

## Provo movement and its influence on the City of Amsterdam

Kryštof Zeman, Praha

November 1998

### **Historical and social background**

Dutch society historically consists of two main groups of Catholics and Calvinist Protestants. The Dutch were often merchants, so they had to work with other different groups of people. These groups had to live together, while having different opinions and values. The recipe for succeeding to do that was (according to Elteren 1994) to apply pragmatism and tolerance and to apply the model of "LAT-relation": Living Apart Together. However, while in the modern sense of LAT, the "Apart" refers to the geographic and the "Together" to the social dimension, it was applied by the Dutch inversely: the "Apart" referring to the social and the "Together" to the geographic dimension. In the middle of the last century another group appeared: the religiously neutral liberals, followed by the socialists at the turn of the century, although the last were not represented in the government until after the World War Two. Dutch society was "pillarised", each group forming a pillar. The groups lived peacefully together, but without real contact.

The end of the World War Two was brought the beginning of big social changes in Europe and the product of industrialisation, migration, urbanisation and secularisation was the change from a very restrictive towards a more permissive and tolerant society. The rapid economic growth caused decreasing of the proportion of the population employed in agrarian sector and increasing of the proportion of people working in service sector, as well as the proportion of students in the population. The Netherlands evolved into a modern industrialised society. A larger social mobility and a liberalisation within the cultural and intellectual sphere caused levelling of social differences in the Netherlands. Higher schooling and increased access to information made people more independent.

According to Elteren (1994), there were four kinds of youth in the Netherlands in the first half of the sixties: a small group of radical anti-bourgeois idealists, tradition orientated "organised youth", consumption-oriented "ordinary youth" and the nozems: "Born out of the post-war economic boom, the nozems were disaffected Dutch teens armed with consumer spending power. Part mods, part 50's juvenile delinquents, they spent most of their time cruising the streets on mopeds, bored stiff and not knowing what to do. Their favourite past-time? Raising trouble and provoking the police." <sup>1</sup> More and more youth lived independently and believed less in contemporary rigid values: "While their parents – seated on refrigerators and washing-machines, with a mixer in one hand and the daily tabloid *De Telegraaf* in the other – were watching THE TEEVEE with their left eye and THE CAR out in front with their right, the children betook themselves to the Spui on Saturday evenings".<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Voeten, 1990

<sup>2</sup> Harry Mulisch: Report to the King Rat, in Delta 1967

## Beginnings of Provo

On the Spui on Saturday midnights, artist Robert Jasper Grootveld held anti-smoking happenings starting in June 1964. He held them round 'Het lieverdje', statue of a little boy, which was donated by Peter Stuyversant cigarette company. On the beginning of next year the Provo group appeared as a fusion of a small group of youths around Robert Jasper Grootveld and the pacifist Ban-the-bomb movement that had protested against the Cold War policy and nuclear arms race. Introverted intellectual Roel van Duyn was the theorist in this group, influenced by anarchism, Dadaism, German philosopher (and counter-culture guru) Herbert Marcuse, and the Marquis de Sade.

Provos borrowed their name from Wouter Buikhuisen, who presented at Utrecht University in January 1965 the doctoral dissertation about "young trouble-makers", called one of the 'nozems' categories "street nozems' or 'provos'. In Provo, there was formulated the state of mind of independent youth: scepticism of an authoritative system and protest against *status quo*. "Welfare states, with their external education system, are always high on the list for possible generational conflicts of the beatnik type. The combination of rapid technological change and continuous political apathy leads easily to that kind of protest." <sup>3</sup> Provo was influenced by American expressive style and symbolic imaginary and it was non-violence and mostly non-authority movement.

