

VIRTUS

23 | 2016



Elyze Storms-Smeets

From elite to public landscapes

The case of the Klarenbeek estate in Arnhem, 1880-1950^{*}

147

In 1886 the noble Van Pallandt van Walfort family decided to sell off the estate of Klarenbeek, near the city of Arnhem in the easternmost part of the Netherlands. Klarenbeek, once renowned for its wonderful baroque water features and park, amounted to over 1000 hectares in 1844, but at the time of the public auction only the core of the estate remained, some 132 hectares. The country house with its gardens was sold to the German industrial J.H. Lüps, whereas the greater part of the estate (about 100 hectares) was purchased by the municipality of Arnhem and transformed into a public park. The case of the Van Pallandt family seems typical for the late nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century and similar cases have been witnessed in other parts of the Netherlands and abroad. High maintenance costs, rising employment costs, decreasing incomes and the succession tax brought many members of the landed elite into financial trouble. Sometimes this meant that owners tried to ensure the future of their family estate by looking at alternative means, for instance cutting down woodlands. Sometimes it meant that the estate was sold off, transferred as a whole or piecemeal to newly wealthy entrepreneurs, municipalities or newly found-

* The author wishes to thank the anonymous peer reviewers for their useful comments. This article was presented as a paper at the European Social Science and History Conference 2016. Discussions and feedback with other European researchers, such as Henry French, Daniel Menning, Yme Kuiper and Jon Stobart, have helped to place the processes of noble decline, transformation of private estates near growing cities, and public ownership in the twentieth century in a broader, European perspective, as will be briefly discussed at the end of this article.



Klarenbeek estate around 1850 (engraving, anonymous; coll. Gelders Archief, Arnhem)

ed trusts for the preservation of nature and cultural heritage, such as *Natuurmonumenten* (1905) and the Gelderland Landscape Trust (*Geldersch Landschap*, 1929), processes that appear similar to those in for instance England (i.e. National Trust and English Heritage).¹

Through the case of Klarenbeek this historical-geographical contribution will investigate the various processes that occurred between 1850 and 1950 in the region around Arnhem, when many landed estates were sold by its private owners, as seen at Klarenbeek, but also at nearby estates like Sonsbeek. What motivated the Van Pallandt family to sell off their family estate, and in addition, what motivated the Arnhem municipality to purchase this former private property? It is remarkable in the case of Arnhem that a large majority of these estates were bought by the municipality. In local and national newspapers the municipality was applauded for its wonderful deed of saving this natural and cultural heritage and opening them to the public.

¹ See, for instance, D. Cannadine, *The decline and fall of the British aristocracy* (New Haven-London, 1990).

But, as we will see, these were not the only reasons for the municipality to purchase these previously privately owned estates.

Klarenbeek as a noble country home and profitable estate

Around the Dutch city of Arnhem many country houses and landed estates were created by city regents during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In comparison to estates elsewhere in Europe they were small, as most Dutch estates, but for these city dwellers their landed properties were places for recreation and entertainment, for experimental forestry and for shaping delightful landscapes. In the 1800s a large number of country houses and landed estates circled the northern part of the city, from west to east: Mariëndaal, Hulkenstein, Klingelbeek, Den Brink, Lichtenbeek, Warnsborn, Boschlust, Menthenberg, Sterrenberg, Rosorum, Zypendaal, Hartjesberg, Sonsbeek, Klarenbeek, Angerenstein, Rennenenk, Bronbeek, Gulden Spijker and Presikhaaf.² In size they ranged between 10 and 200 hectares, with some exceptions like Sonsbeek and Klarenbeek which amounted to over 800 hectares at their peaks. They were the private property of noble families and city regents.

The creation of such country estates was in part related to changes that followed from the Reformation at the end of the sixteenth century (1588). One outcome was that the landed property of Catholic monasteries was confiscated by the new provincial and national governments.³ Economic stagnation in the seventeenth century seems to have encouraged the sale of much of this land to politically loyal members of the emergent bourgeoisie.⁴ The purchase of former monastery lands had many advantages and was preferable to buying wastelands on the hills to the north of Arnhem. After all, the monasteries had cultivated the landscape: there were arable fields, meadows, roads, lanes, brooks, ponds and watermills. Thus, in respectively 1615 and 1635 the regent Rutger Huygens (1586-1666), mayor of Arnhem and delegate to the States General, obtained the former monasteries Monnikhuizerbeek and Monnikhuizen.⁵ Huygens combined the two estates and created the *Claerenbeeck* estate. Later he enlarged his property through the purchase of nearby parcels on the Musschenberg hill. In 1656 Huygens commissioned Johannes van Swieten to map the estate, showing

149

² E.A.C. Storms-Smeets, ed., *Gelders Arcadië. Atlas van een buitenplaatsenlandschap* (Utrecht, 2011).

³ This was also evident in other parts of the Netherlands, for example near Utrecht. See, for instance, S. Broekhoven and S. Barends, *De Bilt. Geschiedenis en architectuur* (Zeist, 1995).

⁴ E.A.C. Smeets, *Landscape and society in Twente and Utrecht. A geography of Dutch country estates, circa 1800-1950* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Leeds, 2005) 23; B. Olde Meierink and E. Storms-Smeets, 'Transformatie en nieuwbouw. Adellijke en burgerlijke buitenplaatsen in Gelderland (1609-1672)', in: Y. Kuiper and B. Olde Meierink, eds, *Buitenplaatsen in de Gouden Eeuw. De rijkdom van het buitenleven in de Republiek* (Hilversum, 2015) 178-207.

⁵ A.J. van der Aa, *Aardrijkskundig woordenboek der Nederlanden* (14 vols; Gorinchem, 1834-1851), VI, 464-465; P.M.M. Klep, 'Economische en sociale ontwikkeling', in: F. Keverling Buisman and I. Jacobs, eds, *Arnhem, van 1700 tot 1900* (Utrecht, 2009) 116-171; M. Potjer, 'Rutger Huygens (1586-1666), een vitale regent', in: F. Keverling Buisman and I. Jacobs, eds, *Arnhem tot 1700* (Utrecht, 2008) 102-103.



Jan baron van Pallandt van Walfort (1776-1844), owner of 'Great Klarenbeek' (drawing, Joseph Kayser, 1835; Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague)

fields, hills, lanes, formal gardens, ponds and plantations, as well as the location of the manor house that was to be built. Remarkable is the glued-on ground plan with different possible designs of the house.⁶ The new country house was to be built, not on the foundations of the demolished monastery, but on a new location within the estate.

