

Marriages between nobility and high bourgeoisie as a way to maintain their elite positions in modern Dutch society.

Jaap Dronkers & Huibert Schijf

Paper presented at the session of the ESA network 'Biographical Perspectives on European Societies' of the 6th Conference of the European Sociological Association, 23-26 September 2003 in Murcia, Spain

Marriages between nobility and high bourgeoisie as a way to maintain their elite positions in modern Dutch society.

Jaap Dronkers & Huibert Schijf
European University Institute & University of Amsterdam

Prof. Dr. Jaap Dronkers, European University Institute, Department of Political and Social Sciences, Via dei Roccettini 9, I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI), Italy. E-mail: jaap.dronkers@iue.it. All correspondence to this author.

Dr. Huibert Schijf, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Amsterdam, Oudezijds Achterburgwal 185, 1012 DK Amsterdam, The Netherlands. e-mail: schijf@pscw.uva.nl.

Abstract

In this paper we analyse the marriage patterns between Dutch nobility and high bourgeoisie, born in the 20th century, in order to explain the constant advantage of Dutch nobility during the 20th century in obtaining more elite positions than Dutch high bourgeoisie. Homogamy in marriage (mother's noble title; noble title of the parents-in-law) is an important mean for Dutch nobility to maintain its distinct social position during the 20th century. The degree of noble homogamy has been decreasing during the 20th century. Although noble homogamy is still decreasing the tempo of the decrease is less fast for the younger generations than for the generation born between 1918 and 1940. There exist refined differences within Dutch nobility and patriciat, which are reflected into their marriage pattern, indicating still relevant social distances between these refined categories. But the mayor distinction remains the distance between nobility and patrician and that difference has the strongest predicting power. The overriding importance of the nobility-patrician distinction above refined distinction within these two groups contradicts the popular 'bougéisation of the nobility' thesis.

Introduction

This paper is a part of a larger project on the social position of Dutch nobility in the 20th century. At the end of this paper there is a list of earlier English publications of this project. The mayor goal of this project is to understand why the Dutch nobility has maintained its social advantage in obtaining elite positions during the 20th century, despite the meritocratisation of allocation of social positions in modern society and despite the clear bourgeois character of Dutch society. In order to deepen the analyses of the 'constant noble advantage' we have added a comparable sample of Dutch high bourgeois families. This combined database was been used by Schijf, Dronkers & George (2002) to test this 'constant noble advantage' hypothesis (During the 20th century members of Dutch noble families hold more elite positions than members of Dutch high bourgeois families). Their advantage might be explained by four possible explanations: 'a lingering relict', 'bourgeoisisation of nobility', 'noble homogamy' and 'new relevance for distinctive noble capital'. Schijf, Dronkers & George (2002) made clear that this 'constant noble advantage' hypothesis has to be accepted and that the best explanation

was the 'noble homogamy' explanation. Two important phenomena underlined the importance of the 'noble homogamy' explanation:

1. A noble mother is still an advantage for obtaining elite positions in modern society, both for the nobility as for the high bourgeoisie. But it is more true for the former than for the latter, which clearly contradicts a simple 'bourgeoisisation of the nobility' explanation. Neither is there any indication that this advantage of having a noble mother is smaller for the younger generations. Their interpretation of this result is that mothers, who are mostly responsible for the socialisation of the next generation into their cultural and social capital, are still successfully transmitting this distinct and useful noble cultural and social capital to the profit of the next generation. This success of this socialisation seems to us the best explanation of the strong effect of mothers' noble title on the chances to obtain an elite position by the next generation. The extra effect of mothers' noble title for the nobility seems to us an indication that the noble homogamy within the parental family produces an accumulation of distinct noble cultural and social capital, which gives an extra advantage to the generation born from a homogenous noble family.
2. Noble parents-in-law or noble spouses are still advantages for obtaining elite positions in modern society, both for the nobility as for the high bourgeoisie in the same strength. Our interpretation of this result is that the distinct social capital of the noble family-in-law is an extra advantage equal for both bourgeois and nobility because social capital doesn't require a long socialisation (like cultural capital). The right social capital gives more or less directly entrance to closed influential circles and concealed useful information, thank to the good noble connections of the parent-in-law or to their well-known noble name. There are indications that this advantage of having noble parent-in-law is smaller for the younger generations.

Given these conclusions, it is necessary to analyse the marriage patterns between Dutch nobility and high bourgeoisie, born in the 20th century, more detailed than has been done in the earlier publications of this project. *Analysing marriage patterns between Dutch nobility and high bourgeoisie, born in the 20th century* is the first aim of this paper. We don't have clear hypotheses on the cause of noble homogamy, but we assume that noble homogamy still exists among the Dutch nobility, and that its strength is less among the younger birth-cohorts.