The first issue of *Provo* magazine appeared the 12 July 1965. The "Provo manifesto" was written by Roel van Duyn and the issue contained also recipes for bombs, reprinted from a nineteenth-century anarchist pamphlet. The issue had an immediate success, before it was confiscated. In *Provo#12* was this magazine introduced as: "*Provo* is a monthly sheet for anarchists, provos, beatniks, pleiners, scissors-grinders, jailbirds, simple simon stylites, magicians, pacifists, potato-chip chaps, charlatans, philosophers, germ-carriers, grand masters of the queen`s horse, happeners, vegetarians, syndicalists, santy clauses, kindergarten teachers, agitators, pyromaniacs, assistant assistants, scratchers and syphilitics, secret police, and other riff-raff. *Provo* has something against capitalism, communism, fascism, bureaucracy, militarism, professionalism, dogmatism, and authoritarianism. *Provo* has to choose between desperate, resistance and submissive extinction. *Provo* calls for resistance wherever possible. *Provo* realises that it will lose in the end, but it cannot pass up the chance to make at least one more heartfelt attempt to provoke society. *Provo* regards anarchy as the inspirational source of resistance. *Provo* wants to revive anarchy and teach it to the young. *Provo* is an image."

---

<sup>3</sup> Piet Thoenes: The Provos of Holland, in Delta, 1967

Finally, in Provo movement participated four groups of people <sup>4</sup>:

1. *The happeners*. They managed happenings in Amsterdam and Antwerp, scandalising and provoking the police and the bourgeoisie. Happenings combined non-violence with absurd humour and the police was an “essential non-creative elements for a successful happening” and “co-happeners”.
2. *The beatniks and hipsters*. Extremely free peoples with strange dressing and haircut. To some degree, they were all practising escapists, using marihuana, LSD and other hallucinogens to flee society into a private world that is better adapted to their own personal standards.
3. *The thinkers*. People who putted ideas of Provo into publications *Provo*, *Revo*, *Eindelijk*, UvA student weekly *Propria Cures* and other opposition press.
4. *The activists*. The Provos of direct action (“street Provos”), which wanted to mobilisate public opinion in the Provo sense. They joined events that threatened world peace, personal freedom and so on.

### **Provo activities**

The first big incident, through which Provos became famous, was the wedding of Princess Beatrix and German Claus von Amsberg, who was for many Dutch people unacceptable because of his Hitlerjugend membership during the World War Two. The engagement was announced in June, in July Provos throw anti-monarchist pamphlets from a bridge into the royal boat. The monarchy became the ultimate establishment symbol for the Provos to attack. Royal ceremonies offered ample opportunities for satire. During "Princess Day," when an annual ceremonial speech was delivered by the queen, Provo made up a fake speech, in which Queen Juliana declared she'd become anarchist and was negotiating a transition of power with Provo. The wedding day was announced to be on the 10 March.

The Provos spent months preparing for the March wedding. A bank account was opened to collect donations for an anti-wedding present. The White Rumour Plan was put into action. Wild and ridiculous rumours were spread through Amsterdam. It became widely believed that the Provos were preparing to dump LSD in the city water supply, that they were building a giant paint-gun to attack the wedding procession, that they were collecting lion manure to spread along the parade route, and that the royal horses were going to be drugged. A few days before the wedding, all the Provos mysteriously disappeared. They did this simply to avoid being arrested before the big day. Meanwhile, the authorities requested 25,000 troops to help guard the parade route.

Jews protested against wedding in Amsterdam, the city that suffered most from the persecution of the Jews during the World War Two. To make matters worse, the municipal authorities committed a few blunders of their own, among them an attempt to use the Anne Frank House as a temporary police station during the ceremonies. Eighteen of the forty-five town councillors, the three chief rabbis of the Jewish community and representatives of the Amsterdam Students` Association had refused invitations to attend the ceremony.

Provos, dressed up like respectable citizens, managed to sneak their smoke bombs past the police and army guards. The first bombs went off just behind the palace as the procession started. Although the bombs were not really dangerous (they were made from sugar and nitrate) they put out tremendous clouds of smoke, which were viewed on television world-wide. Most of the police had been

---

<sup>4</sup> according to Bernhard de Vries, in *Delta*, 1967

brought in from the countryside, and so were totally unable to identify the Provos. A violent police overreaction ensued, witnessed by foreign journalists, many of whom were clubbed and beaten in the confusion. The wedding turned into a public relations disaster. The week after the wedding, a photo exhibition was held documenting the police violence. The guests at the exhibition were attacked by the police and severely beaten. Public indignation against the police reached new peaks. Many well-known writers and intellectuals began requesting an independent investigation of police behaviour.

