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The US Department of State, Bureau of Overseas Building Operations (OBO) requested this Historic Structures and Building Conditions Report from our Design Team; made up of Architects and Planners (Davis Brody Bond) Architectural Historians (Robinson & Associates) and Building Restoration Specialists (Building Conservation Associates). Included in this two-volume Report is an overview of the architectural and historical significance of this building now housing the US Consulate in Amsterdam as well as a survey of its existing conditions.

**Volume 1** has determined that the Period of Significance spans the “Van Heukelom” Residential period of 1912-1948 (Volume 1, p.194-199). A listing of important interior features are included. A recommended interior “restoration” project should consider including the main visitor sequence from the entry vestibule, the main staircase, the second floor stairwell, and main conference room. There is a good opportunity to merge the proper functioning of the consulate spaces as a secure 21st century office environment with a historic partial restoration sensitive to this period of significance.

A portion of the **Volume 2** report touches on the infrastructure of the building. While much of the existing mechanical, plumbing and electrical systems have been replaced and modified, the wooden structural system of the building, with few exceptions, remains as originally designed.

The heating system of the building has been modified and would need extensive revisions to restore back to the original system. The lighting, electric and alarm systems are also disruptive to this existing fabric. Careful replacement and/or reintegration of all of this infrastructure could be sensitively accomplished to respect the historic status of this building. This is highly recommended for those areas of the building that would be most visited and visible by the public (see attached diagram).

This historic “residence” also has many differences with regards to the Architectural Barriers Act (ABA). Access from the front door to the main hall is partially restricted by hardware; there is only a stair allowing for vertical circulation between floors, and there are no ABA accessible toilets for staff. A recently completed Consular Visa entry does comply with all regulations but this is part of a separate zone from the rest of the building. Diagrams and photos are included summarizing these deficiencies. A recommendation of this report is to prioritize improvements which can hopefully be constructed and to minimize any intrusion, leading to the further detriment of this historic building. The addition of an assessable elevator and toilets would be a first priority. While the unisex toilet may be only on a single floor, these two items together will provide for a more suitable office and public facility. Other simpler renovations will complete a program to adapt this facility for the use of all (see attached diagram).

Volume 2 also is an overview of the existing conditions of the facility, both outside and inside. Drawings and photography document the conditions of the façade and of the interior materials of the building. As described when discussing the disruption by infrastructure systems on the interior of this historic facility, this volume describes many of these same disruptions on its exterior. While the building is physically in fair condition, there are many suggestions of repair that would help restore it to its historic grandeur. Window replacement to eliminate exterior mounted roll down grills, and removal of surface mounted conduit and lighting, are two recommendations that might have the largest impact on this building and perhaps are the easiest improvement to improve the public’s perception of this building. Volume 2 concludes with measured drawings of the facility as it currently exists.

In summary, we recommend taking this opportunity to proceed with these few gestures that would both improve the building's character and function, as well as protect and honor this landmark building in this historic City of Amsterdam.
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Executive Summary

Historic Preservation

The American Consulate General in Amsterdam is located at Museumplein 19, on the southeast corner of Museum Square, a broad green park that provides an appropriate foreground to the city’s three monumental cultural institutions, the Rijksmuseum (1885), the Concertgebouw (1888), and the Stedelijk Museum (1894). The building was constructed for Willem Frederick van Heukelom and his family in 1913 as he neared the end of a successful career as the director of profitable colonial enterprises in the Dutch East Indies. Successful Amsterdam architects Theodoor G. Schill and D.H. Haverkamp designed the urban villa in a restrained version of Dutch Renaissance Revival architecture, as were many of the residences in the Museumkwartier.

After van Heukelom’s death, his widow, the former Catharina Digna Peereboom-Voller, sold the house at Museumplein 19 to the German government for use as its consulate. During World War II, during the occupation of the Netherlands by the Nazis, the house was used as the headquarters of the representative of the German civilian government for the city. The United States began using the property as its consulate general in September 1945, shortly after the conclusion of World War II. It acquired the property permanently in 1948 as part of a lend-lease settlement agreement with the Netherlands. It has served as the consulate general ever since.

The historic and architectural significance of the U.S. Consulate in Amsterdam has been recognized by the Dutch Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed, Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap (National Cultural Heritage, Ministry of Education, Science and Culture), which designated Museumplein 19 a Rijksmonument in 1996. The designation cited the villa’s importance to the urban plan for the area around the Museumplein in the early twentieth century, as well as the “historicizing style” of the design by Schill and Haverkamp. Additionally, the house embodies the history of the museum quarter residences throughout the twentieth century, having served as a private home for an affluent Amsterdam businessman, being occupied by the invading German government during World War II, and continuing its institutional use when it was acquired by the United States after the war.

Volume I of the Historic Structure Report (HSR) has been prepared to document the history and construction chronology of the consulate, to describe its as-built condition, and to identify changes to the original design. The HSR designates the period of significance for the building as 1912 to 1948, beginning with Willem Frederik van Heukelom’s purchase of the property and Schill & Haverkamp’s design for the house and ending with its acquisition by the United States for use as its consulate. The architectural, planning, and historical significance of Museumplein 19 were firmly established during this period. Alterations or additions made to the building or its site after this period do not contribute to the property’s importance. Museumplein 19 was found to have a high degree of integrity to its condition in 1948, and the consulate as it existed in that year should be used as the basis for future preservation work.
**Introduction**

**Purpose**

The purpose of Volume I of the Historic Structures & Buildings Condition Report, addressing Architectural & Historical Significance, is to guide the development and implementation of a treatment plan for the U.S. Consulate General in Amsterdam. Designed in 1912 as a family residence for wealthy entrepreneur Willem Frederik van Heukelom, the consulate is a Rijksmonument – a nationally significant historic building in the Netherlands. According to the Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed, Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuure en Wetenschap (National Cultural Heritage, Ministry of Education, Science and Culture), which administers the Rijksmonument program, its importance derives both from its architectural character and from its function in the urban landscape of the Museumplein neighborhood around three significant cultural institutions – the Rijksmuseum, the Concertgebouw, and the Stedelijk Museum. In addition, the building embodies much of the Museumplein's twentieth-century history, having served as the residence of a businessman who earned his fortune in the Dutch East Indies and having functioned as the office of the Beauftragte des Reichskommissars für die Stadt Amsterdam (Representative of the Reich Commissioner in the city of Amsterdam) during the German occupation of the Netherlands in World War II before becoming the American consulate in 1945.

The Netherlands reorganized its Rijksmonument program, comparable to the National Register of Historic Places in the United States, in 1988. The U.S. Consulate became a Rijksmonument eight years later. (Museumplein 19 had been protected as a significant building in Amsterdam prior to this date.) In 2000, the U.S. Department of State organized the Secretary of State’s Register of Culturally Significant Property. This listing, which currently includes twenty-six American diplomatic properties in fifteen countries, is intended to honor American properties abroad. These events illustrate the maturation of a preservation ethic in both countries, moving from a broad appreciation of historic buildings to a focus on detailed histories of individual structures, documentation of the original construction and changes over time, and a deeper understanding of the ways in which a building or landscape fits into the broad pattern of a country's history. This historic structures report is an extension of that ethic. The document will provide the Department of State with a basic understanding of the significance and significant features of the Amsterdam consulate – the first prerequisite in the preservation of historic properties.

Volume I documents the history and construction chronology of the consulate, describes its as-built condition, and identifies changes to the original design. The volume evaluates the significance and integrity of the historic structure as well as its associated landscape and visual character. By recording the historic appearance of the consulate and identifying its character-defining features, Volume I serves as a management tool for selecting the most appropriate approach to treatment prior to the commencement of future repairs, alterations, and additions.

**Methodology**

The contents, format, and objectives of Volume I follow the guidelines for preparing Part I of a Historic Structure Report as set forth by the National Park Service in two publications: “NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guideline” (specifically Chapter 8: Management of Historic and Prehistoric Structures) and *Preservation Brief 43: The Preparation and Use of Historic Structure Reports*. As such, the report focuses on the developmental history of the U.S. Consulate in Amsterdam with sections on historical background and context, chronology of development and use, and evaluation of significance. The NPS guidelines also suggest a process for conducting the work and for formatting the report.

Research methods used in the preparation of this report included the examination of both primary and secondary resources and inspection of the building itself. Primary source material included Department of State records at the National Archives and Records Administration in College Park, Maryland; the Overseas Buildings Operations (OBO) office in Rosslyn, Virginia; the American Embassy in The Hague; and at the consulate itself. DOS staff, including Ronald Tomasso, Lee Warner, Andrew Hetletvedt, Christa Oudshoorn-Hobo, and Frank de
Koning, provided the documents from Rosslyn, The Hague, and Amsterdam. Research was also undertaken at
the Gemeente Amsterdam Stadsarchief (Amsterdam City Archives) and at the Nederlands instituut voor Oor-
logs-, Holocaust-, en Genocidestudies (NIOD, Netherlands Institute for War, Holocaust, and Genocide Studies),
also in Amsterdam. Team members met with Esther Agricola and Coert Krabbe of the city archives and Hubert
Berkhout and Harco Gijsbers of NIOD to discuss their repositories’ holdings. Four students from the Univer-
sity of Amsterdam (Kasper Bockweg, Daan de Leeuw, Roosmarijn Thuijsman, and Kiki Varekamp) subsequently
performed the research and provided research reports, translations, and/or summaries of important documents.
Kasper Bockweg’s efforts included research at the Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis (IISG, Inter-
national Institute for Social History). Dr. Krabbe also answered questions and supplied additional information on
Museumplein 19 from the city archives. Online sources of primary documents included the Nederlands Architec-
tuurinstituut (Netherlands Architectural Institute) and the Beeldbank (image library) of the city archives.

Secondary source material included early twentieth-century Dutch architectural publications reviewed at the
Library of Congress, books and articles on Amsterdam architecture of the time and Department of State
history, and scholarly work documenting the development of the Museumplein. Books related to the State
Department’s overseas building program, such as Jane Loeffler’s *The Architecture of Diplomacy*, provided
contextual history on diplomatic facilities.

On-site evaluation of the Amsterdam Consulate and its associated landscape and site features occurred on a
visit to the consulate from May 28 to June 5, 2013. Site evaluations involved the documentation of physical
evidence of the building’s original construction and subsequent modifications and the verification of exist-
ing conditions. Two experts on Amsterdam architecture of the early twentieth century – Coert Krabbe of the
Bureau Monumenten & Archeologie (Bureau of Monuments and Archaeology) and independent historian
Barbara Laan – offered their interpretation of building features during tours of the consulate. Research tasks
at the consulate consisted of reviewing archival records (photographs of the building both before and after
it became the U.S. consulate, a publication by the interior designer, drawings, and records related to the van
Heukelom family and the German occupation).
Historical Background and Context

The U.S. Consulate in Amsterdam Prior to World War II

Diplomatic relations between the United States and the Netherlands have endured for more than 230 years – the longest such relationship between the U.S. and any nation except France. Diplomatic ties between the two countries began in 1779, when the Continental Congress sought a treaty and a loan from the Dutch during the American Revolution. As a result, Great Britain declared war on the Netherlands in 1780. In 1782, John Adams became the first U.S. Minister Plenipotentiary to the Netherlands, leading the country's legation at The Hague. The Dutch government responded on April 19 of that year by becoming the second nation to recognize American independence. The U.S. accepted the credentials of the Dutch minister, Peter John Van Berckel in 1783. On May 29, 1794, Congress commissioned Sylvanus Bourne as Consul General of the United States in the Netherlands, with his office in Amsterdam. The Dutch government recognized Bourne's credentials on January 2, 1798, beginning more than two centuries of American consular activity in the Netherlands.¹

Throughout the nineteenth century, American diplomatic and consular officials were responsible for securing their own quarters and offices. That approach began to change with passage of the Lowden Act in 1911, which allowed the federal government to purchase property abroad to use as or on which to construct diplomatic facilities. In 1926, the Foreign Service Buildings Act established a commission to oversee the purchase and construction of American government buildings abroad. Planning, design, and construction of these facilities could only proceed as funding was made available, however, meaning that numerous American government functions on foreign soil remained in rented buildings.²

Such was the case in Amsterdam. Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, the American consulate occupied rented quarters in various locations along the city's principal canals. The earliest location discovered in research for this report was a narrow, five-story canal house at Keizersgracht 766, which the consulate rented in 1906, according to an inspection report from October of that year. Three years later, the consulate rented quarters at 2e Weteringplantsoen 7, along the Singelgracht and close to the Rijksmuseum. The consulate occupied the ground floor, the basement, and the attic, while the consul lived in six rooms above the ground floor. The consulate remained in this building until at least February 1913. By July 1916, the consulate had been established, separate from the consul's residence, at Keizersgracht 455. Four years later it was located at Prinsengracht 1073.³

The inspection reports list Keizersgracht 473 as the consulate address as early as May 1923. It appears that the consulate occupied the entire first floor of the four-and-a-half-story brick building, also referred to as Keizersgracht 473-479. (Figure 1) Consul Carl O. Spamer signed a lease for that space on May 1, 1927, and subsequent building inspection reports also include that designation. Keizersgracht 473-479 housed the consulate until the beginning of World War II. Documents from the time indicate that the consulate remained open for at least a short time after the German army invaded the Netherlands on May 10, 1940. In addition to American interests, the consulate also represented France and Belgium, on which Germany had also declared war. It is unclear, however, how long the consulate continued to operate after the German invasion began. Germany did not declare war on the United States until December 11, 1941, and the State


³ Inspection Reports, October 1906, April 1909, March 1911, July 1916, July 1920, Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State, Inspection Reports on Foreign Service Posts, 1906-1939, box 6, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland. The inspection reports do not give background information on the consular buildings. They evaluate the condition of the buildings at the time of the report.
department did not officially terminate the lease on Keizersgracht 473 until December 31 of that year. The United States closed its legation at The Hague, however, on July 15, 1940, reopening a month later in London near the Dutch government in exile. The legation to the Netherlands was raised to embassy status on May 8, 1942.4

The Expansion of Amsterdam and the Development of the Museumplein

The choice of buildings along Amsterdam's principal canals for the location of the U.S. consulate prior to World War II is not remarkable in itself. The four primary canals – the Herengracht, Keizersgracht, Prinsengracht, and Singelgracht – formed the business and residential core of the city and were home to many important public as well as private functions. The planning that had put this canal system in place dated back to the seventeenth-century. In 1612, the Amsterdam city council embarked upon an ambitious plan of draining and filling the area's marshy soils that resulted in the creation of the four principal canals and extended the city beyond its medieval walls. Radial waterways linked these principal canals to each other and to the oldest part of the city. Businesses and residences were constructed on the dry land between the canals. The seventeenth-century expansion plan defined the city's boundaries for three hundred years.

By the late nineteenth century, however, this structure could no longer accommodate Amsterdam's growing population. Colonization of the Dutch East Indies (present-day Indonesia), beginning in the 1830s, and trade based on the raw materials, cash crops, and manufactures of the east led to a period of sustained growth in the Dutch economy and a rapid rise in Amsterdam's population. From an estimated populace of 250,000 in 1850, the number of the city's inhabitants eclipsed 500,000 by 1900. The increasing population required additional expansion of the city's land area to house residents and businesses. As early as 1866, city engineer J.C. van Niftrik produced a plan for development of the area beyond the outermost canal, the Singelgracht. Van Niftrik revised this plan in 1872 to more logically extend the existing pattern of radial and connecting streets and waterways, and his arrangement influenced the 1876 and 1891 proposals developed by P.J.H. Cuypers, architect of the Rijksmuseum. The museum stood just across the Singelgracht and served as the gateway to the new district. In 1902, the city council approved a further revision of Cuypers's 1891 plan to guide Amsterdam's expansion. 5 (Figure 2)

Crucial to all these plans was the disposition of the area now known as the Museumkwartier (Museum Quarter), where the U.S. consulate is located. By the time the city approved the revised Cuypers plan, the space was home to three cultural institutions constructed in concert with the Netherlands' late-century prosperity and power: the Rijksmuseum (opened 1885), the Concertgebouw (1888), and the Stedelijk Museum (1894). The presence of these nationally significant institutions had always been presumed to mean that the neighborhood in which they stood would require special treatment. Various approaches to this treatment were offered. The city considered whether to provide greater density of housing by making it a district of townhouses or a less dense area of detached “urban villas.” The municipal authorities also considered whether to leave the space between the Rijksmuseum and the Concertgebouw open or build more housing there. The thirty-five years that passed between van Niftrik's initial plan and city council's approval of the revised Cuypers' plan indicates the difficulty Amsterdammers had in reaching agreement on answers to these questions. Ultimately, the Museumkwartier was designated as the location of urban villas for affluent members of Amsterdam society bordering an open space – to be known as the Museumplein (Museum Square) – partially defined by the Rijksmuseum, the Stedelijk Museum, and the Concertgebouw.


This plan satisfied several desires on the part of municipal authorities. It provided a prominent, nationally significant public space appropriate to a capital city; it ensured that views of the important cultural institutions would not be compromised by future construction; and it offered the health benefit of a public park, where residents could exercise in a well-lit, open, green environment.6

The quarter, including the Museumplein itself, developed slowly, as it was transformed from an unplanned area of manufacturing and laborers’ housing to the affluent district of elegant, detached residences envisioned by municipal planners. The demolition of one of the largest factories in the city (a candle-making works) in 1906 eliminated one of the biggest obstacles to new development, and the earliest houses along the Museumplein date from just after the factory was removed. The houses east of the Museumplein in the area bounded by Teniersstraat, Johannes Vermeerstraat, and Gabriel Metsustraat – the neighborhood of the U.S. consulate – were all in place by 1920. (Figure 3) The square itself developed slowly, in part due to the numerous activities taking place there – horse racing, ice skating, military parades, exhibitions, political demonstrations, and national ceremonies.7

Willem Frederik van Heukelom and Family, the First Owners of Museumplein 19

Willem Frederik van Heukelom submitted an application for a building permit for Amsterdam Section R, Lot 4971 on February 26, 1912.8 The lot lay at the northeast corner of the intersection of Gabriel Metsustraat and the Museumplein, across the square from the Stedelijk Museum and with the Concertgebouw in clear view to the southwest. It is uncertain when van Heukelom purchased the property, but he appears to have returned permanently to Amsterdam around 1910 after a successful career in the East Indies. In that year he attended the funeral of an uncle in the city, and a year later, his wife, Catharina Digna Peereboom-Voller, and their children traveled from the east to Amsterdam by themselves. It may have been, then, that van Heukelom purchased the lot as the site of the family’s permanent home upon his return to his birthplace.9

Members of the van Heukelom family first moved to the Netherlands in the late seventeenth century from the border area with Germany in the Lower Rhine valley. The family had been prominent in the Mennonite community in the German town of Goch, hard against the Dutch border, since Hendrik van Heukelom left the Catholic church there in 1615. The immigrants first settled in Leiden, about 120 kilometers to the northwest of Goch. About a hundred years later, Frans van Heukelom (1738-1787) moved from Leiden to Amsterdam. Jan, first son of Frans van Heukelom and Catharina Kloppenburg, was the first member of the family born in Amsterdam. He was Willem Frederick’s grandfather.10

---


7 Smit, 12-13; Van der Werfe, 23, 38-40. A map showing the periods of construction for buildings in the Museumkwartier can be found in van der Werfe, 34. The earliest dates of existing buildings on the Museumplein near the consulate are 1907 and 1908.

8 Bouwvergunning en tekening 11974, February 27, 1912, Archief van de secretarie: afdeling publieke werken 5180, Stadsarchief, Amsterdam,Nederland. Both van Heukelom's building permit and the revised site plan for the property dated March 1913 designate the lot number as 4971. The deed transferring the property from the Dutch government to the United States government for use as the consulate (March 19, 1948) gives the lot number as 4981. It is not known when the designation changed. The permit application also projects the address for the lot as Museumplein 21.


Born on September 5, 1858, Willem Frederik grew up in his family's house on the Herengracht. He was the son of Hendrik Pieter van Heukelom (1816-1878) and Charlotta Maria Planteau (1818-1869), who was born in the Dutch colony of Paramaribo, Suriname. In 1863, Hendrik Pieter became one of the founders of the Nederlands-Indische Handelsbank (NIHB, Dutch Indies Commercial Bank), acting both as shareholder and administrator. The bank financed sugar and coffee estates in the country's colonial holdings in the Pacific. Hendrik's involvement in the bank, the second largest enterprise in the Dutch East Indies, indicates his keen business acumen. The cash crops the Dutch introduced into their colonies in the second half of the nineteenth century – including sugar, coffee, tea, and rubber – provided means for Dutch colonial companies to increase their profitability beyond the export of raw materials.