In the following centuries, the Klarenbeek estate was owned, and beautified, by various families until it was bought in 1807 by Jan van Pallandt van Walfort (1776-1844), member of the Estates of Gelderland and later chamberlain of king William I.⁷ Van Pallandt is an old noble house, originally from Gulik, Germany, with many different family branches. Jan van Pallandt belonged to the branch which obtained the medieval manor of Walfort in the middle of the eighteenth century. Hence the supplement 'van Walfort' to the name. Being originally Gulik nobility, it was not until the early nineteenth century that several family members were ennobled within the Netherlands.⁸ Jan van Pallandt van Walfort was admitted to the nobility of Gelder-

6 Gelders Archief, Arnhem (hereafter GA), Huis Klarenbeek, nr. 70, *Caert van Clarenbeek*, 1656, by Johannes van Swieten; Olde Meierink and Storms-Smeets, 'Transformatie en nieuwbouw', 153.

7 P.C. Molhysen and F.K.H. Kossman, *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek* (10 vols; Leiden, 1911-1937), IX, 750.

8 J.M. van Winter, *Ministerialiteit en ridderschap in Gelre en Zutphen* (Arnhem, 1962) 334.

Walking map of the Klarenbeek woods and parks, Monnikenhuizen and the viewpoint Steenen Tafel, circa 1875-1885. North is left, though wrongly shown in the map (*coll. Gelders Archief, Arnhem*)

land in 1814 and in 1818 he was given the title of baron. After obtaining the Klarenbeek estate he started accumulating more and more landed property around the city of Arnhem, amongst others the smaller country estates of Rennehenk in 1820, Bekenkamp in 1830 and Angerenstein in 1833. Together they formed 'Great Klarenbeek', a large family estate with several country houses.⁹ Jan van Pallandt and his wife lived at Klarenbeek, whereas his eldest son Samuel François Anne baron van Pallandt van Oud Beijerland (1808-1880) and his wife Everdine lived at Angerenstein.¹⁰

The layout was altered by Jan van Pallandt 'in the now popular, more carefree taste,'⁴ for which alas many waterworks and heavy trees had to disappear,' the Dutch writer Abraham Jacob van der Aa wrote in his geographical dictionary of the Nether-

9 The cadastral records of 1832 show that Van Pallandt owned almost 200 hectares in the municipality of Arnhem marking him as the third largest landowner there. See: *Oorspronkelijk aanwijzende tafel, kadastrer, gemeente Arnhem*, 1832. The cadastral ledgers that were produced after 1832 show his accumulations in the following years. The cadastral records for Arnhem are located at Gelders Archief, including 0874 pre cadastral maps (c. 1812-1830), 0655 *minuutplans* (1817-1830), and 3170 *Oorspronkelijk Aanwijzende Tafels* (1832). The cadastral maps (*minuutplans*) can also be found via the website of the State Cultural Heritage Agency, <http://beeldbank.cultureelerfgoed.nl/>.

10 Werkgroep Historie Angerenstein, *Angerenstein. Van landgoed tot woonwijk* (Utrecht, 2008) 43.

11 Meaning the landscape style of gardening.

lands in 1845. He continued, saying that Van Pallandt created ‘wide, curving paths over hills and dales, which through the diversity of plantations, alternated with arable fields, was marked by broad panoramas’. Van der Aa was pleasantly surprised that part of the woods was open for the public: ‘Yes, the owner even offers wanderers the occasion to obtain refreshments from the forester’. The wanderer would be overwhelmed, according to Van der Aa, by the beauty of the undulating landscape with its valleys and hills, lanes and curving paths, picturesque plantations and broad vistas all the way to Cleves in Germany, particularly from the highest hill named *Steenen Tafel* (Stone Table) after a remnant of the medieval monastery.¹²

Van Pallandt not only enhanced the house with its parks and gardens, but he also acquired large tracks of heathland with the so-called rights of *schaapsdrift*, that is the right to herd sheep from the farms to the higher located heathlands for grazing. In the mixed agricultural system of arable and pastoral farming, the right of *schaapsdrift* and the wastelands were invaluable. The heathlands were a source of grazing for sheep, and for gathering fuel, honey and *plaggen* (heather, grass and wood humus mixed with dung from sheep for fertilising the sandy soils).¹³ But this was not why Van Pallandt van Walfort purchased so much heathland around Arnhem. His objective was cultivation. And he was not the only estate owner to do so.

From public to private lands

At the start of the nineteenth century the national government came to see the division and privatisation of communal land as a primary means of encouraging the cultivation of the wastelands, which, it was hoped, would accelerate the growth of the wider economy.¹⁴ Such thinking was supported at the local level by the great landowners who were the likely beneficiaries of any scheme of land reallocation. Legislation passed under French ruling in 1809/10 was intended to promote the division and transfer into private ownership of communal lands throughout the Netherlands.¹⁵ However, after the fall of the French Empire the Dutch government displayed no immediate interest in the pursuit of cultivation laws, and little more was done to divide the wastelands until the mid-1830s. In 1837 King William I reintroduced the 1809/10 law and the 1811 tax law, meaning that the wastelands were taxed as they

¹² Van der Aa, *Aardrijkskundig woordenboek*, 466. Translation by the author.

¹³ J.A.J. Vervloet, ‘Het zandlandschap’, in: S. Barends et al., eds, *Het Nederlandse landschap: een historisch-geografische benadering* (Utrecht, 1995) 10.

¹⁴ It should, of course, be acknowledged that the Dutch process of wasteland division had parallels elsewhere in Europe, including the Parliamentary Enclosure movement in Britain and the abolition of the German *Flurzwang*. See, for instance, M. Turner, *Enclosures in England* (London, 1984); H. Haushofer, *Die deutsche Landwirtschaft im technischen Zeitalter* (Stuttgart, 1972).

¹⁵ J.L. van Zanden, *De economische ontwikkeling van de Nederlandse landbouw in de negentiende eeuw, 1800-1914* (Wageningen, 1985) 153; A.M. Pleyte, *De rechtstoestand der marken in Nederland* (Leiden, 1879) 139.



