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In *Religion, Class and the Postwar Development of the Dutch Welfare State* (Amsterdam University Press, 2019), Dennie Oude Nijhuis describes the transformation of the Netherlands from ‘laggard’ to ‘leader’ among welfare states in the advanced political economies. Oude Nijhuis, an Assistant Professor of history at Leiden University and senior researcher at the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam, offers a comprehensive history of the Dutch welfare state with attention for the most important public welfare reforms since the Second World War. Particular emphasis is placed on the introduction of social insurance programs for old-age, unemployment, sickness and disability. The author consulted several archival collections in the Netherlands, including those of the Dutch union and employer federations, the main confessional political parties and several (semi-)public agencies tasked with welfare administration. The result is a *tour-de-force* around the most important developments in the Dutch welfare state over the course of the twentieth century until the most recent debates on pension reform and precarious employment.

The book is a welcome addition to the relatively small number of English-language publications on the political economy of the Dutch welfare state, the most well-known of which (Cox’s *The Development of the Dutch Welfare State* and Visser and Hemerijck’s “*A Dutch Miracle”*) are already several decades old. Since then, international scholarly attention to the Dutch welfare state has been limited. In the first section of the book, Oude Nijhuis makes a convincing argument why this lack of attention is unwarranted: the relative generosity of the Dutch welfare state coupled with its solidaristic features towards low-income workers has been largely carried by the middle classes, yet strong opposition seems to have been absent. The author explains this “act of asymmetric solidarity” by emphasizing the confluence of a political dominance of Christian democracy and the sectoral organization of the Dutch labour movement. In the following two book sections, Oude Nijhuis covers the post-war expansion of the Dutch welfare state and its subsequent retrenchment from the 1980s onwards.

In the chapters on welfare expansion, Oude Nijhuis details how the emphasis on personal responsibility and the strict adherence to actuarial principles by confessional parties and unions acted as a break on the development of a compulsory and strongly redistributive social insurance system in the pre-war years. The subsequent weakening of these ideas in the post-war period then served as one of two catalysts for broad welfare reform. The other driving force – the end to wage moderation in the 1960s – created opportunities for unions and employers to agree on public protections against old-age pensions, unemployment and disability benefits, among others, as these would be financed from the margin of pay increases. Unions had the upper hand in Oude Nijhuis’ narrative, increasingly finding support within Parliament, to whom employers were forced to acquiesce.

Most notable in the second section of the book is the author’s discussion of the severe inactivity crisis of the 1980s and the 1990s, which he convincingly presents as the unintended consequence of the expansionary trajectory in prior decades. Mass withdrawal from the labour market through disability and early retirement schemes pushed confessional politicians towards the right and strengthened the position of employers. These actors supported the subsequent move of the Dutch welfare state towards privatization and activation, as similarly witnessed in other advanced political economies. *Contra* scholars like Paul Pierson, Oude Nijhuis argues that the political dynamics of retrenchment were not fundamentally different from those of its expansion: as before, political parties (especially those on the right-wing) benefited from new electoral opportunities, while the social partners continued to be important interlocutors for policy-makers.

Nonetheless, Oude Nijhuis stays relatively close to the existing scholarship by focusing on formal legislative changes within the welfare state and by identifying unions, employers, and political parties as the main instigators of welfare reform. The author’s own observations on the significance of conflicts *within* these organizations largely go unexplored – a logical consequence of the choice for historical breadth. Questions on how ideas around religion or class informed those representing religious and socio-economic interests in Dutch politics are therefore left open-ended, despite what the book title suggests. Another consequence is the book’s strong focus on the *insiders* of the Dutch welfare state, despite growing attention among welfare state scholars for its dualizing features. This begs the question if the book’s highly positive assessment of the Dutch welfare state’s outcomes can be maintained if, say, the position of women or migrant workers would be more extensively covered.

Still, *Religion, Class, and the Postwar Development of the Dutch Welfare State* will serve as an excellent resource for scholars and students of the welfare state. Those familiar with this scholarship will appreciate this new contribution to the longstanding debate on the *status aparte* of the Dutch welfare state; others without such familiarity will welcome the comprehensiveness with which Oude Nijhuis has charted its historical trajectory.
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