Accounts disagree on precisely when Willem Frederik van Heukelom, who was educated at the Polytechnische School in Liège, began his own colonial career. One obituary published upon his death states that he left Amsterdam at eighteen to work as an engineer at a sugar factory in Surabaya, Java. A second obituary indicates he departed for the East Indies at twenty-one, after learning the sugar trade at factories in Germany. He was certainly in the colony by 1884, when the NIHB created the Nederlands-Indische Landbouw Maatschappij (NILM, Dutch Indies Agrarian Society) to manage the production and sale of colonial agricultural products. Van Heukelom was named co-director of the company at its Batavia (now Jakarta) office, making him one of the more powerful persons in the Dutch colonies at the age of 26. In 1901, he was appointed as the general director of the NILM and its subsidiary, the Javaasche Cultuur Maatschappij (Javanese Culture Society), another entity involved in the management of sugar factories. He remained director of that organization until 1932. Companies such as NIHM had offices in both Amsterdam and Jakarta, meaning that their employees spent time in both the Netherlands and the East Indies.11

Van Heukelom likely met his future wife in Jakarta at social gatherings of the close-knit Dutch elite. Born in Surabaya, Catharina (1873-?) was the eldest daughter of Jan Dirk Peereboom-Voller, a Supreme Court councilor, and Maria Johanna Turk. Willem Frederik and Catharina married on February 18, 1893, and had three children: Frederik Hendrik (1893-1981), Maria Johanna Jacoba (1897-1948), and Therese (1906-?). This was the household for which van Heukelom purchased the lot on the Museumplein.12

As indicated by the importance of the site he chose on which to build his Amsterdam home, van Heukelom greatly profited from his career in the colonial economy. He was one of a number of young Dutch men of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to make what became known as an Indisch fortuin (Indian fortune). In addition to building his house in a prestigious part of town, van Heukelom’s prosperity allowed him to assemble the most valuable collection of Chinese porcelain in the Netherlands in the early part of the twentieth century. 13

11 Bockweg 3-5; “W.F. van Heukelom,” obituary, newspaper unknown, February 26, 1937; “W.F. van Heukelom: Bekend stadgenoot heengegaan,” obituary, newspaper unknown, February 26, 1937; Bockweg, 3-5. Photocopies of the obituaries are in the consulate archives. They were translated for this report by Kiki Varekamp.


Van Heukelom selected Theodoor G. Schill (1852-1914) and D.H. Haverkamp (1850-1920) as the architects for his family's new home – designers with a reputation well-suited to the client's prestigious address. The pair met as volunteers in the office of P.J.H. Cuypers during the construction of the Rijksmuseum and formed their own firm in 1877. Schill studied civil engineering and architecture at the polytechnic school in Delft and worked for a time in an architect's office in Vienna before returning to the Netherlands. Haverkamp's academic background is unknown, but he received on-the-job training as an engineer. Early in his career, he worked at the Amsterdamsche Kanaal Maatschappij (Amsterdam Canal Company) under chief engineer Justus Dirks, and later became involved in the design and construction of a pumping station at Schellingwoude, directed by J.G. van Gendt, Jr. He also worked briefly for a firm headed by van Gendt and Thomas Joannes Stieltjes.

Both were active in professional circles throughout their careers. Schill was a member of the influential Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst (MBB, Society for the Promotion of Architecture), a professional organization not unlike the American Institute of Architects, which published a weekly newspaper and a magazine, mounted exhibits, and administered architectural competitions. He was also involved in the Quellinusschool (Quellinus School), a crafts training workshop that evolved during the construction of the Rijksmuseum, and he advised the city on the design and construction of schools. Haverkamp acted as co-editor of the architectural magazine *De Bouwereld* (Building World) from 1901 to 1910 and published articles and books on technical issues of construction. In careers lasting nearly four decades, Schill and Haverkamp are not known to have produced building designs outside their own collaboration. Journals such as *Bouwkundig weekblad* (Architectural Weekly) and *Architectura* often reviewed the firm's work, praising Schill for the superior aesthetics of his facades and interiors and Haverkamp for his plans and technical ingenuity. 14

The division of labor between the two that the reviews suggest reflects a tension in Dutch architecture at the turn of the century between traditional aesthetics and hand-crafted ornament on the one hand and modern concepts that privileged function over form and utilized advanced technology. As was the case elsewhere in the world with the introduction of industrial production and new construction materials such as concrete and steel, an architectural logic gained traction in the late nineteenth century that favored simplicity of design, expression of structure, and an absence of the kind of applied ornament common to traditional architecture. The debate during the careers of Schill and Haverkamp is perhaps best represented by one of the most important buildings in turn-of-the-century Amsterdam, Hendrik P. Berlage's Beurs (Stock Exchange). The architect's first design for the project, submitted to a competition in 1885, was a typical nineteenth-century revival exercise based on historical precedent – the contrasting brick and stone, tall towers, and ornamented gables of the Dutch Renaissance, expanded to the appropriate scale. After receiving the commission for the building in 1896, however, Berlage completely changed his approach, creating a “robust, almost unadorned building that had nothing more of the nineteenth century,” in the words of architectural historian Hans Ibelings. The expanses of unrelieved brick wall on the exterior of the new design and the unornamented steel supports on the interior all revealed their load-bearing purpose – an important tenet of the developing architectural theory. The stark design and the simplicity of the minimal carved and painted ornament also reflected the new aesthetics. 15

Given their early training at the Rijksmuseum, where both the design and the construction attempted to revive Dutch traditions, it should not be a surprise that Schill & Haverkamp resolved the tension between tradition and technology in favor of the former. While they designed a variety of building types – urban and


rural residences, commercial and institutional buildings – in a number of styles, the pair reliably clothed their buildings in traditional forms while employing current construction materials. As did many of the architects of the late nineteenth century in the Netherlands, they favored the principles and forms of the Dutch Renaissance (sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) and international classical traditions, but understood and employed a variety of historical styles.

An example of this eclectic approach might be seen in an early work, an 1883 country house (the Villa Liliane) in the town of Baarn, southeast of Amsterdam. (Figure 4) Sometimes called a “villa village” for wealthy Amsterdam residents, Baarn provided country house commissions for many of the foremost Dutch architects, including Berlage. Designing the villa in the chalet style derived from Swiss regional architecture that was deemed appropriate at the time for rural residences, Schill & Haverkamp also utilized Gothic and Renaissance revival details for decoration. The following year, the firm won a competition to design the headquarters of the MBB in Amsterdam, an important commission they carried off in an exuberant Dutch Renaissance Revival style. (Figure 5) The principles of Golden Age Dutch architecture governed the overall design, and the building’s façade featured busts of two architects of the seventeenth century (Jacob van Campen and Hendrik de Keyser), as well as sculptor Artus Quellinus, one of the members of the family of artists for whom the Quellinusschool was named. As was characteristic of the firm, however, the architects felt free to employ forms from other periods in their decorative scheme. Students at the Quellinus craft school carried out much of the building’s ornamentation.16

Schill & Haverkamp continued to receive important commissions in the new century, including an urban villa in the developing area beyond the Singelgracht. Around 1907, they designed a residence for stock broker F.L. Wurfbain at Eeghenstraat 112, bordering the Vondelpark. Richly decorated on the interior, the brick house featured a prominent, central bell gable and bay window and unadorned window frames. (Figure 6) In 1912, Schill & Haverkamp received a commission to design the Groote Clubgebouw (Great Club) in a prominent location – on the Dam near the seventeenth-century Koninklijk Paleis (Royal Palace, built as the Stadhuis). Considered one of the firm’s most important commissions, the club was restrained in its exterior design, like the Vondelpark villa. The architects minimized the use of carved ornament on the exterior, employed the simple window surrounds of the Wurfbain home in many locations, and differentiated the ground floor from upper floors through the use of channeled masonry. Those features would also become important in the design for Museumplein 19.17

Architect D.F. Slothouwer contributed to the design of the Groote Clubgebouw when Schill began to suffer from poor health in the last years of his life. A review of the building from 1914, after its completion, stated that Slothouwer remained close to Schill’s original intent. Schill died in 1914, making the club and Museumplein 19, which was also designed in 1912, two of the Schill and Haverkamp’s final collaborations. Haverkamp died in 1920. The firm was commercially, professionally, and critically successful during its existence, and their work was included in surveys of important Dutch architecture of the time, such as J.H.W. Leliman’s Het Moderne Landhuis in Nederland (1917) and Het Stadswoonhuis in Nederland (1924). They participated in the debate on how to resolve the conflict between traditional architectural values and technological advances. Their work is lesser known today in part because Dutch architecture moved away from Schill & Haverkamp’s conservative position in the debate towards the emerging Modernism of Berlage and his followers.18

The Original Design of Museumplein 19

The residence Schill & Haverkamp designed for Willem Frederik van Heukelom and his family hewed to the decorative restraint the architects showed in late designs such as the Wurfbain villa and the Groote Clubgebouw. A mansard-roofed, three-and-a-half-story building (with partial basement) on a corner lot, the main entrance to the Museumplein house, not surprisingly, faced the square to the west.19 (Figure 7) The architects recessed the entrance porch in the northernmost bay of the west façade. The remaining three bays recalled Amsterdam's symmetrical three-bay townhouses. The central bay of this configuration was emphasized through the use of a tripartite window (second floor), balcony (third floor), and a traditional, ornamented gable. Above the channeled masonry of the first (ground) floor, the walls were treated in a manner that suggests pilasters, but the windows were unornamented and carved decoration limited to the gable.20

The secondary facades were treated in a similar, even more subdued manner, with important interior spaces marked by prominent external features. On the south façade, facing Gabriel Metsustraat, for instance, French doors provided access to a first-floor sitting room, a tripartite window lit the salon on the second floor, and a balcony extended from a bedroom on the third floor. (Figure 8) (Another bedroom, facing the Museumplein, was marked on the exterior by the center-bay balcony.) On the rear (east) façade, a five-sided bay projected from the first two floors of the southernmost corner of the façade. (Figure 9) The bay contained the laundry room on the first floor and conservatory above. A balcony sat atop the bay for another third-floor bedroom. The stair hall was marked on the rear façade by tripartite windows on the first, second, and third floors and a double window at roof level. The north façade was unornamented, with the exception of an oriel lighting the second-floor hall and a small oval window with a carved surround.

Based on the exterior ornamentation, it is clear that Schill & Haverkamp intended that the second floor be recognized as the piano nobile, and the interior arrangement of the rooms confirmed this planning approach. While the first-floor plans included a large stair hall, as well as a billiards room and sitting room divided by a column screen, it also contained typical service rooms, such as the kitchen, scullery, laundry room, and “bicycle and provisions” room. (Figure 10) The second-floor plans contained the large rooms used by the family and guests: the salon, dining room, conservatory, and study. (Figure 11) The bedrooms were on the third floor. The fourth, or attic, level, included spare bedrooms, other undesignated rooms (all lit by dormer windows), and a dark room. All four floors included bathrooms. Wall treatments visible in section drawings adhered to this hierarchy: chair rails in the first-floor hall, paneling on the second floor, wainscot on the third.21 (Figure 12)

The building permit application drawings included an undated site plan for the property by Schill & Haverkamp that lacked details, with the exception of the location of a fence at the perimeter of the yard. (Figure 13) A detailed elevation and plan of this fence, including the gate opposite the recessed entryway, was also included among the Schill & Haverkamp drawings. (Figure 14) Two piers, topped with a carved ornament, flanked the gate, which consisted of two leaves forming a semicircular arch when closed. The fence consisted of metal pickets with spike finials and simple rails and was marked at intervals by taller metal elements decorated with scrollwork. Struts anchored these taller elements to the masonry base. A revised site plan, dated March 1913, showed a second opening in the gate on Gabriel Metsustraat that led to the house's

---

19 This description of the original design is derived from drawings associated with the building permit documentation for Museumplein 19. Now held at both the U.S. Consulate and the Gemeente Amsterdam Stadsarchief, Archief van de secretarie, afdeling publieke werken, the drawings consist of floor plans, elevations, sections, renderings, and site plans. The drawings by are titled “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam” and name the creators as “Schill & Haverkamp, Arch.” They are included in an appendix to this volume of the HSR.

20 Schill and Haverkamp's drawings, and subsequent Dutch references to the house, use the European convention in referring to the floors: ground, first, second, third. When the building became the U.S. Consulate General, the new owners began using American floor designations were used (first, second, third, fourth). For the purposes of this report, American floor-numbering conventions will be used.

21 The floor plans indicate that the basement contained fuel storage, furnaces, storage, and a wine cellar.
service entrance on the north façade. This revised site plan also designated the yard surrounding the house on all four sides as tuin, or garden, but gave no details. An octagonal, wood garden structure with a thatched roof was constructed in the northeast corner of the property, probably during the van Heukelom tenure.22

A comparison of drawings submitted to the municipal authorities and the villa as built indicates that Schill & Haverkamp revised details of the exterior design between van Heukelom's initial application for a building permit and its ultimate construction. Neither the floor plans for the house, nor the use of restrained classical forms, however, varied. In the undated elevation blueprints submitted with the building permit application, the wall treatment was not depicted, and the bell gable resembled that of the Wurfbain villa near the Vondelpark. (Figure 7) A rendering of this scheme indicated carved, probably stone ornament associated with the gables on the front and rear facades. A second rendering of these two facades showed a different treatment. Facing the Museumplein, the central bay was crowned by a neck gable framed by pilasters and leading to a simple segmental arch. (Figure 15) A hoist bar projected from the cartouche beneath the arch. Carved festoons decorated the walls flanking the windows. On the rear façade, the second rendering dispensed with the gable entirely, terminating the stair hall with a hipped roof instead. (Figure 16) Museumplein 19 was built using the neck gable and hipped roof depicted in the second rendering. 23

As constructed, however, Museumplein 19 did not follow the second rendering in its entirety. On the west façade, for instance, the hoist bar was never installed, nor were the more elaborate jack arches with keystones over the windows employed. The simpler flat arches of the first rendering were used instead. The second rendering might also be read to suggest channeled stone – or at least masonry rendered to look like stone – for the first floor and stucco for the second and third floors. Instead, red brick finished Museumplein 19’s exterior, as suggested in the first rendering. The choices made in the exterior finish of the house further restrained its decorative character and emphasized the materials used in construction, rather than surface treatments that superficially mimicked historic construction. The choice between the two potential treatments of the facades lay with van Heukelom and the advisory committees who reviewed plans for buildings along the Museumplein. The architects provided their client and municipal authorities with more and less decorative exterior treatments for the house; the decision-makers chose the latter.24

In addition to his architects, van Heukelom employed furniture designer Johan Adam Pool, Jr. (1872-1948), to design furnishings for the interior of Museumplein 19. Pool founded the Onder den St. Maarten workshop in Zaltbommel, making modern Arts and Crafts furnishings. He moved the business to Haarlem in 1902 and altered its focus to machine-made furnishings in order to reach a broader public. Family connections may have played a role in the hiring of Pool, since in 1899 he married Henriette van Heukelom, born in Surabaya, Java, in 1874. The relationship between Henriette and Willem Frederick van Heukelom is not known, but there seems likely to be a family connection.25

22 The only drawing from the building permit office later than the van Heukelom tenure, dated December 1948, depicts the structure in its proper location. It seems unlikely that the German government, which owned the building after the van Heukeloms, would have built such a structure.

23 As if confirmation of the choice of treatment was needed, the rendering showing bell gables has large X-es through the front and rear elevations.
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In 1916, Pool’s discussion of appropriate room distribution and use, Dutch and English furniture traditions and their influence on his work, and modern furniture was published as part of the series Modern Hollandsche Interieurs. In it, he used numerous photographs of the furniture he designed for the van Heukelom household to illustrate his answers to the question he rhetorically posed at the opening of his essay, “How should I decorate my home?” The photographs depicted tables and chairs, based on mid-eighteenth-century English precedents, especially the work of Thomas Chippendale. The photographs revealed public rooms (hall, salon, conservatory) that combined a variety of patterns and textures: parquet floors partially covered by patterned rugs, carved furniture with upholstery of contrasting background and figure, heavy, floor-length, print drapes. (Figure 17) Van Heukelom’s porcelain collection appeared in the photographs, displayed above wall paneling, on tables, and in vitrines. Paintings also adorned the walls.26

The Van Heukelom Family at Museumplein 19, 1913-1938

The floor plans accompanying van Heukelom’s building permit application in 1912 specified which members of the family were intended to occupy the third-floor bedrooms. (Figure 18) The bedrooms planned for Mrs. van Heukelom and her daughters (ages 15 and 6 in 1912) occupied the southwest and southeast corners of the house, respectively, each with direct access to a bathroom in between. Willem Frederik’s bedroom was adjacent to his wife’s, and connected to it, and a room for the governess stood next to the daughters’ room. The floor plans designated a bedroom for the eldest child, Frederik Hendrik (age 19 in 1912), at the northwest corner of the house with a sitting room on the opposite corner and a bathroom between opening onto the hall. Later evidence casts some doubt on whether the family actually used the rooms as the architects had envisioned. One of the photographs published in Pool’s essay, for instance, shows only one bed in the room planned for the daughters, and this room seems to have been the most highly ornamented of the bedrooms, and therefore perhaps less likely used by children. (Figure 19) Room uses could therefore have changed between the house's conception and its construction or between initial occupancy of the house and when the photographs were taken.

The children lived at Museumplein 19 for varying lengths of time before beginning their own families. Frederik Hendrik received his doctorate in law at the University of Leiden in 1917; for at least part of the time during the house’s early years, then, he seems likely to have been at university. He went to the East Indies in 1921 as board secretary for the NILM and returned three years later to work at both NILM and the Javaansche Cultuur Maatschappij, as his father had done. Upon his return to Amsterdam he set up his household at Prins Hendriklaan 37, near the Vondelpark. According to online genealogy records, eldest daughter Maria Johanna Jacoba van Heukelom married Romain Henri Theodore David Quarles van Ufford, but neither the date nor the location of the wedding is recorded. The youngest daughter, Therese, married Hendrik Barthout van Tets, a Dutch nobleman, on September 10, 1927, and gave birth to a son in London in 1929. The family lived in the Netherlands, however, until World War II, when they moved to England.27

City records also note the presence of five household employees moving into Museumplein 19 in 1913. The five – Machtilda Rijke, Pieteranna van Wel, Anna Plato, Helene Bremer, and Elise Krieghoff – ranged in age from nineteen to thirty years old, but their duties are not known. Four of the original group of Museumplein 19 service employees had moved on by the mid-1920s, but they were quickly replaced. The records indicate that the house maintained a household staff of four or five, all women, throughout the van Heukelom tenure. Living accommodations in the house for the staff are unclear, although it is assumed that most slept on the fourth floor. Four of the rooms in Schill & Haverkamp's fourth-floor plan were likely sleeping quarters.28

28 Bouwvergunning en tekening 11974, Archief van de secretarie: afdeling publieke werken 5180; Archief van de Dienst Bevolkingsregister: woningkaarten, Access no. 5445, inventory no. 236, Stadsarchief, Amsterdam, Nederlands. A discussion of room uses based on floor-plan notations can be found in Chapter 2.
During the first few years after construction of the house, Willem Frederik van Heukelom continued his duties at the NILM (until 1921) and at the Javaansche Cultuur Maatschappij (until 1932). It is unclear whether, or how often, he may have traveled to the Indies during this time. Van Heukelom also expanded his activities to include the presidency of Natura Artis Magistra, the Amsterdam zoo. He had become a member of the zoo’s board of directors in 1907, but became its president in 1915, remaining in this position until 1928. After his retirement from the board, he helped purchase animals for the zoo and contributed funds for the construction of zoo buildings. Since one of his obituaries noted that the Noordwijkse Golfclub, which formed in 1915, sent a representative to his funeral, it may be assumed that he became involved in that pastime as well. In the summer of 1936, the Stedelijk Museum included van Heukelom’s collection of Chinese porcelain as part of a special exhibit on Asian art. He died approximately six months later, on February 23, 1937, at the age of 78.29

City records list June 26, 1937, as the date when van Heukelom’s widow, Catharina, and all their children moved out of Museumplein 19. From the previous discussion of the family, however, it is clear that the children likely established their own households much sooner. June 26, 1937, may then represent the date when Catharina van Heukelom vacated the house and city records were reconciled. A newspaper notice of June 17, 1937, stated that Sotheby’s of London had auctioned off the first lot of Willem Frederik’s Chinese porcelain collection the previous day, indicating that the family had begun to take steps at this time to remove their possessions from the house and to reduce their number. The records also show that Mrs. van Heukelom subsequently moved to Van Eeghenstraat 109, near the Vondelpark, with her family. It is not clear from records reviewed for this study which, or how many, of the children also lived at Van Eeghenstraat 109. Four of the household staff from Museumplein 19 – including Machtilda Rijke, who had moved into the house with the family in 1913 – accompanied Mrs. van Heukelom to her new home.30

The June 17 newspaper notice indicated that the previous day’s auction at Sotheby’s offered the first lot of Willem Frederik van Heukelom’s Chinese porcelain collection for sale, suggesting that more of the collection was subsequently offered. At least some of the family’s possessions – including furniture and porcelain – were inherited by Therese, who lent them to be displayed at the Rijksmuseum between 1948 and 1954, while she was in the East Indies.31

Museumplein 19 as Headquarters of the German Government in Amsterdam, 1938-1945

Catharina van Heukelom sold Museumplein 19 to the German government on January 29, 1938. After receiving permission from the Dutch authorities in April, Museumplein 19 became the German consulate in Amsterdam. City records show that Kurt Netwig, whose title or position within the consulate is unrecorded, moved into the building from Berlin on May 25, 1938. The former van Heukelom residence remained the consulate’s home for just over two years.32

The change in use resulted from the invasion of northern Europe by the military forces of Germany. On May 10, 1940, the German army (Wehrmacht) and air force (Luftwaffe) attacked the Netherlands as part of Chancellor Adolf Hitler’s strategy to defeat France. The success of this strategy depended in part on the


occupation of the Netherlands as a defense against a potential British counterattack along the long Dutch coastline. The German military command based its offensive on the idea of the “blitzkrieg” (“lightning attack”), which incorporated the element of surprise, a speedy advance of troops, and the use of both modern armoured vehicles and air support. The Wehrmacht and Luftwaffe attacked multiple cities in the Netherlands and Belgium on May 10, and the Allied forces (Dutch, British, and French) were unable to fend off the advance. The Dutch army retreated to a defensive position protecting Utrecht and Amsterdam on May 12. Queen Wilhelmina left the Netherlands with her cabinet on May 13 and established a government in exile in London. General Henri Gerard Winkelman, the Dutch commander-in-chief, surrendered his army on May 14, and formal capitulation took place the following day. The German consulate closed its operations at Museumplein 19 on May 29, 1940.