153

Topographic map of the municipality of Arnhem, 1873 (detail). The country and landed estates bordering the city are evident: Sterrenberg, Sonsbeek, Zypendaal, Klarenbeek, Angerenstein and Rennenenk (coll. Gelders Archief, Arnhem)

had been during the French period. The establishment of the Cadastre of 1832 furthermore meant that the government now had a comprehensive record of landownership as a basis for taxation. Depending on its quality, one hectare of heath land was taxed at between forty and a hundred cents per year (which would be approximately two to twelve Euro at present). Little wonder that the municipality of Arnhem, which owned circa 3700 hectares of lands in and around the city, was motivated to sell off these poor wastelands to private landowners.¹⁶ The municipality sold the land under the condition that the land was to be cultivated into profitable arable fields or woodlands, that new farms were built and that the infrastructure was improved. The sale of land (from public to private ownership) meant extra income for Arnhem, while the land around the city would be cultivated without any expense for the municipality.¹⁷

¹⁶ Cadastre of municipality of Arnhem, 1832.

¹⁷ J. Hofman, 'Ontginning van de heidevelden in de gemeente Arnhem in de 19de eeuw. Een oriënterend

Between 1835 and 1854 approximately 2700 hectares of heathland were sold to private landowners, for prices between six and twelve guilders per hectare, in order to cultivate them.¹⁸ As a member of the Geldern Commission of Agriculture (*Gelderse Commissie van Landbouw*), founded in 1805, Van Pallandt van Walfort was in favour of cultivating the wastelands, particularly with the introduction of artificial fertilizer. Other members were, amongst others, landowners A.P.R.C. van der Borch van Verwolde and D.W.G.J.H. baron Brantsen van de Zijp. In the scope of twenty years Van Pallandt van Walfort had bought the rights of *schaapsdrift* of Klarenbeek itself, but also of Valkenhuizen, Lange Water, Rennenenk, Bethanië (Presikhaaf), Angerenstein and Schoonzicht, totalling to over 955 hectares on which he owned this particular right.¹⁹ Subsequently he bought sixty hectares of woodland and 550 hectares of heathlands (to which he already owned the sheep rights) from the municipality and cultivated them. Comparing the map by M.J. de Man (1802-1812) with the municipal map of Arnhem (1873) shows how the landscape to the north of the country house Klarenbeek has changed from heathlands to mostly arable fields and woodlands. Van Pallandt wrote that these cultivations served ‘to enhance the beauty and comfort of the municipality’ and were by no means only for his personal pleasure (enhancing his estate). In fact, it was to provide work for ‘the working class’.²⁰ As noble as this may seem, social motives were only partly behind these great investments. The fact that the now cultivated, former wastelands would enjoy a tax-free period of fifty years must be considered.²¹ It offered economic profits as well as the opportunity to create vast landed properties. Van Pallandts ‘Great Klarenbeek’ now stretched to the northern borders of the municipality, including the farmstead of Valkenhuizen. In the west, the estate was bordered by the Sonsbeek estate, in the east by the extensive property of his relative Reinhard Jan Christiaan baron van Pallandt van Rosendaal (1826-1899; the manorial estate of Rosendaal).²² Together, noble and regent families such as Van Pallandt, Brantsen (at the Zypendaal estate) and Van Heeckeren van Enghuizen (at the Sonsbeek estate) dramatically altered the local landscape, particularly through wood plantations on thousands of hectares of former heathlands.²³ Further research is needed to determine the exact economic profit that derived from these private investments in land cultivation. Nevertheless, seeing this transfer from public to private ownership it is remarkable to see the reverse process only a few decades later.

onderzoek’, *Bijdragen en Mededelingen Vereniging Gelre*, LXXIV (1983) 123-124.

18 Cadastral ledgers, municipality of Arnhem (1832-1854). This comes to almost 75 percent of all heathlands within the municipal boundaries.

19 Hofman, ‘Ontginning’, 117-118.

20 Ibidem, 126.

21 J. Buis, *Historia Forestis. Nederlandse bosgeschiedenis* (Wageningen, 1985) 404.

22 Werkgroep Historie Angerenstein, *Angerenstein*, 30.

23 See Storms-Smeets, *Gelders Arcadië*.

The sale of Klarenbeek

On 5 August 1844 Jan van Pallandt van Walfort passed away. The succession tax register from September 1844 of Arnhem shows all of Van Pallandts belongings: over 1000 hectares of land in Arnhem, including the estates of Klarenbeek, Angerenstein and Rennehenk, each with its own country house, carriage buildings, stables, orangery, hothouses, farmhouses and many plots of arable, meadows, woods and heathland; in nearby Velp several meadows (sixteen ha); near Westervoort a farm with lands (22 ha); the *havezathe* (manor) of Walfort near Aalten (211 ha); a part of the Sinderen estate and three farms near Varsseveld (282 ha) and farms in the Overbetuwe (281 ha).²⁴ In total he owned over 1800 hectares in the province of Gelderland. In the Netherlands, unlike for instance in Britain, the right of primogeniture (whereby only one person inherits the title and the land) did not exist. Thus, after the death of Van Pallandt van Walfort in 1844 'Great Klarenbeek' was divided amongst his children from his (second) marriage with Maria Johanna van Hoogstraten (1783-1813). Van Pallandts daughter Adolfine Charlotte Wilhelmine baroness van Pallandt (1806-1884)²⁵ received Rennehenk, whereas her brothers Samuel François Anne baron van Pallandt van Oud Beijerland (1808-1880) and Frederic Carsile baron van Pallandt van Walfort (1810-1869) respectively inherited Angerenstein and Klarenbeek. Thus, it seems that by creating Great Klarenbeek with three country houses, Jan van Pallandt ensured that his children would each inherit their own property. As the landed properties were inherited in a direct line, no taxes needed to be paid (a situation that remained until 1878), and therefore the succession register gave no value.²⁶ From the list of highest taxed individuals (*Lijst van Hoogstaangeslagenen*) of 1850 we know that Samuel François was taxed for his properties in Arnhem 393.14 guilders (soil tax) and 450.05 guilders (personal tax).²⁷ In total he was taxed 683.52 guilders (soil tax) and 450.05 (personal tax; only his Arnhem estate), totalling to 1133.58 guilders, ranking him thirty-third highest taxed individual in the province of Gelderland. This gives some indication of the value of the Arnhem estate of Samuel François (Angerenstein); however, for Frederic Carsile no such data is available, as he does not appear on the tax list.

155

²⁴ GA, *Memorie van Successie*, inv.nr. 56, nr. 21, fol. 35-64-71: Jan van Pallandt van Walfort, 1844.