The second aim of this paper is the *introduction of more refined distinctions within Dutch nobility and high bourgeoisie*. It is possible that the dichotomous distinction between nobility and high bourgeoisie is misleading for two different reasons:

1. The social position of lowest level of Dutch nobility (baronet) is more or less equal to that of the average non-noble high bourgeoisie families, as a consequence of the 'bourgeoisisation of the lower nobility'. Seeker (2000: 281) formulates this opinion about the small social distance between Dutch nobility and patricians in her description of the social background of Dutch members of parliament between 1849 and 1998, although without any empirical reference. Within this popular description of the current position of the nobility high bourgeoisie and nobility have become a more or less homogenous category, with some exceptions like the higher nobility (the counts among the Dutch nobility) and the patrician families which have reached that position recently. If this 'bourgeoisisation of the lower

nobility' thesis is correct, a dichotomy between nobility/high bourgeoisie is misleading and a more refined scaling of both categories would show a large overlap between both.

2. The oldest and most distinguished high bourgeoisie are more or less 'ebenbürtig' (equal birth) with the higher levels (baron; count) of Dutch nobility, because they are cadet branches of higher Dutch nobility or have traditionally intermarried into these noble families. This thesis was put forward to the first author during a 2001 meeting of the Knighthood of Gelderland (one of the Dutch provinces) by one of its eldest members Jhr. J.J.G. Beelaarts van Blokland.

For these two reasons a growing part of the nobility incorporated successfully the main characteristics of high bourgeoisie into its own cultural capital during the 20th century and by doing so was able to maintain its position in a modern society. As a consequence the distinction between nobility and high bourgeoisie has become less important and the overlap between the social position of important parts of nobility and high bourgeoisie has become stronger.

Dutch nobility and high bourgeoisie

The nobility in the Netherlands has always predominantly been a civil (noblesse de robe) rather than a military (noblesse d'épée) or a landed one, whereas in Belgium, Germany, France and the United Kingdom the military and landed nobility dominated (Kuiper 1993, Schmidt 1986). The first reason for this difference is that during the era of the Dutch Republic, the predecessor of the present Kingdom of the Netherlands, between 1580 and 1795, new appointments or additions to the domestic nobility were impossible (Israel 1995: 337-341). Members of the Dutch military nobility were few and far between as officers were usually recruited from abroad. Neither was the position of a landed nobleman in the poorer rural provinces attractive to the wealthy citizens from the economically successful Provinces of Holland and Zeeland. The second reason is the policy with regard to nobility in the new Kingdom of the Netherlands in the 1820s and 1830s (Bruin 1992: 125). This policy was designed to disentangle the legacy of late 18th century political disputes between the Orangists (supporters of Oranje-Nassau, the new royal family) and the Patriots (republican citizens; Schama 1977). It tried to secure the loyalty from the urban Regents (rich merchant and bankers families who ruled many cities throughout the Netherlands) by raising them to the status of aristocrats. New grants of Dutch noble titles have become extremely rare since the early 20th century and since 1994 new grants of nobility (even through acknowledgement or inclusion) have been made virtually impossible by law, because Dutch parliament believed that nobility is an historical relict and thus saw any new addition as undesirable. Life peers (noble titles, only valid for the lifetime of the raised person) have never existed in the Netherlands, contrary to the United Kingdom and Belgium. Finally, sons or daughters can inherit a noble title from their father, but a mother cannot pass on her noble title to her children (which, by the way, is an example of unequal legal treatment of women in the Netherlands).

As a result of the policy by the first Kings in the first half of the nineteenth century, members of ruling families from cities in the Province of Holland were more often awarded with a knighthood or baronetcy, whereas the nobles from the rural provinces secured more frequently a peerage. Thus almost all the Regent families from Amsterdam

in our sample have a baronetcy. In contrast with other European societies, this does not automatically make a knighthood or baronetcy an indication of a lower social status than a peerage. Moreover, one of the major consequences was that many people owed their membership of the nobility to governmental or economic abilities rather than to a noble past or culture. Accordingly, the Dutch nobility reflects a strong civil bias. This may explain why references to the Dutch nobility in the study by Lieven (1992) are missing. The rules of the Dutch nobility have a much stronger resemblance with those in Germany and France than with the rules of the British nobility. The Dutch noble titles and the way to inherit them (both older and younger branches of a noble family) are in line with the German and French procedures. This resemblance is reflected in the fact that descendants from the British nobility will less likely be included into Dutch nobility than members of continental nobility, due to the deviant nobility procedures in the UK.

Not all members of the Dutch high society possess a noble title. Some Regent families, who took part in municipal, provincial and national government for many decades in the past, refused to receive a noble title, because they thought nothing of it (Bruin 1981). At the end of the 19th century they still called themselves proudly patricians. Other families were members of this Patriciaat because they had the same socially recognized prestige as the nobility but for one reason or another were never raised to a noble title. Even in the same family we can find separate lineages with and without a noble title. In general, the families who are these days registered as Patriciaat participated in prestigious councils, in governmental offices or other meritorious public positions for at least three generations. However, there is one conspicuous difference between nobility and patricians. As we will see all members of the nobility are officially registered, whereas the registration of patrician families is to a certain extent arbitrary and biased (Bruin & Schmidt 1980). A consequence of the high criteria (meritorious public position for at least three generations) the inclusion of families into the Nederland's Patriciaat, (especially families included after 1945) is biased towards having more elite positions by these high bourgeoisie families as compared to the noble families, because these high criteria don't apply to these noble families for their registration in the Nederland's Adelsboek. Thus if we compare Dutch nobility and high bourgeoisie families by using both registrations, we have a conservative test of a noble advantage as a consequence this bias.