After a short period of military rule by the occupying German army, Hitler appointed Arthur Seyss-Inquart as Reichskommissar für die besetzten niederländischen Gebiete (Reich Commissioner for the Occupied Netherlands) – the head of the civilian administration of the country with its office in The Hague. Seyss-Inquart had previously served as Chancellor of Austria during the occupation and annexation of that country by the Third Reich. In Amsterdam, which German troops did not enter until May 15, a “war administration councillor” was appointed in June to take over from military authorities. He served until September, when the Beauftragte des Reichskommissars für die Stadt Amsterdam (representative of the Reich Commissioner for Amsterdam) arrived. Seyss-Inquart appointed a Beauftragte for every provincial capital, as well as the cities of Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The Beauftragte was responsible for Referenten Soziale Fragen (Social Questions), Volksaufklärung und Propaganda (Public Enlightenment and Propaganda), and Volkspflege (Public Care). Formally, the Beauftragte could only advise the civilian government, and he was not in charge of the police. Practically speaking, however, as the Reich Commissioner’s representative, the Beauftragte’s wishes were seldom ignored.33

The first Beauftragte for Amsterdam was Dr. Hans Böhmcker, born on November 6, 1899, in Schwartau in northern Germany. He studied law at the Georg-August-University in Göttingen, joined the Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (the National Socialist German Workers’ Party), and, in 1937, became mayor of Lübeck. Böhmcker also served as a soldier in the German army, participating in the occupation of the Sudetenland, the area in Czechoslovakia annexed by Nazi Germany in 1938, before joining the spring 1940 invasion of northern Europe as head of an artillery battery.

Arriving in Amsterdam on September 16, 1940, Böhmcker initially occupied an office at Van Miereveldstraat 1, a townhouse one block east of the Museumplein. In addition to his other duties, he continued the implementation of anti-Jewish measures begun as soon as the city was occupied. In mid-December 1940, Böhmcker sanctioned anti-Jewish actions in cafés, restaurants, shops, and in the streets. By February 1941, these actions escalated into a violent clash between the paramilitary wing of the Nationaal Socialiste Beweging (Dutch National Socialist Movement) and a Jewish action group, in which one of the Socialist members died. The Dutch Nazis then retaliated. A subsequent labor strike in protest of the anti-Jewish policies resulted in further violence. As a result, Böhmcker closed the Jewish quarter, forcing non-Jews to leave and thus creating a de facto ghetto. The Beauftragte then established a Jewish council to register Jewish residents and to distribute identity cards. On March 1, 1941, all Jewish civil servants were fired from their jobs. During this same period, Jewish residents of Amsterdam were prohibited from entering non-Jewish hotels, restaurants and bars.34
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All these actions were taken while Böhmcker’s office was located on Van Mierveldstraat. Although the German consulate had closed its operations at Museumplein 19 in May 1940, the Beauftragte did not move into the former van Heukelom residence until May 26, 1941. (Figure 20) It is not clear whether or how the building was used by the Germans prior to Böhmcker’s move there, but a photograph of Seyss-Inquart reviewing the Ordnungspolizei (Order Police) on the Museumplein from February 1941 shows people at several windows of the house.35 (Figure 21)

The move of the Beauftragte’s office to Museumplein 19 occurred during a period when the Nazis had begun to consolidate their offices around the square. The Stadtitsches Quartierant (City Billeting) office moved into Museumplein 17 on May 16, 1940. The Wehrmachtkommandantur (headquarters of the Germany army) began the use of Museumplein 11 in December. The Ortskommandantur (district commander) occupied Museumplein 13 and 15, although it is unclear when this use began. With the concentration of civilian and military bureaucracy around the Museumplein came use of the open space for public gatherings and propaganda. In addition to his review of the Ordnungspolizei in February, Seyss-Inquart organized a rally on the Museumplein on June 27, 1941, attended by thousands of people, on the occasion of the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union. (Figure 22) The occupying forces also held military drills, speeches, and troop inspections in the museum square in the early 1940s, according to photographs from the period.36

In October 1941, Seyss-Inquart appointed Böhmcker as his Allgemeiner politischer Vertreter [für] Massnahmen gegen die Judenschaft (General Political Representative for Anti-Jewish Measures). It was under direction from a subordinate in Böhmcker’s office that the Jewish Council recruited unemployed Jews for work camps and that the deportation of Jews to the Westerbork concentration camp began. Jewish identity papers began to be stamped with a “J” in February 1942, and they were forced to wear a yellow star on their clothes by April of that year. That same month, Böhmcker returned to Lübeck. He was replaced by Dr. Werner Schröder. Schröder had been mayor of Schwerin, Germany, before the war, and was also a member of the National Socialist German Workers’ Party. He was also a member of the Schutzstaffel, better known as the SS. He had served as Beauftragte of Overijssel, a Dutch province on the border with Germany, prior to becoming the Reich Commissioner’s representative in Amsterdam. The consulate archives includes a print of a circa 1942 photograph in which Dutch Nazi leader Anton Adriaan Mussert shakes hands with Schröder in what had been the dining room of the van Heukelom residence. (Figure 23) Schröder, who remained in office at Museumplein 19 until the end of the war, left few significant traces in the historical record of the German occupation. This circumstance may have been the result of a change in Nazi policy. In June 1942, responsibility for the Reich’s policies toward Jews was removed from the Beauftragte’s portfolio. At that time, the fate of Jewish inhabitants of all of occupied Europe was placed under the jurisdiction of the Reichssicherheitshauptamt (Reich Security Main Office) in Berlin.37
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After June 1942, the Beauftragte’s duties returned to those set down at the beginning of the occupation—general guidance of civilian administration and the courts, propaganda, public health, and social issues. This assessment of duties is borne out by a March 1945 roster of Beauftragte employees. At least twenty-four people were working at Museumplein 19 at that time. While five of these were cleaning ladies, there were also a senior government staffer for administrative and judicial issues, a propaganda officer, a “nutrition” supervisor (perhaps referring to food distribution activities), and an inspector involved in maintaining the labor supply. There were also stenographers, orderlies, drivers, and other staff. It is not known, however, how these employees were deployed within the house.38

It is tempting to think that the March 1945 roster might represent a low point in the number of German staff at Museumplein 19, given that the war would last only two more months and that the Wehrmacht had already prepared the Museumplein for Allied attack. The fortification of the museum square began in May 1943, when the Germans began to close streets with barbed wire and barricades. Construction of bunkers followed in expectation of Allied air raids. By June 1944 – immediately after the D-Day invasion of Normandy, the defensive perimeter had been expanded to incorporate the west side of the Museumplein, Gabriel Metsustraat to Johannes Vermeerstraat, and Tenierstraat back to the Museumplein, according to a report filed by the Dutch Resistance. (Figure 24) Three office bunkers were constructed in the square opposite Museumplein 19 and its neighboring Nazi headquarters buildings, each with concrete walls two meters thick and equipped to employ anti-aircraft guns. (Figure 25) A larger bunker for shelter was built on the opposite side of the Museumplein near the Stedelijk Museum. A command bunker was built on Tenierstraat, an office bunker in the middle of Johannes Vermeerstraat, and an ammunition bunker on van Miereveldstraat. The resistance estimated that one hundred soldiers guarded the fortified area. The military command had “settled” into its bunker by September 1944, according to the report.39

The military retreat to its Tenierstraat bunker coincided with the Allied liberation of Antwerp in northern Belgium on September 4, 1944, and with the expectation of an attack on the Dutch city of Arnhem, 50 miles southeast of Amsterdam. In late September, the Germans repulsed the Allies at Arnhem, delaying their advance into the western Netherlands until the spring of the following year. Under the command of Lieutenant General Charles Foulkes, the Canadian Army began a second assault on Arnhem on April 12, 1945. By April 28, the Canadians had driven the German troops east as far as Wageningen, and a ceasefire was arranged. Foulkes accepted the surrender of the Nazi forces in the Netherlands at Wageningen on May 5, ending five years of German occupation. The surrender of all German military units in Europe was subsequently negotiated at American General Dwight D. Eisenhower’s headquarters at Reims, France, in the presence of Soviet, British, and French representatives. The war officially ended at midnight on May 8.40

38 Der Beauftragte des Reichskommissaris für die Stadt Amsterdam, “Personalverzeichnis, Amsterdam,” 10 Mäart 1945, Archief van de Beauftragte des Reichskommissars, no. 14, inv. 501, Nederlands instituut voor Oorlogs-, Holocaust-, en Genocidestudies.

39 de Leeuw, 1-2; “Amsterdam,” June 15, 1944, Archief van de Groep Albrecht, no. 190a, inv. 25; “Amsterdam,” July 18, 1944, Archief van de Groep Albrecht, no. 190a, inv. 27-I, Nederlands instituut voor Oorlogs-, Holocaust-, en Genocidestudies. Amsterdam, Netherlands, translated by Daan de Leeuw.

Use and Acquisition of Museumplein 19 by the United States, 1945-1948

As the first Allied forces to reach Amsterdam, the Canadians may also have been among the first to enter Museumplein 19 after World War II ended. American Consul General to the Netherlands Albert M. Doyle reported that the Canadians used the former German headquarters buildings for their administration of the city after Amsterdam had been liberated. A photograph from May 1945 in the consulate archives shows four jeeps in front of Museumplein 15, with Museumplein 17 and an ivy-covered Museumplein 19 visible in the background. (Figure 26) The signs in German that had identified the Nazi offices housed in these buildings during the war had already been removed by the time the photograph was taken.41

Doyle arrived in Amsterdam on June 6, 1945, dispatched there with two other diplomatic officers by U.S. Ambassador to the Netherlands Stanley K. Hornbeck to seek a suitable building in which to reopen the consulate. (Figure 27) The American diplomatic staff remained quartered in London at this time, near the Dutch government in exile. Doyle's task also included finding a location in Rotterdam for the American consulate there. Ambassador Hornbeck expected the consular offices to be open for business by the end of June, but the process of finding a permanent home for the consulate actually took much longer, given – in Doyle's words – “the general state of confusion” that reigned in the country in the immediate aftermath of the war.42

Several factors compounded the administrative confusion caused by the transition from Nazi occupation to Allied military rule to Dutch civilian government. Of most immediate concern was the desperate lack of food in the country. Dutch citizens had implemented a rail strike in the fall of 1944, at the urging of Queen Wilhelmina, to hinder the Nazis as the Allies prepared to advance into the Netherlands. When the attack on Arnhem failed, the Germans retaliated against the occupied country by blocking the transport of food, especially to the western provinces. This blockade, along with an early and especially harsh winter, caused widespread famine as 1945 began – a time that would become known in Dutch history as the “Hunger Winter.” The daunting task of providing food for the suffering citizens challenged the Dutch and Allied bureaucracies. Harbors also remained filled with German mines and the railroads did not run, slowing delivery of food and other necessities, such as fuel. Doyle noted that shops selling vegetables, meat, and bread had opened by the time of his arrival, but no other businesses functioned. Long lines extended from the meat shops, and the bread was provided by the Red Cross, not by local bakeries. He wrote the secretary of state that Amsterdam and Rotterdam suffered from “a more or less complete paralysis of normal economic life.” There was little coal or electricity, and a maximum of two hours of natural gas per day might be available “in a few weeks.” The harbors were expected to remain unusable until July.43

Complicating this general confusion was the status of the vast number of buildings utilized by the occupying Germans or their Dutch collaborators. Doyle had been given to believe on his June 6 visit that obtaining the use of one of these buildings might be the quickest route to the re-establishment of the consulate. Ownership, however, would have to be determined prior to a new tenant taking possession. Doyle’s task consisted of determining which office of the post-war government could provide him with a list of such buildings, arranging escorted visits to evaluate their suitability, and then determining what agency had jurisdiction over the buildings and beginning the process for use or acquisition. During his June survey trip to the Netherlands, which lasted until June 13, Doyle consulted with the “town major” for Amsterdam (the British officer responsible for order in the city), the burgemeester (mayor) of the city, the Municipal Billeting Officer, and the legal section of the Militair Gezag (the military government installed by Queen Wilhelmina until the civilian government could return).

41 Albert M. Doyle, Consul General, to the Secretary of State, Dispatch no. 77, January 17, 1946, 8, Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State, Central Files, 1945-1949, Box 1257, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland; Untitled photograph of Museumplein 17 and 19, May 1945, U.S. Consulate archives.

42 Albert M. Doyle, Consul General, to the Secretary of State, “Survey Trip to the Netherlands with Reference to Reopening of Consular Offices at Amsterdam and Rotterdam,” June 16, 1945, 1, 7, Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State, Central Files, 1945-1949, Box 1257, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

On June 8, Doyle, accompanied by a billeting officer, attempted to visit buildings in Amsterdam formerly occupied by the Germans or their Dutch collaborators. Some of the buildings had already been assigned to organizations or individuals. Two others were unsuited to the consulate’s needs. Doyle did manage to look at Leidesplein 1-3, a four-story building that housed Koninklijke Luchtvaart Maatschappij (KLM), the Dutch airline, on the ground floor, and a German fur company on the upper floors. He also visited a house at Stadionweg 50, near the Olympic Stadium, which was attractive enough for use as the consulate that he asked if it could be reserved until he returned to Amsterdam. He was told that the housing situation in Amsterdam was “extremely tight.”

Doyle’s report to the secretary of state on June 16 did not include any recommendations on properties suitable for the consulate, but the office reopened on a temporary basis on July 2 in a building on the Stationweg, perhaps the one he visited on June 8. By the end of July, however, he had settled on the former office of the Beauftragte at Museumplein 19 as a better solution. The British Army’s 18th Line of Communications office occupied the building at that time, but Doyle arranged with Town Major Beyerley and the Municipal Billeting Office to allow it to serve as the American consulate after a Colonel Weir of the Canadian Leave Center waived his office’s interest in the building. Doyle’s correspondence from this period includes several appreciative references to the town major and the billeting office; it appears that the British authority and the municipal agency directly contributed to the American use of this property.

Doyle took possession of the building on a provisional basis on August 1, 1945.

After an exchange of telegrams, the State department informed Doyle on August 24 that the consul might open the consulate at Museumplein 19, providing that an agreement for such use could be arranged with Dutch authorities. The department reaffirmed its position, however, that no lease for use of the building could be signed until its ownership was resolved. At issue was the property’s purchase by the German government prior to the war, which made it subject to the jurisdiction of the Allied Control Council for Germany, an agency established under the terms of the surrender to, among other duties, determine ownership of such properties. Capt. L. M. Verscheure of the legal section of the Militair Gezag subsequently told Doyle that his office had no objection to the American use of Museumplein 19 on an indeterminate basis until ownership could be established, and August 1 was agreed on as the date that would be used as the beginning of a retrospective lease, if one was deemed appropriate.

When Doyle took possession of the premises on August 1, he signed a receipt in the town major’s office for the furnishings remaining in the building. Given the difficulty in acquiring any kind of material goods at the time, the furniture in the building added to the its value. Museumplein 19 had been used by the German consulate, the Beauftragte, the Canadians, and the British as office space, and its furnishings included a large number of utilitarian desks and chairs that would be useful in the consulate’s work, in addition to curtains, rugs, wall hangings, and light fixtures. Doyle considered it likely that the furniture had come from multiple locations, since the Germans and the Allies moved furniture from building to building as it was needed. Intriguingly, however, Doyle wrote that the curtains and draperies “evidently belong to the building and have been so installed for some years.” Since the consul attempted to describe in this dispatch the origins of the furnishings as part of the discussion of ownership, this comment that the drapes and curtains “belong to the building” raises the possibility that, when the U.S. took possession of Museumplein 19, some artifacts from the van Heukelom period may have remained. Doyle also noted that the existing light fixtures had been designed for a private residence, rather than an office, suggesting that built-in lighting, such as chandeliers and pendant lamps, from the van Heukelom residence may also have been extant in the summer of 1945.

---

44 Doyle, “Survey Trip to the Netherlands,” June 16, 1945, 6-8; Doyle, Dispatch no. 77, January 17, 1946, 3; Consulate General of the United States, Amsterdam “History of the Consulate General,” 2.

45 The Town Major controlled the disposition of the property while it was reserved for military use. Once it had been released from military use, the billeting office had jurisdiction.
With the agreement of his own department and the military authority in Amsterdam, Doyle moved quickly to re-open the consulate at Museumplein 19. The consul noted, in his description of the building to his superiors, that adequate security already existed in the iron bars, steel windows, and sliding wood shutters on the ground floor and the folding steel grills on three windows on the second floor and one stair window between the first and second floors. Doyle had the wartime furniture available for his use, but he also moved furniture from the old consulate at Keizersgracht 473, in storage at The Hague, to Museumplein 19. As the condition of the building was generally good, Doyle and the staff he had put into place merely cleaned the building and arranged the furniture before moving in on September 5. The first notarials were issued on September 6. The Rijksgebouwendienst (National Public Building Service) undertook minor repairs to the building after a request from Doyle on November 27. The work consisted of repairs to wallpaper and repapering one room, repairing a hole in one wall, fixing locks and a leak, supplying counterweights for some windows and replacing tiles in a bathroom, trimming the hedge and cutting the lawn, repairing the trapdoors at the rear of the building, and resetting the paving at both the front and back entrances. Painting of the wood trim was undertaken the following May.46

It was also in May that Doyle began to push for the final resolution of the still-unresolved ownership of Museumplein 19 in the hope that it would become the permanent home to the U.S. Consulate in Amsterdam. The Amsterdam office of the Nederlandsche Beheersinstituut (Netherlands Institute for the Custodianship of Enemy Property) had responsibility for the building, which it had delegated to the Inspecteur der Domeinen (Public Officer in Charge of Government-Owned Estates) for Amsterdam. The director of the Beheersinstituut, J.P. Barth, did not think that the Allied Control Council had resolved the issue of the disposition of former German property. Doyle, however, thought that Museumplein 19 could be allocated to the United States by the Control Council as reparations under the terms of the *Final Act of the Paris Conference on Reparation* (December 21, 1945). It could also be allocated to the Netherlands government under the same act, after which it could be leased or sold to the U.S. Doyle wrote to the secretary of state on May 16, 1946, requesting that the department actively seek the allocation of Museumplein 19 to the United States by the Control Council or to the Dutch government for subsequent transfer.47

Museumplein 19, as well as other properties used by the Germans or by Dutch collaborators during the war, was ultimately awarded to the Dutch government. By January 1947, Doyle had begun requesting the property’s acquisition by the U.S., and the State department authorized the acquisition via telegram on March 12. On April 2, Barth, of the Beheersinstituut, provided the terms of the sale of the building and grounds and certain items of furniture, as well as rent for the occupation of the building prior to its sale. On April 14, Doyle requested permission from the burgomaster and aldermen of the city to use the building as the U.S. consulate – as the German government had done in 1938. The regional supervisor of the American Foreign Buildings Office, Allen S. Jacobs, approved of the acquisition of Museumplein 19 – as well as a villa at Apollolaan 178 to be used as the consul’s residence – on April 17 after an inspection two days earlier.48

By October, however, the transfer had still not been made. This seems likely to have been the result of the time it took for all parties to agree on the terms of the transfer and the appropriate language for the deed. The United States and the Netherlands did not agree on the manner by which the Dutch would settle lend-lease, aid, and military relief debts until the end of May 1947, meaning that preparing the deed could not begin in earnest until then. A conference was held at Museumplein 19 on October 10 on the deed language that included Ides van der Gracht, attaché at the American embassy; J.D. Schouten, the Public Officer in

46 Doyle, Dispatch no. 77, January 17, 1946, 1-9; Doyle to Capt. L. Verscheure, Militair Gezag, August 29, 1945, attachment to Dispatch no. 77.

