Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

5 Failures and mistakes

Images of collaboration in post-war Dutch society

Ido de Haan

Introduction

In *Onderdrukking en verzet* (Repression and Resistance), the first comprehensive history of World War II in the Netherlands, Henk van Randwijk discussed the distinction between *goed* and *fout*, right and wrong. According to van Randwijk, who was editor of the underground newspaper *Vrij Nederland*, this was a distinction used extensively during the war to differentiate between those "one could trust and with whom one could share the secrets of underground and open resistance" and those "about whom one could not say this with 100 per cent certainty." While acknowledging that it was a very crude distinction of limited use, Van Randwijk claimed it was necessary in times when "even minimal knowledge in the hands of the wrong people might have had the worst consequences." However, applying it after the war had ended would lead to "grave injustice. … .to wit, when the danger had passed, there was room for more subtle distinctions. From then on, it was no longer a matter of self-protection but of a sense of justice."

Quoting the last minister of the interior of the Dutch government-in-exile in London, Jaap Burger, Van Randwijk stressed the difference between *fout*, as a matter of ideological conviction, and *fouten begaan*, making mistakes, due to a flawed judgment of the situation. The latter was very often the case, according to van Randwijk, since mentally the Netherlands was completely unprepared for the war. Although the nature of the Nazi regime was clear to anyone prepared to look across the eastern border, in the first years of the occupation many had hoped to negotiate a fair deal with the Germans, thus preserving at least part of the nation's pride and independence. Only a few understood immediately the true nature of Nazi Germany and acted accordingly.[1]

While introducing nuances, or maybe even ambivalence, to the discussion of collaboration and resistance, Van Randwijk ultimately confirmed the view that there was a specific and limited group of Dutchmen who had been plainly wrong, that there had been a much larger group with at least a questionable sense of judgment, and that only those who had stood firm from the beginning deserved to be called good Dutchmen. This notion was particularly

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

strong among some members of the resistance in occupied Netherlands and in government circles in London, but most notably in the mind of Queen Wilhelmina. In exile in London, she had acquired much more power than her constitutional position justified, and from this position she sought a radical reform of the political system. Like many others who had deplored the divisiveness of the 1930s, Wilhelmina hoped to tear down the walls that had rent pre-war society. She aspired to "a new Netherlands, in which all of us without distinction would be part of a heroic people."[2] The Netherlands should be led by the good citizens who had resisted the German forces, and be purged of the bad elements that had collaborated with the enemy.

However, as Van Randwijk's ruminations make clear, it was difficult to decide where to draw the line. The disagreement between those who prefer a more restricted definition of collaboration, and those who argue for a wider one has characterized the debate over collaboration from the moment of German capitulation until the present day. There was, however, a dramatic shift in the moral implications of these different perspectives. While the broader definition long served as justification for moral ambivalence in the face of Nazi policies, after 1960 it began to serve as a means of accusing the majority of Dutch society of complicity with them, and particularly in the persecution of the Jews. Since the beginning of the new millennium the pendulum has appeared to swing back in the other direction, explaining, if not justifying, not only the majority who "made mistakes" but also those who consciously chose to collaborate with Nazi Germany.

Collaboration in a legal framework

In the immediate post-war years, collaboration was first and foremost defined in legal terms in regard to the prosecution of collaborators. As early as December 1943, the Dutch government-in-exile in London had drafted a *Besluit Buitengewoon Strafrecht* (Extraordinary Criminal Law Ruling, BBS) against collaboration with the enemy, including not only direct support but also exposing others, or threatening to expose others, to enemy violence. The punishment for these offenses varied, from revocation of citizenship to life imprisonment and the death penalty. The BBS deviated from the Dutch constitution, since it introduced retroactive justice, and re introduced the death penalty, abolished in non-military criminal law in 1886.

On the basis of the BBS and the regular criminal code, a total of 14,562 Dutch citizens were convicted of specific crimes related to collaboration with the enemy. The severest punishment was meted out to people involved in violence and murder. Some 1,342 were convicted of betrayal, in many cases of Jews in hiding. In general, informing on Jews was punished more severely than informing on other people, since almost without exception Jews were killed after they had been betrayed.

Usually, participation in the persecution of Jews led to the death penalty. In total, 152 people were sentenced to death. Forty sentences were actually

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

carried out: thirty-nine men and one woman, the Jewess Ans van Dijk, who, after her arrest by the SD, betrayed a number of Jews hiding in Amsterdam.[3]

Public attention was drawn mainly to a number of high-profile cases involving leading Dutch National Socialists, such as the head of the NSB (Nationaal Socialistische Beweging, National Socialist Movement), Anton Mussert, the propagandist Max Blokzijl and Robert van Genechten, who occupied various high positions in the NSB, the wartime administration and the judiciary. The main line of defense of all three was that they had promoted a genuinely Dutch variant of National Socialism. They rejected the accusation that they had served an enemy power, maintaining, on the contrary, that they had only been seeing to the best interests of the Netherlands. However, many commentators observed a remarkable display of "very personal vanity."[4] Van Genechten exhibited a professorial pompousness, while Blokzijl proffered all kinds of arguments, perceived generally as cowardly subterfuge. Mussert's defense was received with ambivalence. The reporter of the left liberal newspaper *De Groene Amsterdammer* heard only:

> [the] chit-chat of a half-developed person, who thinks he is quite something. … a dumb and vain braggart, whose petty bourgeois decency prevented even the chance of him becoming an illustrious crook. It is perhaps the cruelest thing to be said about a man who is facing death, but it needs to be said, because it is the truth: Mussert is ridiculous, and even facing the firing squad he will remain ridiculous.[5]

On the other hand Herman Kuiphof of the popular periodical *Wereldkroniek* saw an idealist, who presented

> a passionate defense of the movement he had founded. Mussert has never been a great orator, nor is he now because sentence structure is still his weak point; but his plea is inspired, sometimes grim, at times sarcastic and now and then even humorous … Our words do not lack a certain element of appreciation. The reason, in our personal opinion, is that Mussert – despite the wrongness of his deeds and the crookedness of his ways – in essence envisaged the interests of our people.[6]

Collaborators were also prosecuted on the basis of the *Tribunaalbesluit* of September 1944. This ruling pertained to the prosecution of people who had not committed specific crimes but had failed to demonstrate loyal citizenship, such as members of the NSB, or war profiteers. These cases were judged by a lay tribunal – also a novelty in Dutch law. Punishment varied: detention, revocation of citizenship rights, or confiscation of property. The latter was unconstitutional, as were the lack of right to appeal and the absence of an official public prosecutor. Any citizen was allowed to file a complaint against any other citizen, which resulted in a total of 49,920 convictions. In two-thirds of these cases, citizenship was temporarily revoked, and almost all cases led to

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

confinement for varying periods in one of the dozens of detention camps around the country.