Data

Information on the life course of all members of the Dutch nobility has been published by the Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie in The Hague. In compiling the various editions of the Nederland's Adelsboek (the so-called Red Books), the Bureau uses all information available on the genealogies of Dutch noble families (see for the origins of the Adelsboek in 1903 Bruin & Schmidt 1980). The Bureau also invests considerable efforts in tracing all members of a particular family, even if emigration or social decline has reduced the need for listing them in the Nederland's Adelsboek. We believe that the Bureau's approach has yielded far more complete and representative data for this group than even the best questionnaire or a survey would have produced. The members of the nobility themselves, or their direct relatives, report their university degrees, occupation and circle of employment, public offices, memberships of major governmental councils, positions at the Royal Court, and memberships of knightly orders and those of their spouses. The

Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie verifies many of these data from sources as the Staatsalmanak [State Directory]. Since all parties involved are aware of the fact that the collected data are intended for publication, it is unlikely that people provide unreliable information. Moreover, social pressure from the family will deter a member from reporting a university degree, which is not actually obtained, or public offices or other functions not truly held. Although people are obviously more inclined to report the peak of their careers than the lowest point, this practice will certainly not distort our analysis, which is focused on elite positions. On the other hand, we have observed less honourable places of employment and offices in the Nederland's Adelsboek as well. For instance, nearly all members from one of the oldest noble families in our sample born in the 20th century are farmers, blue-collar workers or low-level employees with no connection to their noble past.

From our sources we have selected a research population that consists of all persons born after 1899 and who belong to a family whose name starts with a letter between the letters 'G' and 'Na'. Only the genealogies of these lineages have been published in the volumes of the Nederland's Adelsboek that have appeared between 1993 and 2000. They provide the most recent and complete information on the life course of the sons and daughters. We have not included the royal family and its branches (including de Bourbon de Parma) because of their special status within Dutch society. We have not added or omitted any information to these easily available publications either. Because the first letter of the surname is not connected with any social characteristic, our research population can be seen as a random sample of all nobles who were born after 1899. However, the process of gathering data about the life courses did not end at the same moment for all persons: the gathering of information on individuals whose surname starts with a 'G' ended in 1992, while data on individuals whose surname begins with an 'M' were gathered until the year 1999.

We included all persons irrespectively in which country they were born, lived or died because a noble title (as a pre-modern characteristic) does not depend on nationality or place of birth. This might lead to some underestimation of the importance of social and cultural capital of the nobility, because we do not exclude branches of families who have emigrated a long time ago and thus have left behind to a large extent their Dutch social network and lifestyle. The sample contains 113 noble families. In order to distinguish the sampled persons from their parents, we will call them sons or daughters (or children), as they are our units of analysis. We have used the same volumes again to collect information on the parents, the spouse, and the parents-in-law of the sons and daughters. By definition the data of the fathers are as complete as those of the children. The data on the mothers have nearly the same quality and comprehensiveness. The data on spouses have the same comprehensiveness as those on the mothers. But they are less complete. It is not always clear whether this is due to a lack of information or simply to the fact that children have remained unmarried. The data on the parents-in-law of the sons or daughters have the lowest comprehensiveness, because we have only their names, academic and noble titles. Therefore, it might well be that these titles of parents-in-law are underreported.

The Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie also publishes the Nederlands's Patriciaat (the so called Blue Books), our source of the High Bourgeoisie. The first four volumes appeared in the year 1910-1913 (Bruin & Schmidt 1980) and the independent policy by

this Bureau to include a particular family has at the present become somewhat more open than at the beginning. The way these volumes are compiled differs from the Nederland's Adelsboek, because there exists no clear-cut rule which families should be included in the publications. In the beginning the Nederland's Patriciaat gave lists and genealogies of those families which were considered as 'ebenbürtig' (equally-born) to the Dutch nobility but which had for various reasons (for instance a cadet branch) no noble title. Nowadays inclusion follows partly tradition, but new meritorious criteria have been introduced as well, based on particular elite positions attained by members of a particular family. Nevertheless, the fact that families are mentioned in the Nederland's Patriciaat is still a reliable indication that they belong to the well-established and traditional high bourgeoisie in the Netherlands. But some families with a high status in society might be missing, because they don't want to be included or they don't value it enough to contribute financially to the publication of 'their' volume. We have sampled families from the volumes published between 1993 and 1999, which is about the same period as the used issues of the Nederland's Adelsboek. Each of the volumes lists the complete genealogy of a number of families in alphabetical order. The large majority of the genealogies in the used volumes is up-to-date revisions of genealogies of families, published in earlier volumes. Our sample is thus not biased to newer patrician families. This sample contains 78 patrician families. Nothing in the way our source is compiled suggests a valid reason to believe that these families deviate from the entire population of patrician families. The completeness and quality of the information on each person in these volumes is entirely the same as the Nederland's Adelsboek provides. Therefore, we are able to use completely comparable variables for both groups of families in our analyses.