²⁵ Through her marriage with her cousin Joan Jacob Adolf Alexander van Pallandt van Westervoort the manor house of Walfort passed into this branch of the Van Pallandt family. The Walfort estate remained within the family Van Pallandt van Westervoort until 1958, when it was sold to the municipality of Aalten.

²⁶ From 1878 also direct heirs were taxed based on the inherited goods.

²⁷ The personal tax in the *Lijst van Hoogstaangeslagenen* was a wealth tax based on the rental value of the house he lived in, the number of doors and windows, the number of furnaces, the value of the furniture, the number of servants and the number of horses. The entire lists of 1850, 1860, 1870, 1880 and 1890 are put together as an appendix in: J. Moes, *Onder aristocraten. Over hegemonie, welstand en aanzien van adel, patriciaat en andere notabelen in Nederland, 1848-1914* (Hilversum, 2012).

An interesting detail from Jan van Pallandt's succession register was that his widow (third wife) Anne Henriëtte Elisabeth Verstolk (1785-1866) was given the lifelong right of usufructuary of the Klarenbeek estate. It was only after the death of his step-mother in 1866 that Frederic Carsile moved into the country house of Klarenbeek. In his lifetime, Frederic Carsile was a knight of the Order of the Dutch Lion, member of the knightly order of Gelderland (*ridderschap*), extraordinary member of the High Order of Dutch Nobility and chamberlain of the king.²⁸ He was married to Françoise Jeannette van Herzele (1818-1885), who was given the lifelong right of usufruct of the manor Walfort and of Klarenbeek after Frederic's death in 1869. She chose to live at Klarenbeek. After closing the park and the woods to the public she was heavily criticised (on various occasions) in the local newspaper *Arnhemsche Courant*. Even though damages to her property had led her to do so, in the eyes of the journalists public interests were apparently of greater importance.²⁹ This was 'an outrage', according to some anonymous 'noble inhabitants' of Arnhem, as they called themselves. In their letter, published in a national newspaper, they stood on the brink for the baroness, as it was simply 'a matter of proprietorship'.³⁰

On 7 October 1885 Françoise van Herzele, dowager Van Pallandt van Walfort, passed away. As she and Frederic Carsile had no children the estate was inherited by his brother Samuel's children, Jan Werner baron van Pallandt van Oud-Beijerland (1835-1907) and Henriette Christine baroness van Pallandt (1833-1907, wife of Frederik baron van Tuyll van Serooskerken, owner of Zuylen castle in Utrecht). The succession register of Frederic Carsile van Pallandt of January 1869 shows a tax value of 400,455.93 guilders for the Klarenbeek estate.³¹ His nephew and niece did not have the funds to pay the enormous succession taxes and sold the estate in 1886 through a public auction.³² In several publications on the history of Arnhem reference is made to greater processes that prompted the sale, like the agricultural depression in the 1880s, increasing maintenance costs and decreasing incomes.³³ While these aspects will surely have had an impact, two issues need to be considered: the high taxes at this time and the fact that all the family members had great landed estates elsewhere. Selling one estate helped the family to maintain – for now anyway – their other properties. In any case, within three generations the estate which had been greatly enlarged and beautified as 'Great Klarenbeek' by Jan van Pallandt, had been divided into smaller parts amongst his children and was now sold by his grandchildren.

²⁸ GA, 3010 *Havezathe Walfort*; 0207 *Burgerlijke stand Gelderland*, no. 397.

²⁹ R.P.M. Rhoen, *Klarenbeek in de wandeling: Arnhems eerste stadspark* (Arnhem, 1986) 16.

³⁰ Anonymous letter in *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 27 October 1871.

³¹ The equivalent of nearly 4.3 million Euro in 2013 (www.iisg.nl). GA, 0021 *Memorie van Successie*, inv.nr. 88, *Register IV, akten van het recht van successie en van overgang bij overlijden en n stukken betreffende die vaststelling*, year 1869 (Frederic Carsile van Pallandt, January 1869).

³² Rhoen, *Klarenbeek in de wandeling*, 19.

³³ See, for instance: Markus, *Arnhem*; Rhoen, *Klarenbeek*; Werkgroep Historie Angerenstein, *Angerenstein*.

Several Dutch newspapers feature an advertisement on 30 March 1886 for the sale of:

the universally known and well located beautiful estate of KLARENBEEK cut through by curving brooks, with ponds, waterfalls and fountains, and the country estate Beekenkamp, existing of country house, carriage house, stables, hunters house, porters lodge, gardener's lodge, farms, labourer crofts, woods, arable fields, meadows, together circa 132 *bunders* (hectares) ... large.³⁴

The estate was auctioned in May 1886 in 56 plots. Plots one to six (the country house with land towards the Velperweg, i.e. the road from Arnhem through Velp to Zutphen) and plots seven to twelve (the villa Beekenkamp with its park) were sold to the German industrial Johann Heinrich Lüp (1828-1879), who also owned the nearby castle of Biljoen. Lüp paid respectively 132,111 guilders and 62,555 guilders. Plots thirteen to eighteen were sold to P. Berends for 17,300 guilders. Plots 19 to 46 (the Klarenbeek woods with the viewpoint 'Steenen Tafel') were purchased by H.J. Heuvelink for the municipality of Arnhem for 178,790 guilders.³⁵

157

From private to public landscapes

As many archival documents of the municipality concerning the latter decades of the nineteenth century were destroyed in 1944/1945 it is difficult to trace the exact process of land purchases by Arnhem, but thanks to newspaper articles and remaining archival sources we do get a good impression. It was at a city council meeting in May 1886 that Mr. H.A. Elias esq. proposed the purchase of the entire estate of Klarenbeek, or at least the larger part of it. There was some opposition, arguing that Klarenbeek was situated at such a long distance from the city centre that only people with carriages could reach it. The greater public would not benefit and the costs were too high for the municipality. However, it was the speech of alderman H.J. Cordes that convinced the entire council to 'save the natural beauty of the woods and the impressive walks in order to maintain the attractive nature of the city for its current and future residents'.³⁶

Indeed, the strongest – public – sentiment, as evident in national and local newspapers, was a praise for the decision of the Arnhem city council to obtain Klarenbeek and 'save [its woods and natural beauty] from destruction'. More specifically, to save it from destruction by the feared owner of Biljoen and Beekhuizen estate: J.H. Lüp, who had received massive opposition and criticism by felling woodlands at his prop-

³⁴ *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 30 March 1886; *Het Nieuws van den Dag: Kleine Courant*, 30 March 1886; *Leeuwarder Courant*, 30 March 1886. The same advertisement reappeared in these newspapers few weeks later. The auction took place on 10 May 1886.