Civil servants who collaborated were also prosecuted on the basis of the *Zuiveringsbesluit* (Purge Ruling) of January 1944. This was the means to carry out a purge of the civil service and the educational sector. It was also the model for disciplinary measures among the liberal professions, such as doctors, lawyers and artists. On the basis of the *Zuiveringsbesluit*, the authorities could suspend all civil servants with or without continuation of salary, and at the end of the purge, dismiss them, with or without half-pay. Later, other measures were added: official reprimand, demotion, or honorable discharge. After the German capitulation, hundreds of local purge committees were installed to judge thousands of suspended civil servants. Following complaints and apparent excesses, Interior Minister Louis Beel ordered the reinstatement, in December 1945, of all civil servants who had been suspended, with the exception of the "most serious" cases. Some 10 per cent of a total of 380,000 civil servants were purged. About one-third of these, 11,500 in all, were considered to have been *fout*: these included members of the NSB and women who had been involved with German personnel.

More exact figures are available for the burgomasters who, after the abolition of the city councils on 1 March 1941, were made responsible for all local affairs. At the beginning of the German occupation, 1,054 burgomasters were in service, of whom 726 remained until the end of the war. About one-third of these were purged: 131 were discharged, nine resigned under pressure, and 110 received a reprimand. Another ninety-five had "made mistakes," but were left unharmed by the purge boards. This did not imply they were beyond moral reproach. For instance, not one burgomaster had protested officially against the disbandment of the city councils. Some burgomasters who received a reprimand had been instrumental in the deportation of Jews, a crime for which others had received the death penalty. Others, who escaped purge measures altogether had "cooperated in the arrest of Jews," "given the address of a Jewish man to the SD," "arrested three Jews on the request of the SD," or "arrested Jews without any prior warning."[7]

The sheer numbers involved in the purges and prosecutions constituted an important factor in the impression that the issue of collaboration made on post-war Dutch society. Out of a population of about 10 million, over 100,000 persons were convicted and imprisoned for varying lengths of time. The 120,000 to 150,000 arrests, 165,000 investigations, and some 400,000 personal files compiled in the process meant that many families, workplaces and neighborhoods were involved in the prosecution or purge of collaborators. The distinction between *goed* and *fout* thus became a very concrete instrument of social distinction and exclusion. Moreover, the purge was more severe in the Netherlands than in France, where a similar number were convicted but out of a much larger population. Quantitatively, it might be compared to that of Belgium. However, in the long run, its effects were less far-reaching because, especially in Flanders collaborators suffered for decades as a result

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

of so-called repression. This qualitative difference is due not only to the entanglement of Flemish collaborators in domestic Flemish politics but to the fact that the purge of collaborators in the Netherlands soon met with strong resistance from various quarters.

From perpetrators to victims

The newly installed political authorities placed high priority on the restoration of peace and order. In their view, this required a purge that was severe and fair, but quick.[8] As leading politicians in 1945 stressed, there was a need for a new "synthesis," bridging the world of the underground resistance and post-war political life, and which, said first post-war Prime Minister Willem Schermerhorn, "accords with perspectives other than those that count in the selection of personality and character, courage and perseverance, which have come to light in the world of the resistance."[9] Thus, the desire to leave the war behind undermined the zeal to follow a hard line, once the prosecution of collaborators became lengthy and tedious.

This tendency was reinforced by the deplorable situation in some of the detention camps. Not only were basic material goods lacking, but it soon became clear that the regime in some of the camps was harsh and cruel. Hendrik Willem van der Vaart Smit, who was prosecuted for his support of the NSB, revealed in a widely read brochure that there was a constant lack of food, and that in many camps prisoners were tortured and sexually abused, in some cases resulting in their death. In comparison, he wrote, the German camps were worse, yet, "even if the German camps … were harsh and radical, the Dutch camps and prisons in peacetime are sadistic."[10]

Comparisons of German and Dutch practices were very common. Arnold Meyer, leader of Zwart Front, a fascist organization that vainly competed with the NSB, wrote in a brochure entitled *Pruisische practijken in herrijzend Nederland* (Prussian Practices in the Reviving Netherlands):

> Apparently to some the word "democracy" needs to be defined in the sense that it grants rights only to those from their own party, in short, that it is actually no different from the state absolutism of the German National Socialists.[11]

Yet not only people targeted by the purge compared the extraordinary criminal law system with German practices. In April 1949, the former underground newspaper *Het Parool* justified an article on the situation in the detention camps by stating that "democracy is not served if we remain silent about it. When we shrug our shoulders and accept, this means a victory of the German mentality against which we always fought."[12] This was only the last in a series of newspaper publications denouncing "the weapons of the barbarians." As an article of the radical periodical *De Groene* admonished on 21 July 1945: "We are not Nazis!"[13]

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

In August 1945, the radical theologian Krijn Strijd voiced his wish to "let our people be released from the Nazi shame … committed by Netherlanders." According to Strijd, the treatment of NSB members was a test to prove post-war Dutch society's worthiness for the newly acquired freedom, and he called especially upon "all the churches (Roman Catholic and Protestant) … to help the government remove this black stain from our new carpet." The greatest danger did not come from the relatively limited group of NSB members, Strijd contended, but from the much larger group of "nazified Netherlanders, who think they are anti-national socialists … Among them are those who talk about 'the Germans' as they talked for years about 'the Jews'." Therefore, Strijd argued against a "Pharisaical attitude, as if the situation was: on the one hand, an NSB member, and on the other, "decent" society. It was not all that simple."[14] Thus, the controversy over the detention camps created a partial role reversal of perpetrators and victims, turning collaborators into victims of a disorderly purge and prosecutors into perpetrators comparable to Nazis.[15]

This confusion added to the already substantial aversion among civil servants, politicians and social leaders to the purge. As early as the end of 1945, a strong current emerged against the indiscriminate suspensions and often lengthy rehabilitation of civil servants.[16] Moreover, many high-ranking civil servants and members of the pre-war elite argued they had done nothing wrong. On the contrary, they claimed that they had been the only ones who had stood firm. This was the leading line of defense of the leadership of the Nederlandse Unie (NU), a political movement created in June 1940, which quickly mobilized a mass following of about 700,000 members. The leaders had two objectives: creating a counterweight to the NSB in order to prevent the nazification of Dutch society, and, grasping the opportunity of renewal following the political division and stagnation of the 1930s by strengthening Dutch national unity. Both objectives brought the NU both practically and perhaps also ideologically closer to the German occupier. In 1945, an official research committee on the NU and its triumvirate leadership concluded that mistakes had indeed been made, but that in general the movement had stood firm, particularly when it protested against the first anti-Jewish measures. Only in the 1960s, after one of the leaders of the NU, Jan de Quay, had become Prime Minister, did the mood against the NU become more negative.[17]

