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Chapter 4 – Patterns of interaction

Introduction

As a group, the NSB may have met opposition within the community; however, it is unclear whether and how this general rejection determined interaction patterns in individual cases and which elements caused rejections. In this chapter, I discuss the interaction between National Socialists and their surroundings.

The NSB members interacted with their surroundings under very specific circumstances: the German occupation that completely shifted the prewar power balance. The NSB members had an alliance with the Nazis who also rejected the prewar regime, and through their alliance, they had the opportunity to build a completely new National Socialist community. At the same time, nonmembers saw their power base decreasing. While NSB members felt themselves powerful, others in the community were rather powerless. Besides, the nonmembers perceived the NSB members as the ultimate traitors: choosing the side of the German Nazis and an ideology that aimed to destroy the old society.651

Within the surroundings of NSB members I will study different levels: religious and educational institutions, the workplace, the neighborhood and connections with family members. Which connections endured during the Second World War? The results of this analysis may bring a better understanding of NSB members as well as of nonmembers who interacted with these NSB members. Their opinions of NSB members may shed new light on their attitudes in this tense period.

At different places NSB members interacted with nonmembers. What can be stated about the behavior of National Socialists within non-National Socialist institutions? To answer this question I will focus on two groups of institutions in which NSB members and their family members had contacts with nonmembers: churches and schools. Within these two institutions National Socialists found themselves in a non-National Socialist environment, in most cases even in an anti-National Socialist environment.

After analyzing institutional patterns of interaction, I will shift to the neighborhood level. Within the neighborhood NSB members interacted with both NSB members and

651 Van der Boom, Wij weten niets van hun lot, 124.
nonmembers. As Pamela Swett points out in her PhD research on neighborhood radicalism in Berlin in the 1930s, the cramped housing blocs in a big city created a different neighborhood environment than nowadays. Therefore, residents would know more about the neighborhood, the social life, personal problems, political activities, and each other’s daily schedules and income during that time.\footnote{Swett, Neighborhoods & Enemies, 227.}

Interaction within and between groups might also say something about the level of trust within society. Robert Putnam elaborated on trust in societies by distinguishing bonding within one’s group and bridging with outsiders. The more groups were able to bridge with outsiders, the higher the level of trust in society. As argued in chapter 2, National Socialists were quite successful in bonding with each other. It is, however, unclear if they were bridging. If NSB members were indeed bridging, this will reveal something about the existence of trust in Dutch occupied society.\footnote{Robert D. Putnam, Bowling alone. The collapse and revival of the American community (2000); Robert D. Putnam, Making Democracy Work. Civic traditions in modern Italy (1993).}

One of the social environments is the neighborhood. I have constructed a local case study of three streets in Amsterdam, in different neighborhoods: Kromme Mijdrechtstraat in Amsterdam-South, a district with a high level of Jewish inhabitants; Zacherias Jansestraat in Amsterdam-East with many middle-class/white-collar residents; Hudsonstraat in Amsterdam-West with mainly lower-middle-class residents and workers. Until recently, history from below was rather difficult to carry out in the field of Dutch fascism studies.\footnote{Houwink ten Cate en In ’t Veld, Fout: getuigenissen van NSB’ers; De Jonge ‘Het fascisme en nationaal-socialisme’, 166-191.}

Recently, a new source became more easily available: the postwar files of former NSB members. I have analyzed the postwar dossiers of the street inhabitants who were aligned with the NSB in 1942 because a detailed list of NSB members in Amsterdam from that particular year is available. In that year, NSB membership reached its peak, with nearly 100,000 members. Although the files were constructed after the war and during a judicial process, they contain statements of members and those who interacted with them nearest to the period of the occupation. Moreover, the files often include notes, letters and documents from the period of the occupation. For these reasons, this source is perhaps not ideal but by
all means the best source available. An analysis of these statements demonstrates that the statements came from many different neighbors. In addition, the information offered by these testimonials is combined with other information from the NSB archives and diaries of members and nonmembers. Therefore, these postwar records may offer new insights into the Dutch local community during the German occupation.

The results of these three case studies will be compared with a broader sample of over 250 National Socialists in the regions of Amsterdam, Utrecht, Haarlem, Leiden and Hilversum: nearly 1 percent of the members in this region. In addition, to compare the results with a small village I examine a sample drawn from the coastal village Noordwijk aan Zee. Thus, the data from the capital city with a large Jewish community can be compared with interactions on a local level in other cities and villages in a rural environment.