47 Doyle to Secretary of State, dispatch no. 180, May 16, 1946, Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State, Central Files, 1945-1949, Box 1257, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

48 “Memorandum: Subject: Visit of Mr. Allen S. Jacobs in connection with the acquisition of consular properties,” April 17, 1947; Doyle to Secretary of State, dispatch no. 446, April 18, 1947, Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State, Central Files, 1945-49, Box 1257, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
Charge of Government-Owned Estates; and J.J. Sterkenburg and W. Donath of the Real Estate Section of the Amsterdam Public Works Department. Six months later, all the issues related to the transfer had been resolved, and on March 19, 1948, Ambassador Herman B. Baruch signed the deed for the United States. The purchase price was 129,326 Dutch guilders ($47,179.63), to be paid under the terms of the lend-lease settlement agreement between the two countries. Baruch also signed a deed that day for the transfer of the “corporeal movables” at Museumplein 19 for a price of 4,700 guilders, also to be paid under the lend-lease agreement. The “movables” consisted of curtains, armchairs, “steel cupboards,” and wood furniture.49

The U.S. government’s acquisition of Museumplein 19 in this manner follows a post-war trend in the acquisition of American diplomatic facilities. In an effort to strengthen existing democracies and to turn wartime foes into allies, while at the same time containing the expansion of Soviet influence, the United States sought a more robust presence abroad after World War II, both diplomatically and militarily. With a large number of properties available at good prices in war-ravaged countries, the U.S. determined to purchase, rather than lease, space for their outposts on foreign soil. Congressional authorization to use foreign credit, based on lend-lease and war asset agreements, surplus property disposal, and other programs, allowed the State department to purchase these properties without the use of tax dollars – and therefore without Congressional oversight. Foreign Buildings Operations Director Frederick “Fritz” Larkin actively pursued this policy, purchasing building sites, as well as buildings in Nice, Prague, Dublin, Rome, Brussels, Paris, and elsewhere. Museumplein 19 was one of 386 buildings acquired by the State department between 1947 and 1949.50

Museumplein 19 as the U.S. Consulate General, 1948-2013

When the United States Consulate General opened at Museumplein 19 on September 6, 1945, it offered the same consular services it had prior to World War II and as it does today – citizenship inquiries, visa applications, economic reporting, trade services. (Figure 28) Then, as now, the public functions were concentrated on the first floor of the building, with offices upstairs. The government use of the former van Heukelom residence continued a change in the function of the villas originally built for affluent Amsterdamers that began before the war. The purchase of the house by the German government for use as its consulate occurred at the beginning of this trend. The early years after World War II consolidated it. A report on security at the Amsterdam consulate, made in late October 1948 by Area Security Officer Merrill M. Blevens, based at the U.S. Embassy in Brussels, noted that “a number of other consulates and the Russian Trade Commission for the Netherlands” occupied former residences in the neighborhood.51

In addition to the use of the buildings surrounding the Museumplein, the function and design of the square also changed after the war. Photographs from the early years of the Nazi occupation of Amsterdam show that the landscape of the Museumplein had matured by 1940: An iron fence punctuated at several locations by stone and brick piers and entrance gates marked its boundaries, and tall trees surrounded the space. The addition of barricades, barbed wire, sentry posts, and bunkers after 1943 changed the landscape considerably, and city authorities did not erase the remnants of the German occupation completely until 1953, when the bunkers were removed. That work was part of the transformation of the Museumplein from its primary pre-war function as a gathering place for the citizens of Amsterdam to its use in an overall strategy to manage the city’s traffic, with park functions taking a secondary role. The new design, developed

49 “Legal Conveyance” (deed in English), March 19, 1948; “Legal Conveyance – Furnishings,” (deed in English), Amsterdam_X 13013, Department of Statue, Overseas Buildings Operations, Archives, Rosslyn, Virginia. Dollar value of sale of Museumplein 19 from Ellis A. Sonnet, American Consul, “Statutes of Property Acquisition and Improvements at Amsterdam,” May 4, 1948, Amsterdam_X 13013, Department of Statue, Overseas Buildings Operations, Archives, Rosslyn, Virginia.

50 Loeffler, 37-50.

51 Consulate General to Secretary of State, dispatch no. 131, November 8, 1948, 1, Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State. Central Files, 1945-49, Box 1258, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
in 1952 by Cornelis van Eesteren for the Amsterdam Public Works Department (with Hans Warnau as landscape architect) included a wide traffic artery from Van Baerlestraat near the Concertgebouw to the Rijksmuseum. Van Eesteren sought better automobile linkage with the region surrounding the city, and the redesign included a large KLM bus stop immediately opposite the American consulate that linked Schiphol Airport to the Museumkwartier. Over objections from local residents, who feared the pollution inherent in the increased traffic, as well as the loss of park space, the plan was approved in 1952 and constructed the following year.\(^{52}\)

The relative reduction in the amount of green space within the Museumplein did not end its public use, and the square often became the location for public demonstrations on issues of national and global importance. Beginning in the late 1960s, when outcry against the Vietnam war increased in the United States and in other western nations, these protests frequently focused on the U.S. Consulate. The consulate’s archives include a photograph of a peaceful protest at Museumplein 19 in May 1967, with protesters sitting with their backs to the perimeter fence, which is hung with signs and banners. Later protests became larger and more aggressive. (Figure 29) Protesters occupied the building for a brief period of time in 1973, and in the same year, a bomb was left in the first-floor waiting room. A local employee took the package outside, where the Dutch police disarmed it. \(^{53}\)

In the early 1980s, public demonstrations on other issues involving American foreign policy also centered on the consulate. Demonstrators protested American pursuit of the neutron bomb and the escalation of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. In 1982, when the Salvadoran military was responsible for the deaths of four Dutch journalists in the early years of the country’s civil war, protestors demonstrated at the consulate against an American foreign policy that supported the existing government. The protestors also erected five crosses on the Museumplein opposite the consulate – one for each of the journalists and one for the 40,000 Salvadoran citizens killed during the civil war. (Figure 30) The protestors took advantage of a change in the Museumplein that occurred at just this time. Open space directly opposite the consulate’s front door, in which demonstrators could gather or display signs and symbols, was created when the bus station was removed. The demolition of the station occurred after a train route between Schiphol Airport and Amsterdam’s Station Centraal was established in 1981.\(^{54}\)

The protests of the 1970s and 1980s – which also included bomb threats, physical intimidation of consulate personnel, window breakage, and graffiti painted on the building – resulted in changes to the consulate’s approach to security. A security guard was hired for the first time after the Vietnam protests, and physical changes to the building, such as the use of bulletproof glass, were introduced. The concept of a security corridor was introduced as early as 1980. Exterior physical changes made in this period to address security issues included the construction of a taller perimeter fence, vehicle barriers at the edge of the curb, and a vestibule erected at the French doors on the southeast corner of the building. Security concerns have continued to affect the day-to-day operations of the consulate and its physical presence, especially after terrorist bombings at American embassies in Tanzania and Kenya in 1998 and attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in 2001. The most recent changes to the building related to security occurred in 2012, when a new perimeter fence and security screening facility (compound access control or CAC), designed by Davis Brody Bond, were constructed.\(^{55}\)

---
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\(^{53}\) Van der Werf, 59; Interview with Eugene M. Braderman (typescript), n.d., U.S. Consulate, Amsterdam, Archives, 17-21.

\(^{54}\) Van der Werf, 59; photographs, February 1981, February 1982, photographers unknown, U.S. Consulate, Amsterdam, Archives. The street in the center of the Museumplein was removed in a 1999 redesign of the square.

Figure 1 – For more than fifteen years prior to World War II, the U.S. Consulate in Amsterdam was located on the first floor of this building at Keizersgracht 473-479. (Undated photograph, photographer unknown, U.S. Consulate, Amsterdam, Archives)
Figure 2 – The 1902 plan for the Museumplein approved by the Amsterdam city council. (From Jouke van der Werf, Plein, park of veld? Cultuurhistorische Verkenning Museumplein en omgeving, Gemeente Amsterdam, Bureau Monumenten & Archeologie, n.d., 25.)
Figure 3 – Most of the buildings in the Museumkwartier between the Museumplein and the Boerenwetering canal, including Museumplein 19, were completed between 1910 and 1920. (From Jouke van der Werfe, Plein, park of veld? C Elvischistorische Verkenning Museumplein en Omgeving, Gemeente Amsterdam, Bureau Monumenten & Archeologie, n.d., 34.)
Figure 4 – Schill & Haverkamp designed the Villa Liliane in Baarn in 1883, early in the pair’s career. The chalet style of the building, based on Swiss architecture, represents their eclectic approach to design. (http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Baarn_Wilhelminaalaan_villa_Liliane.JPG#filelinks)
Figure 5 – Schill & Haverkamp executed the 1884 design for the Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst in exuberant Dutch Renaissance Revival motifs. (Auke van der Woud, *The Art of Building: From Classicism to Modernity: The Dutch Architectural Debate, 1840-1900*, Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2001, 114.)
Figure 6 – The urban villa Schill & Haverkamp designed in 1907 for stock broker F.L. Wurfbain at Eeghenstraat 112, bordering the Vondelpark, featured a prominent bell gable, a bay window, and unadorned window frames – elements the architects would also employ at Museumplein 19. (“Villa Van Eeghenstraat 112, Amsterdam,”Nederlands Architectuurinstituut website, http://zoek.nai.nl/CIS/project/23351, viewed July 11, 2013)
Figure 7 – Schill and Haverkamp’s design for the van Heukelom residence placed its main entrance on the Museumplein. (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam,” blad no. 2 (detail), n.d., submitted with a building permit application originally dated February 26, 1912. The original blueprint has been changed from a negative to a positive image in Adobe Photoshop.) For the gable as executed, see Figure 14.
Figure 8 – On the south façade, French doors provide access to a first-floor sitting room, a tripartite window lights the salon on the second floor, and a balcony extends from Mrs. van Heukelom’s bedroom on the third floor. (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam,” blad no. 2 (detail), n.d., submitted with a building permit application originally dated February 26, 1912. The original blueprint has been changed from a negative to a positive image in Adobe Photoshop.)
Figure 9 – A bell gable over the stair hall and a two-story projecting bay vary the rear façade of Museumplein 19. (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam,” blad no. 2 (detail), n.d., submitted with a building permit application originally dated February 26, 1912. The original blueprint has been changed from a negative to a positive image in Adobe Photoshop.) For the façade as built, see Figure 15.
Figure 10 – The first (or ground) floor contained service functions, such as the kitchen (keukem), as well as a combination billiards room (billardkamer) and sitting room (zitkamer), divided by a column screen. (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam,” blad no. 1 (detail), n.d., submitted with a building permit application originally dated February 26, 1912. The original blueprint has been changed from a negative to a positive image in Adobe Photoshop.)
Figure 11 – The second floor included rooms in which the family and their guests gathered, such as the dining room (eetkamer) and the salon. (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam,” blad no. 1 (detail), n.d., submitted with a building permit application dated February 26, 1912. The original blueprint has been changed from a negative to a positive image in Adobe Photoshop.)
Figure 12 – This section drawing shows that the hierarchy of spaces evident in the treatment of the exterior was carried over into the interior. The greater decoration of the second floor indicates its importance relative to the other spaces. (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam,” blad no. 3 (detail), n.d., submitted with a building permit application originally dated February 26, 1912. The original blueprint has been changed from a negative to a positive image in Adobe Photoshop.)
Figure 13 – The original site plan submitted with the building permit application includes the location of the masonry and iron fence at the perimeter of the property. (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam,” blad no. 7 (detail), n.d., submitted with a building permit application originally dated February 26, 1912. The original blueprint has been changed from a negative to a positive image in Adobe Photoshop.)
Figure 14 – Museumplein 19’s original fence consisted of a masonry base and gate piers with spiked vertical pickets and scrollwork in metal. (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam,” blad no. 6, submitted with a building permit application originally dated February 26, 1912. The original blueprint has been changed from a negative to a positive image.)
Figure 15 – This rendering of the front façade depicts the gable as it was ultimately constructed. (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam, Gevel Museumpein,” n.d., submitted with a building permit application originally dated February 26, 1912.)
Figure 16 – A hipped roof, rather than a bell gable, was ultimately constructed atop the stair hall, as shown in this rendering of the rear façade. (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam, Achtergevel,” n.d., submitted with a building permit application originally dated February 26, 1912.)
Figure 17 – The second-floor salon, showing the Chippendale-style furniture and patterned fabrics used to decorate Museumplein 19 by Johan Adam Pool, Jr. (From Moderne Hollandsche interieurs, 2e aflevering: J.A. Pool, meubelfabriek Onder den St. Maarten te Haarlem, 1916, plate 7.)
Figure 18 – Schill & Haverkamp’s third-floor plan (*tweede verdieping*) indicates which members of the family were intended to sleep in which rooms. The plan designates a daughters’ bedroom (*slaapk. dochters*), a son’s bedroom (*slaapk. zoon*), and rooms for Mr. and Mrs. van Heukelom (*slaapk. mijnheer* and *slaapk. mevrouw*, respectively). (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam,” blad no. 1 (detail), n.d., submitted with a building permit application originally dated February 26, 1912. The original blueprint has been changed from a negative to a positive image in Adobe Photoshop.)
Figure 19 – The room that the 1912 floor plan designates as the daughters’ bedroom is the most highly decorated bedroom in the house. (Johan Adam Pool, Jr., Moderne Hollandsche Interiors, 1917, plate 14.)
Figure 20 – Announcement from the Beauftragte (representative of the German civilian government) stating that the office was being moved to Museumplein 19 on May 26, 1941. (Archief van de Groep Albrecht, no. 86, inv. 22, Nederlands instituut voor Oorlogs-, Holocaust-, en Genocidestudies.)
Figure 21 – The façade of Museumplein 19 is visible in this photograph of the review of the Ordnungspolizei (Order Police) by Reich Commissioner Arthur Seyss-Inquart on February 15, 1941. Faces appear at several of Museumplein 19’s windows – nine months after the German consulate closed its offices there, but three months before the Beauftragte moved into the building. (Stapf Bilderdienst, “Day of the Ordnungspolizei Museumplein,” no. 137759, February 15, 1941, Beeldbank, Nederlands instituut voor Oorlogs-, Holocaust-, en Genocidestudies.)
Figure 22 – Seyss-Inquart organized a rally on the Museumplein marking the German invasion of the Soviet Union on June 27, 1941. Museumplein 19 is hidden behind the mature trees at the square’s perimeter at the upper left portion of the picture. (Stapf Bilderdienst, “Manifestation Museumplein Barbarossa 27-6-1941,” no. 41799, June 27, 1941, Beeldbank, Nederlands instituut voor Oorlogs-, Holocaust-, en Genocidestudies.)
Figure 23 – Beauftragte Dr. Werner Schröder (right) shakes hands with Dutch Nazi Party leader Anton Mussert in 1942 in what was the van Heukelom dining room in Museumplein 19. (Untitled photograph of Anton Adriaan Mussert and Dr. Werner Schröder, ca. 1942, U.S. Consulate, Amsterdam, Archives.)
Figure 24 – The Dutch Resistance reported regularly on German organization and movements in Amsterdam. This report from July 18, 1944, included a drawing of the fortified area around the Museumplein, including the location of barbed wire fencing and bunkers. (“Amsterdam,” Juli 18, 1944, Archief van de Groep Albrecht, no. 190a, inv. 27-I, Nederlands instituut voor Oorlogs-, Holocaust-, en Genocidestudies.)
Figure 25 – Earth-covered concrete bunkers in Museum Square opposite Museumplein 19. The three bunkers were intended to act as offices should the German headquarters buildings across the street be threatened by Allied attack. (F. Le Coultré, “Bunkers Museumplein after War,” no. 194513, May 1945, Beeldbank, Nederlands instituut voor Oorlogs-, Holocaust-, en Genocidestudies.)
Chronology of Development and Use

Museumplein 19 as Originally Constructed, 1912-1924

Construction

Willem Frederick van Heukelom submitted his original building permit application on February 26, 1912. As discussed in Chapter 1, the elevations underwent some revision before the final design was approved by the city. Construction presumably began shortly after approval was received, probably in the spring of 1912. The revised site plan, which identifies connections between the residence's plumbing and the city sewers, is dated March 1913. It seems likely, then, that construction was completed at some point after this date. City records indicate that the family moved into the house in 1913, but do not specify the exact date. ¹

Documents indicate that the house was constructed on pine pilings, with the basement consisting of reinforced concrete for the floor and ceiling and brick for the walls. Exterior walls above ground were of brick, with trasraam, a construction technique using masonry and hard mortar to withstand moisture, being used up to the water table. Interior walls were built either of brick or “excelsior” boards, a lightweight wall material. Wood was employed for the floor and roof structure; iron rods in certain locations added strength. The house was heated by a furnace in the basement, probably burning coal, and included two fireplaces on both the first and second floors.²

Exterior

Museumplein 19’s dark red brick was laid in Dutch bond, a pattern of alternating headers and stretchers that terminates each course of stretchers in a three-quarter bat. (Figure 31) This pattern requires that a header be inserted before the three-quarter bat every other stretcher course. On the first floor, every sixth brick course was recessed, giving the wall the appearance of channelized masonry that is a feature of Dutch Renaissance Revival architecture. Above the first floor, the pattern of recessed bricks was repeated at the corners of the building and flanking the central bay of the projecting west façade, recalling Renaissance quoins and pilasters. (Figure 15) The horizontal mortar joints between the bricks were made thicker than the vertical joints, and jack arches supported the walls above the windows.

Although not referred to in the drawings for the house, stone was used for ornament and for features that projected from the facades. A course of gray limestone marked the top of the water table and functioned as a belt course between the first and second floors on all facades. Limestone was also used for the balcony slabs and the porch balustrade rails. Tan sandstone was also used on the exterior. In locations where a drainpipe descended from the roof, carved ornament in the sandstone course between the floors held the pipe in place. (Figure 32) Sandstone was also used for the lintel, brackets, and balusters on the portico, for the brackets of the north façade oriel and the balconies, for the ornamentation on the neck gable, for the fascia below the cornice at roof level, and for window sills. In general, carved ornament took classical forms – scroll-type brackets and cartouches, fruit and flower festoons hanging from lions’ heads in the neck gable. (Figure 33) Schill & Haverkamp’s eclectic approach to ornament, however, is clear in the anthropomorphism of the drainpipe brackets and elsewhere. The balconies were enclosed with decorative iron railings. Ironwork was also used in grilles on the first-floor windows of the north, east, and south facades – consisting of


² Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam, blad no. 3, n.d.; Building Permit application, February 26, 1912, 5, Bouwvergunning en tekening 11974, Archief van de secretarie: afdeling publieke werken 5180, Stadsarchief, Amsterdam, Nederlands. There are some slight discrepancies between these two documents. The building permit application, for instance, refers to “concrete brick” and “alluvial stone,” in addition to brick and concrete, for the walls, while the drawings do not. The assumption that the furnace burned coal is based on Consul General Albert Doyle’s dispatch of January 17, 1946 – thirty years after the van Heukelom family took up residence – in which he said that he would receive coal from the U.S. Army Quartermaster as fuel for the furnace.
alternating spiked, spiral pickets within a rectangular grid – and in the fence around the yard.\(^3\) (Figure 34)

Schill & Haverkamp limited the use of wood on the exterior to the window frames and sashes, the cornice, eaves, and dormer decoration. The cornice consisted of dentils and brackets supporting the eaves. Dentils also decorated the dormer pediments. (Figure 35) A mastic and slate roof covered the house, and lead ridge caps and finials marked the roof’s corners. Lead sheeting covered the barrel vault of the large west dormer. Schill & Haverkamp’s building permit drawings show two chimneys – a larger rectangular chimney emerging from the flat portion of the hipped roof on the south and a smaller square chimney rising from the angled portion of the roof on the east. (Figure 6) It appears, however, that three brick chimneys were constructed instead, all within the flat portion of the roof. Rectangular chimneys rose from approximately the center of the south and east sides of the flat part of the roof, and a square chimney emerged in the southeast corner. All the chimneys were constructed of brick with sandstone detailing.\(^4\)

The original design of the house included two entrances. The main entrance, consisting of a two-leaved wood door with a fanlight above, faced the Museumplein.\(^5\) (Figure 36) A mail slot was located in a carved stone grotesque in the wall next to the door. (Figure 37) In the northernmost bay of the west façade, the main entrance was reached from the stone-trimmed portico. (Figure 38) The east, or rear façade, held the second entrance. (Figure 16) A vestibule, of brick below the water table and of wood and glass above, held a single-leaf door, probably also of wood. French doors in the westernmost bay of the south façade provided passage between the first-floor sitting room and the yard. (Figure 8)

The basement originally had windows on three sides opening onto light wells. (Figure 39) There were two windows on the north, one on the east, and one on the south. No drawings or photographs of these windows were found in research for this study, and their appearance is not known. Early photographs and Schill & Haverkamp’s drawings of Museumplein 19 suggest that window sashes on the first floor of the west and south facades consisted two tall lights below two nearly square lights, perhaps mounted as casement windows. (Figure 40) On the east façade, windows in the first-floor projecting bay consisted of two tall lights surmounted by a transom, assuming the windows were carried out as they were depicted in the drawings. (Figure 16) These may also have been casement windows. Three small square windows lit the lowest level of the stair hall, and two similar windows illuminated the first-floor bathrooms. On the north façade, a one-over-one sash window pierced the eastern bay, while a tripartite window (each part consisting of two lights one above the other) illuminated the vestibule. (Figure 41)

Second- and third-floor windows generally consisted of one-over-one sashes, according to the drawings and photographs showing the west and south facades. At least one of these sashes seems likely to have been movable. Certain windows on these floors diverged from the typical in order to identify important interior spaces. A tripartite window and a French door pierced the center bays of the projecting portion of the west façade on the second and third floors, respectively. The tripartite window illuminated the salon on the second floor, while the French doors gave access to the balcony from the third-floor bedroom designated on the 1912 drawings as Mr. van Heukelom’s. The same arrangement of tripartite window and French doors was used on the south façade, marking the salon and, along with the balcony, the bedroom proposed for Mrs. Van Heukelom. On the east façade, the second floor of the projecting bay was composed entirely of windows

---

3. Drawings of the house’s details, such as brick patterns and decorative touches, are not included in the drawings submitted along with van Heukelom’s building permit application. These details are, however, immediately recognizable as part of the original construction. Where drawings are not given as the source of information in this section, the conclusion that they are original is based on observation or on materials analysis also performed as part of the HSR.