Further justification came from high-ranking civil servants, who had become the *de facto* executive authority after the Dutch government went into exile. Their defense was powerfully presented by Karel Johannes Frederiks, until 1944 secretary-general of the Ministry of the Interior, who was discharged in 1946 because of his "weakening influence on the spirit of resistance." In his apology, *Op de bres 1940–1944*, he portrayed himself as someone who had resisted all the dangers that had threatened the well-being of the population. These included, according to Frederiks, not only the German occupying forces, but also the Dutch resistance movement and the

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

government-in-exile. Moreover, he argued that he had only followed the *Aanwijzingen in geval van een vijandelijke inval* (Instructions in the Event of a Foreign Invasion) of 1937, in which the government had ordered civil servants in wartime to stay put as long as they were able to serve the interests of the population, by keeping the institutions of state intact, fairly distributing the burdens of the occupation, mediating between the occupying force and the population, and protesting against infringements of international law. Frederiks seemed to accept that following this path of a lesser evil forced him to sacrifice the Jewish part of the population in order to assure the welfare of the majority. Yet he also defended his position by referring to the rescue of 632 Jews, who, due to his intervention, were exempted from deportation until September 1944, when they were all transported to Theresienstadt and survived.[18] These so-called "Frederiks Jews," or Barnevelders, named after the place where they had been interned until 1944, also figured in the arguments of other high-ranking civil servants, such as the secretary-general for economic affairs, Hans Max Hirschfeld, and the secretary-general for education, Jan van Dam.

Lower-level civil servants argued that they had merely followed bureaucratic procedures, and that their only fault was that they had taken pride in their administrative duties. For instance, J. T. Veldkamp, director of the Amsterdam census bureau – which played a crucial role in the de-registration of Jews – noted in his memoir of the war period that he was mainly concerned with the workload the deportation of Jews had created for his bureau. Moreover, he deplored the arson attack by a resistance group in 1943 on the registry, by expressing his regret "that an administration which had cost so much time and effort, and to which one had contributed for years on end to make it as good as possible, was destroyed in a couple of hours."[19]

Many of these civil servants were supported by the chairman of the Dutch parliament, the Catholic politician and lawyer Leonardus Gerardus Kortenhorst, in the immediate post-war years. In a brochure published in the fall of 1945, entitled *Was samenwerking met de vijand geoorloofd?* (Was Cooperation with the Enemy Allowed?), Kortenhorst argued that "if and in so far as the measures of the authorities *de facto* serve the interests of the defeated country, then the population is obliged, even morally, to obey its orders."[20] By implication, Kortenhorst presented administrative collaborators as a group that had served the interests of the country in good faith, just like, or maybe even better than the clandestine resistance. This point of view amounted to the "shield and sword" argument used in France to reconcile the Resistance under de Gaulle and the accommodation under Pétain. On the basis of these considerations, in December 1945 Kortenhorst formed a Comité voor Rechtszekerheid (Committee for Legal Security), supported by leading politicians from left to right, and whose mandate was to plead the case of higher-ranking civil servants unnerved by purge procedures.

Not only did the prosecution and trials against collaborators come to be viewed with suspicion but the strict execution of punishments soon lost its

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

appeal. In 1946 a first group was pardoned on the grounds that their sentence was much more severe than that of people who were tried at a later date. On the fiftieth anniversary of the inauguration of Queen Wilhelmina in 1948 prison terms were reduced. These partial amnesties were based on traditional grounds of pardon: equal justice to all and special occasions. In the same year, Justice Minister Johannes Henricus van Maarseveen was pressured by his own Catholic Party to release "young men of good standing" who had been convicted for joining the Waffen SS, had no previous criminal record and "deserved to be reintegrated." This wave of pardons led subsequent Ministers of Justice to adopt a new approach to the punishment and purge of collaborators. The exclusion of political delinquents from society ceased to be a priority, and emphasis was placed on their smooth reintegration. In 1949 and 1950 new waves of pardons followed, no longer preceded by an individual request but which brought about the release of a large category of convicts with fewer than ten years' imprisonment to go; and, then, those convicted for up to fifteen years. The new Minister of Justice, Teun Struycken, was inspired to take this step by the notion of charity, presented by Pope Pius XII as the theme for the 1950 holy year.[21] As of the early 1950s, people sentenced to death were also pardoned: first the sentence was commuted to life imprisonment and then they were released. In 1960 the four Germans remaining in Breda prison fueled a continuous debate, which ended with the release of two of them who were still alive in 1989. None of the Dutch collaborators, some of whom had been involved in the most horrendous crimes, served a sentence of more than fifteen years.[22]

A failed purge?

The tendency toward swift fairness and leniency in execution was rejected by those hoping for justice, revenge and renewal. Yet most of the pardons passed without much public outrage. In the early 1950s, the main protests were directed against commuting of the death penalty of the former head of the SD, Willy Lages, to life imprisonment. Both the Communist Party and the Jewish newspaper *Nieuw Israelietisch Weekblad* (*NIW*) argued that "a deranged girl like Ans van Dijk was put to death while mass murderers were not"; Lages was eventually pardoned. Some 57,500 people signed a nationwide petition demanding that those serving life sentences should not be pardoned at a later date – also to no avail. Another campaign was launched in 1956 against the burgomaster of The Hague, Frans Schokking, who had handed over a Jewish family to the SD while he was burgomaster in another town in 1942. After six months of muckraking journalism, it became clear that not only had Schokking been involved in the deportation of the Pino family but his purge file had been suppressed and leading politicians had supported him although they knew of his dubious record. Ultimately Schokking had to resign, but the judicial procedure against him was not resumed.[23]

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

The campaign against Schokking, as well as other protests, was led by former members of the resistance. On the pages of their newspapers – *Het Parool*, *Vrij Nederland* and *Trouw* – there were strong protests against what was viewed as a failed purge and the continued presence of *foute* people in high places. In 1950, the Grote Advies–Commisssie der Illegaliteit (GAC), a committee established in July 1944 to unite all resistance groups, published a *Witboek* (White Paper), which stated:

> In the course of the purge the illegals [former resistance] were infuriated by the lack of resoluteness, force and consistency of government policy, a variety of norms in different sectors of the purge, inequity and inconsistency, a tendency, legalized by actual policies, to spare the great and to punish the small, to overestimate expertise, to underrate values such as character and principle. In general: that the Government and the People have failed to meet the measure, have fallen back into pre-war pusillanimity, have not been chastened by the suffering of the occupation, are not elevated by the will to bring national life to a higher, broader level – all this caused disappointment and discouraged circles among the illegals.[24]

This image was eloquently presented in *Volg het spoor terug* (Follow the Track), published in 1953 by a former member of the "illegality," as the resistance was called, J. B. Charles (alias the criminologist Willem Nagel). In this book, Charles warned against historical revisionism. In retrospect, it became clear that

> … the traitors still live on. They served their prison term (only the worst) and got half of it pardoned. They sit opposite you in the train, reading the morning paper of the enemy, mark my words. They sit there and read that the persecutions in Spain are not too bad and that we should show charity and that the illegals (whom at the time they had "transported") had been stealing … [25]

The purge was frequently evaluated negatively in the historiography of World War II in the Netherlands. Louis de Jong, for instance, quotes the *Witboek* word for word in the conclusion to his discussion of the purge in his multivolume work.[26] Other historians were more positive. The American Henry L. Mason, military intelligence officer in the Netherlands from 1944 to 1946, pronounced in 1952 that the Dutch purge had involved a huge number of people, but had been hampered by the problematic status of political justice, the distance of the government-in-exile from the realities of the occupation, and the lack of experience due to Dutch neutrality in World War I. Nevertheless, the Netherlands

> … profited immensely from the fact that its purge was kept out of the sphere of party politics. No evidence could be found that any problem of

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

> the purge became a serious point of dispute among political, religious or social groups. Protestants and Catholics, conservatives and Socialists, men and women, workers and employers – all had formed a united front against the occupier.[27]

A less rosy picture emerged from the work of August David Belinfante, a former official of the Directoraat–Generaal voor de Bijzondere Rechtspleging (DGBR, Directorate for Extraordinary Law Enforcement) of the Ministry of Justice. In his 1978 study he drew attention to the maltreatment of collaborators in the detention camps and criticized the lack of publicity in the decision to grant pardons to ever increasing circles of collaborators, including Jew hunters and killers. However, he also concluded that the policy had actually led to a swift reintegration of collaborators into Dutch society and concurred with Mason that the purge had never been politically controversial.[28]

Peter Romijn, too, in his 1989 study, acknowledged the tendency to depoliticize the purge which, on the one hand, promoted a pragmatic and quite effective neutralization of the problem of collaborators within post-war Dutch society, yet on the other created the impression of opacity, inconsistency and injustice. Moreover, Romijn draws attention to the role of lawyers, criminologists and social workers, who in a joint effort transformed collaborators from a class of traitors and enemies of the nation into a group of individuals suffering from the social disease of political delinquency.[29]

The reintegration of collaborators was much facilitated by a huge organization, the Stichting Toezicht Politieke Delinquenten (STPD, Foundation for the Supervision of Political Delinquents). The STPD was supported by all members of the political establishment, had its main office in the building of the Dutch parliament and employed at its zenith more than 300 people. The foundation sought especially to reintegrate small-time collaborators and prevent them from being seduced by other totalitarian temptations. More remarkable than obvious anti-communism in the objectives of the STPD is the explicit socio-psychological approach to collaborators. According to Klaas Toornstra, head of the mental health care section of the DGBR, “these were people who had lost track, due to all kinds of circumstances, due to political and social dull-headedness; misled by empty slogans. First and foremost, they needed guidance and help.”[30]

An even more mental health-centered perspective on political delinquents was presented in a speech to the STPD by the psychiatrist Albert Lourens Cornelis Palies. He argued that the German occupation had created a perfect opportunity for psychopaths to rape, plunder and kill. Since they were mentally disturbed, the legal approach was useless. Palies urged the STPD “to take into account the fact that there might be individuals among these people, who as a result of mental disturbances or of anomalies in temperament and character had joined the NSB and committed the most horrendous crimes.”[31]

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

This image of the collaborator as a victim of circumstance, or as a social dropout seduced by National Socialism, was also prominent in the literary representation of collaborators in the first decades after 1945. A clear example of this view is developed in the novella *W.A. Man*, by the Communist writer Theun de Vries, originally issued by the resistance publishers Busy Bee, in 1944. It describes Frans Dijkgraaf, who as a youngster became aware of the fact "that even within the petty bourgeoisie there were rungs, and that his parents stood on the lowest one." Dijkgraaf "despised politics, since the concept was intrinsically linked to the days of the Red revolt." After joining the NSB, he dressed in uniform, as a result of which "he lost the feeling of being the son of a small grocer … a boy who at school and in life always came out a loser." Only after a cynical co-member of the NSB told him that "we National Socialists are nothing but derailed petty bourgeois who seek to connect with the garbage of the proletariat in order to survive" did he understand that the future lay in the hands of the working classes.[32] In general, the conclusion to these stories was hardly stamped by Marxist orthodoxy, yet the diagnosis of political delinquents as the victims of modernization and political seduction was widely shared.[33]

Murderers among us

A complex image of collaboration in the Netherlands had emerged by 1960. Most collaborators had been well shielded from public exposure. Their prison terms had ended, their citizenship was restored after ten years, and they had been converted into medical cases who could be re-integrated with the assistance of the welfare professions. Perhaps the most telling proof of effective repression of the entire issue was the fact that De Quay, scrutinized in 1945 for his role in the NU, became Prime Minister of a center-right government, without even a single debate about his political past. Yet at the same time, former resistance groups and newspapers, many of them with a relatively progressive viewpoint, continued to draw public attention to the failed purge. As Van Randwijk stated in a collection of articles he wrote beginning in the 1950s, Dutch society still stood "in the shadow of yesterday."[34] Like many others of his generation, he suspected that many collaborators had returned to high places, thus contributing to the sense that the "murderers are among us," as Simon Wiesenthal argued in a book published at about the same time.[35] In addition, on the international level, the Eichmann trial and renewed interest of the German judiciary in the prosecution of war criminals, following the establishment of the Bureau for the Prosecution of National Socialist crimes in Ludwigsburg, contributed to the continuing focus on National Socialists and collaborators.

