; 'Werk van een heel ander genre...', *Elsevier*, 1957-09-07 (?) [personal archive Jan Schaper].
- Nieman, Richard; 'Voor "toevallig" publiek', *Elsevier*, 1958-08-16.
- Nieuwenhuis, Jan; 'Hyacinth Hermans O.P., een halve eeuw journalistiek in Rotterdam', pp164-168 in: *Rotterdams Jaarboekje 1963*, Rotterdam: W.L. & J. Brusse / Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, 1963.
- Nieuwenhuijze, F.A.; 'Wegenruit als ruggegraat; Kwart eeuw Verkeersplanning in Rotterdam', pp11-15 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 7/4, 1969.
- Nimwegen, C.S.L.; *Van Mena Muria tot Allah Al Akhbar; Geschiedenis van terrorismebestrijding in Nederland 1970-2006* [MA thesis], Universiteit Utrecht, 2007. <http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl/student-theses/2007-0328-200237/Scriptie%20Definitief.doc> (2009-01-08)
- Nowotny, Helga; 'The Increase of Complexity and its Reduction, emergent interfaces between the Natural Sciences, Humanities and Social Sciences', pp15-31 in: *Special Issue on Complexity* (John Urry, ed.), *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 22/5, October 2005, Sage Publications.
- Nicolaas, Jacques; 'Drie episoden in architectuur, stedebouw en volkshuisvesting', pp174-202 in: *Architectuur en Planning, Nederland 1940-1980* (Umberto Barbieri ed.), Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1983.
- Onink, Gert; 'De vergeten staking van 1979; 'Historische' havenactie stukgoed, maar slepers Smit lagen zeven weken stil', *Rotterdams Dagblad* (www.rotterdamsdagblad.nl) 2004-08-23.
- Oorthuys, Cas (photography); Cocheret, Ch.A. (text); *Dit is onze havenstad Rotterdam*, Amsterdam / Antwerpen: Contact Foto Pockets, 1952.
- Oorthuys, Cas (photography); Boer, Jan Willem de (text); *Rotterdam, Dynamische Stad*, Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Contact, 1959.
- Oosterman, Arjen (ed.); *Engineering Society / Volume nr. 16*, Amsterdam: Archis Foundation, 2008.
- Oppenheimer-Belinfante, D.; ['het moderne huishouden'], pp98-101 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 6/9, 1935.
- Ott, Leo; *Naar Wijder Horizon, Vijftig jaar Volks-Universiteit te Rotterdam*, Rotterdam: Nijgh & Van Ditmar / Historisch Genootschap Roterodamum.
- Oud, Jacobus Johannes Pieter, 'Kunst en Machine' [originally published in: *De Stijl*, 1918/4], in: *Dat is Architectuur, sleutelteksten uit de twintigste eeuw* (Hilde Heynen, ed. e.a.), Rotterdam: 010, 2001a.
- Oud, Jacobus Johannes Pieter, 'Bouwkunst en normalisatie bij de massabouw' [originally published in: *De Stijl*, 1918/7], in: *Dat is Architectuur, sleutelteksten uit de twintigste eeuw* (Hilde Heynen, ed. e.a.), Rotterdam: 010.
- Ouden, Alex & Jan den; *Rotterdamers – een ode aan de Maasstad, 1900-2000*, CD-ROM (previously: www.rotterdamers.nl), 1100pp, 2003. www.alexdenouden.nl (2010-02-02)
- Oudenaarden, Jan; *Mannen van Gezag, Rotterdam 1940-1975*, Rotterdam: Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, 2004.
- Pallasmaa, Juhani; *The Architecture of Image: Existential Space in Cinema*, Helsinki: Rakennustieto Oy, 2002.
- Patteeuw, Véronique (ed.), *Betreffende Rem Koolhaas en het Office for Metropolitan Architecture – wat is OMA*, Rotterdam: NAI Uitgevers, 2003.
- Pauw, Hans van der; *Rotterdam in de Tweede Wereldoorlog*, Meppel: Boom, Rotterdam: Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, 2006.
- Peach, Mark; "'Der Architekt Denkt, Die Hausfrau Lenkt": German Modern Architecture and the Modern Woman', pp441-463 in: *German Studies Review* 18: 3, October 1995.
- Peeters, Floor; *De Utrechtse Filmliga, 1927-1933; Opvattingen over film als kunst in Utrecht* [MA thesis, unpublished], Utrecht: Universiteit Utrecht, 2002.
- Penz, Francois & Thomas, Maureen; *Cinema and Architecture: Melies, Mallet-Stevens, Multimedia*, London: BFI, 1997.
- Pisters, Patricia; 'Delirium Cinema or Machines of the Invisible', presentation at the conference *Is a Schizoanalysis of Cinema Possible?*, University of Cardiff, November 2006.
- Post, G. e.a. (ed.); 'De Man die Gemeentewerken een gezicht geeft: Peter Alsemgeest', pp1-2 in: *Kontakten*, vol. 7/8, Bureau Voorlichting Gemeentewerken Rotterdam, November 1976.

- Pot, J.E. van der; 'De Rotterdamse Kring, 1913-1942', pp137-169 in: *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, 1962, reeks 6, jrg. 10, Rotterdam: W.L. & J. Brusse / Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, 1962.
- Pronk, Ingeborg; 'Sybold van Ravesteyn', p190 in: *Interbellum Rotterdam* (Halbertsma & Van Ulzen, eds.), Rotterdam: NAI, 2001.
- Provoost, Michelle; *Asfalt;Automobiliteit in de Rotterdamse Stedebouw*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1996.
- Provoost, Michelle; *Hugh Maaskant, Architect van de Vooruitgang*, diss., Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 2003.
- Rappaport, Roy A., 'Ecosystems, Populations and People', pp41-72 in: *The Ecosystem Approach in Anthropology, From Concept to Practice* (Moran, Emilio F., ed.), Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1990.
- Reijndorp, Arnold; 'Met gevoel voor de plek/Introductie op de kaarten', pp7-14 in: *Sense of Place; Atlas van de culturele ecologie van Rotterdam*, Gemeente Rotterdam, dS+V, 2004. ISBN 90-72498-18-6
- Reinhartz-Tergau, Elisabeth; *J.J.P. Oud, Architect – Meubelontwerpen en interieurs*, Urotterdam: De Hef / Museum Boijmans-Van Beuningen, 1990.
- Rennen, Ward; *CityEvents, Place Selling in a Media Age*, Amsterdam: Vossiuspers / Amsterdam University Press, 2007.
- Rhijn, J. van; *Rotterdam 1940-1946*, Delft: Delftsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1947.
- Rhijn, J. van; 'Emigreren... vanaf de 17^e eeuw ging dat per schip via Rotterdam', pp11-13 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 12/2, 1974.
- Rietbergen, Peter; 'De hoge C aan de Coolsingel en het ritme van de grootstad', pp45-57, in: *Interbellum Rotterdam* (M. Halbertsma & P. van Ulzen, eds.), Rotterdam: NAI, 2001.
- Rijkschroeff, Boudewijn; *Etnisch Ondernemerschap, De Chinese Horecasector in Nederland en in de Verenigde Staten van Amerika* [dissertation], Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, Capelle a/d IJssel: Labyrint Publication, 1998.
<http://dissertations.ub.rug.nl/FILES/faculties/ppsw/1998/b.r.rijkschroeff/titelinh.pdf> (2008-07-11)
- Riles, Annelise; *The Network Inside Out*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000.
- Rodermond, Janny; 'Sint Jacobsplaats, verdichtingsbouw in Rotterdam', pp78-83 in: *De Architect*, vol. 10/9, 1979.
- Roding, Michiel (e.a.); 'Wim ten Bosch en Henri le Grand; "Vriendelijk, genoeglijk en speels" (essay), Rotterdam: Bonas. www.bonas.nl > biografische gegevens > Ten Bosch (last time visited 2007-09-08).
- Rodowick, David N.; *The Virtual Life of Film*, Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Roelofs, E.; *De Wederopbouw van de in mei 1940 verwoeste delen van de binnenstad, Kralingen en het Noordereiland van Rotterdam, 1940-1950*, Rotterdam: Stichting Historische Publicaties Roterodamum, 1989.
- Romer, Herman; *Fantasia, Illusie en Betovering; Herinneringen aan Rotterdamse Bioscopen, 1896-2004*, Zaltbommel: Aprilis, 2004.
- Rooijendijk, Cordula; 'Urban ideal images in post-war Rotterdam', pp177-209 in: *Planning Perspectives* 20 (Taylor & Francis, UK), April 2005.
- Rooijendijk, Cordula; *That City is Mine: Urban Ideal Images in Public Debates and City Plans, Amsterdam & Rotterdam 1945-1995* [dissertation], Amsterdam: Vossiuspers Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2005.
- Rossem, Vincent van; *'Het idee van de functionele stad' een lezing met lichtbeelden 1928 - C.van Eesteren*, Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, The Hague: EFL Publicaties, 1997.
- Rotgans, Frits (photography); Kossmann, Alfred (text); *Rotterdam, Stad en Haven*, Rotterdam: Nijgh & Van Ditmar, 1959.
- Rotterdams Jaarboekje* (RJ), annual publication of the *Gemeentearchief Rotterdam*, i.c.w. Historisch Genootschap Roterodamum – editions are online available at: <http://rjb.x-cago.com> (2008-05-15)
- Rouw, Kees; *Sybold van Ravesteyn, architect van Kunstmin en De Holland*, Rotterdam: De Hef, 1988.
- Ruijven, Erik van; 'Joop van den Broek', p51 in: *Interbellum Rotterdam, kunst en cultuur 1918-1940* (M. Halbertsma & P. van Ulzen, eds.), Rotterdam: NAI, 2001.
- Rutten, Gerard; *Mijn Papieren Camera, Draaiboek Van Een Leven*, Bussum: Fibula – Van Dishoeck, 1976.
- Ruyter-De Zeeuw, Chr. de; 'Brautigam, Johan', pp22-25 in: BWSA 4, 1990a – www.iisg.nl/bwsa/bios/brautigam.html (2002-08-05).
- Ruyter-De Zeeuw, Chr.A. de; 'Zeeuw, Arie Bastiaan de', pp231-234 in: BWSA 4, 1990b – www.iisg.nl/bwsa/bios/zeeuw.html (2003-02-05).
- Salingaros, Nikos; *Principles of Urban Structure*, Amsterdam: Techne Press, 2005.
- Santen-Mout, M.E.H.N. van, 'Blijstra, Reinder (1901-1975)', in: *Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland*, The Hague, 1979.
www.inghist.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/BWN/lemmata/bwn1/blijstra (2008-03-13)
- Sassen, Saskia; *Globalisering, over mobiliteit van geld, mensen en informatie*, Amsterdam: Van Gennep, 1999.
- Scheele, Piet; 'Staking bij ICI; Het gevecht om de automatische prijscompensatie en de 5-ploegendienst' [1977], FNV-net, 2006-03-28.
www.fnv.net/host/industriebond/stakingici.html (2010-02-02)