Unfortunately, the Nederland's Adelsboek nor the Nederland's Patriciaat give any information, next to the occupation on the wealth of the families and its members. Neither there exist reliable sources for information on this wealth elsewhere in the Netherlands. But given the history and background of Dutch nobility and Patriciaat there is no reason to believe that the wealth of Dutch nobility is larger than that of high bourgeoisie. One will hardly find any noble person on the recent lists of the 100 richest persons of the Netherlands.

The following variables will be used:

1. Ranking of family of son or daughter within nobility or patriciaat. The ranking of a noble family within nobility is more or less self-evident. We use the title, which runs from low to high: baronet; baron; count. With a very few exceptions, which are not included into our sample, there don't exist outside the royal family Dutch nobility with rankings higher than count. Due to the republican past of the Netherlands and the nobilisation of many families shortly after 1813, year of nobilisation is not a useful distinction. The ranking of a patrician family is based on the changes in the policies of inclusion families into the *Nederland's Patriciaat*. We made the following categories from low to high: New patrician (family included for the first time after 1940); Old patrician (family included for the first time after 1918 and before 1940); Quasi-nobility (family included for the first time before 1919).

2. Decade in which the son or daughter was born, which runs from the first decade (1900-1909) until the decade 1990-2000.
3. Tertiary education degree of the son or daughter, his or her spouse, both parents and parents-in-law. These variables reflect the university or other tertiary education degrees of the son or daughter, his or her partner, his or her parents and the combination of his or her parents-in-law. In the case of mothers, parents-in-law and to lesser degree spouses, these variables have to be derived from their academic titles, which might lead to an underestimation of the vocational college diplomas. We were able to use the profession or occupation, which gave additional information on vocational college diplomas, for a more precise coding of the acquired educational level of the sons or daughters and their father.
4. Ranking of the spouse and of the mother of the son or daughter. We apply the same categories as for the son or daughter. If the non-noble family of the mother was not included in the Nederland's patriciaat that person got the ranking of citizen, a category below new patrician. The few noble titles higher than count are coded as count. Foreign noble titles are coded in the same way as Dutch noble titles.
5. Highest ranking of both parents-in-law of the son or daughter. Categories are equal to that of spouse. The highest ranking of both parents is used and a ranking within nobility is higher than in patriciaat.
6. Elite position within the household of son or daughter, or his or her parents. To establish whether the individual has an elite position involves his or her place of employment, public offices and the like. In this study we apply a combination of the restricted and the broad description of the elite position concept. We also try several other operationalizations, but all produce analogous results. The restricted and broad description is the one already used by Dronkers and Hillege (1998), Dronkers (2003) and Dronkers & Schijf (2002). It comprises Governmental Ministers, Members of both Houses of Parliament and the Council of State, the highest ranking civil servants of governmental Departments, Commissioners of the King for a province, Mayors of the provincial capitals and of Amsterdam and Rotterdam, the most important Dutch ambassadors, members of the Royal Court, Managers of members of the Supervisory Boards of large companies, banks and industrial enterprises, the second highest ranking civil servants of Departments; members of the Provincial Executive; City Council members; mayors; ambassadors at less important posts; high-ranking officials at international organizations; military officers holding at least the rank of general or vice admiral; professors; and senior managers of large companies or banks. Occupations and positions of which the social significance could not be established unambiguously have been omitted from the description of elite to avoid distorting the analyses. These include unspecified heads at departments and universities; managers of hardly known or small firms; unspecified entrepreneurs, merchants and bankers; advisors and self-employed individuals. Therefore, our list of elite positions is a conservative estimate of the elite positions possessed by the sons and daughters. We have constructed the variable elite position in the household of son or daughter through a combination of the elite position of a son or daughter and his or her partner. The same procedure we applied to construct

the variables elite position in parental household and in household of parents-in-law.

Analyses

Table 1 gives information on the distribution. As a consequence of our data collection sons or daughters cannot be a citizen, but must have a ranking within nobility or patriciaat. Everybody has a mother but information on the family name 21 mothers was missing. Only 54,5% of all sons and daughters is married, which is not amazing because also the very young are included in the analysis if possible. The first column of table 1 gives the rang-order of a nobility-citizen scale, which runs from the lowest rang (citizen) to the highest rang (count of more) and which we will test and used in the coming analyses in order to measure the social distances between nobility, patricians and citizens.

Table 2 is the homogamy table for the sons or daughters and their spouse. The first number within a cell is the observed number with that combination, the second number is the expected number, if there was no relation between the ranking with nobility and patriciaat of son or daughter on the one hand and the ranking with nobility and patriciaat of the spouse on the other hand. The larger the discrepancy between both numbers the stronger the relation between both rankings, especially in that combination. If the observed number is higher than the expected number that combinations occurs more than by pure chance, if the observed number is lower than the expected number that combinations occurs less than by pure chance. The combinations count with count, count with baron, baron with baron, baronet with baron, and baronet with count happen far more often than one might expect. The combinations count with old patrician or with new patrician, baron with old patrician or with new patrician, and baronet with new patrician happen fare less often than one might expect. The overall rang correlation is .13 (table 4), which is clearly significant and substantial, special if one would take into account the differences in volumes between the patriciaat and nobility and the rest of the Dutch population.