³⁵ *De Tijd: Godsdienstig-staatkundig dagblad*, 27 May 1886; *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 26 May 1886.

³⁶ Rhoen, *Klarenbeek*, 19.

erty in nearby Velp.³⁷ As we have seen earlier in the case of barones Van Pallandt-Herzeele, it was not the first time that noble landowners were openly criticised for the way they managed their properties. However, the fact that Lûps did buy the Klarenbeek country house and immediate surroundings was apparently less ‘harmful’, perhaps indicating that the critical sentiments mostly focused on parklands that were or had previously been open to the public. Overall, the almost ‘lyrical adoration’ of Arnhem for saving the woods persists in publications to this day.³⁸

Nevertheless, to convince the city council, a speech about saving natural beauty was – as one might expect – not enough: Cordes also promised that the incomes from tenure would be sufficient for maintaining the land. He had calculated that the land would yield 9300 guilders a year, a revenue of more than four percent.³⁹ Although these figures appear to have convinced the city council to purchase the estate, it turned out that extra costs were necessary to transform the parks and woods into public walking areas. The paths had to be hardened and broadened, extra benches added (particularly on locations with a view), and so forth. In the end the municipality had to take a loan for maintaining the property. To justify such use of public money, other, greater, economic reasons stood at the base of purchases of noble estates by the city of Arnhem, of which Klarenbeek was the first of seven.⁴⁰ In fact, the decision to purchase Klarenbeek was most likely based on recent developments in the city, where several impoverished landowners sold parts of their estate to building companies, a process that needs closer investigation to understand the municipality’s motivations.

The need for new building plots was evident as the Arnhem population rose from over 18.000 in 1849 to nearly 41,000 people in 1880 to over 56,800 in 1900.⁴¹ As the large landed estates bordered the city to the north the expansion possibilities were limited. Private building corporations coveted the land owned by noble and regent landowners and selling several plots of the edges of their property as building land must have seemed a logical and profitable undertaking to some of the families. Thus, in 1878 the *Arnhemse Maatschappij ter exploitatie van onroerende zaken* (Arnhem Company for exploiting immovable properties) had purchased part of the estate of Gelders Spijker on which the residential area *Spijker Kwartier* was subsequently built, with large gentlemen’s houses with rich decorations.⁴² In 1880 over eight hec-

37 *Bataviaasch Handelsblad*, 26 June 1886.

38 See, for instance, A. Markus, *Arnhem* (Arnhem, 1975) 494-497; P.R.A. van Iddekinge et al., eds, *Sonsbeek. Stadspark van Arnhem* (Zwolle, 1998); Werkgroep Historie Angerenstein, *Angerenstein*.

39 *Het Nieuws van den Dag: Kleine Courant*, 29 May 1886.

40 The municipality bought the following estates: Klarenbeek (1886), Sonsbeek (1899), Zypendaal (1930), Presikhaaf (1930), Angerenstein (1941), Gulden Bodem (1958), Beaulieu (1985).

41 E. de Boer, ‘De kans op een beter bestaan. De groei van de bevolking van Arnhem sinds 1815’, *Bijdragen en Mededelingen Vereniging Gelre*, LXXIV (1983) 139; W. Lavooij, *Twee eeuwen bouwen aan Arnhem. De stedenbouwkundige ontwikkeling van de stad* (Zutphen, 1990) 39, 65.

42 R.J.A. Crols, ‘De verburgerlijking van het buiten wonen in de tweede helft van de negentiende eeuw in Arnhem’, in: R. van der Laarse and Y. Kuiper, eds, *Beelden van de buitenplaats. Elitevorming en notabelencultuur in Nederland in de negentiende eeuw* (Hilversum, 2005) 179.



159

Klarenbeek outdoor swimming pool, 1950s (photo Gelders Archief, Arnhem)

tares of the Rennenenk estate were sold by the Van Pallandt family to another building company. Here too, new houses and villas rose on the former estate lands.⁴³ From 1885 Willem Frederik baron van Heeckeren van Enghuizen (1858-1915), owner of Sonsbeek, the most famous and largest of all Arnhem country estates, sold large parts of his estate which were then converted to an entire new residential area: Sint-Marten.⁴⁴ It is possible that, to prevent random city planning, as done by these privately owned enterprises, the city council realised that it was their duty to purchase the estates and start well planned city expansions, as is proposed by J. Willemsen.⁴⁵ It may even be seen as the start of creating a 'green city', as the present mayor of Arnhem, Herman Kaiser, recently stated.⁴⁶

Back to the purchase of Klarenbeek in 1886. What developments took place after the sale? Owning the land, first of all, enabled the municipality to broaden the Velp-erweg, the main road from Arnhem to Zutphen, thereby improving the regional in-

⁴³ J.Th.W. Willemsen, *De volkshuisvesting in Arnhem 1829-1925. Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van Arnhem* (5 vols; Arnhem, 1967), III, 10-11.

⁴⁴ P.R.A. van Iddekinge, 'Park van de gemeente', in: P.R.A. van Iddekinge et al., eds, *Sonsbeek. Stadspark van Arnhem* (Zwolle, 1998) 56-66.

⁴⁵ Willemsen, *De volkshuisvesting*, 11.