- Scheepmaker, Nico; *Het meest bekeken programma, 25 jaar NOS-journaal*, Naarden: Strengholt, 1981.
- Schelling, H.G.J.; 'Film over moderne Nederlandse architectuur', p309 in: *Bouwkundig Weekblad* vol. 72/33-34, 1954.
- Schmidt, Bertus; 'Dichter Jules Deelder bezeten van zijn stad – Rotterdam', pp19-20 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 16/3, 1978.
- Scholte, Henrik; 'Herleeft de avantgarde?', pp12-14 in: *Filmliga* vol. 6/1 (20 November 1932).
- Scholte, Henrik; *Nederlandsche Filmkunst*, Monografieën over Filmkunst, deel 3 (Coen Graadt van Roggen, ed.), Rotterdam: W.L. & J. Brusse, 1933.
- Schoots, Hans; 'De rechte lijn naar het paradijs: Rotterdams modernistische erfenis', pp115-123 in: *De Rotterdamse cultuur in elf spiegels* (A. de Jonge & M. de Wolff, eds.), Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010, 1993.
- Schoots, Hans; 'De geest maakt levend, het amerikanisme doodt, De Nederlandsche Filmliga tussen hoge en lage cultuur', pp149-214 in: *Het Gaat Om De Film! Een Nieuwe Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Filmliga 1927-1933*, (Gunning, Linssen, Schoots, eds.), Bas Lubberhuizen / NFM, 1999.
- Schoots, Hans; *Van Fanfare tot Spetters, een cultuurgeschiedenis van de jaren zestig en zeventig*, Amsterdam: Nederlands Filmmuseum, Lubberhuizen, 2004.
- Schuitema, Paul; 'Welke vragen rijzen als we over de hedendaagsche film spreken?', pp229-230, in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 6/21, 1935.
- Schuyt, Kees & Taverne, Ed; *1950 Welvaart in zwart-wit*, The Hague: SDU, 2000.
- Scott, James C.; *Seeing Like a State, How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Scott, Allen J.; *The Cultural Economy of Cities*, London: Sage Publications, 2000.
- Scott, Allen J.; *On Hollywood, the Place, the Industry*, New Jersey: Princeton UP, 2005.
- Selten, Peter; 'Tot lering en Vermaak. De Ontwikkeling van het jeugdwerk en de jeugdverenigingen in Nederland tussen 1850 en 1920', in 59-71: *Leidschrift* 20/2, September 2005. www.leidschrift.nl/artikelen/jaargang20/20-2/11%20SELTEN.PDF (2008-10-31).
- SHAEF – PWD (Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force, Psychological Warfare Division); German film section (catalogue), 1945. [UvA-UB 125: FTTW S44]
- Shaw, Jeffrey & Weibel, Peter (eds.); *Future Cinema: The Cinematic Imaginary After Film*, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 2003.
- Shiel, Mark; 'Cinema in the City in History and Theory, pp1-18 in: *Cinema and The City: Film and Urban Societies in A Global Context* (Fitzmaurice T. & Shiel M., eds.), Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 2001.
- Shonfield, Katherine; *Walls Have Feelings: Architecture, Film and the City*, London/New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Sichel, Kim; *Germaine Krull, Photographer of Modernity*, Cambridge (MA) / London: MIT Press, 1999.
- Smit, Ellen; 'Broek, Johannes Hendrik van den (1898-1978)', in: *Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland* (6), The Hague: 2008. www.inghist.nl/Onderzoek/Projecten/BWN/lemmata/bwn6/broek [2008-03-13]
- Smith, John; 'Complexity, Ecology and the Materiality of Information', pp 141-163 in: *Special Issue on Complexity* (John Urry, ed.), *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 22/5, October 2005, Sage Publications.
- Smit, Vanetta; *Later ga ik alle dagen naar de film. Gij ook? Een onderzoek naar de Rotterdamse Filmliga, 1927-1933* [MA thesis], Universiteit Utrecht, Film- en Televisiewetenschappen, Faculteit Letteren, Utrecht: Universiteitsbibliotheek / Igitur, 2005. <http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl/student-theses/2006-0324-082925/UUindex.html> (2008-10-22)
- Smits, Louis; *De Rotterdamse Video en Smalfilm Liga, 70 jaar Amateurfilmers in Rotterdam*, Rotterdam: Rotterdamse Video en Smalfilm Liga, 2002. [library GAR: XXVC10]
- Snelleman, A.P.; 'Jan Schaper maakte een poëtische film over de stad en de mensen... "Schiedam is 'n opengebarsten knop; 'n burcht, die is opengegaan"', *Het Vrije Volk*, 1966-07-06.
- Sobchack, Vivian; *Carnal Thoughts: Embodiment and Moving Image Culture*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Sonnen, Arthur; 'Theaterreflect', speech contributed to the event *Theater moet schuren! Essays over de maatschappelijke opdracht van het theater*, 2005-06-21, Muziekgebouw aan het IJ, Amsterdam: Boekmanstichting, 2005. www.boekman.nl/publicaties_theatermoetschuren_presentatie_sonnen.html (visited: 2008-07-31)
- Sørensen, Bjørn; 'Travel Films in Norway: the Persistence of the View aesthetic', pp102-113 in: *Nordic Explorations: Film Before 1930* (J. Fullerton, ed.), Sydney / London: John Libbey 1999 – www.hf.ntnu.no/ikm/bjornso/Bjornweb/Artikler/travel.htm (2008-12-16).
- Sørensen, Bjørn; 'Ein modernes Medium für eine moderne Mitteilung: Norsk Jernverk im Film, 1946-1974', in *Filmische Mittel, industrielle Zwecke. Das Werk des Industriefilms* (Hediger & Vondereau, eds.), Berlin: Vorwerk 8, 2007.
- Spaandonk, J.W.M. van; 'Studie per beeldscherm', pp9-11 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1 1973.
- Staal, Arthur; 'Nog meer abstracte kunst?', p88 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 9/9, 1938.
- Staay, Adriaan van der; 'Lokale radio, wegnemen van informatietekort', pp13-14 in: *Rondvraag, 1973/1 – Lokale Radio en Televisie*, appendix to *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1, 1973.

- Staiger, Janet; 'Docudrama', website of MBC: *The Museum of Broadcast Communications*, Chicago, December 2005 – www.museum.tv/archives/etv/D/htmlD/docudrama/docudrama.htm (visited: 2008-07-31).
- Stam, Mart; 'Het passagiersschip de Nieuw Amsterdam', pp119-128 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 9/12-13, 1938.
- Stam, Mart; 'De architectenkant is de menselijke kant', pp225-226 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 9/23, 1938.
- Steen, Bart van der; 'Met de Roode Auto op reis. Een fragment uit de memoires van Jef Last', in: *Onvoltooid Verleden*, nr. 23, May, 2007. www.onvoltooidverleden.nl/index.php?id=74 (2009-03-18)
- Steward, Julian; *Theory of Culture Change, the Methodology of Multilinear Evolution*, Urbana / Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1976 [1955].
- Stiemer, Flora; *Wout van Heusden, 1896-1982; Graficus en Schilder in Rotterdam*, Rotterdam: Stichting Kunstpublicaties Rotterdam, 1992.
- Stokvis, Ab; 'Het BVHL is dood, leve de SMS', p2 in: *Medisch Comité Nederland Vietnam*, vol. 35/1, April 2005 – http://www.mcnv.nl/uploads/media/MCNV_krant_2005_1_08.pdf.
- Straaten, Evert van; *Theo van Doesburg, Schilder en Architect*, The Hague: SDU, 1988.
- Strate, Lance; 'A media ecology review', *Communication Research Trends*, vol. 23/2, Los Gatos, CA: Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture (CSCC), 2004.
- Strauss, Claudia & Quinn, Naomi; *A Cognitive Theory of Cultural Meaning*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Stroman, Ben; *Stad*, Rotterdam: W.L. & J. Brusse, 1932.
- Struijs, Aad van der; 'E'55: manifestatie met veel energie', p1 in: *De Oud Rotterdammer*, vol. 2/7, 2006-04-04. www.deoudrotterdammer.nl/archief/week14_jaargang2.pdf (2008-07-31).
- Struyvenberg, Willemijn; 'Een oase op het dak van Hotel Atlanta', pp69-92 in: *Interbellum Rotterdam* (M. Halbertsma & P. van Ulzen, eds.), Rotterdam: NAI, 2001.
- Stufkens, André; 'Ivens revisited: 15 films in the footsteps of Ivens', pp28-30 in: *Newsmagazine European Foundation Joris Ivens*, November 2004. www.iven.nl/nieuwsbrief10pdfs/DE%20JORIS%20IVENS_28.pdf (2008-12-19)
- Stuvel, H.J. (a.o.); *Kleinpolderplein*, issued by Van Hattum & Blankevoort, reprint (32pp.) from the magazine *Weg en Waterbouw*, nr. 1969/07, Voorburg, 1969. [UvA, UB: NN.Bok.n.pl]
- Suermondt, Rik; 'Rotterdam 1950-1960. Vijf fotografen – vijf boeken', pp22-29 in: *Foto*, April 1993. www.riksuermondt.nl/pages_rik/artikelen/fotoboek/3.htm (2010-01-19)
- Susi, Tarja & Ziemke, Tom; 'Social cognition, artefacts, and stigmergy: a comparative analysis of theoretical frameworks for the understanding of artefact-mediated collaborative activity', pp273-290 in: *Cognitive Systems Research*, vol. 2/4, December 2001 – reference document: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.15.8463> > download: pdf (2009-02-20)
- Suteanu, Christian; 'Complexity, Science and the Public; The Geography of New Interpretation', pp113-140 in: *Special Issue on Complexity* (John Urry, ed.), *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 22/5, October 2005, Sage Publications.
- Szczepanik, Petr; 'Modernität, Industrie, Film: Der Verbund der Medien in der Firma Bat'a und in der Stadt Zlin in den dreißiger Jahren', pp250-281 in: *Filmische Mittel, industrielle Zwecke* (Vinzenc Hediger, Patrick Vonderau eds.), Berlin: Vorwerk 8, 2007.
- Szénássy, István; *Architectuur in Nederland, 1960-1967*, Amsterdam: Scheltema & Holkema.
- Talle, An; 'Coolsingel, 8 mei 1940', pp235-253 in: *Interbellum Rotterdam* (M. Halbertsma & P. van Ulzen, eds.), Rotterdam: NAI, 2001.
- Taverne, Ed.; 'Architects without architecture', pp24-47 in: *Architectuur en Planning, Nederland 1940-1980* (Barbieri, ed.), Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1983.
- Taverne, Ed & Vletter, Martien de & Wagenaar, Cor (eds.); *J.J.P. Oud, Poëtisch Functionalist, 1890-1963, Compleet werk*, Rotterdam: NAI, 2001.
- Taverne, Ed; 'Screenville; stadfilms, verfilmde steden en filmsteden', pp6-7 in: *Architectuur Film Festival Rotterdam* [festival programme magazine], Rotterdam: AFFR, 2007.
- Tode, Thomas; 'Albrecht Viktor Blum', in: *Cinegraph, Lexikon zum deutschsprachigen Film*, Lieferung 29 (Hans-Michael Bock, ed.), Munich: Text + Kritik, 1997.
- Tode, Thomas; 'Dossieres Muskelspiel', pp527-575 in: *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland: 1919-1933* (K. Kreimeier e.a. eds.), Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005.
- Tijen, Willem van; 'Flatgebouw Parklaan', pp140-146 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 4/16, 1933.
- Tijen, Willem van; 'Rotterdam en het Bouwen', pp97-99 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 7/9, 1936.
- Tijen, Willem van; 'Hoogbouw aan de Kralingsche Plas te Rotterdam Arch. Ir. W. van Tijen en H. Maaskant', pp99-105 in: *De 8 & Opbouw*, vol. 9/11, 1938.
- Timmer, Han; 'Ravesteijn, Sijbold van (1889-1983)', in: *Biografisch Woordenboek van Nederland 5*, The Hague: ING, 2002.
- Toy, Maggie; *Architecture & Film, Architectural Design* (AD Profile) v64: pp6-96, London: John Wiley & Son, Nov./Dec. 1994.