Table 3 is the homogamy table for the fathers and mothers of the sample. The results of this table 3 are one generation older than those of table 2. The overall rang correlation of this older generation is higher (.18) than that of the younger generation (table 4). The combinations baronet with baron, baronet with count, baron with baron, baron with count, and count with count happen far more often than one might expect. The combinations new or old patrician and count, quasi-nobility and count, baronet and new patrician, and baron with new or old patrician happen fare less often than one might expect.

Table 4 shows the degree of noble/bourgeois homogamy on the citizen-nobility scale: the higher the correlation the higher the homogamy. It is higher for the older generation than for the younger: parents versus respondent (.18; .13); born before 1940 or after (.15; .11). So, there is a clear decline in homogamy. But the decline is stronger for the two parental generations (.27; .12) than for the two generations of our sample (.15; .11). This suggests that the generation, born between 1910 and 1940 had the strongest tendency not longer to

follow the strong homogamy, which the generation born before 1910 still adhered, while the generation born after 1940 continued to have the moderate homogamy level of earlier generation. For this point of view the rebellious generation was not the post-war boom generation, but the more 'silent' interwar-generation.

The decline is also stronger for daughters (.17; .09) than for sons (.13;.13). Daughters homogamy came down from a higher level than sons for those born before 1940 (.17; .13) to a lower level than sons for the generation born after 1940 (.09; .13). This suggests that the citizen-nobility ranking has become far less attractive and interesting for male than for females.

Table 5 computes the social distances between the categories within the citizen-nobility rankings, based on the marriage pattern of the sons and daughters, their parents and their parents-in-law. The more or less equal discrimination measures of the variables show that they have a more or less equal importance for constructing the ranking order and the social distances between the categories.

The values of the categories of these ranking underline that a ranking order exists, although the distances within the citizen and patrician side of the citizen-nobility scale are smaller than within the nobility side. Overall the largest distances are found between nobility and patriciaat and not within nobility or patriciaat.

Quasi-noble patricians belong more to the patriciaat than to the nobility, contrary to the thesis put forward by Beelaerts van Blokland. But the distances between the new and the old patrician are smaller than those between old patrician and quasi-nobility. Moreover the distances between new patrician and citizen are as large as the distances between quasi-nobility and old patrician. This suggests that quasi-nobility (families registered before 1918) are socially a distinctive group from the other patricians. From this point of view Beelaerts van Blokland was partly right: those families which were registered before 1918 in the Nederland's Patriciaat are more closely connected to the Dutch nobility but they are not 'ebenbürtig'.

The distance between old and new patrician indicates that the inclusion policy of the Nederland's Patriciaat has also changed after the Second World War.

Social distance also clearly exists within nobility, with the largest distance between baronet and count. Contrary to the suggestion of some proponents of the 'bourgeoisisation of the nobility thesis' that the differences between noble titles have become obsolete, the results show that this is clearly not the case.

Table 6 has the citizen-noble scale of the spouse (running from citizen to count) as the dependent variable. Models 3 and 4 are the final models.

The negative effect of birth-cohort (the younger the birth cohort, the less nobility tends to marry a spouse with a high score on the citizen-nobility scale) in model 1 & 2 is spurious according these final models. It is the consequence of a decreasing effect of mothers' score on this citizen-nobility scale. Although the effect of mothers' score on this scale is positive, it becomes less in the younger birth-cohort. One can interpret this result as a declining strength of the parental generation in socialising the necessity of noble homogamy. Interesting, no other significant effects of variables or interaction-variables with birth-cohort are found. So, this weakness of the socialising power of the parental generation is the cause of the decline of noble and patrician homogamy.

The higher the score of a respondent on the citizen-nobility scale the higher the probability to marry a spouse with a higher score on this scale. The absent of the significant interaction-variable 'birth-cohort*respondent score on citizen-nobility scale' tells us that this tendency to homogamy don't decrease over time. Combined with the earlier result on the weakening socialising power of parents, this tells us that the decreasing effect of homogamy cannot be explained by a rebellious younger generation of nobles and patricians.

Male nobles and patricians married, compared with their female counterpart, less high-scaled wives, but this is less strong for males with a university degree. But on the whole female still married more upward on the citizen-nobility scale, while male marry more downwards. The absent of the significant interaction-variable 'birth-cohort*gender' tells us that this gender bias in marrying down or up don't decrease over time. This can be interpreted as a sign that the social distances between citizens, patricians and nobility are still alive and kicking.

Respondents with parents in elite position and who score high on the citizen-nobility scale (thus by this combination coming from the upper-class) have a higher tendency to marry a spouse with a high score on the citizen-nobility scale than those respondents whose parents don't combine these two characteristics. This suggests that noble and patrician homogamy is not a compensation strategy of falling middle class patricians or nobles, but still a social relevant phenomenon connected with the highest strata of society.