Tension increased and it broke 13 June, when a constructor worker Jan Weggelaar had been killed during demonstration <sup>5</sup>. *De Telegraaf* wrote, that he was killed by co-worker and later official autopsy wrote about heart attack, but everybody believed that the man had been killed by police. Second day, a strike was called by construction workers. Large numbers of workers and their sympathisers, including Provos, marched through the city. The building and vehicles of *De Telegraaf* were attacked and on the Dam and Damrak serious battles broke out between strikers and police. Later, 16 July 1966 the chief of the Amsterdam police H. J. van der Molen was dismissed from his post.

Another target of Provo's provocations was the monument of the Dutch colonial general Johannes van Heutsz, who led the Dutch forces to final military victory over the independent state of Achin in Sumatra after a war lasting from 1873 to 1905. For the Provos, Van Heutsz was the symbol of colonialism. The monument was first painted with white colour and finally damaged by bombs, what Provo commented that "although they felt sympathy for the cause, they deeply deplored the use of violence". Provos were also protesting against Vietnam War, which protests and sit-downs were often forcefully broken, mainly by the burgomaster Gijsbert van Hall.

After van Hall had been dismissed on 9 May 1967, Grootveld and Rob Stolk (printer of Provo magazine) decided to liquidate Provo. At the liquidation meeting on 13 May 1967, Stolk said: "Provo has to disappear because all the Great Men that made us big have gone", a reference to Provo's two arch-enemies, Van Hall and Van der Molen. Some of the Provos continued in politics in the anarchistic "Kabouter" party <sup>6</sup>, founded by Roel van Duyn, more later also in Green Party.

### **Provo and the politics**

On 1 June 1966 there were elections for the municipal council. The Provos won over thirteen thousand voices, what means 2,5 % They seated their first candidate, Bernhard de Vries, on the forty-five member council <sup>7</sup>. The election results showed, that Provo was voted (compared with other parties), mainly by men, by voters not affiliated with churches, by younger voters, by voters from higher socio-economic levels and by higher educated voters <sup>8</sup>.

At about the same time crucial changes took place within the domain of party politics. The new political party *Democraten '66* was founded as an expression of disaffection of young people especially with the low democratic quality of politics in the Netherlands as they perceived it. Its leaders shared the

---

<sup>5</sup> The demonstration was held against an administrative decision regarding holiday money. Later, two court decisions have established that the 2% deduction of bonus money was illegal.

<sup>6</sup> Kabouter party continued with the ideas of Provo. In September 1969, they founded the Amsterdam-Kabouterstad and in February 1970 they proclaimed the 'Oranjevrijstaat'.

<sup>7</sup> Next year De Vries resigned and was replaced by Luud Schimmelpenninck.

<sup>8</sup> Der Maesen, *Acta Politica*, April 1967, recapitulated in *Delta*, 1967, pp.110-111

'end of ideology' thesis. D'66 was unprecedentedly successful in the 1967 elections, when it won seven seats in parliament, support certain measures that in some respects are related to the issues raised by Provo (even though they had nothing to do with each other). Besides, within the social democracy party (PvdA) a group arose which dismissed the established ideas and practices of the Old Left within the party. In September 1966 *Nieuw Links* (New Left) challenged the established leaders of the PvdA, with reproaches about unclear premises, conservative traits and the insufficiently democratic quality of the party. Its adherents wished to make the process of political decision-making more transparent, to decentralise power, and strive for greater industrial democracy and a more equitable distribution of incomes. "Provo exerted a strong influence on political culture." (Elteren 1994, pp. 133) But also the extreme right-wing Farmers Party under its leader Hendrik Koekoek (called 'Farmer Cuckoo') had profited from lack of understanding and widespread feeling of disquiet in the second half of the sixties.