- Traa, Cornelis van; 'Rotterdam startklaar', pp2-4 in: *Bouw*, vol. 2, 1947.
- Traa, Cornelis van (ed.); *Rotterdam: de geschiedenis van tien jaren wederopbouw*, Rotterdam: Donker, 1955.
- Tschumi, Bernard; 'Space and Events' [1983], reprint: pp139-151 in: *Architecture and Disjunction*, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 1994.
- Tschumi, Bernard; *Architecture and Disjunction*, Cambridge (MA): MIT Press, 1994.
- Tschumi, Bernard; *Le Fresnoy, Architecture In/Between*, New York: Monacelli, 1999.
- Urry, John; *Global Complexity*, Cambridge (UK): Polity, 2003.
- Urry, John; 'The Complexity Turn' [introduction]; pp2-14 in: *Special Issue on Complexity* (J. Urry, ed.), *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 22/5, October 2005, Sage Publications.
- Valck, Marijke de; *Film Festivals, History and Theory of a European Phenomenon that became a Global Network* [dissertation], Amsterdam: ASCA / Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2006.
- Valk, Felix; 'Video: mogelijkheid voor lokale televisie', pp14-15 in: *Rondvraag, 1973/1 – Lokale Radio en Televisie*, appendix to *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 11/1, 1973.
- Vanstiphout, Wouter; *Maak een Stad, Rotterdam en de architectuur van J.H. van den Broek*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2005.
- Velden, André van der; 'Het Hofplein en de illussie van een wereldstad', pp93-120 in: *Interbellum Rotterdam* (M. Halbertsma & P. van Ulzen, eds.), Rotterdam: NAI, 2001.
- Velden, André van der; 'Vijftien jaar van het leven van Abraham Tuschinski (1886-1942)', pp82-102 in: *Tijdschrift voor Sociale en Economische Geschiedenis*, nr 3, 2004. www.iisg.nl/~tsegsite/2004/3-vandervelden.pdf (2010-02-02)
- Velden, Eric van der; 'Echtpaar Vis: samen ruim honderd jaar Rotterdams bioscoopleven', p23 in: *Brabants Nieuwsblad*, 1983-02-05.
- Velden, Sjaak van der (ed.), *Stakingen in Nederland, arbeidersstrijd 1830-1995*, Amsterdam: Stichting beheer IISG/NIWI, 2000.
- Velden, Sjaak van der, *Werknemers in Actie; twee eeuwen stakingen, bedrijfsbezettingen en andere acties in Nederland*, Amsterdam: Aksant, 2004.
- Velden, Sjaak van der (ed.), *Kranen over de wal. De grote Rotterdamse metaal- en havenstaking van 1970*, Amsterdam: Aksant / Vakbondshistorische Vereniging, 2005.
- Velzen, Endry van; 'Laboratorium voor stedelijke vernieuwing, over de architectuur van het Oude Westen', pp28-41 in: *Het Oude Westen, Laboratorium van de Stadsvernieuwing*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1993.
- Verhoeff, Nanna; *Panorama Behind Glass: Framing the Spatial and Visual Design of Highways* [web publication], The Hague: Ruimtelijk Planbureau, 2007 [extension of an article from *Snelwegpanorama's in Nederland*, RPB and NAI, 2006]. www.ruimtelijkplanbureau.nl/uploads/media/Panorama_behind_glass.pdf (2008-10-23)
- Vermeer, Annemarie, *NSB-films: propaganda of vermaak?*, Beetsterzwaag: AMA Uitgeverij, 1987.
- Visscher, Wim; *Amsterdam in Film: een filmografie van 1896 tot 1940*, Amsterdam: Gemeente Archief Amsterdam, 1995.
- Vlerk, A.J. van der (e.a.); *Rapport van de commissie voor het kunstbeleid, uitgebracht aan burgemeester en wethouders van Rotterdam*, Gemeente Rotterdam: June 1957.
- Vletter, Martien de; *The Critical Seventies; Architecture and Urban Planning in the Netherlands, 1968-1982*, Rotterdam: NAI, 2004.
- Vollaard, Piet; *Herman Haan, Architect*, Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1995.
- Vriend, J.J.; *De Schoonheid van ons Land; Architectuur van deze Eeuw*, Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Contact, 1959.
- Vries, Tjitte de; 'Feijenoord: gefilmd portret van een gehavende wijk', in: *Het Vrije Volk*, 1974-09-21.
- Vries, Tjitte de; 'In elke wijk straks video- en filmgroep', in: *Het Vrije Volk, section Film*, 1975-01-10 (a).
- Vries, Tjitte de; 'Rotterdamse filmers: "Elk bejaardenhuis is slecht"', in: *Het Vrije Volk*, 1975-04-28 (b).
- Vries, Tjitte de; 'Ontmoeting met: ex-bioscoop operateur Max Vis', p13 in: *Het Vrije Volk*, 1983-05-14.
- Vroegindeweij, Rien; 'Voetballen op de fiets', in: *Hard Gras*, nr. 44, September 2005. www.vroegius.nl/artikelen/ (2009-02-02)
- Wagenaar, Aad; *Rotterdam van dag tot dag, 1940-1995*, Zwolle: Waanders, 1995-1996.
- Wagenaar, Cor; *Welvaartsstad in wording; De wederopbouw van Rotterdam 1940-1952*, Rotterdam: Nai Uitgevers, 1992.
- Wagenaar, Cor & Steenhuis, Marinke; 'Laboratorium Spangen', pp179-202 in: *Interbellum Rotterdam* (M. Halbertsma & P. van Ulzen, eds.), Rotterdam: NAI, 2001.
- Wagener, W.A.; 'Vijftig Jaren Kunstzinnig Leven te Rotterdam 1898-1948; Rede uitgesproken op 26 Augustus 1948 in het Museum Boymans ter gelegenheid van de gelijknamige tentoonstelling', pp141-159 in: *Rotterdams Jaarboekje*, Rotterdam: Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, 1949.
- Wagt, Wim de; *Piet Elling, 1897-1962; Een samenstemmende eenheid*, Bussum: Thoth, 2008.

- Wattjes, J.G. & Bosch, W. Th.H. ten; *Rotterdam en hoe het Bouwde*, Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1st edition, 1940.
- Wattjes, J.G. & Bosch, W. Th.H. ten; *Rotterdam en hoe het Bouwde*, Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 2nd edition, 1941.
- Welling, Dolf; 'Aardige fotoreportage over jonge mensen in Rotterdam', *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad*, 1957-09-04.
- Wester, Rudi; 'LAST, Josephus Carel Franciscus', pp141-146 in: BWSA 8, 2001 – www.iisg.nl/bwsa/bios/last.html (2007-10-02)
- Westhoff, Marcel; *Levensgangen, biografische data over 30 cineasten*, SFW-werkuitgave no.9, Amsterdam: Stichting Film & Wetenschap, 1995.
- Wieten, Jan; 'Televisie is omroep', in: *Informatie & Informatiebeleid (I&I)*, 1994/3 – www.cram.nl/ieni (2006-06-07)
- Wigley, Mark; *Constant's New Babylon, The Hyper-Architecture of Desire*, Rotterdam: Witte de With / 010 Publishers, 1998.
- Willemsen, Harry; 'Meer wit dan grijs; Jan Schaper steekt de loftrumpet over Schiedam', *De Tijd/De Maasbode*, 1966-07-06.
- Willemsen, Harry; 'De Lantaren, wáár laboratorium voor podiumkunsten en films', pp11-13 in: *Rotterdam, Officieel Tijdschrift van de Gemeente Rotterdam*, vol. 17/1, 1979.
- Winter, Peter de; *Evenementen in Rotterdam, Ahoy', E55, Floriade, C70*, Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010, 1988.
- Wit, Herman de (ed.); *Herman van der Horst, cineast*, Utrecht / Amsterdam: Nederlands Film Festival / International Theatre & Film Books, 1994.
- Wit, Mieke de; *Vrouwen Bouwen aan Rotterdam, 1945-1995*, Rotterdam: Dienst Stedebouw + Volkshuisvesting Gemeente Rotterdam, 1995.
- Wit, Onno de; 'Pedagogen en zedenmeesters in de greep van het bioscoopkwaad. De Rotterdamsche Bioscoopcommissie, 1913-1928', pp15-39 in: *Jaarboek Mediageschiedenis*, deel III, Amsterdam: Stichting Mediageschiedenis: Amsterdam, 1991.
- Wonen-TABK; edition dedicated to Rotterdam: *Keurmeesters Von Moos, Frampton en Dal Co beoordelen Rotterdamse bouwwerken*, Wonen-TABK, nr. 16/17, 1979.
- Zamjatin, Evgenij; *Wij* [Dutch translation of *My*, 1920], Amsterdam: Arbeiderspers, 1970.
- Zimmermann, Yvonne; 'Was Hollywood für die Amerikaner, ist der Wirtschaftsfilm für die Schweiz', pp54-72 in: *Filmische Mittel, Industrielle Zwecke, Das Werk des Industriefilms*, Hediger & Vonderau (eds.), Berlin: Vorwerk 8, 2007.