Table 7 analyses whether a high score on the citizen-noble has still social relevance outside the marriage. The dependent variable in this table 7 is the whether the respondent or his/her spouse has obtained an broad or restricted elite position (=elite position in household). This analysis is restricted to those persons who have been born before 1951 because we assume that these persons have enough time to obtain an elite position. Given the data-gathering period of the processed issues of the *Nederland's Adelboek* and the *Nederland's Patriciaat*, a person born in 1950 was between 42 and 49 years old at the moment of registration of his current occupation. This young age might lead to an underestimation of the elite positions still to be obtained by those born in the 1940s, because most persons will normally reach an elite position at an age older than 50 years. But we prefer to keep those born between 1940 and 1950 in our analysis, because it is the first generation born after the Second World War. With this selection we follow the same selection procedure as Dronkers (2000) and Dronkers & Schijf (2002) used.

The negative effect of male indicates that female nobles or patricians have a higher probability that males with the same characteristics to obtain an elite position herself or to have a spouse with an elite-position. Given the relative small number of females with elite positions of their own, this suggest that upward marrying by females is socially successful and that female nobles or patricians tend to marry more ambitious male persons (either noble, patrician or citizen). The significant interaction variable 'male*birth cohort' suggests that is difference between male and female nobles and patricians becomes more pronounced in the younger birth cohorts. This is again an indication that marriage strategies, among others based upon the social and cultural capital of nobility and high bourgeoisie, are not phenomena of the past that are dwindling away, but are still alive also among the younger generations. Males with a university

degree have far higher probability on obtaining elite positions, while an university degree has no positive effect for females. This suggests again that obtaining an elite position by males is mainly within their own career for which they need an university education, while obtaining an elite position by females is mainly within their marriage for which they don't need an university education.

The two final models show that the position of the respondent on the citizen-nobility scale doesn't give a higher probability on an elite position, controlled for the other independent variables. The openness of elite positions is equal for new patricians as for counts. But a high score on that citizen-nobility scale combined with a high score of the mother on that scale does increase that probability on an elite position. Also having parents-in-law with a high score on that scale increases that probability. Both results suggest that noble and patrician homogamy, special in the parental generation, is helpful for the social position of the next generation, more than their own position with nobility or high bourgeoisie.

The positive effect of the interaction-variable 'male*parents elite position' shows that there still exists an intergenerational transition of elite positions in a modern society like the Netherlands, but only for males.

The main difference between these result of table 7 and a analogous analyses with the dichotomy patrician-nobility of sons and daughters in stead of their position on the citizen-nobility scale (Schijf, Dronkers, George, 2002; table 4) is that this dichotomy had a positive and significant effect on the probability of a elite position. This suggests that the distinction patrician-nobility is more important than the differentiation within these classes.

Table 8 repeats the analysis of the social distances between the categories within the citizen-nobility rankings, but not only based on the marriage pattern as in table 5 but also including the elite position in the household and the parental elite position. We restricted this analysis to those persons who have been born before 1951. In these results we can see more detailed the connection between the homogamy within nobility and high bourgeoisie and having elite positions in the own household and in the parental household. The positions of mothers and parents-in-law on the citizen-nobility scale are the strongest variables building the ranking order within nobility and high bourgeoisie, as shown by their discrimination measures. But own and parental elite positions and the citizen-nobility scale of the respondents and spouses fit still within this ranking order of the various categories of high bourgeoisie and nobility, and they don't build a separate dimension. Including the own and parental elite position don't lead to other conclusions than those already obtained by table 5. Overall the largest distances are found between nobility and high bourgeoisie and not within them. Contrary to the suggestion of some authors that the differences between noble titles have become obsolete, the results show that this is clearly not the case.

Conclusion

Homogamy in marriage is clearly an important mean for Dutch nobility to maintain its distinct social position during the 20th century. The importance of the position of mothers and of the parents-in-law on the citizen-nobility scale are clear indications of this importance of homogamy within both nobility and high bourgeoisie, both for the marriage choice of the next generation and for the probability to obtain a elite position by that next generation.

There are clear indications that this homogamy within nobility and high bourgeoisie is still a live and kicking, also for the younger generations. Especially the still increasing gender difference in marrying upward and downward is such an indication. But also the stable importance of the position of mothers and of the parents-in-law on the citizen-nobility scale for obtaining elite positions are other indications of that current relevance.

However, the degree of homogamy within nobility and high bourgeoisie has been decreasing during the 20th century. But our results suggest that this decline was stronger for the 'silent' interwar-generation than for the post-war baby-boom generation. Although the homogamy with nobility and high bourgeoisie is still decreasing the tempo of the decrease is less fast for the younger generations than for the generation born between 1918 and 1940.

There exist refined differences within Dutch nobility and patriciat, which are reflected into their marriage pattern, indicating still relevant social distances between these refined categories. But the mayor distinction remains the social distance between nobility and patrician and that difference has a stronger predicting power than a more refined scale, both for marriage and obtaining elite positions. The overriding importance of the nobility-patrician distinction above refined distinction within these two groups contradicts the popular 'bougeoisiation of the nobility' thesis.

List of earlier publications of the Dutch nobility in the 20th century project

Dronkers, J., 2003. "Has the Dutch Nobility retained its Social Relevance during the 20th Century?" *European Sociological Review* 19:81-96.