In the Netherlands, this led to reinforcement of the concepts of *goed* and *fout*, which began to be used in an increasingly encompassing way, especially through remembrance of the persecution and murder of the Jews. After the Eichmann trial, another major influence was the publication in 1965 of the

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

two-volume study *Ondergang* (*Ashes in the Wind*, in the English translation), a history of the persecution of the Jews, by the historian Jacques Presser, which was a huge commercial success, selling over 140,000 copies within the year. Presser describes the persecution, on the one hand, conventionally, as a "cat-and-mouse game" between Germans and Jews. On the other, he writes explicitly from the perspective of the Jewish victims, whose voice had been muffled until then.[36] Moreover, he adds a scathing criticism of the role of the administration, non-Jewish bystanders, and the Jewish Council, established in February 1941.

Remarkably, Presser only mentions in passing the role of Dutch civil servants, railway officials and police officers in the persecution of the Jews. Presser compares the behavior of the non-Jewish population to that of Friedrich Weinreb, a Jewish healer, who in June 1945 was charged with espionage and betrayal of a large number of Jews, and in 1948 was sentenced to six years' imprisonment. In the framework of the pardons granted on the occasion of Queen Wilhelmina's fiftieth year in office, he was released on 11 December 1948. According to Presser, "the Jew Weinreb was made into a scapegoat, who had to pay for the failure of so many non-Jews. He had to have failed, to have failed too, since they had failed."[37]

By suggesting that Weinreb should actually be considered a hero Presser contributed to a painful debate within the decimated Jewish community about the lack of Jewish resistance and even the involvement of the leadership of the Jewish Council in the deportation of the Jewish community. In December 1947, this discussion led to judgment by an internal Jewish council of honor, which advised banning the leaders of the Jewish Council from all public office, as well as bringing criminal charges against Abraham Asscher and David Cohen. After a public outrage they were released, and their case was dropped in 1951.[38] In all these debates, Weinreb had appeared occasionally as an example, both of Jewish collaboration, and of the positive counterexample, of a Jew who had creatively and daringly tried to delude the Germans in a complicated game of deception.[39]

In the latter sense, Weinreb also became a hero of those who came to think that Dutch society had not dealt seriously with the collaborators in its midst, and consequently, was still in a sense a fascist society. His three-volume memoir, *Collaboratie en verzet*, attracted much attention, especially after a ferocious debate developed between leading literary figure Renate Rubinstein, who defended Weinreb, and Willem Frederik Hermans, who argued that Weinreb's memoirs were a collection of fantasies of resistance concocted to cover up his crimes. In the end, an official commission established that Weinreb's claims were false and that he had been justly convicted in 1948.[40] This notion was reinforced by the Eichmann trial. In the Netherlands, the account of the trial by the novelist Harry Mulisch rather than Hannah Arendt's report (*Eichmann in Jerusalem*) contributed to the idea that his acts might be explained more by a thoughtless normality than by abnormal cruelty.[41] Together, these images led to a growing sense of a generalized, if

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

passive, responsibility for the persecution of the Jews.[42] This perception was clearly represented in the documentary *Vastberaden, maar soepel en met mate. Herinneringen aan Nederland 1938–1948*, modeled after Marcel Ophüls's *Le Chagrin et la pitié*, which stressed the continuities from the pre- to the post-war period, and the predominant accommodation with the Occupation.[43]

This conception also fed the sense of imminent danger that it could happen again. It fueled, for instance, the protest against the 1971 census, which began after the lawyer and spokeswoman for Dutch gypsies, Lau Mazirel, wrote letters of protest to Vrij Nederland, and the Comité Waakzaamheid Volkstelling (Census Watchdog Committee, named after the Comité van Waakzaamheid, which in the 1930s had warned against the rise of Nazism), established, among others, by the editor of Weinreb's memoirs, Peter Muijlwijk. She argued that, like the registration of Jews by the German authorities, the census was the first step to the concentration camps.[44]

Radicalization of public opinion also led to renewed interest in individual collaborators. On the one hand, investigative journalists pressured the authorities to examine several high-profile cases of apparent collaboration, or even worse, involvement in war crimes, such as that of the Dutch antique collector Pieter Menten. Like many others, he had escaped close scrutiny in the late 1940s, yet in May 1976 it was revealed he had been an SS officer in Galicia. He was arrested and tried; an official research committee was also set up to investigate (and subsequently reject) rumors that at the time his case had been dropped as a result of political manipulation.[45] Among others investigated in this period was the parliamentary leader of the Protestant Antirevolutionaire Partij, Willem Aantjes, who resigned in 1977 after it was revealed he had joined the German SS in 1944; and former Minister of Foreign Affairs (1956–71) and Secretary General of NATO Joseph Luns, who had been a member of the NSB – an allegation he denied, first claiming there was confusion with his brother, and later that he had never consciously joined the party. Finally, in 1979, a special prosecutor was appointed to investigate old cases against war criminals and crimes against humanity. No trials ever took place.[46]

Alongside this renewed interest in war criminals, the attitude toward collaborators in this period became more open. This fascination culminated in a series of interviews conducted with eight (out of 25,000) former Dutch members of the SS, "out of curiosity" and "unhampered by personal feelings," as the authors stated in their introduction. The interviewees gave a frank account of their career before and during the war. In general, they showed little regret, although some distanced themselves from the destruction of European Jewry by doubting the figures or by stressing their disappointment in the Nazi regime.[47] After 1980, there was also a small wave of "collaboration novels." As Rolf Wolfswinkel argues in his account of the theme of collaboration in Dutch literature, the clear-cut moral scheme of right and wrong is effectively absent in these works. "The "enemy" has developed into an

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

object of curiosity and partial admiration, while collaborators have developed into potential idealists."[48]

Accommodation

Ultimately, the renewed interest in collaborators and the application of the notion of collaboration to various social phenomena increasingly blunted its sense. In 1983, dissatisfaction with this conceptual atrophy became manifest in the inaugural lecture of Hans Blom, Professor of Dutch History at the University of Amsterdam. He argued that for too long the historiography of World War II in the Netherlands had been dominated by the moral categories of *goed* and *fout*. As a result of the close relation between historiography and purge in the first post-war years, the Dutch Institute of War Documentation and the semi-official historian of the war, De Jong, had emphasized the alternatives of resistance and collaboration. De Jong's work had an enormous influence: over 100,000 copies of the complete series of twenty-nine volumes were sold. According to Blom, the possibility to get beyond De Jong "depended on the extent to which historians could break the spell of the political–moral question of *goed* and *fout*, and the associated perspective of collaboration and resistance."[49] He suggested reading the works of German historians Martin Broszat and Gerhard Hirschfeld, as well as those of Dutch historian Ernst Kossmann, commencing from the assumption that the majority of the population had not chosen between resistance and collaboration but had tried to adapt to the occupation.