REFERENCES – GENERAL

CONSULTED ARCHIVES, COLLECTIONS, DATABASES – SELECTION (see footnotes for further references)
[websites as on 2010-01-25]

abbreviations:

B&G Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld & Geluid, Amsterdam
GAR Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, Rotterdam
IMDB International Movie Data Base
NAi Nederlands Architectuur Instituut, Rotterdam
NFM Nederlands Filmmuseum (Eye), Amsterdam
UvA Universiteit van Amsterdam

general search

Google – www.google.com

diverse

Calresco (internet encyclopaedia on the *Complexity and Artificial Life Research Concept*) – www.calresco.org
Geheugen van Nederland (database) – www.geheugenvannederland.nl
Gemeentearchief Rotterdam (archive, collection, database) – www.gemeentearchief.rotterdam.nl
Instituut voor Nederlandse Geschiedenis (database) – www.inghist.nl
Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis (archive, collection, database) – www.iisg.nl
Maritiem Digitaal (database), Maritiem Museum, Rotterdam – www.maritiemdigitaal.nl
Nationaal Onderwijsmuseum, Rotterdam – www.onderwijsmuseum.nl
Nederlands Fotomuseum (collection, database) – www.nederlandsfotomuseum.nl
Theater Instituut Nederland, Amsterdam (collection, archive, database) – www.theaterinstituut.nl
Wikipedia (internet encyclopaedia) – www.wikipedia.nl

literature (bibliographical references)

Amazon (database / sales) – www.amazon.com
Antiquarian books (sales): Boekhandel Delfshaven, Rotterdam; Antiquariaat Schuhmacher, Amsterdam; Boekenbuuv, Rotterdam; Cine Qua Non, Amsterdam; NAi, Rotterdam; Opbouw, Amsterdam; Raster, Rotterdam; De Slegte, Amsterdam/Rotterdam, e.a.
Antiqbook (sales) – www.antiqbook.com
Bibliotheek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam (library, database) – <http://cf.uba.uva.nl>
Boekwinkeltjes (sales) – www.boekwinkeltjes.nl
Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, Bibliotheek (library, database) – www.gemeentearchief.rotterdam.nl
Selexyz (sales) = Athenaeum, Amsterdam; Donner, Rotterdam; Scheltema, Amsterdam e.a. www.selexyz.nl

architecture

ArchInform (database) – www.archinform.net
Bibliografieën & Oeuvrelijsten Nederlandse Architecten & Stedebouwkundigen (database) – www.bonas.nl
Gemeente Rotterdam (database) – www.wonen.rotterdam.nl
Modern European Architecture Museum (database) – www.meamnet.polimi.it/index.html
Nederlands Architectuur Instituut, Rotterdam (collection, archive) – www.nai.nl

film

Cinema Context [UvA, Karel Dibbets, ed.] (database) – www.cinemacontext.nl
Filmportal [Deutsche Filminstitut / CineGraph] (database) – www.filmportal.de
Gemeentearchief Rotterdam, Beeld & Geluid (archive, collections {films, books, photographs, e.a.}, database) – www.gemeentearchief.rotterdam.nl
Internet Encyclopedia of Cinematographers (database) – www.cinematographers.nl
Internet Movie Database – www.imdb.com
Nederlands Filmmuseum (Eye), Amsterdam (collection {films, books, photographs e.a.}, archive, database [not online]) – www.filmmuseum.nl
Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid, Hilversum (collection {films}, archive, database) – www.beeldengeluid.nl
Nederlands Instituut voor Mediakunst (collection {video}), Amsterdam
Nederlandse Film Database – www.nfdb.nl (until 2009)

MAIN INFORMANTS

[name and place of (1st) encounter]

Peter Aelsemgeest – Hilversum	Jan Oudenaarden – Rotterdam
Ruth von Barys – Munich	Bob van Persi – Rotterdam
Grete Bednarik – Vienna	Roland Rainer – Vienna (telephone)
Ed van Berkel – Rotterdam	Hans de Ridder – Rotterdam
Eva Besnyö – Laren (telephone)	Dick Rijneke – Rotterdam
Hugo Bongers – Rotterdam	Ferri Ronteltap – Rotterdam
Joop Burcksen – Almere Hout	Christine van Roon – Rotterdam
Hans Citroen – Rotterdam	Jan Schaper – Schiedam
Martin van Dalen – Rotterdam	Peter Scholten – Rotterdam
Eddy van der Enden – Amsterdam (telephone)	Adriaan Staal – Rotterdam
Louis van Gasteren – Amsterdam	Bert Steeman – Rotterdam
Noud Heerkens – Rotterdam	André Stufkens – Nijmegen
Jacques van Heijningen – Rotterdam	Tom Tholen – Rotterdam
Joop de Jong – Rotterdam	Peter Uiterdijk – Rotterdam
Pim Korver – Lauwersoog (telephone)	Wim van der Velde – Rotterdam
Mildred van Leeuwaarden – Rotterdam	Bob Visser – Rotterdam
Trudy Mulder – Rotterdam	Kees Vrijdag – Rotterdam
Thys Ockerse – Zandvoort (telephone)	e.a.
Fiona van Oostrom – Rotterdam (telephone)	

SUMMARY

introduction

Media have become ubiquitous in modern life, especially in urban society, which has fuelled an interest in the 'cinematic city'. This orientation offers new perspectives to film studies away from the paradigms of the *auteur*, national cinema and the art film, and beyond textual analysis. Little known predecessors of current media practices are being rediscovered and their historical potentialities reassessed. Along with this the idea of linear history and its notion of time are being challenged. At the same time, a 'spatial turn' within the humanities has foregrounded ontological questions. The debate on the cinematic city, however, has remained loose. There have been attempts to connect different disciplinary approaches, but there is also a question of the relevant corpus, which should not be restricted to fiction or to the major metropolises of the world.

I opted for Rotterdam to carry out a case-study, in addition to existing studies about Frankfurt (Elsaesser, 2005b) and Glasgow (Lebas, 2005 & 2007). The challenge of this research has been to extend the scope and to develop a more comprehensive view of the cinematic city that concerns not only avant-garde city symphonies and features, but also newsreels, educational and commissioned films, among others. Thousands of audiovisual productions dealing with Rotterdam were made during the heydays of modernity and modernism, from the 1920s to the 1970s. Why were they made, what functions did they fulfill, and how did they participate and intervene in social and spatial processes? The purpose of this research has been twofold: to write the film history of Rotterdam, in order to show how films have participated in its development as a modern city, and to provide theoretical insights regarding the relationship between film and the built environment. To this end I have made use of network approaches from the social sciences, and more specifically, the theory of cultural ecology (Steward, 1955).

the emergence of a cinematic city

The first film recordings of Rotterdam were made in 1898 by Stefan Hofbauer for Casino Variété, which were early 'newsreels'. Due to a clustering of film activities in the following decades, the cinema entrepreneurs Tuschinski and Weisbard also produced local newsreels. It caused a competition and then, through specialisation, collaboration with the nationally operating film companies Polygoon and Profilti (1920s, 1930s). As a result, the city was no longer the focus of attention, but enterprises could commission films, of which parts were used for newsreels.

Although several film companies appeared in Rotterdam, many films about the city were produced elsewhere. Using a concept of Elsaesser, Rotterdam became mostly *Tatort*, while other cities became *Standort*. Rotterdam developed as a 'porous' system linked to others. Common became films to advertise the port and to show industrial production processes, which provide an audiovisual map of the city's then existing subsistence arrangements. 'Construction films' became also important, as did films for social organisations and labour unions.

Regarding these films I have applied Elsaesser's concept of the triple 'A', of mapping the *Auftraggeber*, *Anlass* and *Anwendung* of a film, and to relate them to one another. By tracing the commissioners, reasons and uses of the films, it turned out that certain films resembled each other, but were made for different reasons, while rather different films could share the same purposes, as part of strategies to reach different audiences, which became clear from their screening at factories, conferences, schools or exhibitions. Many films were not *about* modernity, but *for* modernity (cf. Lebas, 2000). In this way, unexpected connections have appeared between distinct realms, like art and industry, or social engagement and commerce, and similarly between cinema and photography as well as design and architecture. In this perspective the Van Nelle factory and its director Van der Leeuw played a pivotal role. The connections between different media correspond to Elsaesser's concept of *Medienverbund*, which says that different media are applied to serve the same purpose. This has also been observed in the case of events, especially

the industry exhibition *Nenijto* (1928). I have subsequently extended this concept to cultural ecology by amplifying the shared purpose of media to a shared attractor of systemic development, particularly that of rationalisation and modernisation.

The networks and institutions that enabled film productions have been related to Steward's (1955) 'levels of socio-cultural integration', which indicate the degree of cultural ecological interdependence. At one end are home movies, with common values and 'institutions' to be found within single families, which embody the most elementary level of integration. At the other end are feature films like *LENTELIED* (1936, Simon Koster), which praised the modern city, and *BOEFJE* (1939, Detlef Sierck), which addressed the problems of the slums; these films revealed extensive networks with socio-cultural integration at an international level. The coherence between different cultural phenomena has been elaborated regarding social housing and educational cinema (*Schoolbioscoop*). Integration between the two realms took place at the level of the municipality and its progressive policy.

Films on local issues shown to local audiences immediately linked back to the city. I have explained this dynamic as a matter of 'stigmergy', of collective learning and communication through the environment, which is then also affected. This applies to industrial and promotional films as well, but many of them were also shown elsewhere, and the interest they generated was often paid back indirectly through the interplay between environmental and 'historical factors'. The city became a 'switchboard' (cf. Hannerz) through which ideas were locally appropriated and sent into the world again. This applies, for example, to the avant-garde and its international networks, especially that of the cineclub *Filmliga* with its branches in different cities. It became embedded in Rotterdam due to strong involvement from architects, the business elite, and the press. Along with it, various 'city symphonies' were made, among them *THE BRIDGE* (1928, Joris Ivens) and *NUL UUR NUL* (1927-1928, Simon Koster). They mediated relations and provided personal references while fulfilling the functions of memory and oscillation (cf. Luhmann). This came to the fore through my research by considering both content and conditions and the connections between them as part of personal and extensive networks.

Following the logic of relationality (cf. Urry, 2003), a network within a network (cf. Hannerz, 1996) corresponds to a particular group or 'scene', which is largely responsible for the achievements of its individual members. The successful union film *EN GIJ, KAMERAAD?* (1928, Joannes Ratté), exemplifies such a collective effort, not of an *auteur*, but of a 'scenius' (cf. Eno). This comes in addition to the case of the cinematographer Andor von Barsy. His avant-garde film *HOOGSTRAAT* (1929) is well-known. By drawing the networks that he was part of, one observes his numerous involvements with fiction films, commercials, and especially with commissioned films, in which respect his name is sometimes not even mentioned. I have addressed his work in terms of 'functional cinematography', which applies also to his port films, including *THE CITY THAT NEVER RESTS* (1928). As its production history has illustrated, contingent events may have decisive consequences. However, within an environment such as the city a multitude of contingent acts constitute a common movement and direction.

the cinematic reconstruction of a city

The bombardment of May 1940 strengthened the commitment of the citizens with their city, as reflected by amateur recordings, which I have addressed in terms of stigmergy. The subsequent reconstruction took place over two decades and had to recreate the achievements of seven centuries. The port and its industry appeared to be the city's 'culture core', in accordance with the theory of cultural ecology. While the reconstruction of the port received priority, its further growth required appropriate infrastructure, industrial facilities, and housing for workers. Commissioned films supported this by channelling visions and directions. There has actually been a double move: while shipping and industry fed the local culture and the city's development, they became also engaged with a world system of trade, emigration, and defence. Higher levels of

sociocultural integration emerged, which was mediated and reported by films, while film production was also affected by it.