### **Provo and drugs**

From the beginning, many people around Provo movement were familiar with drugs, especially marihuana and hallucinogens. "Every weekend in 1962, I paid a visit to a police officer named Houweling," says Grootveld. "During these visits, I often dressed like an American Indian. We always had very friendly chats about marijuana. Houweling didn't know anything about it, so I could tell him anything I wanted." Grootveld with his friends began a misinformation game with police. The idea was to demonstrate the establishment's complete ignorance on the subject of cannabis. They used tea, hay, catfood, spices and herbs instead marihuana and tried to get busted for consuming it. They often called the police on themselves. "One day a whole group of us went by bus to Belgium," says Grootveld. "Of course I had informed my friend Houweling that some elements might take some pot along. At the border, the cops and customs were waiting for us. Followed by the press, we were taken away for a thorough search. The poor cops . . . all they could find was dogfood and some legal herbs. 'Marijuana is dogfood,' joked the papers the next day. After that, the cops decided to refrain from hassling us in the future, afraid of more blunders." <sup>9</sup> This game became the model for future Provo tactics as an effective way of shattering the self-righteousness of the authorities. The police would usually overreact, making themselves seem ridiculous in the process. Later, Grootveld and artist Fred Wessels opened the "Afrikaanse Druk Stoor," where they sold both real and fake pot. On Saturday midnight's happenings, lot of people smoked marihuana and through the extensive media coverage of these events cannabis became associated with civil unrest and as such became a public concern. A lot of Provos also took psychedelic drugs, like mescaline and LSD <sup>10</sup>. Grootveld was campaigning against LSD, as he was campaigning against cigarettes, but Provo philosophy didn't admit it. LSD was favourite for its imagination functions, for creating new situations. Idea, that through LSD, marihuana and peyote one could create a kind of paradise on earth, were propagated by one of the key-figures of the counter-cultural movement, Willem de Ridder, who was an editor of youth magazine *Hitweek*. Clubs Fantasio

---

<sup>9</sup> Voeten, 1990

<sup>10</sup> LSD was brought under the Opium Law and was thus made illegal in 1971. This act of the Government was illegal, because the Opium Law explicitly stated that a new drug could only be brought under this law when this was a necessity due to the ratification by Parliament of an international treaty. Such a treaty concerning LSD did not exist at that time, but panic dictated and nobody objected to the sudden addition of LSD to the list for prohibited drugs by the Minister of Public Health. (Fromberg, 1994)

and Paradiso and – due to a liberal municipal youth policy – many youth hostels and sleep-ins, contributed greatly to Amsterdam's succeeding London and San Francisco as the new 'magical centre' in 1969. "At that time these psychedelic-cosmic recreation centres were thought to be the temples of the beginning of a New Age. Young tourists – mostly middle-class students – and temporary expatriates from the USA, playing the hippie game, put a strong stamp on this international counter-culture." (Elteren 1994, pp.147)

### **Provo plans**

Many Provo activities were concentrated on solving the problem of making Amsterdam more liveable. Their plans were called 'white plans':

*White bicycle plan* - Invented by Luud Schimmelpenninck, who later pushed it as Provo member of the municipal council. The plan claimed closing the centre of Amsterdam (at least the ring of old canals) to all motorised traffic including motorbikes, what would have improved the frequency of public transport by more than 40 % and saved two millions guilders per year. Taxis, as a semi-public means of transport in the city, had to be electrically powered and have maximum speed of 25 m.p.h. The plan assumed buying 20000 white bikes by municipality each year. These bikes would have been the public property and everybody could have used it. Provos themselves offered volunteers painting their bikes into white colour. After city hall rejected the idea, Provos decided to supply bicycles anyhow. They painted the first 50 bikes white and left them on streets for public use. Police afterwards rounded up all the white bikes and impounded them, because of violating the municipal law forbidding citizens to leave bikes without locking them. Provos retaliated with stealing few police bicycles. When Provos finally got their bikes back, they equipped them all with combination locks and then painted the combinations on the bicycles. Later, Schimmelpenninck designed and developed a small electric car, the Witkar. In the mid-seventies, there was an experiment with Witkar as a supplement of taxi. It had to have stations dispersed in centre and the computerised system of payment allowed the collective ownership.