4. The southeast corner chimney does not appear in Schill & Haverkamp’s 1912 drawings. It shares construction details with the other chimneys, however, and appears in a 1944 photograph of the house, suggesting that it was original to the van Heukelom construction.

to light the conservatory. According to drawings of the east façade, the center section of the bay held four tall lights surmounted by three transom windows. The flanking sections each held two tall lights surmounted by a transom. A French door on the third floor opened onto the balcony atop the projecting bay. The second- and third-floor windows on the east façade lighting the stair hall consisted of three tall, banked lights. An oriel projected from the center of the north façade's second floor, consisting of paired tall lights with a transom above in the center and tall lights with a square sash above on each side. The oriel illuminated the second-floor hall. A small oval window with stained, leaded glass within a carved stone cartouche west of the oriel lit a second-floor bathroom.

The photograph of Museumplein 19 published in Het Stadswoonhuis in Nederland (Figure 40) indicates that some of the house's windows were shaded by awnings. The photograph shows awnings on the second floor of the west façade and on the second and third floors of the south façade. It is not known whether awnings were used on other facades.

The attic level was lit by dormer windows. In most cases, the dormers held what were likely casement windows with small, paired lights, according to Schill & Haverkamp's drawings and historic photographs. The exceptions occurred on the west façade, where the neck gable held taller paired windows, and on the east façade, where the stair hall projection also held taller, paired windows.

Interior

Schill & Haverkamp's section drawings of the van Heukelom house illustrate the hierarchy of treatment planned for Museumplein 19's interiors. (Figure 12) With the exception of the first-floor hall, the greatest concentration of finely finished surfaces are shown on the second floor, where the large rooms for the gathering of family and visitors were located – the salon and the dining room. Relatively less decoration was planned for the public rooms of the first floor (again with the exception of the hall) and the bedrooms of the third floor. The basement and the attic rooms received the least amount of decorative treatment.

Basement: Storage and the house's heating apparatus were located in the basement. (Figure 39) Schill & Haverkamp's floor plans show that the furnace was intended for a large room on the southeast corner of the building, with fuel storage adjacent in the bow under the projecting bay. Windows in light wells illuminated these spaces. The three other rooms in the basement were intended for storage, including a wine cellar at the northwest corner. These spaces were likely treated in a utilitarian manner. The walls, likely plastered and painted, projected at the base (Figure 42), and simple wood doors were probably used. The floor treatment is unknown, but a simple plaster molding outlined the ceilings. (Figure 43)

First Floor: Schill & Haverkamp divided the functions of the first floor roughly in half. Public rooms (entrance vestibule, hall, billiards room, sitting room) occupied the northwest portion of the building, while service functions (kitchen, laundry, storage, and scullery) were located to the southeast. (Figure 10) Decorative treatment of the rooms followed this division.

The section drawings show that the architects intended to fit the wall of the vestibule (room 101) opposite the front door with baseboards, wainscot, and moldings. (Figure 44) The details of the moldings are unknown. A door, surmounted by a decorative overdoor or transom, was centered in this wall and led into the cloakroom (112). (The first floor plan shows a closet in the cloakroom and one other built-in detail, the purpose of which is unclear, but no other details.) The vestibule's west wall held the arched, front door and mail slot. The north wall was paneled in wood below its wood-framed tripartite window. Treatment of the south wall of the vestibule is uncertain. The section drawing depicts the doorway as an arched opening containing a two-leaved door, flanked by narrower vertical panels. (Figure 45) The configuration probably resembled the remaining original framing on the hall side of this doorway, which has been recently altered.

---

6 To provide continuity for descriptions of the consulate's rooms over time, a system of room numbers was developed during the site survey. The room numbers will be inserted parenthetically next to the original room functions in this section and then used to identify the rooms after acquisition of Museumplein 19 by the United States.
Figure 46) It is unclear whether the doors, flanking panels, and overdoor were constructed of wood or a combination of wood and glass. If they were constructed of wood only, the adjoining hall would have received light only from the stair hall windows. Marble surfaced the vestibule floors, light gray at the center with a deep red border. (Figure 47) The ceiling’s plaster molding consisted of three concentric squares with circular floral medallions at the corners. (Figure 48) It is not known how the vestibule was lit.

The door in the south wall of the vestibule led into the hall (102), which seems to have contained the greatest profusion of rich materials in the house. The gray and red marble of the vestibule floor was continued in the hall, and the east side of this space, framed by a pair of classically inspired, red and gray marble pilasters supporting an entablature of the same material, opened onto the home’s central stairway. (Figure 49) The remaining wall surfaces in the hall featured tan marble wainscot. The treatment of the walls above the wainscots is uncertain. Wood doors and doorways led off the hall to the kitchen, a storage room and to the billiards room. (Figure 50) The moldings of the door frames included an architrave. The doors consisted of two rectangular panels, the lower one shorter than the upper, framed by stiles and rails, and featured a brass lever handle in an oval plate. (Figure 51) The coved hall ceiling included concentric square moldings with a central medallion.

One of Schill & Haverkamp’s section drawings shows a view looking north through the billiards room (103), suggesting the room’s original treatment. (Figure 45) Wood wainscots surfaced approximately half the height of the north wall. This paneling may also have been used on the west wall, flanking the window, and on the east wall, flanking the door to the hall. Treatment of the wall above the paneling is not clear. Beneath the wood window frame, a wood radiator cover disguised the heating system. (Figure 52) Wood shutters, hidden in pockets in the window frame, could be slid out to close the window opening behind the glass. (Figure 53) The door frame on the east wall included a wood molding but did not include the architrave used in the hall. The billiards room employed a beamed, wood ceiling. (Figure 54) The beams divided the ceiling into square coffers, with the exception of a hexagonal coffer in the center of the ceiling. Pendant lights may have hung from the corners of the hexagon. The wood elements were probably naturally finished and clear-coated.

Wall treatments in the larger sitting room (104), south of the billiards room, continued the same pattern of wainscot, window frames, shutters, and radiator covers. (Figure 55) Materials analysis indicates that the sitting room walls above the wainscots were originally covered with wallpaper over canvas or burlap attached to wood stretchers. (See Volume II.) The wallpaper pattern used is not known. The sitting room also had a beamed wood ceiling. (Figure 56) On the east wall of the sitting room stood an elaborate stone, tile, and wood fireplace. (Figure 57) Stone columns and brackets supported the carved wood mantel of the fireplace that featured carved heads in three panels. Scenes of windmills, castles, rivers, and boats decorate the tiles at the back of the fireplace. Between the sitting room and the billiards room was a column screen (according to the second drawing), which consisted of two free-standing classical columns and two pilasters or engaged columns. The columns and engaged columns/pilasters stood on pedestals, and a decorative railing, perhaps of carved wood, connected the pedestals. Brackets were intended to extend from the entablatures toward the center of the room, supporting pendant lamps.

Treatment of the other rooms on the first floor is less certain. The kitchen (105) included a fireplace of white tiles decorated in blue on the west wall. (Figure 58) The tiles flanking the fireplace opening depicted columns decorated with exotic birds, while the tiles connecting the columns featured shepherds and other figures in roundels. The floor plan included in the J.H.W. Leliman’s book Het Stadswoonhuis in Nederland, which was published after the house was built and therefore may be more accurate than Schill & Haverkamp’s earlier 1912 floor plans, shows a closet north of the fireplace. (Figure 59) The section drawing indicates that the east wall of the kitchen was also partly tiled and included a door into the scullery. (Figure 44) The first-floor plan in Het Stadswoonhuis shows a three-part built-in feature on this wall, and Schill & Haverkamp’s section drawing provides further details, illustrating a tall (as high as the door), three-part cabinet that appears to include glass doors above panel doors. A long counter is shown along the entire south wall below the window in the Het Stadswoonhuis drawing, and the counter turns the corner along the west wall. The kitchen window was
framed in wood but did not have sliding shutters. Instead, it was secured on the outside by an iron grille. The opening to a dumbwaiter was located on the north wall of the kitchen.

Perhaps simpler still was the treatment of the scullery (106), the laundry room (mangelkamer, 107), and the room labeled provisiekamer (pantry, 108) in the Het Stadswoonhuis floor plan legend. (Schill & Haverkamp’s floor plan labeled this room fietsen en provisie – bicycles and provisions.) The first-floor plan showed four closets on the west wall north of the door in the scullery and an unknown feature in the southeast corner, but no other built-in furniture. Doors and windows had frames with broad moldings, and baseboards linked the door openings. (Figures 60-61) Similar door and window surrounds were original features of rooms on the third floor. Interior doors in most of those rooms consisted of four panels (two smaller below two taller), which may have been the configuration of doors in the service rooms. Three closets were planned for the north wall of the bicycles and provisions room, and the dumbwaiter occupied the southwest corner, next to the door into the hall. The rear entrance to the house led from the rear vestibule (113) into the pantry room.

Tile surfaced the lower portion of the walls of the laundry. (Figure 62) The top portion of the tiling consisted of figures in roundels, as in the kitchen fireplace, bordered above and below by floral horizontal tiles. The figured tiles were also used as a border at the base of the tile wainscot and in patterns in the center. The three large windows of the mangeltkamer each had wood surrounds. The provisiekamer also included a tile wainscot. Two water closets were located in the northeast corner of the first floor (110-111), each lit by a small square window. The treatment of these spaces is not clear from Schill & Haverkamp’s drawings or from early photographs. They, along with the hall beneath the stairs (109), likely had same wood door and window frames and plaster ceiling moldings as other secondary spaces on the first floor. (Figure 63)

**Second Floor:** The treatment of the stairs between the first and second floor (201) also showed the importance of these two levels of the house. The half-turn stairs were constructed of wood, with a wood wainscot and banister. (Figure 64) The wainscot continued on the landing beneath the window as a paneled, wood radiator cover. (Figure 65) Features such as the newel and the banister on the landing were elaborately carved with floral motifs. (Figure 66) According to a 1916 photograph in Pool’s Modern Hollandsche Interieurs, the wall above the wainscot included a simple foliate border. (Figure 67) The undersides of the stairs, framed by the wood members, featured raised moldings. (Figure 68) The three windows on the landing were formed of small, mostly rectangular panes of glass held together with lead came. (Figure 69) The exception to the rectangular caming was in the center window, where an oval pane of glass formed the focus of a decorative feature – resembling an elaborate, classically inspired, gold frame – stained in the surrounding panes. It is possible that the frame originally contained a stained-glass rendering of a Dutch painting. The window on the landing between the second and third floors included such a rendering within its stained-glass frame. Each of the three landing windows was also colored in gold at the perimeter, with a pale green panel at the bottom. The artist or manufacturer of the stained glass was not discovered in research for the HSR. A folding, metal, security grate was located in pockets in the windows between the first and second floors.

Schill & Haverkamp’s 1912 plans for the house included a mix of public and family spaces on the second floor: the salon and dining room, where the family and visitors would gather, as well as a study, a playroom, and the nursery. (Figure 11) The use of some of the smaller rooms may have been changed prior to construction of the house, or their functions may have evolved as family members grew older, because the floor plans in Het Stadswoonhuis (published in 1924) identify slightly different functions. (Figure 70) Leliman’s publication describes the rooms designated studeerkamer (study) and kinderkamer (nursery) in the architect’s floor plans both as huiskamer (living room). The playroom retains that label in both drawings. Pool’s Moderne Hollandsche Interieurs does not include photographs of these rooms that might help define their purpose. Adjacent to the dining room a long narrow space acted as the room from which dinner was served. Called the dessertkamer (dessert room) in Schill & Haverkamp’s floor plan and the dienkamer (service room) in the Het Stadswoonhuis drawing, the room contained closets and cabinets and the dumbwaiter by which food was raised from the kitchen below.
The larger gathering spaces received the greatest decorative detail and finest materials, beginning with the
spacious hall at the top of the stairs (202). Photographs of the space in *Moderne Holandsche Interieurs* show
a wood floor laid in a herringbone pattern with squares composed of contrasting light and dark triangles as
highlights. (Figure 67) The floor also had a patterned wood border. The hall's wood wainscot, which rose to
the height of the doors opening into rooms off the hall, consisted of three framed panels with a horizontal
band at the top. The doors were two-paneled, with a slight arch at the top of the upper panel and a brass
lever handle in an oval plate. Brackets supported a projecting architrave above the door. (Figure 71) The
photographs reveal a monochromatic treatment of the walls above the wainscot. The oriel window lit the hall
at its north end. The window was framed with wood, and wood paneling surfaced the wall below the oriel.
(Figure 72) The ceiling was decorated with plaster moldings centered on a trio of Greek crosses. (Figure 73)

The photographs in the Pool publication show dishes, perhaps part of van Heukelom's Chinese porcelain
collection, displayed on top of the paneling. Also seen in the photographs are a large, figured area rug in
the center of the hall, Chippendale-style tables and chairs, potted plants, a painting on a stand, and another
elaborately carved piece of furniture of unknown purpose. The presence of a table and chairs suggests the
hall may have been used by the family as additional living space. On the other hand, the presence of the
same furniture in two different locations in the hall may mean it was simply arranged there by Pool to show
the furniture to good effect in the well-lit space.

The salon (207) occupied the southwest corner of the house. This space featured a parquet floor, and the wall
treatment consisted of a painted wood wainscot below what was probably wallpaper of the same tone as the
wainscot between wood stretchers. (Figure 74) The interior face of the door matched its hall-side composition
(two panels, with a slightly arched upper panel), but the frame was simpler, like the interior face of the door
to the billiards room. (Figure 75) Paint analysis suggests the wainscot, door, and other woodwork, such as the
wall covering stretchers and picture rail, may have been a tan color. A white marble fireplace was centered in
the east wall with a metal fireplace insert. The wall above the mantel projected slightly, and a classical molding
transitioned from this projection to the ceiling. (Figure 76) Classically derived plaster ornament also decorated
the ceiling. The ornament consisted of a rectangular frame with squares at the corners featuring central
rosettes. (Figure 77) The plaster molding seems likely to have been the same greenish-tan color that exists today,
and gold highlights in the moldings may have been an early treatment, according to materials analysis. Lights
were affixed at intervals along the inner part of the molded frame. (Figure 78) The room's location, along with
its three windows (two of them large, tripartite openings), made this one of the brightest rooms in the house.
Wood radiator covers were located below the windows. (Figure 79) Pool's photographs suggest that the salon
provided an opportunity for display of the family's collections of paintings, furniture, and decorative arts, as well
as being a comfortable location in which to gather. In addition to the plush sofas and armchairs in the room,
numerous paintings and/or prints hang from the picture rail, and sculpted figures, vases, and plates can be seen
on the mantel, table, and chest, and in the vitrine.

Adjacent to the salon, and occupying the northeast corner of the house, were the dining room (208) and
conservatory (209). While the documentary record does not settle the matter, the dining room floor was
likely also to have been wood parquetry, given its use in other important spaces. Both the Schill & Haverkamp
second-floor plan (Figure 11) and the one published in *Het Stadswoonhuis* (Figure 70) show a fireplace in the
center of the west wall of this room flanked by built-in cabinets. The fireplace consisted of a decorative metal
insert, surrounded by pink marble, with a carved wood mantel and a pink marble mantel shelf. (Figure 80)
A carved festoon decorated the paneled overmantel, which also featured classical moldings. (Figure 81) The
flanking, built-in cabinets included two paneled doors below with glass and wood doors above. (Figure 82)
Wood decoration continued on the north wall. (Figure 83) Horizontally oriented panels occupied the center
of the composition, flanked by vertically oriented panels. Doors (to the hall and the serving room) stood in
the outer segments of the wall. The configuration of these doors on the interior differed from their exterior
appearance, consisting of eight panels divided by stiles, rails, and muntins (two square over two oblong at
top and bottom). Within the dining room, these doors displayed oval knobs with rectangular plates. Two
tall windows pierced the south wall, framed in wood. A wood radiator cover with a marble top was located
below the windows. (Figure 84) The dining room featured a beamed ceiling. The beams created an octagonal coffer at the center flanked by hexagonal coffers. (Figure 85) Lamps were appended to the beams at intervals. The east wall of the dining room consisted of four sliding wood and glass doors that led to the conservatory. (Figure 86) Above the sliding doors was a transom composed of panels of small, stained-glass panes. Treatment of the walls above the paneling, doors, and windows is uncertain, but the surfaces may have been wallpapered, as in the salon.

Photographs in *Moderne Hollandsche Interieurs* suggest that the van Heukeloms treated the half octagon of the conservatory as additional living space, outfitted with a desk, chairs, and a cabinet in the style, as the photo captions indicate, of eighteenth-century English furniture designer Thomas Sheraton. (Figures 87 and 88) The wood floor, again a parquet design with contrasting border, was set off by the white wood of the wainscot, radiator covers, window frames, and sliding doors. A simple plaster molding decorated the ceiling. (Figure 89) The suggestion of a diamond pattern can be seen behind the curtain in one of Pool's conservatory photographs, perhaps indicating that the conservatory windows were composed of small, diamond-shaped or triangular panes of glass or (more likely) that the windows were protected by a folding metal grate, as were those in the stair hall.

Next to the dining room was the auxiliary space from which dinner was served, or pantry (210). In both Schill & Haverkamp's and Leliman's floor plans, the walls of this room were almost entirely occupied by closets and cabinets, a window on the east, and the door to the dining room on the south. Details of these storage features are not known, but they were likely constructed of wood and may have combined glass-fronted units with solid doors, similar to the arrangement shown in the section drawing of the kitchen. (Figure 44) Paint analysis indicates that the wall surfaces and ceiling were originally painted plaster – greenish gray for the walls and light cream for the ceiling.

The larger of the two huiskamers identified in Leliman's book, on the west side of the house (206, Figure 70), received less extensive decorative treatment than the larger public rooms. The space included a coved ceiling with plaster molding, a picture rail, and a radiator cover with metal ornament not seen elsewhere in the house. (Figures 90-91) The original treatment of the walls and floors is unknown, although, again, as a room with decorative features on the piano nobile, a patterned wood treatment may have been used on the floor. Evidence of a painted decorative band was found on one wall through materials testing. The interior face of the door to the hall consisted of four vertically oriented panels (shorter panels below, taller above) separated by stiles, rails, and a muntin (Figure 92), and the typical oval door plate and lever handle. The door was set into the same kind of simple wood frame seen in the salon. Flanking the door were built-in closets. (Figure 93) The side of the closet facing the door essentially extended the doorcase, which was finished in the same four-panel configuration as the door itself. Materials testing suggests that wood elements in the room were grained to imitate mahogany. The exterior of the closet doors probably matched the plain treatment of the wall outside the door frame. The interior faces of the closet doors matched that of the door to the hall. The interior of the closets were lined in vertical beaded boards with cross members to hold shelves. Schill & Haverkamp's 1912 floor plan shows a broad opening between this room, which it labels the nursery, and the playroom to the north. (Figure 11) It would appear from the drawing that no door was planned for this opening. The *Het Stadswoonhuis* floor plan is not clear on this point, but seems to suggest that doors were intended between its huiskamer and the speelkamer. 7 The doors and door frame matched other doorways leading from one room to another or from a room to the hall. (Figure 94)

Decorative features of the smaller living room on the northeast corner of the building (203) resembled those of the larger room. While the smaller room did not have a cove ceiling, it had a ceiling molding and picture rail (Figure 95), wood-framed window, two built-in closets (both north of the door), and paneled door and doorcase treatment. It may also have had a decorative radiator cover and wood floor.