Blom's lecture inspired a range of new research, which placed the notion of collaboration on a new footing. For instance, Guus Meershoek argued that the Amsterdam police force did not fit the model of initial accommodation and gradually growing resistance, which Hirschfeld and others had suggested.[50] Meershoek demonstrated how police officers had been prepared to assist in the arrest of Jews in 1942, as a result of German policies which addressed a number of complaints that the officers had voiced since the 1930s.[51] In his study of economic development between 1938 and 1948, Hein Klemann argued that most entrepreneurs kept a clear eye on their economic interests, and were able to contribute to economic prosperity, which continued until the end of 1941. As a result, "daily life could continue and the average Dutch person could ward off the suffering that comes with war in work and family."[52] Afterwards, German exploitation and finally outright plundering of the economy increasingly frustrated the possibility of accommodation, although material supply and production remained at an acceptable level until 1944. In the cultural sector, such as music, the German occupation was welcomed as an opportunity to improve work conditions, such as in orchestras – for non-Jews.[53] At the universities, most professors tried to continue "business as usual," an attitude that was prefigured by the strict separation of politics and science that had prevailed in the 1930s.[54] On the other hand, the motives of declared academic collaborators were neither

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

opportunistic nor even clearly ideological, but derived from a mixture of political and scientific considerations, which drove some of them to seek support from Germany.[55]

In general, these studies confirmed the conclusion that resistance and collaboration failed to capture the range of options and motives that people had in their response to the German occupation. They profited from growing interest in the history of the war and collaboration by social scientists, who introduced more refined conceptual tools.[56] On the other hand, it is clear that accommodation meant that business could not continue as usual. It also implied an adjustment so that German demands could be met with minimal effort. In the context of an increasingly repressive and murderous German policy, this sometimes meant looking in the other direction, or even assisting in the injustices committed against clearly defined co-patriots.

The inevitability of moral choices formed the basis for the protest by some commentators against Blom's call to go beyond the distinction of *goed* and *fout*. His lecture was fiercely criticized by the literary historian Adriaan Venema, who wrote a multi-volume history denigrating the Dutch literary scene during World War II, in which he tried to vilify the reputation of some of the most respected authors, in some cases with an apparently solid resistance record.[57] In addition, Nanda van der Zee, in her short account of the persecution of the Jews in the Netherlands, reinstalled a clear moral framework. She accused the political elite, and above all Queen Wilhelmina, of having abandoned Dutch Jews, either by staying put and condoning anti-Jewish measures as the best way "to prevent the worst," or by fleeing to London, where she and the government-in-exile showed little concern for their suffering.[58] Moral indignation is also a prevalent element in the account of Joggli Meihuizen of the purge of economic collaborators. The Dutch government viewed this purge as a "necessary evil" that could hamper the rebuilding of society. Consequently, the purge was "dictated by opportunism in the service of reconstruction."[59]

Some of these studies, notably Van der Zee's indictment of Queen Wilhelmina, caused a stir; yet the fierce public debates of the 1960s and 1970s over collaboration did not continue after 1980. At the same time, these works confirmed the persistence of a predominantly moral perspective toward collaboration. In addition, former collaborators remained social outcasts. Nevertheless, there was a slight change in views. In the slipstream of the victim-centered approach of social problems, and also of the history of war and persecution that came to prevail after 1980, the children of former collaborators demanded recognition of their particular suffering. As part of a much larger group of second-generation victims, they found a niche to tell their story.[60] This trend led to the publication of a series of novels, memoirs and confessions, all stressing the fact that while the children of collaborators bore "no guilt," they received "the punishment all the same."[61] Further, their parents found a new opportunity to voice their concerns, generally their remorse about their wrongdoings, but also their feeling that they had been

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

victims of circumstances, thus returning to the predominant view of collaborators from the 1950s. This is most clearly demonstrated in "Social Psychological Research on Criminal Behavior in the Service of the German Occupying Force," as the dissertation "De collaborateur" of Jacob Hofman is subtitled. Hofman concluded that "comparatively one may more often observe characteristics … which predispose to collaboration and political crimes.

> [Yet] it is not so much their personal character as the perfidious Nazi regime that created the conditions of their criminal behavior from the moment they became, for whatever circumstances or motives, part of this regime. There occurred for them the tragic situation that they helped to sustain this regime, while at the same time they fell victim to it, in the sense that they lost their freedom to act.[62]

All these developments came together in the publication of Chris van der Heijden's *Grijs Verleden. Nederland en de Tweede Wereldoorlog*. In this concise account of World War II in the Netherlands, Van der Heijden explicitly adopted the agenda Blom had formulated in 1983. He argued that, instead of the heroic device *luctor et emergo* (I struggle and overcome) which inspired the Dutch resistance, most Dutchmen lived by the credo "I drift about and stay afloat." Most choices made in the face of the German forces were inspired by opportunism. Pragmatism predominated not only among average Dutch people, but also among the Jews who reacted to the persecution, as well as among those who decided to join the SS. With this radical version of the accommodation argument, Van der Heijden invited the obvious comment that the moral grayness he observed could not be applied equally to victims and perpetrators.[63] This criticism became more sharp-edged when it turned out that Van der Heijden was the son of a former Dutch National Socialist. The explanation of moral choices as the outcome of pragmatic evaluation in the face of dire circumstance was interpreted by some as justification for the inexcusable moral failures of his father.

Conclusion

The reactions to Van der Heijden's work belied his claim that World War II had lost its moral appeal, and that the Dutch could finally view it with an objective eye. Even today, remembrance of collaboration acts as a dividing line between them and us. References to Nazi sympathies or methods are among the sharpest political tools used regularly to discredit unfavorable policies or politicians. In daily parlance, too, the collaborator remains a recognizable negative stereotype. In the course of writing this chapter, I visited my local supermarket, where two young shop assistants were joking about the tasks they were assigned. When one of them apparently connected up with the wrong team, his colleague shouted: "Get lost, you traitor, NSB-er!" So

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

much for the deplored loss of historical consciousness among youth. The history of the collaboration remains clearly very much alive.