*White chimney plan* was developed to protect environment against discharging alien substances into the air. According to this plan, all fumes had to be painted into white colour, it would be prohibited to discharge radioactive substances, hydrogen sulphide and fluorides and additional charge would be paid for other alien substances. The charge depended on number of inhabitants per acre within a radius of 10 miles of the outlet, on volume of discharged poisonous gases and reversibly on the height of chimney. The temperature of the fumes should have lied 25°C above the acid dew-point of its gases.

*White wives plan* was developed mainly to prevent unwanted pregnancy. The plan claimed for clinics for girls and women, where they can obtain contraceptives and medical advice. Girls of sixteen should have been invited to visit the clinic and the school medical officers should have informed about this clinics. The plan pointed out the irresponsibility of entering marriage as a virgin.

*White chicken plan* to reorganise police (called kip=chicken in Dutch slang). The plan claimed disarmament of police and falling Amsterdam police under the jurisdiction of the municipal council and not the burgomaster. Every municipality would have democratically elected its own chief of police. The future policemen would be rather social worker than guarder.

*White housing plan* adumbrated few possibilities for improving the housing situation. The plan claimed stopping of speculation in house building, postponing the reconstructions after housing crisis slacks off and possibility of using not-used houses for squatters. The plan wanted to keep Waterlooplein as an open-air market and to abandon the project of the new town hall. The plan also recommended using more economical building methods. Later was suggested that this plan should be supplemented by a weekly list of vacant houses, flats and rooms for the use of people seeking living quarters in Amsterdam. *White corpse plan* was written as a disgust on killing pedestrians by cars. The plan claimed building warning memorials – *memento mori* – on the places of traffic accidents by chalking the victims outline, hacking the silhouette one inch deep and filling the hollow with the white mortar. All of this should have been done by the killer.

Also other activities of Provo had often the adjective 'white'. Notes on white poetry from Pieter Beek who claimed for writing of understandable poetry, not only "the intellectual measuring stick or jigsaw puzzle". The White Philosophy considered work (especially mundane factory labour) obsolete.

The concept of New Urbanism had been created by painter, sculptor and architect Constant Nieuwenhuys (born 1920, signs his work only with first name Constant). He was one of the founders of the famous international Cobra group <sup>11</sup> in 1948 and since 1959 he dedicated his many talents to creating new culture of New Babylon. New Babylon is a Utopian concept of the new world of plenty, where man (*homo ludens*) no longer toils, but plays. The name of New Babylon was provocative, since in the Protestant tradition Babylon is a figure of evil. "New Babylon, perhaps, is not so much a picture of the future as a Leitmotiv, the conception of an all-comprehensive culture which is hard to comprehend because until now it could not exist, a culture which, for the first time in history, as a consequence of the automation of Labour, becomes feasible although we do not yet know what shape it will take, and seems mysterious to us." <sup>12</sup> In the sense that he predicted the revolt of *homo ludens*, Constant was the forerunner of Provo.

Constant criticised, that town-planners and architects still tend to think in terms of the four functions of the city as defined by Le Corbusier in 1933: living, working, traffic and recreation. According to Constant, this over-simplification reflects opportunism rather than insight into and appreciation of what people actually want today. That's the reason, why the city is rapidly becoming obsolete. Constant criticised the building of new working-class districts, suitable only for passing the night, when automation and other technological advantages are reducing the demand for manual labour. He criticised the big numbers of cars in towns, which makes themselves practically useless, while more and more of living space is given up to provide parking facilities. The number of parked cars at any moment far exceeds the number on move and use of car loses its major advantage: rapid transport from one place to another. Traffic's invasion leads to violation of the most fundamental human rights. Individuals moving by natural means of locomotion – pedestrians – curtailed their freedom of movement to such an extent that it now amounts less than that of a vehicle. The city is losing its most important function of meeting-place,

---

<sup>11</sup> COBRA was the group made of architects and artists from COpenhagen, BRussels and Amsterdam. Their aim was to renew art, to renew the action of art on life.