---

7 Schill & Haverkamp's drawings use dotted parallel lines to show openings without doors, such as the archways between the stairs and halls. Openings with doors have two solid parallel lines with a narrower spacing between the lines. In the Leliman book, the arches between the stairs and the halls are unmarked, while openings with doors are indicated by solid parallel lines. The opening between the huiskamer and the speelkamer in the Leliman book has these parallel lines.
The decorative features of the playroom (205) may have been limited to the doors, doorcases, and window frame (all similar to the living rooms). It is not clear whether the room’s ceiling was decorated beyond the extant simple band molding at the edge of the ceiling. (Figure 96) Paint analysis suggests that wood features in this room were grained to imitate mahogany. The room originally had two built-in closets on the north wall, and may have had a wood radiator cover. Original treatment of the floor is not known.

The bathroom (204), located in the northeast corner of the playroom but entered from the hall, also had a band molding around the ceiling, as well as an oval window with a plain frame. (Figure 97) The window was composed of nine small panes of glass set in lead cames and stained in gold on the perimeter. The interior face of the door to the hall was grained to imitate mahogany.

**Third Floor:** The stairs from the second to the third floor received similar, though slightly less extensive ornament than those between the first and second floors. (Figure 98) The arched opening between the hall and the stairs was undecorated with the exception of a beaded edge to the soffit, for instance, and the newel and the landing banister were less elaborate than their counterparts on the first-floor stair. The wood stairs, wainscot, and window frame continued, however, as did the plaster moldings on the undersides of the stairs and stained-glass windows on the landing. The focus of the trio of landing windows was an elaborate stained-glass frame at the center on which was replicated Jacob van Ruisdael’s painting *De Molen bij Wijk bij Duurstede*. (Figure 99) When the van Heukeloms lived at Museumplein 19, as now, the circa 1670 painting could be seen at the Rijksmuseum at the north end of the museum square.8

Schill & Haverkamp planned six of the ten third-floor rooms as bedrooms for members of the family, the governess, and guests. (Figure 100) In the architects’ plans, all of the family members’ rooms included auxiliary space: balconies projecting from three bedrooms, and a small room on the northeast corner was designated as a sitting room. The hall included a bathroom at each end and a closet, according to the 1912 floor plan. Photographs in *Moderne Hollandische Interieurs* indicate that at least one change was made to the 1912 floor plan. In what was designated as the daughters’ bedroom (*slaapk. dochters*) on the southeast (310), the photographs show a door in the north wall where Schill & Haverkamp show a blank wall. (Figure 101) The photographs also indicate only one bed in the room, suggesting that the room usage identified in the original plans had been altered.

Treatment of the third-floor hall (302) differentiates this domestic level from the gathering spaces below. The walls, for instance, received wood wainscoting, rather than the door-height paneling of the second-floor hall. (Figure 102) Third-floor doors and frames resembled those of the first floor rather than those on the second. The walls above the wainscot on the third floor were painted and stenciled. (Figure 103) The ceiling treatment included simple rectangular moldings, rather than the Greek cross design of the second floor. (Figure 104) An arched opening provided shared access to the hall from the bedrooms intended for Mr. and Mrs. van Heukelom, according to the 1912 floor plan. (Figure 105) A closet (312) opened off the hall next to the arch. With a bathroom located at its north end, the third-floor hall would have received less natural light than the second-floor hall received from its large oriel window.

The southeast bedroom (310) was the largest of the family chambers. (Figure 100) It included a parquet floor with contrasting border, wood baseboards, and light-colored walls broken into rectangular panels. (Figure 101) Materials analysis indicates that the rectangular panels consisted of painted canvas separated by raised moldings. Concentric rectangular moldings marked the ceiling, at the center of which a pendant light fixture hung from a classically derived plaster medallion. (Figures 106-107) One of the Pool photographs shows the light fixture, as well as what may be a telephone or intercom device. (Figure 19) Wood closets, their doors fronted by tall mirrors, flanked drawers and cabinets at the west end of the north wall. (Figure 108) This represents a change from Schill & Haverkamp’s floor plan, which shows a sink between the two closets. As built, the sink was located between the closets and the door at the east end of the wall. All three doors in the

---

room – the other two, in the west wall, opened onto the hall and the bathroom – were six-panel wood doors with oval door plates and knobs set in a wood frame with a projecting molding at the top. Wood framed the French doors to the balcony, which included a small grate above the opening, as well as the window. (Figure 109) Figured area rugs were used on the floors, and the furniture shown in the photographs tended toward the slender-legged, eighteenth-century designs of Sheraton rather than Pool’s heavier interpretations of Chippendale patterns.

The southeast bedroom appears to be the most highly finished of all the bedrooms on the floor. The rooms that the 1912 drawings designated as belonging to Mr. and Mrs. van Heukelom (307 and 308, respectively), on the southwest side of the house, were similar but had important differences. All three had French doors leading to balconies, as well as wood baseboards and frames around the windows and French doors. All three had rectangular ceiling moldings with a plaster medallion in the center (Figure 110), and the elder van Heukeloms’ rooms probably also had wood floors. Two sets of features that distinguished the southeast bedroom from the others, however, were the interior doors and closets. The interior faces of the doors in the southwest rooms were of the four-panel variety with the relatively simple frame found in the lesser public spaces of the second floor (Figure 111), while the southeast bedroom doors were composed of six panels, and the frame included a projecting molding at the top. Neither did the southwest bedrooms have the built-in wood closets and drawers of the southeast room. Rather, their closet doors were flush with and probably treated the same way as the surrounding walls (Figure 112), as were those in the living rooms on the second floor. In the bedroom designated as Mrs. van Heukelom’s, the construction of the closets flanking the west window resulted in the same deep, paneled casing used in doors with flanking closets in the second-floor living rooms. (Figure 113, 92)

The room labeled *logeerkamer* (guest or spare room, 306) was decorated in much the same way as the other west side bedrooms: wood floors (probably), wood baseboards, wood window surround with a grate above, rectangular ceiling moldings with a central medallion. (Figures 114-115) The room had closets flanking the door to the hall and employed the same paneled casing as other similar arrangements in the house. The *logeerkamer* currently employs a wood panel below the window, edged in a simple bead. (Figure 116) Since the wall areas below the windows in the third-floor rooms are all finished somewhat differently, the original finish of these spaces is not clear.

The room in the northwest corner of the house designated *slaapk.zoon* (son’s bedroom, 305) had some of the features of the other bedrooms, such as the paneled window casing to accommodate the built-in closets and the wood panel below the window. (Figure 117) The chief decoration in these rooms, however – the ceiling molding – is lacking almost altogether in the son’s room, where a single band of raised plaster borders the perimeter. (Figures 118) If it is original, this simple ceiling treatment – used in the basement and bathrooms – may indicate an alteration in the planned use of this room after 1912. The room on the opposite side of the hall (303), by comparison, included greater decoration. Designated as the son’s sitting room on Schill & Haverkamp’s floor plan, it included ceiling molding and medallion and a picture rail, as well as baseboards, window frame, closets, and paneled door case. (Figures 119-120) The walls, according to materials analysis, may have been covered in wallpaper, applied over burlap.

Little is known about the original appearance of the room Schill & Haverkamp intended for the governess (311), which stood between the stair hall and the southeast bedroom. The 1912 plan shows two closets on the south wall near the east window, but as has already been mentioned, a door was placed in the southeast bedroom in the location of one of the closets. According to a 1948 plan for this area, the door connected the governess’s room with the southeast bedroom. (Figure 121) The door to the hall from the governess’s room had the same door frame as other rooms on this floor, and the room probably had similar window treatments, baseboards, floors, and closets. (Figure 122)

Bathrooms were located at both ends of the third-floor hall (304 and 309), each with a tub and toilet, according to Schill & Haverkamp’s floor plan. The architects’ section drawing suggests that tile surfaced the
walls to door height. (Figure 123) Doors and door frames conformed to the four-panel, simple frame pattern of most of the other interior doors on the floor. (Figure 124) The windows had wood frames and a grate in the wall above, and the ceilings were decorated with a simple band around the perimeter. Other details of the treatment of the bathrooms are not known.

Fourth Floor: The stair hall between the third and fourth floors (401) continued the floor and wall treatments of the stair hall one floor below: wood stairs, banister, and wainscot. (Figure 125) The paired windows at the landing between the floors stood higher in the wall than triple windows of the floors below; the wainscot rose in that location to meet the window frame. These windows were also of stained glass at the perimeter, but without the gold frame feature of the windows below. (Figure 126) As the termination of the house's stair hall, the coved ceiling received a high degree of decorative treatment, rising in a gentle arch from a band of classical ornament to a series of rectangular moldings, also classically derived. (Figure 127-128) The archway between the stairs and the fourth-floor hall resembled its counterpart on the third floor: a simple, half-round arch with a bead at each edge of the soffit.

Schill & Haverkamp's plan for the fourth floor included such general function names as zolder (loft, 403 and 404), kamer (chamber, 407), and dienst (service, 405), but more specific room functions were also identified. (Figure 128) These included donkerekamer (darkroom, 410) and logeerkamer (guest or spare room, 409). Four of the eight rooms around the central hall (402) contained a bed in the architects' drawing, and a bathroom was also planned (408). The floor therefore seems to have been intended, at least in part, as sleeping quarters for some of those employed in the house, and the fourth-floor logeerkamer may have been foreseen as being used by servants of guests staying downstairs. 9 The floor plan also noted the intention of using skylights (bovenlicht), in addition to dormer windows (dakvenster), to illuminate two of the attic rooms on the west side of the house.

As might be expected in secondary domestic spaces like the attic, surface treatments were generally simple. Door frames, both facing the hall and facing the rooms, matched the interior frames of most of the secondary spaces in the house. (Figure 130) The doors probably matched the four-panel types used elsewhere. As with other wood features of this floor, it is uncertain whether the doors and frames were painted or stained. Walls had the same baseboards used elsewhere in the secondary spaces, and plain plaster bands outlined the ceilings, as in other service rooms. (Figures 131-132) The broad window in the west-facing gable had a wood frame with the same profile used with windows on the third floor. (Figure 133)

Schill & Haverkamp may have conceived of the opening from hall to the loft spaces on the north side of the attic floor as an archway without doors. Neither the 1912 floor plan nor section drawing shows a door filling this opening. (Figure 134) A pair of doors flanked by sidelights was employed, however, probably during the van Heukeloms’ residency. (Figure 135) The hinges on the doors match those on original third-floor doors. The sidelights consisted of single wood panels below, glass and wood above, while the doors were composed of paired wood panels beneath glass panes in a wood frame.

The wood structural supports of the mansard roof were exposed in many of the fourth-floor rooms, limiting usable space. (Figure 136) With the exception of an occasional curve, these supports were squared off and undecorated.

Only two closets were shown on the 1912 plan for the fourth floor, both in the bathroom. (Figure 129) A narrow molding – similar to the outside portion of the frame of the bathroom door – bordered the opening to one of these closets. (Figure 137)

Site: Schill & Haverkamp's initial site plan for Museumplein 19 showed the location of a fence along the property's street frontage. (Figure 13) It ran the length of the lot on Gabriel Metsustraat and the Museumplein and turned the corners on the north and east sides of the property. (The north and east sides

---

9 The suggestion that the fourth-floor logeerkamer may have been used by the servant of a houseguest staying on the third floor was made by architectural historian Barbara Laan on a tour of the house on May 31, 2013.
of the yard may have been enclosed by a board fence.) Plan and elevation drawings of the iron and masonry fence were submitted as part of the building permit application process. (Figure 14) The permit application for the fence was made on March 8, 1918, meaning that Museumplein 19's yard remained unenclosed for nearly five years. Constructed, like the house, on pine pilings, the fence's masonry base consisted of rounded bricks between stone footings. Two brick piers, each topped with carved stone and including a stone plaque for the house number, flanked the gate facing the Museumplein. A pair of iron leaves forming an arch when closed made up the gate, and the fence was composed of iron pickets with spike finials and simple rails. Taller, openwork, iron posts marked the fence at intervals; struts anchored these taller elements to the stone footings. A hedge was planted behind the fence early in the house's history; it appears in photographs as early as the 1924 Het Stadswoonhuis in Nederland. 10 (Figure 40)

Photographs from around 1930 show a broad brick sidewalk between the fence and the Museumplein. (Figure 138) A similar sidewalk probably paralleled the fence along Gabriel Metsustraat. Photographs from the period also indicate that the basic pattern of brick and stone base and iron fence with a hedge backing may have been the preferred treatment of landscapes bordering the Museumplein. (Figure 139)

The photograph in Leliman's book shows trees at the southeast and northwest corners of the house. In the circa 1930 photograph of the Museumplein houses, mounding shrubs appear to rise slightly above the fence at intervals along the west front. Other details of the tuin's landscaping during the van Heukeloms' residence are unclear. Stone may have been used for the front walk, as Consul General Doyle noted that the Rijksgebouwendienst had reset "the paving stones leading from the street to the front entrance" in the late fall of 1945. The Rijksgebouwendienst also reset the bricks at the rear entrance at the same time. It is not clear from Doyle's description whether the entire service drive off of Gabriel Metsustraat was paved with brick.11

Changes Prior to Acquisition by the United States, 1925-1945

Exterior

A comparison between photographs taken of the exterior of Museumplein 19 in the years after the house was constructed and those taken during and immediately after the Nazi occupation shows no significant changes to the building. One visible addition is a flagpole extending from the third-floor balcony of the Museumplein façade, seen first in a February 1941 photograph. (Figure 140) Since flagpoles appear in photographs of other villas taken during the occupation, but not in pre-war photographs, it seems likely that the Germans added the flagpole at Museumplein 19. It is not certain, however, whether it was added during the period when the building was used as the German consulate (April 1938-May 1940) or after the occupation of Amsterdam had begun.

In general, it appears that the Nazis, whether in civil or military roles, made few changes to the exterior of the buildings they occupied on the east side of the Museumplein. Photographs taken during the war show signs attached to the facades and fences but no other significant additions or changes. (Figure 141) In some instances, small guard booths were located in the public space near a building's entrance gate. Even in those photographs taken in the last years of the occupation, when the Nazis began to anticipate an attack by Allied forces, fortifications were concentrated in the streets and in the Museumplein rather than in the occupied buildings or their yards, as seen in a photograph from 1944. (Figure 142) None of the photographs of Museumplein 19 from the war years shows signs on its facade or structures near its entrance. Windows remained free of enclosures; weapons were not mounted in the building yards or on roofs or balconies. The

10 Bouwwerking en tekening 11979, March 8, 1918, Archief van de secretarie: afdeling publieke werken 5180, Stadsarchief, Amsterdam, Nederlands; “Amsterdam, Section R 4981, Netherlands” (survey), revised October 1960, Amsterdam, X13013_Survey Map, Overseas Buildings Operations, Department of State, Rosslyn, Virginia. The 1960 survey shows a four-foot-high board fence on the north and east sides of the house.

11 Doyle, Dispatch no. 77, January 17, 1946, 10.
1944 photograph does show what may be frames of some kind around the second- and third-floor window openings. A 1942 photograph shows a small plaque attached to the north gate pier. (Figure 143)

At some point before the Americans moved in, probably during the van Heukeloms’ residence, a wood garden structure with a thatched roof was constructed in the northeast corner of the property. (Figure 144) The undated building permit drawing for the structure calls it a *koepel* (cupola). The 1960 survey for the property describes it as a “cyclehouse.” The eight-sided building (four longer sides alternating with four shorter sides) had two wood and glass doors facing south, fixed sixteen-light windows in its other three long sides, and oval windows on the short sides. The structure sat on a concrete foundation. ¹²

*Interior*

The early floor plans developed by the American consulate when it acquired Musemplein 19 show certain differences from the plans submitted by Schill & Haverkamp in 1912 and those appearing in *Het Stadswoonhuis in Nederland* in 1924. Many of the alterations depicted in these plans remain in existence. It is not known for certain when they took place – whether they were made by the van Heukeloms to improve the functioning of their household or by the German government in the transformation of the residence to a government office. It may seem more likely, though, that the Dutch family made the changes during their twenty-five-year residency than the occupying Germans in their brief five-year wartime stay. Most of the significant modifications took place on the ground floor and involved the service areas of the house.

Some of the alterations can be seen in a drawing submitted as part of an American building permit application to city authorities. (Figure 145) The consulate submitted the application in December 1948, nine months after the United States acquired the building and, according to the documentary record, prior to any significant alterations being made. The December 1948 drawings illustrate a door, not shown in earlier drawings, opening from the north side of the laundry room (107) into the rear vestibule (113). In addition, the water closets in the northeast corner of the house (110-111) had been reorganized by moving the south wall farther south, thereby decreasing the size of the cloakroom (112). A more significant alteration was the insertion of an elevator on the north wall of the provisions room (108), reducing the available closet space there. The elevator rose to the third floor, where the family bedrooms were located, and thus also resulted in changes to the pantry outside the dining room on the second floor (210) and the governor’s room on the third floor (311). The insertion of the elevator may have been accompanied, or perhaps followed, by the construction of a partition wall in the scullery (106), which decreased the size of that room while creating an additional storage space off the provisions room. That change may have resulted in moving the door from the scullery to laundry room slightly to the south. Both the 1912 and 1924 drawings of Musemplein 19 show this door in the center of the wall, exactly opposite the laundry room’s central exterior window, while the 1948 drawings show an off-center door.

Perhaps the most significant change to the original character of the house took place when the column screen between the billiards room (103) and the sitting room (104) on the first floor was replaced by a wall with a central door. The enclosure of the billiards room removed a decorative treatment not used elsewhere in the house – free-standing columns and engaged columns or pilasters on pedestals. Since the room did not appear in any published photographs of the house, the original appearance of the column screen is unknown. Treatment of the added wall can be seen in a 1956 consulate photo. (Figure 146) The high, wood wainscot of the rest of the sitting room continued along this wall, and the door frame included small brackets as part of its upper molding. The two-paneled door consisted of a tall lower panel and a smaller, arched upper panel. Probably at the same time that the billiards room was enclosed, a doorway was opened between the sitting room and the hall (102).

---
Existing conditions plans submitted by Doyle to the Department of State in November 1948 also show a door between the son’s bedroom (305) and the guestroom (306) that does not appear in Schill & Haerkamp’s 1912 drawings. (Figure 147) The presence of this opening may be considered further evidence, along with the lack of ornamentation in room 305, that circumstances may have altered room functions after the architects’ initial plans were conceived in 1912.

Changes to the fourth-floor hall (402) from the original floor plans are documented in a second 1948 existing conditions drawing. (Compare Figures 129 and 148.) The alterations included a partition wall to divide the space in two, a closet for room 406 in the northwest corner of the new room, a chase of unknown purpose on the south wall, and a door connecting a bedroom and living room on the west side of the floor (405 and 406). That the partition wall postdated original construction can be seen in its interruption of the simple band molding on the ceiling. (Figure 149) A comparison of the 1912 and 1948 floor plans indicates that a total of ten additional closets were created on the fourth floor after the house’s original construction.

The only interior photograph taken during the war discovered during research for this study depicted Beauftragte Dr. Werner Schröder shaking hands with Dutch Nazi leader Anton Mussert in what had been the van Heukeloms’ dining room (208). (Figure 23) Only a small portion of the north wall can be seen in the photograph, but the room’s wood panelling and arch-panelled door remained in place.