The destruction of the city and the eventual void raised the question (cf. Crimson, 2002): what is a city when it has no longer a material form? The answer has to do with urban identity and the collective cognitive domain, and hence media became important. They were applied to communicate values and views that promoted modern urbanism and particularly the reconstruction plans. The void became a screen on which memories and possible futures were projected. Plans and films were both spatial *and* temporal indicators, drawing a difference between past and future. Through building one could read progress, while achievements were communicated by way of film, which offered (positive) feedback. Moreover, films presented a concentrated image of what was happening, which emphasised the new.

While the bombardment had been an external intervention, underscored by the UFA film ANGRIFFF AUF ROTTERDAM, the question of how to recover was answered by state planner Ringers, and, as an internal intervention, and almost as a 'conspiracy', by Van der Leeuw as well as city planner Van Traa and the 'scenius' of the business association Club Rotterdam. It is expressed by the first major reconstruction film on Rotterdam EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM (1950, Polygoon-Profiliti), which drew a history that rhetorically presented the new plan as self-evident. Other reconstruction films documented the results in order to provide input to new projects. Film was used to provide positive feedback, as a model to communicate or channel urban plans, or for reasons of analysis and evaluation, education and information. To address, alternatively, the creative and directive forces of film, I have spoken of 'projective reflexivity'. This is a kind of monitoring according to an assumption of what will or should happen, as in STEADY! (1952, Herman van der Horst).

Although many films about Rotterdam were produced elsewhere, most films were still related to the city's institutions, its reflexivity and identity. Polygoon has been important here too, for its commissioned films as well as its newsreels, which show that Elsaesser's 3A model even applies when there is no direct commissioner. Agents move in common directions due to larger structures and their attractors, especially the attractor of social welfare that is to be achieved through modernisation. Rotterdam linked this to its image of a 'city of labour'. Architecture and cinema, among other forms of modern culture, actively contributed to it. As such, a key role was played by the *Bouwcentrum*, in terms of record, rhetorics and rationalisation (cf. Hediger & Vonderau).

While the construction worker joined the dockworker in the city of labour, as in STEADY!, the development of the port was preconditional for urban development. Both were channelled by plans and media as 'multiple extensions' of the culture core. This also applies, quite literally, to the extension of the city through new suburbs and neighbouring towns (e.g. Vlaardingen). Partly inspired by Mumford, the socially engaged elite advocated the *wijkgedachte*, to achieve a new social order, which was combined with industrialised production to fight the housing shortage. Since it needed a critical mass, films were made to explain its urgency, such as ALLE VOGELS HEBBEN NESTEN (1961, Louis van Gasteren). This embodies the joined forces of avant-garde and industry, social engagement and business, and the convergence between economy and culture.

Beyond the rhetorics of labour, the *act* of building became an experience in itself, a 'reality film'. A series of events concretised the convergence between economy and culture with the Ahoy' being a true milestone (1950). This event, to celebrate the reconstruction of the port, was characterised by a collaboration between the arts (i.e. *Medienverbund*). Here I have distinguished three kinds of media practices: films shown at the events promoted its 'intensions'; reports about the event were its 'extensions'; and amateur films shot there were its 'retentions'. Such practices were intensified by the E55 and its experiment of commercial television. Different events, including events abroad, propelled a common agenda, which implies a *Medienverbund* at yet another level.

the cinematic proliferation of a city

Along with the process of modernisation, the 1960s and 1970s witnessed a bifurcation from cinema to television, to cable television, to video. It allowed for new media applications regarding urban development, while the image of the city diversified, both socially and spatially. I have related these changes to the five main 'elements' that Scott (2005) has marked as factors within creative processes (i.e. human input, skills, production networks, multiple stimuli at points of interaction, and institutional infrastructures). I have additionally invoked a sense of self-reflexivity of the urban system (cf. Conti, 2005, a.o.). This is complicated by divisions between *Standort* and *Tatort*, but can even be recognised in foreign productions that emerged through international networks.

At the same time, however, there have been practices of local monitoring, experimentation, and appropriation. The changing media landscape gave, furthermore, rise to what I have called 'developing compositions'. Cinema newsreels (i.e. Polygoon) used to be little stories, with pronounced aesthetic qualities and witty comments. Television news, instead, became an ongoing narrative, which shared features with fiction stories. Many television reports were made for just that day, rather than for weeks. Feedback loops could be so quick that monitoring itself became an active force within events. Important became the fact that the NOS JOURNAAL started to work with local correspondents, Pim Korver in the case of Rotterdam. He combined this with the production of promotion films, especially for companies in the port, and interrelations existed as a result. City news was eventually produced through local television in which the city itself became of primary interest again.

As a matter of 'visual engineering' rooted in the city's culture core, commissioned films continued to be made. Such 'corporate images' (e.g. for Shell, Volker, Verolme, Wilton-Fijenoord) served publicity purposes and internal feedback. Certain filmmakers, among them Burcksen, who made films about the Europoort development, and Alsemgeest, who made many 'episode films' for Gemeentewerken, operated like technicians, while they were also narrators presenting production processes as comprehensive accounts. Many films heralded infrastructural projects as hallmarks of modernisation, especially the construction of the metro, the ring road, the airport, and the port. Some films showed Rotterdam's position within the Randstad or within larger systems of waterways and the city's role within the Dutch economy.

While many (commissioned) films were records of progress, resistance grew. Television, in its turn, offered a stage for alternative visions and debate, and affected the public opinion. Filmmakers, however, became used to working in both realms, which allowed for cross-connections. Important as such has been Jan Schaper and his Open Studio. Next to that, a key production was Ivens's ROTTERDAM-EUROPOORT (1966). His critical view became part of a marketing strategy conducted by the authorities. Asking Ivens was a matter of path-dependency. It invoked the memory function of culture, due to the international fame of THE BRIDGE (1928), in order to effect an 'oscillation' that went beyond rationalisation. Competition and collaboration went hand-in-hand in an ongoing process of modernisation.

Such dynamics were reinforced after 1967, when the Europe Container Terminus (ECT) was established in Rotterdam. The ECT commissioned several films, away from the public discourse, as various media reported on strikes with the reports providing negative feedback. In the end the port was forced to innovate and to adapt itself to the new regime of the container. Media were part of this process, underscoring the double dialectic of modernisation. Especially television 'amplified' the mediating role of public space, which offered possibilities for events to take place, including the Floriade and other events that were organized at the Ahoy' hall. Eventually a new Ahoy' complex was built, which stimulated the development of a media infrastructure. Gradually a change took place in the way the reconstruction was communicated – from explaining reasons to highlighting achievements. The C'70, dedicated to the theme of

communication, turned the entire city into a medium. A proliferation of events took place, including the international film festival, as a planning strategy to animate the city.

Media practices were reinforced when Van der Louw became Mayor in 1974, after he had worked for radio and television. The government sponsored video productions by the Lijnbaancentrum and the Videocentrum in order to support the arts and to facilitate citizen participation and urban renewal, and informational films on municipal services, while the municipality also collaborated on television reports and features. Additionally it supported artistic films that worked as 'oscillators' to imagine or to predict developments. These practices exemplify the theory of stigmergy, of collective learning and appropriating the environment as a communication process. Using the ideas of Nowotny (2005) I have considered this, next to socially motivated television reports and (provocative) feature films, in terms of an 'emergent interface' regulating 'interface turbulence'. Collective expressions (e.g. by Mediafront) and a political engagement have, furthermore, recalled activities from the 1920s and 1930s, which implied a revision of the modern city.

conclusion

The film history of Rotterdam is characterised by a number of strands. Besides avant-garde experiments and features there have been amateur films and especially news reports and commissioned films, sometimes closely connected, which recorded as well as participated and intervened in the development of the port, the industry, construction works, social engagement (and housing), and various events. While the productions by Von Barsy, Schaper and Korver, among others, were interwoven with the city, many other films were not produced in Rotterdam itself, but were still part of webs that were anchored in the city in which various people acted like spiders, among them Van Nelle director van der Leeuw.

As a 'porous' system within a networked landscape, due to its port and social-economic infrastructure, Rotterdam encompasses a multitude of 'paths'. While following paths, agents leave traces and markers providing information to others. This information is used to adapt to the environment or to appropriate it, which in turn provides new information, and so on. In modern urban society, such traces and markers have become complex systems of spatial design, information and communication. Within this form of stigmergy, the study of audiovisual media implies a historiography based on complex network dynamics, drawn as spatial configurations framing time.

The role of film in the development of Rotterdam cannot be explained in terms of an immediate cause-and-effect relationship. Not every social or spatial project needs a film, but film has been an indispensable factor within the city as a cultural ecology. Audiovisual media appeal to and are part of the cognitive dimension of the modern city. According to Urry (2003), contemporary society is characterised by 'reflexive modernisation' and monitoring through aesthetic-expressive systems. Beyond monitoring, however, are the ways in which the information links back to the environment. This is a matter of feedback that is enabled through culture, which fulfils a collective memory function. Besides memory, to refer to Luhmann, there is oscillation: to cross boundaries in order to propose new states to move to, as Rotterdam has shown, in support of, but also beyond the attractors of rationalisation and industrialisation. In this way culture is what marks the difference between past and future.

To say that feedback is a matter of culture does not mean that Rotterdam should be understood as a 'city of culture', neither as a 'city of labour'. It is a city whose culture is typified by artefacts such as industrial architecture and social housing as well as by films that articulate the system's reflexivity, with a 'culture core' that is informed by the port. Both commercial and municipal companies were somehow involved with media practices. Many media practices, however, have remained invisible. Film has been a hidden dimension within the history of 20th century Rotterdam. Although the media industry in Rotterdam has become an economic sector in

its own right today, the times and tides of the modern city may eventually cause them to become part again of more regular business practices.

I have made an attempt to contribute to a film theory and methodology that relates *content* to *conditions*, while paying special attention to *connections* between people and artefacts across different social-cultural fields. By taking the three Cs into account I have added to Steward's theory of cultural ecology the intrinsic values, ideas and visions of cultural forms, films in particular, and with it the self-reflexivity of the urban system. As my study has shown, this approach provides an alternative to the paradigms of the art film, the *auteur*, and national cinema. Rather than reflections or representations of an experienced or imagined reality, films are part of urban networks and concrete environments. It implies another ontology of cinema, which offers a new prospect to media studies as well as the spatial disciplines.