⁴⁶ Herman Kaiser held a speech at a symposium of *Vrienden van Park Sonsbeek*, 27 May 2014.

frastructure.⁴⁷ Subsequently small scale housing development took place along the southern outskirts of the park and large public buildings were built and facilities created. Here follows a short summary.⁴⁸ In 1887 the city council and the Ministry of War decided to move the military hospital out of the city centre. A new military hospital was built in 1891 on the Klarenbeek estate, an area of circa one and a half hectare known as *Onder de Linden* (Under the Lime trees).⁴⁹ In 1888 a primary school (called School XVI) was erected on the corner of Vijverlaan and Rosendaalsestraat. In 1908 one of the original Klarenbeek farms, the forester house, was demolished and on its location a new hotel arose called *Monnikhuizen*. This building was later, from 1930 onwards, expanded and transformed into a school for asthmatic children and ex TBC patients (the *Arnhemse Buitenschool*). In 1916 military barracks were constructed south of the great pond. The park around the pond was used as a military training field. To the north of the pond municipal tree plantations and three tennis lawns were created, later transformed to sport fields for the Arnhem football club *Vitesse*. West of the great pond temporary emergency housing was realised in 1919 and 1921: Vijverwijk, Bloemenwijk and Boschwijk.⁵⁰ Furthermore, as more and more residential areas were created in Arnhem a new water tower was needed. It was constructed in 1926-1928 behind the famous *Steenen Tafel* viewpoint. The tower was designed in the expressionist style by architect Johannes van Biesen (1892-1968). Located on the highest point of Klarenbeek the water tower was also used as a belvedere and as a restaurant for tourists. Van Biesen also designed the large open air swimming pool (1950-1954) in the southernmost part of the Klarenbeek estate. There were three pools, a kiosk, a restaurant, dressing rooms and toilets. The costs were estimated at 850,000 guilders.⁵¹ To the north of the water tower a large military complex was established from 1938 onwards: *Saksen-Weimarkazerne*. Whereas in 1886 the municipality had purchased 100 hectares of the Klarenbeek estate, by 1940 it had shrunk to 91 hectares and the current Klarenbeek park is circa 69 hectares large.⁵²

New developments were not limited to this part of the Klarenbeek estate. Also, the country house and its direct surroundings, bought in 1886 by Lüps, went through many changes. The country house was rented and changed into a hotel where parties, diners and concerts could be held.⁵³ Lüps also organised a 'concoors hippique' (1887) and cycling tours (1895). And, as other landowners had previously done, he planned a new residential area with villas. In order to succeed he offered to sell thirteen hec-

47 *De Tijd: Godsdienslig-Staatkundig Dagblad*, 14 July 1886.

48 Based on: Rhoen, *Klarenbeek*, 24-29.

49 *De Tijd: Godsdienslig-Staatkundig Dagblad*, 1 July 1887.

50 Although intended for only five years, they were not demolished until 1934.

51 GA, Secretarie Gemeente Arnhem 1950-1954, inv.nr. 2154, doc. 2154. *Lijst van noodzakelijk geachte kapaalswerken voor het dienstjaar 1952*.

52 GA, Secretarie Gemeente Arnhem 1940-1949, inv.nr. 2197, doc. 8776. *Vergoeding waarde perceelen Klarenbeek*.

53 *Leeuwarder Courant*, 7 June 1886.

tares of the part of the Klarenbeek estate in his possession to the municipality (July 1892). He asked 50,000 guilders for the land and had a very particular condition: that the municipality would create roads, squares and a fountain, which would probably cost about 110,000 guilders. The city council was interested, but thought it was too expensive and they did not agree to his condition. However, it did offer possibilities to improve the road network and enlarge the park and thus the city council proposed their own term of sale to Lüps, namely that he would upkeep the country house and surrounding park.⁵⁴ In the end, there was no sale, although Lüps did create a new luxury residential area.⁵⁵ It would lead us too far to discuss this development in more detail here, but it shows the city's great interest in land exploitation and ownership for public benefit.

Another purchase of a former landed estate

161

Instead the city council looked into buying another great landed estate: neighbouring Sonsbeek.⁵⁶ As described above, from 1880 the owner Van Heeckeren van Enghuizen started selling more and more parts of Sonsbeek to building cooperations. Not only the mentioned St. Marten was subsequently created, but also Burgemeesterskwartier (from 1885) and Sonsbeekkwartier (1896, 1898).⁵⁷ At Sonsbeek we see the same pattern as at Klarenbeek: the property that was bought, enlarged (to circa 800 hectares) and beautified under the first generation (Hendrik J.C.J. baron van Heeckeren van Enghuizen, 1785-1862) was eventually parcelled and sold by the third generation (Willem Frederik baron van Heeckeren van Enghuizen). And, like Klarenbeek, the municipality of Arnhem largely became the new owner when the entire estate was sold. The director of the municipal works department, Jan Willem Cornelis Tellegen (1859-1921), said that:

I believe that Arnhem, by buying Sonsbeek, will do a deed so great, it will not only be applauded in the city itself, but throughout the entire country, and I deem it not impossible that through this deed the migration to Arnhem (...) will grow.⁵⁸

He furthermore stated, in his address to the Arnhem city council, that buying Sonsbeek would enable the city to expand through a well-designed and coherent plan instead of surrendering the land to private companies. In order to have control over

⁵⁴ *Het Nieuws van den Dag: Kleine Courant*, 26 May 1892; 12 July 1892.

⁵⁵ In 1913 the Klarenbeek country house was bought by Jan de Goeijen from Zwolle. Previously, in 1907, he had purchased Angerenstein from the Van Pallandt family. See: Werkgroep Angerenstein, *Angerenstein*, 45.

⁵⁶ In 1894 Arnhem wanted to buy the Warnsborn estate, west of the city, but the Provincial States of Gelderland disapproved of the plan as the public interest would not be sufficient. See: Van Iddekinge et al., *Sonsbeek*, 59.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, 49-53.

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, 63.



The country houses and landed estates owned by the municipality of Arnhem and used as public parks, with the year of purchase (*map by author, 2015*)

the urban expansion, including higher quality housing and infrastructure, the city needed to be the owner, Tellegen concluded.⁵⁹ Together, these were the greatest arguments for Tellegen: stimulate migration to Arnhem and subsequently control the urban planning to house newcomers. Other benefits, Tellegen exclaimed, would be: exploitation incomes (for instance from tenure), the preservation of the woods, the creation of a public park and the productive labour by unemployed people (cultivating the wastelands). Tellegen's lobbying worked. On 9 August 1899 the municipality bought Sonsbeek for 800.000 guilders, consisting of 507 hectares of land, including country house, park (with waterfalls, ponds, deer park and gardens), arable lands, meadows, farms and heathlands. Mayor Salomon J.R. de Monchy (1880-1961) stated in 1928 that buying Sonsbeek had served a mixture of interests, enabling the creation of an open-air museum, a zoo, two hospitals, sport fields and various residential areas, such as northern Sonsbeekkwartier, Braamberg and Hazegrietje.

59 F.W. van Voorden, *Schakels in stedenbouw. Een model voor analyse van de ontwikkeling van de ruimtelijke kwaliteiten van 19de-eeuwse stadsuitbreidingen op grond van een onderzoek in Gelderse steden* (Zutphen, 1983) 112, 119-122; Van Ildeking et al., *Sonsbeek*, 65-69.