<sup>12</sup> Constant, in Delta, 1967, pp. 53

because most of public space is forbidden for pedestrians and they have to seek their social contacts in private houses or commercial cafés and rented halls.

The recreation means recouping the energy lost during the working process. But when there is surplus of energy available for activities other than work, recreation becomes meaningless and will be replaced by creativity. Parks and forests nearby cities are visited by people more to flight from the functional city than to enjoy the beauties of nature. The redevelopment of city centres and the deportation of inhabitants to the suburbs is destroying the strongest 'acculturation zones' in towns. According Constant, garden-cities had its reason in the beginning of century as better living for working class, but they doesn't have anymore. "Isolated housing units marooned in a sea of traffic become ghettos for a population whose sole contact with the rest of the world is through the controlled 'communications' media of press, radio and television." <sup>13</sup> With the disappearing of the need for manual work, it's not necessary to live for a long time on the same place, and the demand for temporary accommodation will be growing. The nature of social development will depend on the way in which the newly released energy is put to use, so in future, man` way of life will be determinated not by profit but by play. In the end of the article, printed in Provo magazine #9, Constant connected the sixties youth revolt and the New urbanism: "The above points explain why the teen-age revolt against the fossilised standards and conditions of the past is aimed chiefly at the recovery of social space – the street – so that the contracts essential for many may be established. Idealists who think that these contacts can be arranged by organising youth clubs, publications, or hiking groups are seeking to substitute prescribed patterns of behaviour for spontaneous initiatives. They are opposed to the most important characteristics of the new generation, creativity – the desire to create a behaviour pattern of their own and ultimately to create a new way of life." <sup>14</sup>

## Conclusions

Notwithstanding that the number of Provo members was never high, it became notoriously known all over the Netherlands and even abroad in short time. Non-violence provocations of their happenings were interesting for lot of people, especially young, who found Provo close to their opinions. Provo became the symbol of protest against conservatism and rigidity in public life. As mentioned above, Provo had strong influence on policy life in the Netherlands. Provo was the symbol of antiimperialism, republicanism and anti-royalism, Provo influenced decentralisation changes in other parties. Also abroad rose groups of anarchist-oriented young people, influenced by Provo ideas. Provo had big credit on dissmision of unpopular chief of the Amsterdam police H. J. van der Molen and burgomaster Gijsbert van Hall. From elections in 1966 Provo had their own deputy at Amsterdam municipal council, who tried to enforce Provo 'white plans'.

The idea of white bikes was experimented in different European cities including Paris. Witkars weren't too successful due to the high cost of production, though in Amsterdam they are not rare. Other white plans and also the concept of New Urbanism has more and more to say to contemporary human being and present policies are going closer and closer in their direction: The air pollution is strongly

---

<sup>13</sup> Constant in Delta, 1967, pp.60

<sup>14</sup> Constant, Provo#9, also in Delta, 1967, pp. 61)

controlled, clinics for women is common thing, policemen are friendly and helpful and squatting under given conditions is possible.

The biggest change has been implemented on the field of drug policy. The Provo opened the question of legalisation of cannabis and abandoning this 'historical relict' of cannabis' criminalisation. The discussion continued through Dutch society. A change of the law was further necessitated by an incident in Rotterdam in 1972, when a hashish dealer, caught in the possession of a couple of hundred kilograms, was finally acquitted by the High Court of the Netherlands, because it could not be proved that the seized hashish answered the exact description of hashish given by the Opium Law of 1928.