NEDERLANDSE SAMENVATTING

CINEMATISCH ROTTERDAM; DE GETIJDEN VAN EEN MODERNE STAD

inleiding

Media zijn niet meer weg te denken uit de moderne maatschappij, wat bovenal opgaat voor stedelijke omgevingen. Om die reden is er een groeiende interesse voor de 'cinematische stad'. Deze oriëntatie biedt nieuwe perspectieven voor filmstudies, in plaats van de paradigma's van 'de auteur', 'nationale cinema' en 'filmkunst', en voorbij tekstuele analyse. Vrijwel onbekende voorlopers van hedendaagse mediapraktijken worden herontdekt en historische mogelijkheden worden opnieuw beoordeeld. Daarmee worden ook de notie van lineaire geschiedenis en van het begrip tijd ter discussie gesteld. Een 'ruimtelijke kentering' binnen de geesteswetenschappen heeft bovendien ontologische vraagstukken op de voorgrond geplaatst. Het debat over de 'cinematische stad' kent echter weinig samenhang. Er zijn pogingen geweest om benaderingen uit verschillende disciplines met elkaar te verbinden, maar er is ook de kwestie van het relevante corpus, hetgeen tot nog toe veelal werd gevormd door speelfilms in de context van bekende metropolen.

Voor mijn onderzoek heb ik, bij wijze van casus, voor Rotterdam gekozen, als aanvulling op bestaande studies over Frankfurt (Elsaesser, 2005b) en Glasgow (Lebas, 2005 & 2007). De uitdaging bij dit onderzoek was het blikveld te vergroten en een completer en een meer samenhangend beeld te ontwikkelen ten aanzien van film en de stad, waarbij niet alleen gelet zou worden op fictie en de 'stadssymphonieën' van de avant-garde, maar ook op bijvoorbeeld nieuwsreportages, onderwijsfilms en opdrachtfilms. In de periode dat de moderniteit en het modernisme hoogtij vierden, van de jaren twintig tot en met de jaren zeventig van de twintigste eeuw, werden er alleen al met betrekking tot Rotterdam duizenden audiovisuele producties gerealiseerd. Waarom was dit zo, welke functie vervulden ze, en hoe namen ze deel aan, en intervenieerden in sociale en ruimtelijke processen? Het doel van dit onderzoek is tweevoudig geweest: enerzijds om de filmgeschiedenis van Rotterdam te schrijven, om zo te laten zien hoe films hebben bijgedragen aan haar ontwikkeling als moderne stad, en anderzijds om theoretische inzichten te bieden ten aanzien van de relatie tussen film en de gebouwde omgeving. Daartoe heb ik gebruik gemaakt van sociaalwetenschappelijke benaderingen gericht op netwerken, en in het bijzonder de theorie van culturele ecologie (Steward, 1955).

de opkomst van de cinematische stad

De eerste filmopnamen van Rotterdam werden gemaakt in 1898, door Stefan Hofbauer, voor Casino Variété, die beschouwd kunnen worden als vroege filmjournaals. Door een clustering van filmactiviteiten in de daaropvolgende decennia, maakten Tuschinski en Weisbard, die met name bekend zijn geworden vanwege hun theaters, ook lokale filmjournaals. Dit betekende concurrentie voor de landelijk opererende 'journaalfabrieken' van Polygoon en Profilti (jaren '20 en '30), maar door verdergaande specialisatie leidde het uiteindelijk tot samenwerking. Het resultaat hiervan was evenwel dat de stad niet langer als focus gold, al konden bedrijven wel bioscooptijd kopen, door opdrachtfilms te laten maken waarvan dikwijls ook gedeelten werden gebruikt voor journaals.

Hoewel er verschillende filmbedrijven in Rotterdam kwamen werd toch een groot aantal films over de stad elders geproduceerd. Gebruikmakend van een concept van Elsaesser kan worden gezegd dat Rotterdam vooral *Tatort* werd, terwijl andere steden als *Standort* fungeerden. Rotterdam ontwikkelde zich als een 'poreus' systeem dat nauw verbonden raakte met andere steden. Algemeen voorkomend werden films die publiciteit maakten voor de haven en industriële productieprocessen in beeld brachten, die tezamen een audiovisuele kaart vormen van de

toenmalige stedelijke bestaansgronden. Ook van belang werden constructiefilms en films voor maatschappelijke organisaties, waaronder vakbonden.

Op basis van Elsaesser's 3xA model – het in kaart brengen en aan elkaar relateren van *Auftraggeber*, *Anlass* en *Anwendung* – ben ik opdrachtgevers nagegaan, evenals de reden van een filmproductie en de wijze waarop een film werd ingezet. Bepaalde films vertonen gelijkenissen, maar werden vervaardigd om verschillende redenen, terwijl andere films, die van elkaar verschillen, soms juist gelijke doelen dienden, als deel van strategieën om verschillend publiek te bereiken. Dit werd duidelijk door te kijken naar de plekken waar films vertoond werden, zoals in fabrieken, op conferenties, op scholen of als deel van tentoonstellingen. Talloze films gingen niet over moderniteit, maar waren gemaakt ter bevordering van moderniteit (cf. Lebas, 2000). Zo verschenen er onverwachte dwarsverbanden tussen verschillende domeinen, zoals die van kunst en industrie, of sociaal engagement en handel. Op een vergelijkbare manier deden zich relaties voor tussen film en fotografie, alsmede vormgeving en architectuur, in welk verband de Van Nelle fabriek een centrale rol speelde. Dit komt overeen met Elsaesser's concept van *Medienverbund*: verschillende media die een gezamenlijk doel dienen. Dit is ook van toepassing op evenementen, in het bijzonder de grootschalige nijverheidstentoonstelling Nenijs (1928). Ik heb vervolgens het concept opgerekt tot het idee van culturele ecologie, door de gedeelde agenda van verschillende media uit te vergroten en te identificeren als gedeelde 'attractor' van systeemontwikkeling, in het bijzonder de attractor van rationalisatie.

De netwerken en instituties die filmproducties mogelijk maakten heb ik gerelateerd aan Steward's (1955) 'niveaus van sociaal-culturele integratie', die aangeven wat de graad van cultureel-ecologische samenhang is. Het ene uiterste wordt gevormd door homemovies, waarbij gemeenschappelijke waarden en 'instituties' te vinden zijn binnen families, die het meest elementaire niveau van integratie belichamen. Het andere uiterste wordt gevormd door speelfilms als *LENTELIED* (1936, Simon Koster), die de moderne stad toonde, en *BOEFJE* (1939, Detlef Sierck), die de problemen van de achterbuurten liet zien; deze films ontstonden op basis van uitgebreide netwerken met sociaal-culturele integratie op internationaal niveau. De samenhang tussen verschillende culturele fenomenen is vervolgens verder onderzocht ten aanzien van sociale woningbouw en onderwijsfilm (*Schoolbioscoop*). In dit geval vond integratie plaats op het niveau van de gemeente en diens progressieve beleid.

Films over lokale onderwerpen, vertoond voor een plaatselijk publiek, zorgden voor een directe terugkoppeling naar de stad. Ik heb dit uitgelegd als gemeenschappelijk leren en communicatie via, en met betrekking tot de omgeving. De omgeving was tegelijkertijd onderwerp van verandering en maakte zo deel uit van toe-eigeningsprocessen en gemeenschappelijke ontwikkeling. Hoewel dit ook opgaat voor industrie- en promotiefilms werd een groot deel daarvan ook elders vertoond; het belang dat die films genereerden werd veelal indirect uitbetaald, door een wisselwerking tussen omgeving en 'historische factoren'. De stad gold als een *switchboard* (cf. Hannerz) waardoor ideeën die binnen een internationaal circuit opgang deden lokaal werden opgepikt en verwerkt tot nieuwe vormen die weer de wereld in werden gestuurd. Dit is onder meer van toepassing op de avant-garde en haar netwerken, in het bijzonder die van de Filmliga, die zich in de stad verankerde door een sterke betrokkenheid van met name architecten, de zakenwereld en de pers. Daarmee ontstonden ook verschillende 'stadssymphonieën', waaronder *DE BRUG* (1928, Joris Ivens) en *NUL UUR NUL* (1928, Simon Koster). Deze producties fungeerden als 'bemiddelaars' en vormden persoonlijke referenties, terwijl ze in bredere zin ook de functies vervulden van een (collectief) geheugen en van 'oscillatie' (cf. Luhmann). Dit bleek uit zowel de inhoud als de omstandigheden van de producties, alsmede de verbindingen daartussen, als deel van persoonlijke en meer uitgebreide netwerken.

Een netwerk binnenin een netwerk (cf. Hannerz), volgens de logica van 'relationaliteit' (cf. Urry, 2003), komt overeen met een bepaalde groep of *scene*, die grotendeels verantwoordelijk is voor de prestaties van diens individuele leden. De succesvolle vakbondsfilm *EN GIJ, KAMERAAD?* (1928, Joannes Ratté) vertegenwoordigt zo'n gemeenschappelijke inzet, niet van

een *auteur*, maar van een *scenius* (cf. Eno). Dit staat naast de casus van cameraman Andor von Bary. Zijn avant-garde film HOOGSTRAAT (1929) geniet de nodige bekendheid. Het schetsen van de netwerken waar hij deel van uitmaakte brengt evenwel zijn talloze betrekkingen naar voren wat betreft speelfilms, commercials en in het bijzonder opdrachtfilms, in welk verband zijn naam eerder soms in het geheel niet werd genoemd. Ik heb zijn werk beschreven in termen van ‘functionele cinematografie’, wat ook van toepassing is op zijn havenfilms, met inbegrip van DE STAD DIE NOOIT RUST (1928). Zoals de productiegeschiedenis hiervan heeft duidelijk gemaakt, kunnen toevallige gebeurtenissen bepalende gevolgen hebben. Binnen een omgeving zoals die van een stad, echter, vormt een veelheid aan toevallige gebeurtenissen desalniettemin een gemeenschappelijke beweging en richting.

de cinematografische wederopbouw van een stad

Het bombardement van mei 1940 versterkte de verbondenheid van de Rotterdammers met hun stad, zoals ook amateuropnamen laten zien, iets wat ik heb beschouwd in termen van *stigmery*. De wederopbouw die vervolgens plaatsvond moest de verworvenheden van zeven eeuwen in twee decennia overdoen. De haven en industrie kwamen hierbij naar voren als ‘cultuur-kern’, in het licht van de theorie van culturele ecologie. Terwijl de wederopbouw van de haven prioriteit kreeg, vereiste de verdere groei ervan uitbreiding van de infrastructuur, industriële voorzieningen, en huisvesting van de arbeiders. Opdrachtfilms ondersteunden deze ontwikkeling, door het kanaliseren van visies en oriëntaties. Er heeft in feite een dubbele beweging plaatsgevonden: terwijl scheepvaart en industrie de plaatselijke cultuur en de ontwikkeling van de stad voedden, werden ze ook deel van een mondiaal systeem van handel, emigratie en defensie. Er ontstonden hogere niveaus van sociaal-culturele integratie, waarbij media voor bemiddeling en verslaggeving zorgden en er tegelijkertijd onderhevig aan waren.