One type of change that the Beauftragte may have made to the building was the addition of security grates to some lower-floor windows. In his January 1946 dispatch to the secretary of state, American consul Albert Doyle noted that inspectors deemed security at Museumplein 19 to be adequate. In addition to the steel basement windows and iron bars and wood shutters on the first floor (all part of the original construction), Doyle noted the presence of “a folding steel grill” on three second-floor windows and on a stairway window between the first and second floor.13 As has been mentioned, the stair-hall window was originally secured with metal grates that could be hidden in pockets. Another original security feature on the second floor referred to by Doyle may have been a folding grille in the conservatory, which is suggested in the 1916 Pool photograph. (Figure 87) A third grille may have been associated with the oriel illuminating the second-floor hall; a 1956 photograph of the window shows such a grille in its folded position near the arched opening from the oriel to the hall. (Figure 150) The December 1948 building permit plan also depicts a “sluithek” – roughly translated as “closed grille” – on the interior of the second-floor pantry window. (Figure 151)

Adaptation for Use as the U.S. Consulate General, 1945-1958

The Department of State authorized the American embassy in The Hague to acquire Museumplein 19 for use as the U.S. consulate by telegram dated March 12, 1947. A month later, discussions had already begun as to how the private residence might be modified to better suit its use as a government office building with public functions. In addition to consulate and embassy personnel in the Netherlands, those involved in the discussions included W.E. Reynolds, the Commissioner of Public Buildings in Washington, who visited Amsterdam in December 1946, and Allan B. Jacobs of the State Department’s Foreign Buildings Operations office, who worked out of the American embassy in Paris. Chief among their concerns was the reorganization of spaces around the first-floor hall to address circulation, waiting areas, and efficient functioning of consular activities.14

Such alterations could not be implemented, of course, until the property was acquired by the U.S. from the appropriate post-war authority. By the time the transfer took place, on March 19, 1948, Doyle had moved back to the State department offices in Washington, replaced in Amsterdam by Jesse F. van Wickel. On November 1, 1948, van Wickel wrote Ides van der Gracht, attaché at the American embassy in The Hague,

---

13 Doyle, Dispatch no. 77, January 17, 1946, 7.
14 “Memorandum: Subject: Visit of Mr. Allen S. Jacobs in connection with the acquisition of consular properties,” April 17, 1947, U.S. Consulate, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, Archives; Albert M. Doyle to Secretary of State, dispatch no. 446, April 18, 1947, 1, Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State, Central Files, 1945-49, Box 1257, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
outlining proposed alterations to the building. He enclosed both existing conditions and proposed floor plans in his letter. While changes to the building had been considered for at least eighteen months, the spur to this particular request for authority and funding to make the changes was the opportunity to acquire an automatic telephone system for the consulate. Such systems were still nearly impossible to come by in the Netherlands, three years after the war’s end. The consulate had been using a manually operated switchboard to transfer calls, which occupied the staff member intended to monitor the waiting area in the hall. A more expensive alternative to leasing the telephone system would have been to hire a full-time receptionist. Van Wickel suggested combining acquisition of the phone system with building alterations he considered of utmost importance.

The changes the consul proposed included the removal of the elevator from the first, second, and third floors, removal of the closets in the rooms in which the elevator was located (provisions room, pantry, and governess's room), and removal of the elevator equipment from the basement. The consul also proposed removing the wall that had been built in the scullery to create a storage room off the provisions room, the closets in the scullery, the fireplace in the kitchen, and the plywood panelling next to the fireplace. On the second floor, the sink, as well as the closets and elevator, would be removed from the pantry, and the room would be refinished for the use of the consul's secretary. Van Wickel's letter also proposed blocking the opening between the governess's room on the third floor and the southeast bedroom to create a separate room for the telephone equipment. These changes were designed to increase available office space by freeing up the elevator rooms and to make better use of the first-floor space in the southeast corner of the building by creating a connected suite of rooms (including the former mangelkamer, or laundry room) in which the consulate's citizenship functions would be located. Other suggested changes included adding iron grilles to the windows of what had been the billiards and sitting rooms on the first floor and repapering the northeast corner room on the third floor.15

Van Wickel sought van der Gracht's immediate attention to his request because the installation of the phone system, if it were to be acquired, was to begin on November 30, and the remodelling work needed to advance to a certain stage before the equipment could be installed. The embassy appears to have acted quickly, though perhaps not quite as quickly as van Wickel had hoped, because the consulate did not submit a building permit application until December 1948. Drawings that accompanied the application diagrammed the proposed changes.16 (Figures 152-153) It appears that approval was not received until August 1949. Existing conditions drawings for subsequent proposals to alter the building indicate that many of van Wickel's changes were made. The elevator and closets along the wall where the elevator stood were removed. The wall in the first-floor scullery and the sink in the second-floor pantry were removed, and the opening between the governess's room on the third floor and the southeast bedroom was blocked. In addition, the dumbwaiter, which occupied the southwest corner of the rooms where the elevator was located, was also removed. The kitchen fireplace, however, as well as the plywood panelling next to it, remained in place, and grilles appear not to have been installed in the west windows on the first floor.17

In addition to the immediate changes van Wickel sought, he also referred to “the general remodelling of the building” in his November 1, 1948, letter to van der Gracht. The purpose of the remodeling was to address the shortcomings perceived in the former residence. “Space in the building is poorly distributed,” van Wickel wrote, “the flow of traffic is difficult to control, different sections must share offices, sections cannot be grouped together, many callers must be received one or two floors above the street level, and waiting space is inadequate.” According to a drawing that illustrated the remodelling, the consul's plans called for moving several first-floor walls in order to create larger rooms, expanding and enclosing the portico, moving the west

15 Jesse F. van Wickel, Consul General, to Secretary of State, dispatch no. 127, November 1, 1948, enclosure 1, 1-3, Box 1257; Jesse F. van Wickel, Consul General, to Secretary of State, dispatch no. 131, November 8, 1948, enclosure, 1-2, box 1258, Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State, Central Files, 1945-49, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

16 The name of the architect, who was located in Bussum, is not clear on the copy of the drawing reviewed for this study.

17 “Plans of Existing Building, Museumplein 19, Amsterdam,” drwg. FBO-1, April 9, 1953, U.S. Consulate, Amsterdam, Archives. The window grilles do not appear in a 1956 photograph of the west façade of the consulate. See Figure 155.
entrance one bay to the south, and building a one-story addition to the east. (Figure 154) The work would have placed all the consular functions requiring public access on the ground floor. 18

Van Wickel’s proposals appear not to have been implemented, given that Consul General Frederik van den Aren, who replaced him, reiterated the need for enlarged first-floor space on February 8, 1950. He noted that the changes had been “repeatedly discussed” and that current and proposed plans were on file in Amsterdam, The Hague, and Washington. In 1953, revised plans for enlarging and altering the building were made by “the government architect.” Neither were these plans implemented, the reason being that Congress provided the State department with no construction funds for overseas operations for fiscal year 1954. By 1958, plans for enlargement or large-scale alteration of the building seem to have been shelved for good. In December of that year, Consul General G. Edward Clark outlined some possibilities for rearranging room functions for more efficient use of space, but the only physical change being contemplated for Museumplein 19 at the time was the enclosure of the porch (which was not implemented). Rather than seeking additional space, Clark concurred with foreign service inspectors’ recommendations that the post should seek “allocation of office space in a way which suits the greatest number of employees without inconveniencing the public, but which, narrowly speaking, is not logical.”19

A group of photographs taken of the consulate in April 1956 suggests the character of Museumplein 19 in the early years of American occupancy. The original fence and its hedge backing (closely trimmed) remained in place; a plaque identifying the building as the “Consulate General of the United States of America” had been added to the south gate pier above the building number. (Figure 28) Shrubs were spaced at intervals in the yard between the building and the fence, and a taller tree grew in the northeast corner of the yard, beyond the oriel window. Dense vines covered much of the west facade above the first-floor windows. A flagpole, shorter and at a lower angle than its German predecessor, had been installed on the third-floor balcony. The Great Seal of the United States had also been placed above the west door. The frames that appeared in the 1944 photograph of the building (Figure 142) remain in evidence on the second-floor, south-bay window and the third-floor French doors.

The 1956 photographs of the interior of Museumplein 19 show recently painted or wallpapered rooms, with few other changes from the original building beyond than the replacement of the house’s “movables.” On the first floor, whether in public spaces like the hall, billiards room, and sitting room, or in the service areas of the house, like the kitchen and scullery, large plain carpets, simple wood office furniture, filing cabinets, and light-colored curtains took the place of the heavier, more densely patterned furnishings of the van Heukeloms. (Figures 155-156) The most conspicuous additions to the house seem to have been radiators along the walls and fluorescent lights on the ceilings. (Figure 157) The new radiators indicate that the heating system had been modified or replaced.

On the second floor, the consulate maintained the decorum established by Schill & Haverkamp’s original plans and the furniture Pool designed for the van Heukelom family: Leather-covered, rather than wood, furniture was located in the second-floor hall. (Figure 150) Office building necessities like water fountains and fire extinguishers also appear. Consul van den Aren’s 1950 memo noted that the consul’s office needed

---

18 Van Wickel, dispatch no. 127, November 1, 1948, enclosure no. 1, 3; “Enclosure no. 3 to Despatch No. 127, dated November 1, 1948, from American Consulate General, Amsterdam, Netherlands, entitled ‘Remodeling of Building at Museumplein 19, Amsterdam, Occupied by American Consulate General.’” U.S. Consulate, Amsterdam, Archives. The drawing of the proposed plans discovered in the consulate archives appears to be the one referred to in the dispatch located in the National Archives.

19 Frederik van den Aren, Consul General, to Department of State, February 8, 1950, 1, Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State, Central Files, 1950-54, Box 803, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland; “Statement to Facilities Inspection, Amsterdam, Netherlands, Section 5, Administration(c) property,” September 1, 1953, U.S. Consulate, Amsterdam, Archives; G. Edward Clark, Consul General, “Replies to Recommendations of Foreign Service Inspectors,” December 12, 1958, 3-5, Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State, Central Files, 1950-59, Box 704, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.
repapering, and the conservatory needed repainting. The 1956 photographs suggest that both may have been carried out. Van den Aren also noted that the room in which the trade promotion clerks and the commercial reading material were located needed to be painted and repapered. Based on desks, filing cabinets, and bookshelves seen in the 1956 photographs, these functions were likely located in the former salon on the southwest corner of the second floor. (Figure 168) The photographs also indicate that the repainting and repapering had accomplished. 20

The 1956 photographs depict only a small number of secondary spaces. Few details can be gleaned from these pictures, but at least one of the offices appears to have been painted rather than papered. (Figure 159) Walls above the wainscot in the stair hall and in the third-floor hall also appear to have been painted in the 1950s. (Figure 160-161)

The Consulate General since 1958

Based on a comparison of floor plans and photographs through the years, it appears that few changes to significant spaces were made between 1958 and the early 1980s. Generally speaking, the building fabric has maintained continuity with the consulate acquired by the United States in 1948. It may be expected that changes to the building resulted from repairs to older elements and upgrades to systems, such as phones, electricity, lighting, heating, and plumbing. One change that seems to have been made during this period was the return of the doorway between the former scullery (106) and laundry room (107) to the center of its wall. This arrangement appears as an existing condition in an October 1974 sketch of proposed changes to the consulate and in subsequent drawings.21

The political demonstrations that began in the early 1970s eventually led to additional changes in the building and grounds. These demonstrations could sometimes be violent, with windows broken, threats made to consulate staff, and, in one case, a bomb planted in the building. As a result, the consulate and the Department of State began to seek means of isolating public functions from the remainder of the building and to provide security within the public areas. Eugene M. Braderman, the consul general from 1971 to 1974, stated in an interview that barriers and bullet-proof windows were employed during his tenure. The 1974 drawings proposed windows between rooms 103 and 104, possibly teller-style windows through which consulate staff engaged the public. Such an arrangement seems to have been in place by 1977, when the consulate reported to the embassy in The Hague that “[p]ersons in the waiting room are interviewed through security windows by means of an intercom system.”22

Planning for additional changes continued, in consultation with city authorities, into the early 1980s. By 1982, according to photographs from the time period, chain-link fencing was arranged in a zigzag fashion in the streets adjacent to the consulate to keep demonstrators away from the building, a taller picket fence replaced the property’s original fence, bars protected the first-floor windows on the west façade, and a small vestibule was added to the French doors on the south façade. (Figure 162) The chain-link fencing may have been put in place in anticipation of demonstrations against American involvement in El Salvador. The installation of the taller fence resulted in the entrance gate piers being increased in height. A year later, roll-down security shutters were placed on the consulate’s windows, and in 1984 concrete barriers were placed at the edge of the Museumplein and Gabriel Metsustraat. (Figure 163) In 1986, plans were made for a larger

No information was found on the unusual light fixture shown in the 1956 photograph of the former salon. (Figure 160) While the fixture, suspended from the ceiling, is clearly a fluorescent light, it also includes what may be candle-holders attached to its rectangular frame. Fluorescent lights suspended from the ceiling appear in other 1956 photos of the consulate (Figure 158), but none resemble the one in the former salon.


“entrance booth” on the south façade, which was subsequently constructed.23

Also during the 1980s, the consulate building underwent a roof replacement, according to staff members. The original natural-cut slate was replaced with machine-cut slate, and lead flashing and sheet metal (with the exception of the finials and ridge caps) were replaced with zinc.

A building-wide project of replacing the consulate’s wood windows and French doors with aluminum-framed glazing took place in 1994, according to staff. The replacement windows emulate the configuration, but not the profiles, of the original windows. Original wood frames and leaded glass windows on the stair landings (east façade) and the circular window on the north façade were retained. At some point, protective plexiglass panels were attached to the stair landing windows. Also in the 1990s, acoustic panels replaced the 1950s-era wall covering in the salon (207).

In 2011, the consulate’s perimeter security was enhanced when the entrance booth on the south façade was replaced with an angular, glass and steel screening facility designed by Davis Brody Bond. (Figure 164) The design and materials follow both American and Dutch tenets by differentiating a new addition from the historic structure. The project also included replacement of the exterior fence, demolition of the van Heukelom-era garden structure in the rear of the property, and its replacement with a new, wood and steel storage building. A bathroom was built off the former kitchen (105) as part of the project. Although the bathroom itself was located in the first-floor hall (102), it was accessed through the door in the north wall of 105, which was altered for the purpose. The hall elevations of the bathroom emulated the finishes of the historic space.

There have been other minor changes in wall placement and openings within the last twenty-five to thirty years. The exact dates of the changes cannot be determined based on documentation reviewed for this study. Below is a summary of these changes:

**Basement**

- Large storeroom on north divided into two spaces
- Vestibule in stair hall added to storeroom

**First Floor**

- Doorway between vestibule (101) and hall (102) altered
- Security window replaced the door between the vestibule (101) and the cloakroom (112)
- Door opened between the hall (102) and the cloakroom (112)
- Door closed between the hall (102) and the sitting room (104)
- New service windows constructed between the billiards room (103) and the sitting room (104)
- New door opened between the sitting room (104) and the kitchen (105)
- Service windows constructed between the kitchen (105) and the scullery (106)
- West wall of laundry room (107) altered (encroaches on door surround)
- Plywood paneling (covering remnants of tile surface) installed in the bicycles and provisions room (108)

Second Floor

- Closets removed from the north wall of the playroom (205)
- Wallpaper in the dining room (208) replaced

Third Floor

- Wall between the hall (302) and the bathroom (304) moved to the south

Fourth Floor

- Closets in loft (403) altered and doorway between 403 and 404 moved
- Closets altered or removed in 405, 407, and 409
- Wall and door added between hall (402) and 406

In addition to these changes to the room configurations, many superficial changes have been made. These alterations include overall updates to bathrooms (floors, tile, fixtures, lights), wall-to-wall carpet and laminate flooring, suspended ceilings, replacement of radiators and alterations to radiator covers, upgrades in light fixtures, conduits on walls, added fire protection equipment, and repainting. In some these cases, the new features have simply been affixed to the historic ceiling or wall. In other situations, such as some floor coverings and suspended ceilings, the later additions cover or obscure the original material.
Figure 31 – The Dutch bond brick pattern at Museumplein 19 alternates header and stretcher courses and terminates each stretcher course with a three-quarter bat. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013)

Figure 32 – Carved sandstone ornament in the belt course between the first and second floors holds a downspout in place. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013)
Figure 33 – Sandstone ornament used at Museumplein 19, such as this scroll bracket supporting the portico lintel, generally follows classical precedents. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013)
Figure 34 – Iron grilles helped secure the first floor of Museumplein 19 when it was used as the van Heukelom residence. (Robinson & Associates, 2013)
Figure 35 – Decorative woodwork included dentils and brackets at the eaves and a dentillated pediment for the dormer windows. The sandstone fascia beneath the brackets is now painted. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013)
Figure 36 – The existing doorway and semicircular fanlight match the rendering of the west facade that included the as-built neck gable. Another elevation drawing, unexecuted, had shown a flat-topped doorway and bell gable. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013)
Figure 37 – A mail slot was located in this carved sandstone grotesque next to the front door. (Robinson & Associates, 2013)
Figure 38 – The main entrance to Museumplein 19 was located in the recessed, northernmost bay of the west façade, facing the museum square. (Robinson & Associates, 2013.)
Figure 39 – Basement (kelder) rooms were illuminated with windows opening onto light wells. (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam,” blad no. 1 (detail), n.d., Stadsarchief, Amsterdam.)
Figure 40 – First-floor windows generally consisted of two tall lights topped by nearly square lights, perhaps installed as casements. (J.H.W. Lelman, *Het Stadswoonhuis in Nederland Gedurende de Laatste 25 Jaren*, 1924, 15.)
Figure 41 – A tripartite window on the north façade illuminates the first-floor vestibule inside the entrance. (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam,” blad no. 2 (detail), n.d., Stadsarchief, Amsterdam.)
Figure 42 – Basement walls included a projection at floor level. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)

Figure 43 – Basement ceilings featured a simple molding. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 44 – Section drawings show that wainscot was planned for the vestibule (left, 101) and hall (center, 102). Tile was the material chosen for the lower portion of the wall in the kitchen (right, 105). (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam,” blad no. 3 (detail), n.d., Stadsarchief, Amsterdam.)

Figure 45 – The section drawing depicts the doorway between the hall and the vestibule on the first floor (center) as an arched opening containing a two-leaved door, perhaps flanked by sidelights. (Schill & Haverkamp, “Villa aan het Museumplein te Amsterdam,” blad no. 3 (detail), n.d., Stadsarchief, Amsterdam.)
Figure 46 – The wood framing of this doorway between the vestibule (101) and the hall (102) may remain from the original construction of the house. Drawings, however, indicate that a two-leaved door was planned. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 47 – The vestibule floor featured two kinds of marble. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)

Figure 48 – The vestibule’s plaster ceiling was decorated with floral medallions at the corners. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 49 – The first-floor hall contains the greatest concentration of rich materials in the house – marble floors, wainscot, and classical pilasters and entablature. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 50 – As originally built, this stained wood doorway with architrave led from the hall into the billiards room (103). (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 51 – This paneled door, leading from the hall into what once was the billiards room, is typical of first-floor hall doors at Museumplein 19. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 52 – This wood radiator cover is typical of treatments of the wood surfaces in the billiards room. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)

Figure 53 – The billiards room window included pocket shutters. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 54 – The beamed ceiling of the billiards room focused on a large, hexagonal coffer at the center. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 55 – The sitting room (104) also used wood paneling, radiator covers, window surrounds, and pocket shutters. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 56 – The beamed ceiling in the sitting room featured three hexagonal coffers at the center.
(Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 57 – The fireplace in the sitting room employed carved stone, carved wood, and painted tiles. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 58 – The columns on the tiles on the kitchen fireplace were decorated with exotic birds. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 59 – This first-floor plan was published in 1924 in Het Stadswoonhuis in Nederland, by J.H.W. Leliman, after Museumplein 19 was constructed. It may represent the as-built residence more accurately than the 1912 floor plans submitted with the building permit application. (J.H.W. Leliman, Het Stadswoonhuis in Nederland, 1924, 15.)
Figure 60 – The door from the scullery (106) to the provisions room (108) had broad wood moldings. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 61 – Windows in the first-floor service spaces had broad moldings, like this one in the *mangelkamer* (laundry room, 107). (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 62 – Tiles in the *mangelkamer* included figures and decorative borders. (U.S. Consulate, Amsterdam, Archives, n.d.)