For the analysis of interactions on an institutional level the information available to us is scattered. Therefore, it is not possible to present a quantitative analysis of the confrontations. But the few available documents do present new insights into the actions and relations of NSB members.

Different factors that could have influenced the level of interaction are taken into account. There may have been a relationship between political activities and relationships with nonmembers. Higher political participation may have led to increasing identification with the NSB, which may have led to a lower level of interaction with the non-NSB environment. It is also possible that there was a relationship between political participation in general and a social personality. According to Lester Milbrath, political participation is positively related to social skills. In 1965 he stated that: “sociable personalities are more likely to enter politics than non-sociable personalities; this is especially true of political activities that require social interaction.” Therefore, the more active National Socialists could have been more sociable and perhaps had the talent of having contacts both in and outside the party. Another correlation may have existed between violent activities and interactions. The most violent NSB members may have been aligned with the paramilitary WA and/or the internal police organization, the Landwacht. Because of their violent activities, the relationships of WA men and members of the Landwacht with nonmembers may have been more damaged than those of other NSB members. A final element is the specific features of
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655 In 2025 the files will be fully disclosed; Donker and Faber, Bijzonder gewoon, 83-104.
656 Milbrath, Political Participation, 75.
the group of NSB members. It may be the case that members were already more isolated before entering the NSB and that it was not their membership as such which determined their socially isolated position in society.

Institutional in- and exclusion

Once the German Nazi occupation regime had been established, Dutch National Socialists impatiently urged the Germans to improve the NSB position in local political, religious and educational organizations. While in September 1940 the rumors about an NSB government were numerous, the Germans still did not consider that option seriously. Reacting to the deferred expectations, the national NSB leaders hoped to continuously enhance their position vis-à-vis the German regime in the first months of the occupation. In the meanwhile, local NSB members tried to improve their unsure, but hopeful political future at that time. During this process of “takeover” the NSB faced hostility. The NSB members were confronted with opposition on all fronts. Churches, schools and local government institutions received many complaints from NSB members.

One month after the German invasion, the local leader of the NSB in Zandvoort criticized the anti-NSB atmosphere in his village. In a letter to the mayor he elaborated on the suffering of NSB members due to the anti-NSB atmosphere during their internment in May 1940 and afterwards. He summoned the mayor to publish a statement in every local newspaper announcing that “NOTHING, really NOTHING, has been proven nor any information been found that arrested National Socialists or sympathizing National Socialists between May 10-14 indeed had anything to do with treason, espionage, arms smuggling, etc.” He demanded that National Socialists be rehabilitated completely. The mayor replied that due to national announcements by the Land and Naval Commander, he saw no need to repeat the message on a local level. The attempt of the NSB leader was thus unsuccessful.
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657 Rost's position was better than that of Mussert in the first weeks of the occupation; Hirschfeld, Bezetting en collaboratie, 218-228; De Jong, Het Koninkrijk IV, 432.
658 “Dat NIETS maar dan ook NIETS is komen vast te staan en op welke wyze ook is gebleken, dat Nationaal Socialisten of daarmede sympathisierende gearresteerd van 10-14 mei ook maar iets met landverraad, spionage, wapensmokkelarij e.d. te maken hebben gehad”; Letter of circle leader of the NSB to the mayor of Zandvoort, June 17th, 1940; Reply of the mayor, June 19th, 1940; NHA, access number 2232, file 2199, gemeentebestuurt Zandvoort.
In the same village, an undertaker complained that he was excluded from new business because of his NSB membership. The police took the complaint seriously and started an investigation. However, in their research, a rather different picture arose. The reason for his exclusion was not his NSB membership - another undertaker was a NSB member too - but that he was not a church caretaker anymore. This is one of probably many examples of the continuous efforts of NSB members to benefit from their “disadvantaged” position. While their membership did not always cause the problems, they used their NSB affiliation to complain and in the end profit from their “misfortune.” These expressions of discontent to the local government of Zandvoort are a good example of a probably more general pattern of dissatisfaction with their position.

The school is one of the meeting points for NSB members and nonmembers. The NSB built many economic and social organizations during the German occupation. However, the NSB failed to organize its own school system since there were only a couple of German-oriented National Socialist schools in the Netherlands. Most NSB children thus attended non-NSB schools. Their parents’ membership had an impact on the children who were often perceived as “NSB children,” and at school nonmembers surrounded them. NSB members complained about the anti-NSB atmosphere at the schools of their children. The anti-NSB ambiance at schools permeated the national level as well: it was discussed in the meetings of the attorney general. In these meetings in November 1940, after receiving many reports about misbehavior at schools, the “alarming” atmosphere at schools was perceived as an undesirable situation.