Notes

1 H. M. van Randwijk, "'Fout' en 'goed'," in J. Bolhuis, C. D. J. Brandt, H. M. van Randwijk and B. C. Slotemaker (eds.), *Onderdrukking en verzet. Nederland in oorlogstijd*, Vol. I (Nijmegen, n.d. [1949–54]), pp. 381–84.
2 Quoted by Cees Fasseur, *Wilhelmina. Krijgshaftig in een vormloze jas* (Amsterdam, 2001), pp. 463–64.
3 K. Groen, *Als slachtoffers daders worden. De zaak van de joodse verraadster Ans van Dijk* (Baarn, 1994).
4 Reine Friedman-van der Heide, *Drie processen* (Amsterdam, 1946), pp. 18–19.
5 G. Th. Kempe, *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 8 December 1945, quoted in *Het proces Mussert* ('s Gravenhage, 1948), p. 302.
6 H. P. Kuiphof, *Wereldkroniek*, 8 December 1945, quoted in *Het proces Mussert*, p. 310.
7 W. Derksen and M. L. van der Sande, "Wij waren niet op heldendom geselecteerd," in W. Derksen and M. L. van der Sande (eds.), *De burgemeester, van magistraat tot modern bestuurder* (Leiden, 1984), pp. 5–82, 69–72.
8 P. Romijn, *Snel, streng en rechtvaardig. Politiek beleid inzake de bestraffing en reclassering van 'foute' Nederlanders 1945–1955* (Groningen, 1989).
9 Radio broadcast, Schermerhorn, 1 July 1945, quoted by Romijn, *Snel, streng en rechtvaardig,* p. 69.
10 H. W. van der Vaart, *Kamptoestanden 1944–'45–1948* (4th edn., Haarlem, 1949), p. 44.
11 Arnold Meyer, *Pruisische practijken in herrijzend Nederland* (Oisterwijk, 1945), p. 12.
12 Quoted in A. van het Kamp, *Kamptoestanden 1944–1952* (The Hague, 1973), p. 13.
13 Quoted in K. Strijd, *Wat moet er met de NSB-ers gebeuren?* (2nd edn., Hengelo, Overijsel, 1945), p. 1.
14 Strijd, *Wat moet er met de NSB-ers gebeuren? passim*.
15 Similarly, A. Ingwersen, *Open brief aan Zijne Excellentie de Minister-President Prof. Ir. W. Schermerhorn* (n.p., n.d. [Amsterdam, 1945]), strongly emphasizes the negative effect of the purge on children of collaborators.
16 L. de Jong, *Het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden in de Tweede Wereldoorlog*, Vol. 12 (The Hague and Leiden, 1988), pp. 479–85.
17 *De Nederlandsche Unie en haar Driemanschap. Rapport uitgebracht door de daartoe op verzoek van het Driemanschap door Prof. Ir. W. Schermerhorn benoemde Commissie* (Schiedam [1946]). See also Wichert ten Have, *De Nederlandse Unie. Aanpassing, vernieuwing en confrontatie in bezettingstijd 1940–1941* (Amsterdam, 1999).
18 K. J. Frederiks, *Op de bres 1940–1944. Overzicht van de werkzaamheden aan het Departement van Binnenlandse Zaken gedurende de oorlogsjaren* (The Hague, 1945).
19 J. T. Veldkamp, *Het Amsterdamse bevolkingsregister in oorlogstijd* (Amsterdam [1954]), *passim*.
20 L. G. Kortenhorst, *Was samenwerking met de vijand geoorloofd?* (The Hague, 1945), p. 19.
21 A. D. Belinfante, *In plaats van bijltjesdag. De geschiedenis van de Bijzondere Rechtspleging na de Tweede Wereldoorlog* (Assen, 1978), pp. 513–40.
22 Belinfante, *In plaats van bijltjesdag*, pp. 436–58, 542–66.

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

23 Ido de Haan, *Na de ondergang. De herinnering aan de Jodenvervolging in Nederland 1945–1995* (The Hague, 1997), pp. 104–16
24 H. W. Sandberg, *Grote advies-commissie der illegaliteit. Witboek over de geschiedenis van het georganiseerde verzet voor en na de bevrijding* (Amsterdam, 1950), p. 154.
25 J. B. Charles, *Volg het spoor terug* (Amsterdam, 1984 [1953]), p. 14. The "enemy newspaper" was *De Telegraaf*, which had continued publication during the war and was banned until September 1949; see Jan Driever and Jan Brauer, *Perszuivering. De Nederlandse pers 1944–1951* (Weesp, 1984).
26 De Jong, *Het Koninkrijk,* Vol. 12, pp. 476–7.
27 Henry L. Mason, *The Purge of the Dutch Quislings: Emergency Justice in the Netherlands* (The Hague, 1952), p. 139.
28 Belinfante, *In plaats van bijltjesdag.*
29 Romijn, *Snel, streng en rechtvaardig*; see also P. Romijn, "The Image of Collaboration in Post-war Dutch Society," in *Bulletin du Comité international d'histoire de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale 27/28 (1995,)* special issue *1945: Consequences and Sequels of the Second World War*, pp. 311–24.
30 Quoted in Romijn, *Snel, streng en rechtvaardig*, p. 232.
31 A. L. C. Palies, *De politieke delinquent. Enige sociale en psychiatrische aspecten bij de berechting en reclassering van politieke delinquenten. Met een voorwoord van P. J. Bouman* (Assen, 1948), p. 21.
32 Theun de Vries, *W.A.-man* (Amsterdam, 1982 [1944]), pp. 27, 31, 47, 57.
33 See Rolf Wolfswinkel, *Tussen landverraad en vaderlandsliefde. De collaboratie in naoorlogs proza* (Amsterdam, 1994), pp. 47–83.
34 H. M. van Randwijk*, In de schaduw van gisteren. Kroniek van het verzet in de jaren 1940–1945* (Amsterdam, Baarn and The Hague, 1967).
35 S. Wiesenthal, *Moordenaars onder ons* (Amsterdam and Brussels, 1967 [1966]); see also Koos Groen, *Landverraders, wat deden we met ze?* (Baarn, 1974); Koos Groen, *Landverraad. De berechting van collaborateurs in Nederland* (Weesp, 1984).
36 De Haan, *Na de ondergang*, p. 28.
37 J. Presser, *Ondergang. De vervolging en verdelging van het Nederlandse jodendom 1940–1945*, Vol. 2 (The Hague, 1985 [1965]), p. 110.
38 J. Th. M. Houwink ten Cate, 'De justitie en de Joodsche Raad', in E. Jonker and M. van Rossem (eds.), *Geschiedenis en Cultuur. Achttien opstellen* (The Hague, 1990), pp. 149–68; Veld, N. C. K. A. in 't Veld, *De Joodse Ereraad* (Amsterdam, 1989).
39 I. Schöffer, "Weinreb, een affaire van lange duur," *Tijdschrift voor geschiedenis* 95 (1982), pp. 196–224; Regina Grüter, *Een fantast schrijft geschiedenis. De affaires rond Friedrich Weinreb* (Amsterdam, 1997).
40 Friedrich Weinreb, *Collaboratie en verzet 1940–1945: een poging tot ontmythologisering*, 3 vols. (Amsterdam, 1969); Grüter, *Een fantast schrijft geschiedenis*; Veth D. Gilthay and A. J. van der Leeuw, *Rapport door het Rijksinstituut voor Oorlogsdocumentatie uitgebracht aan de Minister van Justitie inzake de activiteiten van drs. F. Weinreb gedurende de jaren 1940–1945, in het licht van nadere gegevens bezien* (2 vols., The Hague, 1976).
41 Harry Mulisch, *De zaak 40–61. Een reportage* (Amsterdam, 1961).
42 J. Bank, *Oorlogsverleden in Nederland* (Baarn, 1983), p. 23.
43 H. J. A. Hofland, H. Keller and H. Verhagen, *Vastberaden, maar soepel en met mate. Herinneringen aan Nederland 1938–1948* (Amsterdam, 1976).
44 J. Katus, *Volkstelling in opspraak. Een studie naar de overheidsvoorlichting met betrekking tot de volkstelling van 1971* (Leiden, 1984).
45 J. C. H. Blom, A. C. 't Hart and I. Schöffer, *De affaire-Menten 1945–1976. Eindrapport van de commissie van onderzoek betreffende het opsporings- en vervolgingsbeleid*