De verwoesting van de stad en de leegte die erop volgde riep de vraag op wat een stad is wanneer deze niet langer een materiële vorm heeft (cf. Crimson, 2002). Het is een zaak van stedelijke identiteit en van een gemeenschappelijk cognitief domein, waarbinnen media een rol spelen. Media werden ingezet voor het communiceren van de waarden en visies van de moderne stedenbouw, en de wederopbouwplannen in het bijzonder. De leegte werd een scherm waarop verleden en toekomst geprojecteerd werden. Plannen en films werden indicatoren van ruimte en tijd, wat een onderscheid mogelijk maakten tussen dat wat geweest is en dat wat komen gaat, en zodoende ook een temporele horizon trokken. Door de bouw kon men vooruitgang zien, waarvan de hoogtepunten werden gecommuniceerd door middel van film, wat voor positieve feedback zorgde. Films presenteerden een selectief beeld van wat er gebeurde, gericht op vernieuwing.

Waar het bombardement een interventie van buitenaf was, hetgeen onderstreept werd door de UFA-film ANGRIF AUF ROTTERDAM, daar werd het vraagstuk van de wederopbouw onmiddellijk beantwoord door rijksingenieur Ringers en vervolgens, als interventie van binnenuit en als een soort ‘complot’, door Van Nelle-directeur Van der Leeuw en stedenbouwkundige Van Traa, als deel van de ‘scenius’ van de Club Rotterdam (c.q. de zakenelite). Dit kwam tot uitdrukking in de eerste grote wederopbouwfilm, getiteld EN TOCH... ROTTERDAM (1950, Polygoon-Profilti). De film verhaalde van een geschiedenis die het wederopbouwplan op retorische wijze presenteerde als vanzelfsprekend. Andere wederopbouwfilms documenteerden de resultaten om zo input te geven aan nieuwe projecten. Film werd gebruikt om positieve feedback te geven, als een model om stedelijke plannen te communiceren en een kader te schetsen, of om redenen van analyse en evaluatie, educatie en informatie. Om verder de creatieve en sturende werking van film duidelijk te maken heb ik voorts gesproken van ‘projecterende reflexiviteit’. Het is een vorm van monitoring op basis van een idee van wat bereikt moet worden, zoals in HOUEN ZO! (1952, Herman van der Horst).

Hoewel veel films over Rotterdam elders werden geproduceerd waren de meeste films toch verbonden met de instituties, reflexiviteit en identiteit van de stad zelf. Polygoon is ook in dit opzicht van belang geweest, zowel qua opdrachtfilms als journaals, wat aantoont dat

Elsaessers 3A model zelfs van toepassing is als er geen directe opdrachtgever is. Individuen en groepen bewegen zich voort in een gemeenschappelijke richting door gemeenschappelijke structuren en hun attractoren, in het bijzonder die van maatschappelijk welzijn en sociale zekerheid, te bereiken via modernisatie. Rotterdam verbond dit met haar imago van 'werkstad'. Architectuur en film, temidden van andere vormen van moderne cultuur, droegen daar actief aan bij. Wat dat betreft was er een sleutelrol weggelegd voor het Bouwcentrum, in termen van documentatie, retoriek en rationalisatie (cf. Hediger & Vonderau).

Terwijl in de werkstad de bouwarbeider de havenarbeider kwam vergezellen, zoals in HOUEN ZO!, gold de ontwikkeling van de haven als voorwaarde voor stedelijke groei. Deze groei werd gekanaliseerd door plannen en media die zich lieten gelden als 'meervoudige extensies' van de cultuur-kern. Dit is ook aan de orde, en zelfs tamelijk letterlijk, ten aanzien van stedelijke uitbreidingen in de vorm van buitenwijken en de groei van naburige steden. Deels geïnspireerd door Mumford bepleitte een geëngageerde elite de *wijkgedachte*, om een nieuwe maatschappelijke orde te bewerkstelligen, in combinatie met industrieel bouwen om de woningnood tegen te gaan. Aangezien dit een kritische massa nodig had werden er films gemaakt zoals ALLE VOGELS HEBBEN NESTEN (1961, Louis van Gasteren). De film belichaamt de vereende krachten van avant-garde en industrie, sociaal engagement en business, en een convergentie van economie en cultuur.

Voorbij de retoriek van de arbeid werd de bouwactiviteit zelf een belevenis, als een werkelijkheid die het karakter kreeg van een film. Dit kwam tot uiting in diverse activiteiten, waaronder een reeks evenementen die de convergentie van economie en cultuur verder illustreren, met de Ahoy' (1950) als belangrijke mijlpaal. Deze tentoonstelling, ter viering van de wederopbouw van de haven, werd gekenmerkt door een samengaan van verschillende artistieke disciplines (c.q. *Medienverbund*). Ik heb hier een onderscheid gemaakt tussen drie soorten mediapraktijken: films die op de tentoonstelling vertoond werden en de 'intenties' ervan bevorderden; reportages die 'extensies' waren van het evenement; en amateuropnamen die dienst deden als 'retenties'. Het een en ander kwam ook tot uiting op de E55 met onder andere een experiment op het gebied van commerciële televisie. Verschillende manifestaties, waaronder in het buitenland, gaven vorm aan een gemeenschappelijke agenda, wat als *Medienverbund* gezien kan worden op weer een ander niveau.

de cinematische verbreiding van de stad

Tezamen met het proces van modernisatie, zagen de jaren '60 en '70 een vermeerdering van audiovisuele media, door splitsingen van film naar televisie, naar kabeltelevisie, naar video. Dit maakte nieuwe toepassingen mogelijk op het gebied van stedelijke ontwikkeling, terwijl het beeld van de stad diverser werd, zowel sociaal als ruimtelijk. Ik heb deze veranderingen gerelateerd aan de vijf elementen die Scott (2005) heeft aangeduid als factoren binnen creatieve processen (menselijke input, vaardigheden, productienetwerken, meervoudige stimuli op plaatsen van interactie, en institutionele infrastructuur). Aanvullend heb ik gesproken over de zelf-reflexiviteit van het stedelijke systeem (cf. Conti, 2005), hetgeen gecompliceerd wordt vanwege relaties tussen *Standort* en *Tatort*, maar waar zelfs over gesproken kan worden in het geval van bepaalde buitenlandse producties, vanwege internationale netwerken waar Rotterdam deel van uitmaakte. Aan de andere kant waren er binnen de stad zelf praktijken van lokale monitoring, waren er filmexperimenten en werden media ingezet ten behoeve van bewonersparticipatie. Het veranderende medialandschap leidde verder tot het ontstaan van 'ontwikkelcomposities', zoals ik het genoemd heb. Filmjournaals (m.n. Polygoon), waren gewoonlijk korte verhaaltjes, met een uitgesproken esthetische kwaliteit en met spitsvondige commentaren. Televisienieuws daarentegen werd een doorgaand verhaal. Veel televisiereportages werden alleen voor die dag gemaakt, en niet voor gebruik gedurende weken. Feedback cycli konden soms zo vlug zijn dat monitoring zelf een actieve factor werd in een bepaalde gebeurtenis. Belangrijk hierbij is het gegeven dat het NOS JOURNAAL met plaatselijke correspondenten begon te werken; in het geval

van Rotterdam was dat Pim Korver. Hij deed dit naast het maken van opdrachtfilms, met name voor bedrijven in de haven, waardoor dwarsverbanden onstonden. Uiteindelijk zou stedelijk nieuws een zaak worden van lokale televisie, waarmee de stad zelf weer van primair belang werd.

De opdrachtfilm was een blijvend fenomeen in Rotterdam, wat als audiovisuele *engineering* geworteld was in de stedelijke cultuur-kern. Dergelijke *corporate images* (b.v. voor Shell, Volker, Verolme, Wilton-Fijenoord) dienden publieke doeleinden en interne feedback. Sommige filmmakers, onder wie Joop Burcksen, die films maakte over de ontwikkeling van de Europoort, en Peter Alsemgeest, die 'episodenfilms' maakte voor Gemeentewerken, gingen te werk als ingenieurs, terwijl ze ook vertellers waren die productieprocessen als begrijpelijke verhalen presenteerden. Veel films toonden infrastructurele projecten als boegbeelden van de moderniteit, in het bijzonder de bouw van de metro, de ringweg, het vliegveld, en de haven. Sommige films toonden Rotterdams positie in de Randstad, of binnen grotere systemen van waterwegen, en haar rol in de Nederlandse economie.

Dergelijke films werden gemaakt als getuigenissen van de vooruitgang, maar weerstand groeide. Televisie op haar beurt bood een podium voor alternatieve visies en voor debat, wat de publieke opinie beïnvloedde. Filmmakers werkten gewoonlijk op beide terreinen, waardoor verschillende praktijken vervlochten waren. Belangrijk als zodanig voor Rotterdam was Jan Schaper en diens Open Studio. Daarnaast geldt Ivens' ROTTERDAM-EUROPOORT (1966) als een sleutelproductie. Zijn kritische blik werd deel van een marketing strategie die door de autoriteiten werd ingezet. Het vragen van Ivens was ook een kwestie van *path-dependency*, vanwege de internationale faam van DE BRUG (1928). De geheugenfunctie van cultuur manifesteerde zich als een vorm van 'oscillatie' voorbij rationalisatie. Competitie en samenwerking gingen gepaard in een voortgaand proces van modernisatie.

Zo'n dynamiek werd versterkt na 1967, toen de Europe Container Terminus in Rotterdam werd gevestigd. Het liet verschillende films vervaardigen, weg van het publieke debat, sinds media verslag deden van stakingen die voor negatieve feedback zorgde. Uiteindelijk was de haven genoodzaakt zich te vernieuwen en aan te passen aan het regime van de container. Media maakten deel uit van dit proces, wat de dubbele dialectiek van modernisatie onderstreept. Met name televisie vergrootte de bemiddelende rol van de publieke ruimte, wat mogelijkheden bood voor evenementen om plaats te vinden, waaronder de Floriade en diverse andere manifestaties die werden georganiseerd in de Ahoy'hal. Uiteindelijk werd er een nieuw Ahoy'complex gebouwd, wat ook de ontwikkeling van een media-infrastructuur bevorderde. Geleidelijkaan vond er een verandering plaats in de wijze waarop de wederopbouw werd gecommuniceerd – van het uitleggen van redenen tot het benadrukken van wat bereikt was. De C'70, gewijd aan het thema communicatie, veranderde de gehele stad in een communicatiemedium. Vervolgens vonden er steeds meer evenementen in de stad plaats, waaronder het Internationaal Film festival, als deel van een planningstrategie om de stad nieuw leven in te blazen.