Dronkers, J., 2001. "Differences between and within urban and rural twentieth-century Dutch nobility." *The Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences* 37:155-168.

Dronkers, J. & Schijf, H. (2002). "The transmission of elite positions among the Dutch nobility during the 20th Century," paper presented at the 10th Sociaal-wetenschappelijke Studiedagen, Amsterdam: 30-31 May 2002. Will be published in: Eckart Conze & Monika Wienfort (eds.), *Adel und Moderne. Deutschland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert im europäischen Vergleich*, Wien/Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 2004. Available on: <http://www.iue.it/Personal/Dronkers>

Schijf, H., Dronkers, J. & George, J. *The transmission of elite positions within Dutch noble and high bourgeoisie families during the 20th century*. Paper presented for the *Session Family processes and stratification 1* of RC28 on Social Stratification, XV World Congress of Sociology, Brisbane, 7-13 July 2002. Available on: <http://www.iue.it/Personal/Dronkers>. A Dutch version will be published in Meindert

Fennema & Huibert Schijf (eds.), *Nederlandse elites in de twintigste eeuw*. [Dutch elites in the 20th century]. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2004.

Other literature

Bruin, K. & K. Schmidt (1980). "Zur Genealogie der Genealogie. Over het boekstaven van 'aanzienlijkheid' in het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden [On the registration of Dutch High Society], *Sociologische Gids*, 26, 274-292.

Bruin, K. (1981). "Kwesties of Stand. Over de opname in de adelstand van Amsterdamse patriciërs in de 19^{de} eeuw" [Matters of Status, the raising of Patricians in nineteenth century Amsterdam], *Sociologische Gids*, 27, 110-140.

Bruin, K. (1992). "Adelsbeleid in Nederland. Notities bij recente ontwikkelingen" [Nobility policy in the Netherlands. Notes on current developments], *Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift*, 18, 119-133.

Dronkers, J. & Hillege, S.M.M. (1998). "Board Membership of Traditional Male Fraternities and Access to Dutch Elites: A Disappearing Avenue to Elite Positions?," *European Sociological Review*, 14, 191-204.

Israel, J. (1995). *The Dutch Republic. Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kuiper, Y. (1993). *Adel in Friesland 1780-1888* [Nobility in Friesland]. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff/Egbert Forsten.

Lieven, D. (1992). *The Aristocracy in Europe 1815-1914*. Houndsmills: Macmillan.

Schama, S. (1977). *Patriots and Liberators. Revolution in the Netherlands 1780-1813*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Seeker, I. (2000). Representatives of the Dutch People: The Smooth Transformation of the Parliamentary Elite in a Consociational Democracy 1849-1998. In: H. Best & M. Cotta (eds.). *Parliamentary Representatives in Europe 1848-2000. Legislative Recruitment and Careers in Eleven European Countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, C. (1986). *Om de eer van de familie. Het geslacht Teding van Berkhout 1500-1950; een sociologische benadering*. [The honour of the family. The family Teding van Berkhout 1500-1950; a sociological approach]. Amsterdam: Bataafse Leeuw.

Table 1. The distribution in percentages of our sample of Dutch nobility and high bourgeoisie, their mothers, spouses and family-in-law on a scale running from citizen to count or higher

	Sons or Daughters	Mothers	Spouse = father-in-law	Family-in-law = father & mother
Citizen	-	58,2	64,4	44,9
New patrician	23,6	8,7	8,5	9,8
Old patrician	20,9	13,2	11,3	18,0
Quasi-nobility	17,2	9,4	7,9	16,3
Baronet	24,1	6,5	4,6	5,7
Baron	12,6	3,2	2,5	3,9
Count or higher	1,6	0,7	0,8	1,3
Total	10375 (100%)	10354 (99,8%)	5655 (54,5%)	5471 (52,7%)

Table 2: The numbers for each combination of our sample of Dutch nobility and high bourgeoisie and their spouses: observed and estimated if no relation between level of sample and spouse

Spouse	Respondent						Total
	New patrician	Old patrician	Quasi-nobility	Baronet	Baron	Count or higher	
Citizen	905/815	779/746	645/643	828/892	424/477	60/69	3641 (64,4%)
New patrician	101/108	108/99	90/85	121/118	57/63	4/9	481 (8,5%)
Old patrician	132/143	134/131	130/113	138/157	93/84	12/12	639 (11,3%)
Quasi-nobility	89/100	91/92	72/79	146/110	45/59	6/9	449 (7,9%)
Baronet	25/59	31/54	30/46	92/64	71/34	13/5	262 (4,6%)
Baron	10/31	11/29	22/25	53/34	36/18	7/3	139 (2,5%)
Count or higher	3/10	4/9	10/8	7/11	15/6	5/1	44 (0,8%)
Total	1265 (22,4%)	1158 (20,5%)	999 (17,7%)	1385 (24,5%)	741 (13,1%)	107 (1,9%)	5655 (100%)

Table 3: The numbers for each combination of the fathers and mothers of our sample of Dutch nobility and high bourgeoisie: observed and estimated if no relation between level of father and mother