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

inzake Menten vanaf de bevrijding tot de zomer van 1976 en de invloeden waaraan dat beleid al dan niet heeft blootgestaan (The Hague, 1979).

46 P. M. Brilman, "Een strafrechtelijke nalatenschap," in D. Barnouw, M. de Keizer and G. van der Stroom (eds.), *1940–1945: Onverwerkt verleden* (Utrecht, 1985), pp. 163–78.

47 Armando and Hans Sleutelaar, *De SS-ers. Nederlandse vrijwilligers in de Tweede Wereldoorlog* (Amsterdam, 1967); for a more reasoned report of interviews, see J. Th. M. Houwink ten Cate and N. C. K. A. in 't Veld, *Fout. Getuigenissen van NSB-ers* (SDU, 1992).

48 Wolfswinkel, *Tussen landverraad en vaderlandsliefde*, p. 136. The novels are Louis Ferron, *Hoor mijn lied, Violetta* (1982); A. ten Hooven (alias Adriaan Venema), *Lemmingen* (1982); Dirk Ayelt Kooiman, *Montyn* (1982; the English version, *Montyn, a Lamb to Slaughter*, also mentions Jan Montyn as co-author); Adriaan Venema, *Het dagboek* (1990).

49 J. C. H. Blom, *In de ban van goed en fout? Wetenschappelijke geschiedschrijving over de bezettingstijd in Nederland* (Bergen, 1983), p. 11.

50 Hirschfeld had argued in his study of the German occupation of the Netherlands that, at least until the end of 1941, the attitude of the population had to be characterized as "attentism," "the preparedness of the majority of the population to accept the political consequences of military defeat and to reach a *modus vivendi* with the victorious Occupation forces in order to restore order and authority." G. Hirschfeld, *Bezetting en collaboratie. Nederland tijdens de oorlogsjaren 1940–1945 in historisch perspectief* (Haarlem, 1991 [1984]), p. 250.

51 Guus Meershoek, *Dienaren van het gezag. De Amsterdamse politie tijdens de bezetting* (Amsterdam, 1999).

52 Hein Klemann, *Nederland 1938–1948. Economie en samenleving in jaren van oorlog en bezetting* (Amsterdam, 2002), p. 566.

53 Pauline Micheels, *Muziek in de schaduw van het Derde Rijk. De Nederlandse symfonie-orkesten 1933–1945* (Zutphen, 1993).

54 Peter Jan Knegtmans, *Een kwetsbaar centrum van de geest. De Universiteit van Amsterdam tussen 1935 en 1950* (Amsterdam, 1998).

55 Peter Jan Knegtmans, Paul Schulten and Jaap Vogel, *Collaborateurs van niveau. Opkomst en val van de hoogleraren Schrieke, Snijder en Van Dam* (Amsterdam, 1996).

56 Cor Lammers, "Levels of Collaboration: A Comparative Study of German Occupation Regimes during the Second World War," *Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences* 31 (1995), pp. 3–31,

57 Adriaan Venema, *Blommeldingen* (Amsterdam, 1990); Adriaan Venema, *Schrijvers, uitgevers en hun collaboratie* (5 vols., Amsterdam, 1988–92).

58 Nanda van der Zee, *Om erger te voorkomen. De voorbereiding en uitvoering van de vernietiging van het Nederlandse jodendom tijdens de Tweede Wereldoorlog* (Amsterdam, 1997).

59 Joggli Meihuizen, *Noodzakelijk kwaad. De bestraffing van economische collaboratie in Nederland na de Tweede Wereldoorlog* (Amsterdam, 2003), p. 751.

60 See Ido de Haan, "The Construction of a National Trauma: The Memory of the Persecution of the Jews in the Netherlands," *Netherlands Journal for Social Science* 34 (1998), pp. 196–217.

61 Rinnes Rijke, *Niet de schuld, wel de straf. Herinneringen van een NSB-kind* (Bussum, 1982); see also R. Berserk, *De tweede generatie. Herinneringen van een NSB-kind* (Utrecht and Antwerp, 1985); Sytze van der Zee, *Potgieterlaan 7. Een herinnering* (Amsterdam, 1997). Earlier Van der Zee published *Voor Führer, Volk en Vaderland. De SS in Nederland* (Amsterdam, 1992), in which his personal connection with the theme remained unmentioned.

Template: Royal A, Font: ,
Date: 24/02/2010; 3B2 version: 9.1.500/W Unicode (Dec 1 2008) (APS_OT)
Dir: C:/Documents and Settings/angelin/Desktop/24-feb/9780415564410.3d

62 J. Hofman, *De collaborateur. Een sociaal-psychologisch onderzoek naar misdadig gedrag in dienst van de Duitse bezetter* (Amsterdam, 1981), p. 275.

63 Ido de Haan, “Een wereldbeeld in grijstinten,” review of Chris van der Heijden, *Grijs verleden. Nederland en de Tweede Wereldoorlog* (Amsterdam, 2001) in *Vrij Nederland* 62 (2001), pp. 62–3. The debate over Van der Heijden’s family background, notably the arguments of author Leon de Winter, also appeared in the summer 2001 issues of *Vrij Nederland*.