De betrokkenheid bij mediapraktijken werd versterkt met de komst van Van der Louw als burgemeester, in 1974, nadat hij zelf voor radio en televisie had gewerkt. De gemeente ondersteunde de videoproducties van het Lijnbaancentrum en het Videocentrum, respectievelijk ter bevordering van de kunsten en ten behoeve van bewonersparticipatie en stadsvernieuwing, en voorlichtingsfilms over gemeentelijke diensten, terwijl de gemeente ook meewerkte aan televisiereportages en speelfilms. Daarbij kwam nog dat de gemeente ook subsidie gaf aan kunstzinnige films die als 'oscillatoren' bepaalde visies of ontwikkelingen tot uitdrukking brachten, verbeeldden of voorspelden. Deze praktijken zijn exemplarisch voor de theorie van *stigmery*, als kader voor het begrijpen van collectief leren via, en toe-eigenen van de omgeving, als communicatieproces. Naast sociaal-gemotiveerde televisiereportages en (provocatieve) speelfilms, heb ik deze mediaproducties gezien in Nowotny's (2005) concept van een *emergent interface* die *interface turbulence* reguleert. Collectieve uitdrukkingsvormen (b.v. door het Mediafront) en een politiek engagement hebben verder activiteiten uit de jaren 1920 en '30 doen herleven. Het een en ander zorgde voor een herijking van de ontwikkeling van de moderne stad.

conclusie

De filmgeschiedenis van Rotterdam kent enkele hoofdlijnen. Naast avant-garde experimenten en speelfilms, en talloze amateurfilms, gaat het hierbij vooral om journalistieke producties en opdrachtfilms, niet zelden in relatie tot elkaar, die behalve als documenten van, ook hebben bijgedragen aan, en geïntervenieerd hebben in de ontwikkeling van de haven, de industrie, de bouw, sociaal engagement (en volkshuisvesting), en evenementen. Terwijl het werk van onder andere Von Bary, Schaper en Korver verweven was met de stad, werden talloze andere films niet in Rotterdam geproduceerd. Ze maakten echter wel deel uit van netwerken die in Rotterdam verankerd waren, waarin verschillende personen optraden als een soort spinnen, onder wie Van Nelle directeur Van der Leeuw.

Met het karakter van een 'poreus' systeem binnenin een netwerk-landschap, vanwege haar haven en sociaal-economische infrastructuur, kende Rotterdam een veelvoud aan 'paden'. Bij het volgen van paden laten actoren sporen en markeringen achter, die informatie geven aan anderen. Deze informatie wordt gebruikt om de omgeving aan te passen en toe te eigenen, wat vervolgens weer voor nieuwe informatie zorgt, etcetera. In de moderne, stedelijke samenleving zijn zulke sporen en markeringen uitgegroeid tot complexe systemen van ruimtelijke vormgeving, informatie en communicatie. Binnen deze vorm van *stigmergy* impliceert onderzoek naar audiovisuele media een historiografie gebaseerd op complexe netwerkdynamica, zijnde ruimtelijke configuraties waarbinnen tijd manifest wordt.

De rol van film in de ontwikkeling van Rotterdam kan niet worden gevat in termen van een directe oorzaak-gevolg relatie. Niet ieder sociaal of ruimtelijk project heeft een film nodig, maar film in het algemeen is een niet te verwaarlozen factor in de stad als culturele ecologie. Audiovisuele media appelleren aan, en zijn deel van de cognitieve dimensie van de moderne stad. Volgens Urry (2003) wordt de hedendaagse samenleving gekenmerkt door 'reflexieve modernisatie' en monitoring door middel van esthetisch-expressieve systemen. Voorbij monitoring gaat het echter om de manier waarop informatie teruggekoppeld wordt naar de omgeving. Dit is een zaak van feedback die mogelijk wordt gemaakt door cultuur, wat de functie vervult van collectief geheugen. Daarnaast is er, met verwijzing naar Luhmann, 'oscillatie': het slechten van barrières om een nieuwe staat van ontwikkeling te kunnen bereiken, zoals Rotterdam heeft laten zien, ter versterking van, maar ook voorbij de attractoren van rationalisatie en industrialisatie. Zo is cultuur datgene wat het verschil maakt tussen verleden en toekomst.

De stelling dat feedback een zaak is van cultuur betekent niet dat Rotterdam moet worden gezien als 'cultuurstad', evenmin als 'werkstad'. Het is een stad met een cultuur die wordt gekenmerkt door artefacten zoals industriële architectuur en sociale woningbouw, evenals films die de reflexiviteit van het systeem articuleren, met een cultuur-kern die wordt gevormd door de haven. Zowel commerciële als gemeentelijke bedrijven waren betrokken bij mediapraktijken. De meeste mediapraktijken zijn echter onzichtbaar gebleven. Zo bleef film een verborgen dimensie in de geschiedenis van het twintigste eeuwse Rotterdam. Hoewel de media-industrie in Rotterdam nu zelf een economische factor is geworden, kunnen de getijden van de moderne stad ervoor zorgen dat op den duur media weer deel worden van meer reguliere zakelijke praktijken.

Ik heb een poging gewaagd om bij te dragen aan een filmtheorie en methodologie die de inhoud (*content*) en omstandigheden (*conditions*) van films koppelt, met speciale aandacht voor de verbindingen (*connections*) tussen mensen en artefacten, over de grenzen van verschillende sociaal-culturele domeinen. Door deze drie C's in ogenschouw te nemen heb ik Stewards theorie van culturele ecologie aangevuld met de intrinsieke waarden, ideeën en visies van culturele expressievormen, films in het bijzonder, en daarmee heb ik de zelf-reflexiviteit geschetst van het stedelijke systeem. Zoals mijn onderzoek heeft laten zien biedt deze benadering een alternatief voor de paradigma's van de kunstfilm, de *auteur*, en nationale cinema. Meer dan dat het gaat om reflecties op of om representaties van een beleefde of verbeelde realiteit, maken films deel uit van stedelijke netwerken en een concrete omgeving. Dit impliceert een andere ontologie van film, wat een nieuw vergezicht biedt aan mediastudies, maar ook aan de ruimtelijke disciplines.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Here I would like to thank the members of the PhD committee, Prof. dr. F. Bollerey, Prof. dr. T.P. Elsaesser, Prof. dr. V. Hediger, Prof. dr. A. Reijndorp, Dr. W.B.S. Strauven, and Prof. dr. F.P.I.M. van Vree. I would also like to express my appreciation and gratitude to everyone who has enabled me to conduct my research and to write my thesis, first of all to my supervisor Prof. dr. Thomas Elsaesser for his great support (and patience) during a wonderful period of collaboration. This dissertation is one of the results of the research project ‘Cinema Europe, 1929-1999’ that was directed by Elsaesser at the Department of Media Studies and the Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis (ASCA), Universiteit van Amsterdam. Other members of this research group included Melis Behlil, Yeşim Burul, Malte Hagener, Tarja Laine, Gerwin van der Pol, Ward Rennen, Drehli Robnik, Senta Siewert, Ria Thanouli, and Marijke de Valck. Thanks to all of you.

During my research and writing I have participated in various PhD seminars at ASCA, especially the Cinema Europe seminar, the seminar on Digital Ontologies, directed by Jan Simons, the Film and Philosophy seminar, by Thomas Elsaesser and Joseph Früchtel, the Theory Seminar by Mieke Bal, and the seminar and research project of Imagined Futures (iFut), by Thomas Elsaesser, Jaap Kooijman, Wanda Strauven, and Michael Wedel. Besides the people already mentioned, there have been many other participants and guests with whom I have had fruitful discussions, and I would therefore like to mention Tina Bastajian, Carolyn Birdsall, Charles Forceville, René Glas, Pepita Hesselberth, Gül Kaçmaz Erk, Julia Noordegraaf, Maria Poulaki, Patricia Pisters, Laura Schuster, Martijn de Waal, and Maryn Wilkinson, among many others. Jennifer Steetskamp deserves special thanks here, for being my paranymph.

My research has been supported by ASCA, through the efforts of Jantine van Gogh, Eloe Kingma, Mireille Rosello, Wanda Strauven, Hent de Vries, and Willem Weststeijn. I would similarly like to mention the people that have been responsible at the Department of Media Studies, José van Dijck and Frank van Vree, next to many others that have taken care of all kinds of organisational matters, especially Henny Bouwmeester, Jobien Kuiper, and Dymph Verdiesen.

Parts of this thesis have been presented at various conferences. I would like to thank all their organisers and respondents, especially Eef Masson, Jussi Parikka, Petr Szczepanik, Vinzenz Hediger and Patrick Vonderau.

As an extension of my research I have been the curator, since 2007, of the film programme ‘Rotterdam Classics’ for the Gemeentearchief Rotterdam and Lantaren/Venster, in collaboration with Peter Bosma (L/V) and Anouk de Haas (GAR) – thank you so much! Many other people of the GAR have enabled and supported my work: Gemma van den Berg, Kees van Buren, Mette van Essen, Max van Essen, Wilma van Giersbergen, Susan Kruidhof, Vincent Robijn, Jantje Steenhuis, and Guus van Veldhuizen, among others. Various collaborations have resulted from this. Thanks to Peter de Winter (010 Publishers) for his support too. Important as well has been the Nederlands Filmmuseum in Amsterdam, particularly Marleen Labijt, Mark-Paul Meijer, Simona Monizza, Ad Pollé, and all the people that have helped me at the museum’s information centre. I also would like to thank Bert Hogenkamp and Colin Nawrot of the Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld & Geluid in Hilversum, and many other people from different institutions. Also thanks to Paul Op de Coul, Robin van ‘t Haar, Edward Hulsbergen, Linda Wallace and others for their suggestions and comments.

Many thanks to Bronwyn Birdsall for her proofreading and to the Van Eesteren-Fluck & Van Lohuizen Foundation for making this possible.

For questions, comments and support of all sorts, special thanks to my children Elina and Tycho Paalman, and all other members of my family, my parents Annemieke and Fra in particular – thank you so much!, as well as Jochem, Laura, Deborah and Dirk-Jan; also many thanks to Sera Koolmees and her family, Irene, Elise, Sander, and especially Adrie and Ria. Many thanks to Martijn Wit (also in the role of paranymp) and other friends, among them Nora Martirosyan, Bert Oosting, Akke Visser and Joost Zonneveld. Thanks to all other relatives, colleagues and neighbours that have supported me in one way or another!

Many thanks to the aforementioned people that I have interviewed, who have shared with me their experiences, memories and thoughts.

Floris Paalman,
Amsterdam, June 2010.