Figure 63 – The ceiling outside the first-floor water closets (110-111) had the same simple perimeter molding as other secondary spaces on the lower levels. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 64 – The stair between the first and second floors (201) used carved wood banisters and wood wainscot, along with stained-glass windows, as decorative treatment. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 65 – The radiator cover beneath the window on the first-floor landing continued the paneled wood treatment of the wainscot. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)

Figure 66 – The first-floor landing banister is carved in floral motifs. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013)
Figure 67 – A foliate stencil appears on the wall of the stair hall in this 1916 photograph. Patterned wood floors and wood paneling also provided a backdrop for Johan Adam Pool’s furniture and Willem Frederik van Heukelom’s collections in the second-floor hall (202) at Museumplein 19. (Johan Adam Pool, Jr., *Moderne Hollandsche Interiors*, 1917, plate 5.)
Figure 68 – Raised moldings frame the undersides of the stairs. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 69 – The windows of the landing between the first and second floors featured leaded and stained glass. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013)
Figure 70 – This second-floor plan, from J.H.W. Leliman’s *Het Stadswoonhuis in Nederland* designates two rooms as living rooms (no. 3). Schill & Haverkamp’s original plans labeled the rooms a study and a nursery. (J.H.W. Leliman, *Het Stadswoonhuis in Nederland*, 1924, 15.)
Figure 71 – Acanthus leaves were carved into the wood brackets supporting the architrave of the doorways on the second floor. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)

Figure 72 – The hall’s wood paneling was continued beneath the oriel window on the north end of the hall. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013)
Figure 73 – Plaster molding focused on a Greek cross decorated the second-floor hall ceiling. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 74 – In the salon (207), the wall treatment consisted of wood wainscot below the windows and probably wallpaper above the wainscot. (Johan Adam Pool, Jr., *Moderne Hollandsche Interiors*, 1917, plate 6.)
Figure 75 – The interior face of the salon door matched its hall-side appearance, but the frame was simpler than the frame facing the public space. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013)
Figure 76 – A classically inspired molding marks the transition from the projecting fireplace wall to the ceiling. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)

Figure 77 – Classical foliate moldings decorate the salon ceilings. (Robinson & Associates, Inc. 2013.)
Figure 78 – This photograph from *Moderne Hollandsche Interieurs* shows the lights along the inner frame of the ceiling molding. (Johan Adam Pool, Jr., *Moderne Hollandsche Interiors*, 1917, plate 7.)
Figure 79 – Radiator covers were located below the windows in the salon. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)

Figure 80 – The dining room (208) fireplace was decorated with marble and carved wood. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013)
Figure 81 – The dining room overmantel featured a carved-wood festoon and classical moldings.
(Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 82 – Built-in wood and glass cabinets flanked the fireplace on the west wall of the dining room. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013)
Figure 83 – The symmetrical composition of the dining room’s north wall included horizontally oriented panels in the center, flanked by vertical panels and doors. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)

Figure 84 – Decorative wood radiator covers were located below the dining room windows. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 85 – Like other rooms with beamed ceilings, the dining room probably included lights at intersections of the beams. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)

Figure 86 – Four sliding glass doors, surmounted by a stained-glass transom, opened from the dining room into the conservatory. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 87 – The conservatory (209) was outfitted as additional living space in the style of Thomas Sheraton. (Johan Adam Pool, Jr., Moderne Hollandsche Interiors, 1917, plate 9.)
Figure 88 – In addition to the furniture Pool designed for the conservatory, this photograph shows a diamond pattern behind the curtain, perhaps indicating the original treatment of the conservatory windows or a protective screen. (Johan Adam Pool, Jr., *Moderne Hollandsche Interiors*, 1917, plate 10.)
Figure 89 – A simple plaster molding decorated the conservatory ceiling. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 90 – The larger of the two living rooms on the second floor (206) included a picture rail, coved ceiling, and plaster ceiling molding. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 91—The radiator cover in the larger living room includes decorative metalwork not seen elsewhere in the house. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 92 – The interior face of the door from the larger of the two living rooms into the hall was composed of vertically oriented panels, stiles, rails, and a muntin. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 93 – Closets with plain doors flanked the door to the larger living room. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 94 – The broad doorway into the playroom (205) from the larger living room appears to have had double doors originally. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Figure 95 – The smaller living room (203) did not have a cove ceiling but did have a picture rail and ceiling moldings. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013)

Figure 96 – The ceiling molding in the playroom was simpler than those in the other rooms on the second floor. (Robinson & Associates, Inc., 2013.)
Evaluation of Significance

Statement of Significance

The historic and architectural significance of the U.S. Consulate in Amsterdam has been recognized by the Dutch Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed, Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap (National Cultural Heritage, Ministry of Education, Science and Culture), which designated Museumplein 19 a Rijksmonument in 1996. The designation cited the villa’s importance to the urban plan for the area around the Museumplein in the early twentieth century, as well as the “historicizing style” of the design by Amsterdam architects Thedoor G. Schill and D.H. Haverkamp. Additionally, the house embodies the history of the museum quarter residences, having served as a private home for Willem Frederik van Huekelom, an affluent Amsterdam businessman, before being given over to government use by Germany and the United States. During World War II, Museumplein 19 functioned as the Amsterdam headquarters of the Beauftragte, or representative, of the Nazi civilian government of the occupied Netherlands.

Van Heukelom purchased the lot at Museumplein 19 in 1912 as he neared the end of a successful career as the director of profitable colonial enterprises in the Dutch East Indies. The property was located in the culturally significant Museumkwartier of Amsterdam, part of the city’s 1902 plan to expand beyond its seventeenth-century boundaries. The city had developed the plan to accommodate a rapidly rising population in an orderly manner. In addition to providing needed housing, the urban design for the Museumkwartier was intended to create an appropriate setting for the three cultural institutions that had been built outside the city walls in the late nineteenth century: the Rijksmuseum (1885), the Concertgebouw (1888), and the Stedelijk Museum (1894). Museumplein 19 occupies an important position at the southeast corner of the museum square, anchoring an urban composition of detached, traditionally designed villas bordering a leafy, green landscape.

Van Heukelom hired architects Theodoor G. Schill and D.H. Haverkamp to design the villa at Museumplein 19 for his wife and family. Schill and Haverkamp met while assisting architect P.J.H. Cuypers in the construction of the Rijksmuseum and thereafter developed a long-term architectural collaboration that resulted in important commissions all over the city and in the countryside. The firm was commercially, professionally, and critically successful during its existence, and its work was included in surveys of outstanding Dutch architecture of the time, such as J.H.W. Leliman’s *Het Moderne Landhuis in Nederland* (1917) and *Het Stadswoonhuis in Nederland* (1924). The van Heukelom residence represents Schill & Haverkamp late style - a restrained version of Dutch Renaissance Revival architecture, using familiar motifs such as a neck gable, suggested quoins and pilasters, and channelized masonry to recall the city’s seventeenth-century golden age. On the interior, the architects employed wood embellishments – paneling, banisters, windows and doors, and ceiling treatments – to create a hierarchy of significant spaces. Van Heukelom also hired furniture maker Johan Adam Pool, Jr., to design furnishings for the house.

Museumplein 19 and its occupants also represent the history of the city’s museum quarter. Like other residences facing the square, it was designed and served during the early part of its history as the private home of an affluent Amsterdam businessman. Van Heukelom had prospered in the colonial enterprises that spurred an economic boom in the Netherlands in the late nineteenth century. The surging economy, in turn, led to the population growth that resulted in Amsterdam’s expansion beyond its seventeenth-century walls and the creation of the museum quarter. When van Heukelom died, however, his widow, Catharina, sold the house to the German government for use as its consulate in Amsterdam. Many of the large, expensive houses along the Museumplein would also transition from private to government or institutional uses just before and just after World War II.

During the war, the occupying German military and civilian government also made the Museumkwartier its headquarters, appropriating numerous buildings for their use and establishing a fortified perimeter that included the museum square itself and streets three blocks to the east. The Beauftragte des Reichskommissars für die Stadt Amsterdam (representative of the Reich Commissioner for Amsterdam) made his office within this perimeter at Museumplein 19. The Beauftragte was the Amsterdam representative of the civilian government installed by the Nazis during the occupation of the Netherlands. Museumplein 19 thereby became that
government's headquarters in the city. When the war was over, the United States established its consulate
general at Museumplein 19. The building represents one of hundreds on foreign soil acquired by the United
States after the war. The acquisitions helped re-establish a U.S. presence abroad as the American government
attempted to strengthen post-war democratic governments.

Period of Significance

The period of significance for the U.S. Consulate General in Amsterdam has been determined to begin in
1912, with Willem Frederik van Heukelom's purchase of the property and Schill & Haverkamp's design for
the house, and to end with the 1948 acquisition of the building by the United States for use as its consulate.
This period encompasses the building's design, construction, and alteration as a residence appropriate for an
affluent Amsterdam businessman and for the city's plan for the Museumkwartier. It also includes the significant
historic functions to which the building has been put: residence of Willem Frederik van Heukelom, headquarters
of the Nazi civilian government in the city during World War II, and office of the American consul general.
The architectural, planning, and historical significance of the Museumplein 19 were firmly established during
this period. Alterations or additions made to the building or its site after this period do not contribute to the
property's importance.

Important Features Dating to the Period of Significance

The following list identifies the important visual aspects and physical features of the consulate that define
its essential character and reflect its appearance during the period of significance. These character-defining
elements are drawn from the overall form of the building, its materials, decorative details, interior spaces and
features, and aspects of its site and environment. This list provides a starting point for identifying the features of
the consulate that, if lost or altered, would diminish its historic significance.

Site

☐ Setback of building from property edge and public space
☐ Location of fence at edge of property
☐ Brick and stone footings of original fence
☐ Original gate piers at entrance (altered)

Exterior

☐ 3 ½-story, nearly cubic massing
☐ Restrained Renaissance Revival design (neck gable, quoins and pilasters, channelized masonry)
☐ Window and door opening patterns, all facades
☐ Hipped roof, including brick and stone chimneys, lead ridge caps and finials, and dormer windows
☐ Dutch bond brickwork and mortar joint form
☐ Limestone entrance balustrade rails, water table molding, and balcony slabs
☐ Sandstone details (lintel, brackets, balusters, and mail slot at entrance; window sills, oriel window
   brackets and slab, oval window cartouche; balcony brackets; belt course and downspout support;
   fascia below roof cornice; neck gable ornament)
☐ Wood features (entrance door; stair-hall window frames, vestibule window framing, and conservatory trim
   on east elevation; oval window frame and oriel entablature on north elevation; cornice, eaves, and dormers)
Grilles on south, east, and north first-floor windows and wrought-iron balcony railings

Leaded and stained glass of stair-hall windows and oval north window

**Interior**

**Basement**

- Plaster ceilings and moldings
- Original window openings

**First (Ground) Floor**

- 101: room dimensions; marble floor; wood baseboards; wood entrance door, surround, fanlight, and mail slot frame; wood window surround; plaster ceiling and moldings
- 102: room dimensions (excluding recent bathroom addition); marble floor (excluding red marble floor next to bathroom); marble wainscot, pilasters, and entablature; wood framing in north archway; wood door surround and architraves and stone thresholds leading to rooms 103 and 108; wood door to room 103; wood door surround to room 109; plaster ceiling and moldings
- 103: room dimensions; wood baseboard; wood door to hall (102) and door surround; wood window surround (including pocket shutters) and radiator cover; coffered wood ceiling
- 104: room dimensions; wood wainscot; wood window surrounds (including pocket shutters) and radiator covers; original wall covering installation on west, south and east walls; fireplace on east wall (marble columns and brackets, ceramic tile hearth back, iron fireback, carved wood mantel); coffered wood ceiling
- 105: wood window surround; blue-and-white tile fireplace
- 106: wood window surround; wood door surround on north wall; bracket-supported chase in southeast corner [status uncertain]
- 107: room dimensions; wood window surrounds; wood door and surround (altered) to room 113; blue-and-white tile wainscoting
- 108: wood door surround to room 102
- 109: wood door and surround to room 111; wood window surrounds on east wall; plaster ceiling and moldings
- 110-111: room dimensions; wood window surrounds on east wall
- 112: room dimensions
- 113: room dimensions; wood window surrounds; plaster ceiling and moldings

**Second Floor**

- 201: room dimensions; underside of stairs (plaster surface with moldings and wood frame); wood treads and risers (beneath carpet); wood balustrade (stringers, balusters, top rail, and newel posts); plaster walls and wood wall stringer and wainscoting; wood radiator cover; wood window frame, including pockets for security gates; leaded, stained-glass windows
202: room dimensions; arched openings to stair hall (301) and oriel window; high wood wainscot of hall and lower wood wainscot below oriel window; wood doors (including hardware) and surrounds; plaster walls; plaster ceiling and moldings

203: room dimensions; wood baseboards; wood door to 202 and door casing; wood window surround; closet locations and door frames; wood picture rail; plaster ceiling and moldings

204: room dimensions; wood door and door surround, including hardware and imitation mahogany graining; oval window, including stained glass, lead caming, wood frame, and wall inset; plaster ceiling and moldings

205: room dimensions; wood door to 202 (including hardware) and surround; wood baseboards, wood window surround; plaster ceiling and moldings

206: room dimensions; wood baseboards; wood door to 202, surround, door casing; wood window surround; wood radiator cover, including decorative metal screens; closets, including doors, frames, and interior beaded boards; wood picture rail; plaster coved ceiling and moldings (altered)

207: wood parquet floor (beneath nonhistoric carpet); wood wainscot, door to 202 (including hardware), door surround, and radiator covers (altered); marble fireplace and mantel; plaster ceiling and moldings

208: wood parquet floor (beneath nonhistoric carpet); high wood wainscoting; built-in wood bookcases with glass doors; marble fireplace with metal insert, carved wood surround, and wood and marble mantel; wood doors (including hardware) to rooms 202 and 210; wood window surrounds and wood and marble radiator covers with decorative metal screens; wood and glass sliding doors to 209, including hardware and stained-glass transom; coffered wood ceiling with pendant lights

209: wood wainscot and radiator covers; wood and glass sliding doors to 208, including hardware and stained-glass transom; plaster ceiling and moldings

210: wood doors to 202 and 208 (including hardware) and surrounds; wood window surround

Third Floor

301: room dimensions; arched opening to 202; underside of stairs (plaster surface and moldings and wood frame); wood treads and risers (beneath carpet); wood balustrade (stringers, balusters, top rail, and newel posts); plaster walls, wood wall stringer, and wainscoting; wood radiator cover; wood window frame and leade, stained-glass windows

302: room dimensions; arched openings to stair hall (401) and rooms 307 and 308; wood wainscot and plaster walls; wood doors (including hardware) and surrounds; plaster ceiling and moldings

303: room dimensions; wood baseboards; doorway to 304, wood surround and casing; wood window surround and ventilation grate above window; location of closets; wood picture rail; plaster ceiling and moldings

304: wood window surround and ventilation grate above window; wood doors (including hardware) and surrounds (altered)

305: room dimensions; wood baseboards; wood door to 304 (including hardware) and surround; wood window surround and window casing and ventilation grate above window; closets flanking window, including doors, frames, and interior beaded boards; location of door to 306; plaster ceiling and moldings
306: room dimensions; wood baseboards; wood surround and casing for doorway to 302; closets flanking door to 302, including doors, frames, and interior beaded boards; wood window surround and ventilation grate above window; location of door to 305; plaster ceiling, moldings, and medallion

307: room dimensions; wood baseboards; wood door, including hardware, to 302 and surround; closets next to door to 302, including doors, frames, and interior beaded boards; wood French door surround and ventilation grate above doors; step and threshold to French doors [status uncertain]; location of door to 308; plaster ceiling, moldings, and medallion

308: room dimensions; wood baseboards; wood doors (including hardware) to 302, 307, and 309 and surrounds; wood French door surround; wood window surround and window casing; closets flanking window, including doors, frames, and interior beaded boards; plaster ceiling and moldings

309: wood doors (including hardware) to 302, 308, and 310 and surrounds (doors to 308 and 310 are sealed off); wood window surround

310: room dimensions; wood baseboards; wood doors (including hardware) to 302, 309, and 311 and surrounds (doors to 309 and 311 are sealed off); wood French door surround and ventilation grate above doors; wood closets and drawers on north wall; wood window surround; plaster ceiling, moldings, and medallion

311: room dimensions; wood door, including hardware, to 302 (altered) and surround; wood window surround; wood door to 310

312: wood door (including hardware) to 302 and surround; tile wainscot; ceramic sink; plaster ceiling

Fourth Floor

401: room dimensions; arched opening to 402; wood balustrade (stringers, balusters, top rail, and newel posts); plaster walls and raised moldings; coved ceiling and raised moldings

402: arched openings to 401 and 404, including wood and glass doors, sidelights, and surround to 404; plaster ceiling and moldings; wood surrounds to 405, 408, 409, 410; wood baseboards (altered)

403: exposed, wood, roof structure; wood door surround to 404; location of dormer window

404: arched openings to 402, including wood and glass doors, sidelights, and surround; exposed, wood, roof structure; wood door surround to 403; location of dormer windows

405: plaster ceiling and molding; wood door surround to 402; exposed, wood, roof structure; location of dormer window

406: plaster ceiling and molding; wood door surround to 407; wood surrounds on both sides of original east wall doorway; wood dormer window surround; location of dormer window

407: plaster ceiling and molding; wood door surround to 406; location of dormer windows

408: plaster ceiling and molding; exposed, wood, roof structure; location of dormer window; wood door surround to 402; closet location and wood door surround;

409: plaster ceiling and molding; exposed, wood, roof structure; location of dormer windows; wood door surround to 402; closet location on east wall

410: plaster ceiling and molding; exposed, wood, roof structure; wood door surround to 402
Assessment of Integrity

Integrity, as regards historic preservation, is defined as the ability of a property to convey its significance. The aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, can establish the integrity of a historic property, according to the National Register of Historic Places, include location, setting, feeling, association, design, workmanship, and materials. As described below, the U.S. Consulate General in Amsterdam retains a high degree of integrity for its location, design, setting, materials, and workmanship, and, to a slightly lesser degree, its feeling and association. Its primary exterior features continue to convey the restrained Renaissance Revival classicism of the mature work of its architects, Theodor G. Schill and D.H. Haverkamp. With the exception of a security screening addition on the south, the consulate remains within its original building envelope and in the same relationship to its lot, its neighboring buildings, and the Museumplein. The building has suffered from few significant changes to the configuration of its rooms, and important core interior spaces retain their original materials and finishes. In other spaces the features remain while the finishes have changed and later inappropriate upgrades have been made to original features. Many of these later changes are superficial, so that the original design intent can be understood, and they can be reversed.

Location is the place where a historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event associated with the property occurred.

The consulate anchors the southeast corner of the Museumplein, completing an assemblage of urban villas on the east side of a green open space that Amsterdam planners envisioned as an appropriate setting for the city’s nationally significant cultural institutions. The consulate maintains the setback and cornice lines on the east side of the Museumplein, helping to form a uniform edge that foregrounds the monumentality of the Concertgebouw, the Stedelijk Museum, and the Rijksmuseum.

Setting is the physical environment of a historic property.

The consulate building maintains its historical relationship to its lot, and the site continues to be characterized by grass strips, shrubs, and taller trees bordering the building mass. The physical relationship between the consulate, its neighbors, the open space of the Museumplein, and the monumental cultural institutions also continues. Built features and plant materials in this urban composition have changed since the period of significance. The current disposition of the Museumplein – green lawn bordered by trees and crossed by paved walks – might, however, be said to more closely approximate its arrangement prior to World War II than in the decades after the war, when a broad traffic artery divided the square and a large bus terminal occupied a site immediately opposite the location of the consulate, diminishing the historic public park. The setting of the U.S. Consulate today therefore approximates its setting during the period of significance more closely than it did in the last half of the twentieth century.

Feeling is a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

The U.S. consulate – relatively unchanged on the exterior and in its historic relationship with neighboring buildings and with the Museumplein – maintains the feeling envisioned by city planners and the building’s architects and its association with the development of this portion of Amsterdam in the early twentieth century. It remains an urban villa in a revival style helping to define the edge of Museum Square. Inside the building, the integrity of this feeling and association remains strong in certain areas – in the marble and wood of the first-floor hall, the stained-glass windows and wood trim of the stair tower, the tall wainscot and wood doors of second-floor hall, the built-in bookcases, wood and marble fireplace, and coffered ceiling of the former dining room. In other locations, however, loss of wall treatments, modern lighting features and superficial work associated with utility, communications, and security upgrades obscure features dating from the period of significance and diminish the feeling and association of the building as a residence for a prominent Dutch businessman and his family. In many cases, however, the character-defining features remain in place and information exists for the feeling and association – and therefore the building’s integrity – to be strengthened with future restoration.

**Design** is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.

The eclectic elements of early twentieth-century Dutch Renaissance Revival architecture that characterize Museumplein 19’s exterior – Dutch bond brick work, suggested quoins, pilasters, and channelized masonry, traditional neck gable with carved stone ornament, oriel and bow windows, balconies, and restrained use of stone details – remain extraordinarily intact for a building that has endured a century-long history that includes occupation by enemy forces during World War II. On the interior, the hierarchy of spaces organized by design features also remains comprehensible. The first-floor hall and stairs remain the most highly ornamented of the public spaces, and the former salon and dining room retain the features that made these rooms stand out as the most important gathering spaces in the house. On the third floor, the design intent of the domestic spaces remains visible in the wood work, doors, windows, and ceiling decoration of the bedrooms, despite subsequent changes. Overall, the 1912 design by Schill & Haverkamp retains a high degree of integrity.

**Materials** are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property. **Workmanship** is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.

On the exterior, materials and workmanship at Museumplein 19 are best represented in the Dutch bond brick work, mortar joints, carved and cut stone detailing, and wood cornice. These elements are little changed since the building was constructed. Interior stone work in the first floor hall, wood features throughout the building, leaded and stained glass, plaster ornament, and the use of porcelain tile on the first floor as both an ornamental and functional wall covering evidence the kinds of materials used in the construction of early twentieth-century Amsterdam residences, as well as the wide variety of skills architects and builders could call on to implement their designs. That some original features of the consulate building (wall coverings, stenciling, imitation wood graining) no longer exist or are currently hidden only slightly diminishes these two aspects of Museumplein 19’s integrity.
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