Mother	Father						Total
	New patrician	Old patrician	Quasi-nobility	Baronet	Baron	Count or higher	
Citizen	1629 /1427	1302 /1251	1065 /1038	1303 /1452	656/764	75/98	6030 (58,2%)
New patrician	242/214	224/188	120/156	222/218	94/115	3/15	905 (8,7%)
Old patrician	344/324	329/284	251/236	292/330	140/173	13/22	1369 (13,2%)
Quasi-nobility	170/232	189/203	216/168	299/236	96/124	8/16	978 (9,4%)
Baronet	37/158	77/139	85/115	247/161	190/85	32/11	668 (6,5%)
Baron	25/78	21/69	35/57	113/80	115/42	22/5	331 (3,2%)
Count or higher	4/17	6/15	10/13	17/18	20/9	16/1	73 (0,7%)
Total	2451 (23,7%)	2148 (20,7%)	1782 (17,2%)	2493 (24,1%)	1311 (12,7%)	169 (1,6%)	10354

Table 4: The degree of noble/high bourgeois homogamy on the citizen-nobility scales (Spearman rank correlation).

Population	Respondent/Spouse	Father/Mother
Total	.13	.18
Male	.13	.14
Female	.14	.13
Respondent born before 1940	.15	.27
Respondent born after 1940	.11	.12
Son born before 1940	.13	.26
Son born after 1940	.13	.11
Daughter born before 1940	.17	.28
Daughter born after 1940	.09	.12

Table 5: Social distance based on marriage patterns between the categories on the citizen-nobility scale (category quantification of the first dimension of HOMALS)

	Sons or Daughters	Mothers	Spouse	Family-in-law
Citizen	-	-.40	-.39	-.47
New patrician	-.74	-.15	-.01	-.25
Old patrician	-.53	-.11	.14	-.11
Quasi-nobility	-.15	.14	.30	.02
Baronet	.43	1.89	3.25	2.67
Baron	1.08	2.13	3.77	3.37
Count or higher	2.29	2.77	4.04	3.49
Discrimination measure	.47	.53	.59	.59

Table 6: The position on the citizen-nobility scale of the spouse of all married respondents, predicted by the characteristics of the respondents and their parents (standardised effect parameters of multivariate regression)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Respondent citizen-nobility	.17**	.13**	.11**	.10**
Birth cohort	-.12**	-.11**	-.03	
Parents in any elite position		.09**	.04	
Male		-.08**	-.31**	-.18**
University degree respondent		.06*	-.10*	
Mother Citizen-nobility		.16**	.28**	.31**
Mother Citizen-nobility * birth cohort			-.16**	-.19**
Respondent citizen-nobility * Parents in any elite position			.06*	.10**
University degree respondent * male			.32*	.13**
Adjusted R ²	.04	.09	.10	.10

**p<0.01; *p<0.05

Table 7: Likelihood of an elite position within household of married children (N= 4017) born before 1951 (effect parameters of logistic regression)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Respondent citizen-nobility	1.10**	1.07*	1.05	1.31	
Birth cohort	.88**	.85**	.84**	.80**	
Parents in any elite position		1.37**	1.24*	.92	
Male		.57**	1.08	.25*	.22**
University degree respondent		5.15**	3.97**	2.20**	
Father university degree		1.31**	1.12	1.08	
Mother Citizen-nobility		1.24**	1.18**	1.09	
University degree spouse			3.41**	3.57**	3.60**
University degree parents-in-law			1.74**	1.75**	1.71**
Spouse citizen-nobility					1.07
Parent-in-law Citizen-nobility			1.18**	1.09	1.18**
Respondent Citizen-nobility * birth cohort				1.02	
Respondent Citizen-nobility * parent any elite position				.95	
Respondent Citizen-nobility * university degree				.85*	.96
Respondent Citizen-nobility * parents-in-law citizen-nobility				1.02	
Citizen-nobility * non-noble university educated parents-in-law & spouse				.98	
Respondent Citizen-nobility * mother citizen-nobility				1.02	1.05*
Male * university degree				1.83*	2.34**
Male * birth cohort					.90**
Male * parents elite position				1.33*	1.18**
Nagelkerke R ²	.01	.09	.14	.14	.14
-2 Log likelihood	3395	3019	2820	2803	2809

**p<0.01; *p<0.05

Table 8: Social distance based on marriage patterns and elite positions in own household and parental household, both for the categories on the citizen-nobility scale and the elite positions. (category quantification of the first dimension of HOMALS)

	Sons or Daughters	Mothers	Spouse	Family-in-law	Elite position in own household	Elite position in parental household
Citizen	-	-.39	-.46	-.55		
New patrician	-.47	-.21	.05	-.24		
Old patrician	-.36	-.03	.18	-.06		
Quasi-nobility	-.25	.08	.30	.04		
Baronet	.35	1.36	2.73	2.32		
Baron	.82	1.76	2.66	2.48		
Count or higher	1.34	1.58	1.99	1.85		
No elite position					-.14	-.22
Broad elite position					.65	.73
Restricted elite position					2.04	1.40
Discrimination measure	.24	.67	.39	.68	.17	.19