W. Lavooij argues that through the purchase of former landed estates the municipality had created the now famous parks of Sonsbeek, Klarenbeek and Zypendaal around the city.⁶⁰ But, of course, the parks were in fact the remnants of gardens and parks once created for noble and regent families – parks that from the end of the nineteenth century were transformed into public spaces. This transformation in use also meant a change in appearances. Nevertheless, the choices made by families like Van Pallandt are still visible in the present landscape. But through the transformation from private to public ownership, Klarenbeek and six other estates became integrated into the urban structure. Or, as A. Markus described it in 1906 most poignantly (and in a very poetic way): ‘No stranger can think of Gelderland’s beautiful capital or the Klarenbeek woods come to mind. The city and the woods have both lived with and for each other. They belong together.’⁶¹

Taxed to extinction?

163

The case of Sonsbeek compliments the Klarenbeek evidence. Obviously, we are not dealing with an isolated event of one noble family struggling with their finances. In fact, it was an overall problem for great landowners in the whole of the Netherlands (for instance around the cities of Den Haag, Haarlem, Heemstede, Zeist, Bilthoven and Utrecht).⁶² Furthermore, it was also apparent in other European countries such as Britain, Germany, Italy and France from the 1880s onwards, largely based on lower incomes as a result of the agricultural depression and higher taxes.⁶³

Looking back, the liberal politician Johan ter Spill, addressing the State General in 1915, saw a clear correlation between city expansions and taxation. If country and landed estates near cities were taxed for their sale value (meaning the value as a possible future building plot), then the resulting high taxes would force landowners to sell part or whole of their properties, as indeed had happened in the past.⁶⁴ An issue that still occurred a decade later, as a local Dutch newspaper stated in 1924 that

a worse phenomenon of late and an uncontradictory fact is, however, that many estates, private woodlands, pretty lanes that form the beauty of our landscape are rapidly being

⁶⁰ Lavooij, *Twee eeuwen bouwen*, 65–66.

⁶¹ Markus, *Arnhem*, 496.

⁶² See, for instance, W. Verstegen, *Vrije wandeling. Het parlement, de fiscus en de bescherming van het particuliere Nederlandse natuurschoon. De Natuurschoonwet tussen 1924 en 1995* (Amsterdam, 2012); P. van Cruyningen, *Landgoederen en landschap in de Graafschap* (Utrecht, 2005); Moes, *Onder aristocraten*.

⁶³ As is discussed in the recent publication of Y. Kuiper, N. Bijleveld and J. Dronkers, eds, *Nobilities in Europe in the twentieth century. Reconversion strategies, memory culture, and elite formation* (Leuven, 2015).

⁶⁴ *Handelingen der Staten-Generaal. Bijlagen. 1914-1915. Amendement Ter Spill 19 maart 1915*. As published on: <http://www.statengeneraaldigitaal.nl>.

sold, parcelled, cut down and in the instance that they still exist, often are no longer being cared for with the same devoutness and care as previously.⁶⁵

In the same year, the Royal Dutch Touring Club ANWB stated:

To battle for the preservation of our natural beauty! Always one hears about auctions of large landed estates, of the demolition of country houses, the felling of woods, the chopping of lanes, the parcelling of parks, water features and woodlands for the constructions of villas.⁶⁶

The 'battle' of the ANWB, the Dutch forestry commission and various nature organisations such as *Natuurmonumenten* eventually resulted in a new fiscal law in 1928: *Natuurschoonwet* or the Law for Natural Beauty. This law ensured that no succession taxes needed to be paid for landed properties larger than five hectares and that the land was valued according to its present function.⁶⁷ It certainly helped but was by no means a panacea. For instance, at Rosendael castle, east of Arnhem, times were hard after the death of owner Frederik Jacob Willem baron van Pallandt (1860-1932), relative of the Van Pallandts who once lived at Klarenbeek. His successor R.J.C. baron van Pallandt offered to sell a large terrain of over 2000 hectares to the Ministry of Defence for 450,000 guilders: Planken Wambuis. In his letter Van Pallandt explicitly mentions that this sale is needed to pay off succession taxes.⁶⁸

Obviously, the *Natuurschoonwet* alone was not enough to solve the financial problems. In 1977 the last lord of Rosendael, W.F. Torck baron van Pallandt, passed away. At his death the estate, once circa 1000 hectares large, was now only 50 hectares. In his will Van Pallandt left Rosendael to the foundation *Geldersch Landschap* (the Gelderland Trust). In this instance, at least, it appears to be partly a case of philanthropy, 'a noble thing', as is suggested for the British landowners who granted their estates to the National Trust.⁶⁹ Analysed as a whole, the example of Rosendael shows that the process of estate transfer was a complex one. Up to the 1970s the family tried to maintain the chore of the Rosendael estate by selling off parts of the wider estate. This, like the examples of Klarenbeek and Sonsbeek, seems to point at merely financial necessity and self-preservation, and eventually saving the country house with its park and gardens by leaving it to a charity as national heritage. From the dozens of important castles and country houses that the various Van Pallandt branches owned many persevere, although most are now owned by public bodies.⁷⁰

65 *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, 26 August 1924.

66 ANWB, 11 December 1924, quoted by Verstegen, *Vrije wandeling*, 17.

67 On the history of the *Natuurschoonwet*, see Verstegen, *Vrije wandeling*.

68 Ibidem, 71.

69 See: M. Watson, *A noble thing. The National Trust and its benefactors* (London, 2011).

70 The most important castle still owned, and occupied, by descendants of the Van Pallandt family is Kerpel castle in Gelderland.