The first group to publish report about drugs was the Hulsman-group, which in 1971 advised strongly for decriminalisation of the use of drugs, especially cannabis. The Baan-committee in 1972, basically agreed with the Hulsman group's advice, proposed cannabis to be defined as a drug whose use was considered an acceptable risk (as a soft drug) as opposed to all the other drugs, being labelled hard drugs, whose use was at that time considered an unacceptable risk. They also proposed to make a clear-cut distinction between drug users and traffickers, in order to avoid classifying the possession of drugs by users as a serious crime and to allow easy access to prevention and voluntary interventions. Moreover it was advised to differentiate penalties for trade in soft drugs on one hand and hard drugs on the other. The possession and/or trade of an amount of cannabis up to 30 grams was made a misdemeanour and the maximum penalties for trade in cannabis were made significantly lower than for hard drugs. This proposal became finally law in 1976, but the governments proposal of the law in 1973 already ended the phase of criminalisation by prohibition of cannabis. A new development in the cannabis situation started when in Amsterdam "Mellow yellow", the first regular coffeeshop opened. The retail trade, until now hidden in youth centres, went public again and took place in the open. The limits of tolerance were defined by AHOY-G rules, which means no advertising, no hard drugs, no nuisance, no youth (first under 16, later under 18) and no selling big quantities (more than 5 grams). The phenomenon of coffeeshops mushroomed through Amsterdam and other Dutch cities: in 1980, there were around 20 coffeeshops in Amsterdam, in 1989 around 300. In 1996, it was estimated to be 1293 coffeeshops in the Netherlands <sup>15</sup>.

Contemporary Dutch soft drug policy, characterised by a lack of state involvement in individual cannabis use, separates cannabis market from all other drug markets and so protects soft drug users from the world of hard drugs. The decriminalisation of drug users is also based on the premise, that criminal prosecution must be no more damaging to the drug users than the drug use itself. All of this is a big success, because the legalisation has not resulted in a greater increase in use than in other countries and the number of hard drug users in last years is declining on the contrary of other countries with repressive drug policies.

The Provo movement existed only for two years, but the ideas of Provo influenced Dutch public life in an appreciable amount. Also Provo has the credit for why the Dutch society is one of the most tolerant, 'healthy' and good sensed societies of the world.

---

<sup>15</sup> Jansen, 1989; Dutch Drug Policy and Cannabis

## Literature:

- Amsterdam planning and development, Town Planning Section, Public works` Department, Amsterdam, 1975
- Delta - A Review of Arts Life and Thought in the Netherlands, Autumn 1967, Amsterdam
- Dutch Drug Policy and Cannabis, <http://www.trimbos.nl/ukfsheet/fc7uk.html>
- Drugs Policy in the Netherlands: Continuity and Change, <http://www.drugtext.nl/reports/wvc/drugall.htm>
- Peter Cohen: Drugs as a Social Construct, UvA 1990
- Mel van Elteren: Dutch Youth and Its Sense of Place - Imaging America, Tilburg University Press, 1994
- Drs. E. Fromberg: The Case of the Netherlands - Contradictions and Values, Questioning prohibition 1994, International report on drugs, International Antiprohibitionist League, Brussels, 1994
- A. C. M. Jansen: Cannabis in Amsterdam - een geografie van hashish en marijuana, Coutinho BV, Amsterdam, 1989
- Provo, vol. 1/1965-15/1967, Amsterdam
- Kristen Ross: Henri Lefebvre on the Situationists: An Interview, <http://www.thorn.net/~rose/lefebvre-interview.html>
- Sandwijk, J.P.: Licit and Illicit Drug Use in Amsterdam II, Instituut voor Sociale Geografie, Amsterdam 1995
- Coen Tasman: Louter Kabouter, Babylon-De Gaus, Amsterdam 1996
- Hans Tuynman: Full-time provo, Amsterdam 1966
- Teun Voeten: Dutch Provos, [http://www.pdxnorml.org/HT\\_provos\\_0190.txt](http://www.pdxnorml.org/HT_provos_0190.txt)