From private country estate to public park

Just as the decline of the Van Pallandt family is not an isolated event, neither is the purchase of private estates by municipalities. First, it should be pointed out that the purchase of former landed estates by municipalities was not restricted to urban areas like Arnhem. In the more rural parts of Gelderland, for instance, many country houses and castles were bought and turned into council houses, such as Ruurlo, Vorden, Wijchen and Scherpenzeel. Secondly, in some instances the private landowners would not sell off their lands close to the cities, as is – for instance – seen at the estate of Almelo (in the province of Overijssel, the Netherlands) and Isny im Allgäu (Baden-Württemberg, Germany), thereby influencing or even restricting urban growth.⁷¹ Thirdly, the transformation of private country estates to public parks can be witnessed in many growing European cities in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As such it seems to portray a time in which city councils sought to create green environments in an urbanising region: public parks that were widely accessible for all. Such processes therefore deserve a more detailed and comparative analysis on a European scale. In the scope of this article we have to suffice with one British example: Roundhay estate in Leeds. By 1800 the landed estate, used in the Middle Ages as a hunting park by the De Lacy family, was much enclosed and had partially been worked for stone and coal. In 1803 part of the Roundhay estate was bought by Thomas Nicholson, a businessman in shipping and share broking. Nicholson created a large landscape park with various lakes (the most spectacular being the lower lake, which was approximately thirteen hectares large), gardens, woodland walks, a ravine, a gorge and waterfalls. Amidst this parkland, a new mansion was built between 1811 and 1826, designed by the architect John Clarke in the Greek Revival style.⁷² Fifty years after Nicholson's death in 1821, his descendants put the estate up for sale. It was purchased for £139,000 by John Barran, mayor of Leeds, who then sold it to the Leeds city council. Subsequently it was presented to the people of Leeds as a public park, although parts of the estate were sold for building developments. New roads and a tramway were constructed to make the park accessible. In the following decades, new amenities were added for the public benefit, such as a sports arena, a cycling track and an outdoor swimming pool.⁷³ The construction of the sports arena even provided work for the unemployed in Leeds. The mansion was leased out by the city council as a hotel and restaurant, whereas the park was greatly enjoyed by the public and the lakes used for boating. At more than 280 hectares it is still one of the largest public parks in Europe.⁷⁴

165

71 For the case of Isny, see H.G. Wehling, 'Der oberschwäbische Adel in der Kommunalpolitik', in: M. Henninger and E.L. Kuhn, eds, *Adel im Wandel. Oberschaben von der frühen Neuzeit bis zur Gegenwart* (Ostfildern, 2006) 178-180.

72 G. Sheeran, *Landscape gardens in West Yorkshire, 1680-1880* (Wakefield, 1990) 112-113.

73 Roundhay Park is still a popular public park, see www.leeds.gov.uk.

74 For more information, see S. Burt, *Roundhay Park – an illustrated history* (Leeds, 2000).

Conclusion

The processes of land transfer and transformation at Roundhay Park was very similar to that of Klarenbeek and other Arnhem parks. Further research is necessary to analyse these processes on a European scale, but the case study of Klarenbeek shows that financial difficulties as a result of higher taxes, lower incomes and higher expenses, together with the need for urban expansions, put noble families like the Van Pallandts into an almost impossible position. The sale of one of their estates seemed a smart thing to do (sacrifice one to save the others), although eventually – in the course of the twentieth century – the family parted with most of their houses. In the case of Arnhem, it is remarkable, as shown, that the municipality became the owner of seven, previously private, landed estates. Presently, it is a popular belief in Arnhem that the city could not expand further north due to the presence of landed estates, which acted as a buffer. However, it was in fact thanks to the purchase of such landed properties that the municipality was able to create the desired ‘green city’, and indeed expand further north, thereby incorporating country house gardens and parks as public walking areas. Despite urban development at the southernmost and northernmost edges the central part of the Klarenbeek park and woodlands still remains today, as do the ponds, the lanes, the curving paths and ‘overwhelming’ views, although the municipal garden allotments (every one as different as their owners) do not fit into this once elite landscape, designed as an ensemble. Perhaps herein lies the greatest challenge for present-day municipalities: how to manage and maintain the cultural heritage of a landed – previously privately-owned – estate when public functions are wanted? The historic investigation of late nineteenth- and twentieth-century developments and changes, as brought forward in this article, thus becomes relevant for present-day owners and estate managers.

Elyze Storms-Smeets

From elite to public landscapes

The case of the Klarenbeek estate in Arnhem, 1880-1950

From the late nineteenth century a particular process of land transfer and transformation occurred around growing cities across Europe: the sale of privately owned landed estates. In this article one particular case is central to investigation: the noble estate of Klarenbeek near the city of Arnhem in the Netherlands. It was purchased in 1807 by Jan van Pallandt van Walfort (1776-1844). By subsequently buying surrounding estates (Angerenstein and Rennenenk) and former wastelands he created 'Great Klarenbeek', together over 1000 hectares of land bordering the city. However, within two generations the family came into financial trouble due to high maintenance costs, rising employment costs, decreasing incomes and the high succession tax. The core of the Klarenbeek estate was sold off in 1886. Circa 100 hectares was purchased by the municipality of Arnhem and transformed into a public park. In 1899 Arnhem furthermore bought the estate of Sonsbeek. This article shows the council's reasoning behind this: preserving nature, creating public parks, building public facilities (i.e. sport parks, schools and military barracks) and creating new residential areas. Creating a 'green city'.

167

Dr. Elyze Storms-Smeets (1975) studied human geography in Utrecht and Durham (U.K.). She received her PhD from the University of Leeds with the thesis *Landscape and society in Twente and Utrecht. A historical geography of Dutch country estates, c. 1750-1950*. Since 2007 she is employed at Gelders Genootschap as a heritage consultant, specialised on country houses and estates. Since 2012 she also works as a university lecturer Historic Country and Landed Estates at the Centre of Landscape Studies, University of Groningen. Elyze furthermore is an editor for *Virtus. Journal of Nobility Studies* and *Dutch Castle Studies*.

University of Groningen, Oude Boteringestraat 34, 9712 GK Groningen, The Netherlands – e.a.c.storms-smeets@rug.nl

Finding safety in feuding. Nobles' responses to Nuremberg's rural security policy in the mid-fifteenth century 11

Ben Pope

Adellijke beschermers van een christelijke gemeenschap. Veluwse edelen tussen machtswerking en religieuze verandering in de zestiende eeuw 33

Jos de Weerd

The longing for leadership. Collective memory of nobles, the perception of their present days, and the need for 'noble-minded personalities' in the Weimar Republic 57

Michael Seelig

Dossier

Landed elites, landed estates and lifestyles in Europe (1880-2000). A historiographical balance and a research agenda 85

Yme Kuiper

Dining in aristocratic households of nineteenth-century France. A study of female authority 105

Elizabeth C. Macknight

The economic and social transformation of the Finnish landed elite, 1800-2000 125

Alex Snellman

From elite to public landscapes. The case of the Klarenbeek estate in Arnhem, 1880-1950 147

Elyze Storms-Smeets

Redefining nobility. Germany during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries 169

Daniel Menning

23 | 2016



9 789087 046552