In the fall of 1940, after the school holidays, NSB members made several complaints. They stated that schoolmates were bullying their children, and they complained that teachers spread anti-NSB feelings at school. NSB members sent their complaints to the Afiwerdienst, the judicial department of the NSB. In October 1940, an NSB member sent several letters about the anti-NSB atmosphere at a trade school in Utrecht. He wrote that his son was accused in the school corridors of being a “traitor.” According to the son’s testimony, he was punched in the back twice. As a result, the son slapped one of his attackers in the face,

659 NHA, access number 2232, file 2199, Zandvoort, April 1941.
660 Paul van der Steen, Keurkinderen. Hitlers elitescholen in Nederland (Amsterdam 2009).
661 PG, November 14th and 21st, 1940.
662 NIOD, file 123, ATL, 2048, 2049, April 23rd, 1941, June 18th, 1941 in Utrecht.
which led to the son’s suspension, and he was only allowed to come back to school the next morning, after writing 200 lines for punishment. The father of the boy complained about his son’s punishment and about the school permitting two other children of NSB members to leave the school ten minutes earlier in order to prevent confrontations. This measure was completely wrong, according to the NSB member, because it made the NSB children look like “black sheep.” The bullying children and their negligent parents should be punished instead. The letter is full of frustration; the complaining father perhaps had hoped that the NSB and their children would have had a more prominent position at school.

Some problems arose at schools in the village of Aalsmeer, eight miles southwest of Amsterdam. In October 1940, an NSB member elaborated on the verbal abuse (like “traitor”) that his son had to endure. According to this NSB member, the French teacher failed the boy for political reasons. The school responded decisively. The school principal talked with the boy. The latter wanted to give the names of only two boys because the others were his friends. The boy denied the guilt of the French teacher. Afterwards, the school principal gave a long speech to the boys’ class, warning them about the consequences should they continue bullying. Additionally, the principal summoned all classes to refrain from speaking about politics at school and in the schoolyard. In a letter to all the teachers in the school, he warned them to be cautious about political expressions. This incidents reveals that this school principal had taken serious measures to prevent political expressions and abuses and that the slightest provocation led NSB members to express their objections.

In the same city, a group leader of the NSB expressed his complaints to an even broader circle than only one school principal. In May 1941, he sent a letter to all elementary schools in the city in which he elaborated on the bullying of NSB children that was permitted or even encouraged by the teachers and the school principal. He announced that the NSB would no longer tolerate this behavior. “If I hear of any more complaints, I will not hesitate to take my measures.” Reacting to these threats, the local government assembled all school principals to ask them about their experiences. The principals stated that they were
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663 NIOD, Afweerdienst NSB, Utrecht, October 23rd, 1940. And another complaint about a school in Haarlem as well; October 1st, October 14th and 19th, 1940. The school principal acted immediately against the pro-Unie behavior of this teacher at school.

664 NHA, 1949, file 624, gemeente Aalsmeer, October 10th, 1940.

665 “Mochten mij nog weer klachten bereiken, dan zal ik niet aarzelen, mijn maatregelen te nemen om een regelmatige gang van zaken bij het onderwijs te Aalsmeer in de toekomst te verzekeren.”; May 16th, 1941, NHA, access number 1949, file 624.
fully aware of the difficult circumstances these days and tried to ensure good interactions between all children and teachers. The deputy mayor of Aalsmeer instructed all principals to prevent complaints and if there were complaints to report them.\footnote{NHA, access number 1949, file 624, May 21st 1941.}

In the week following this statement, school principals reported a couple of complaints. One reported incident dated from the summer of 1940, when two students were verbally abused because of their father’s NSB membership. The principal immediately punished the two responsible students. A second principal described how one girl of NSB parents was once shouted at in the summer of 1940. Other principals stated they were already acting firmly against bullying, whether caused by political reasons or other factors. Therefore, the teachers thought the letter of the NSB leader was insulting.\footnote{NHA, access number 1949, file 624, May 19th 1941.} Thus, the local NSB leader failed to make himself very popular among the school principals in Aalsmeer. And he had clearly violated hierarchical lines. In addition, the reason behind the accusation of the school system and local government was rather limited. The other schools in Aalsmeer wrote that nothing remarkable happened at their schools.\footnote{NHA, access number 1949, file 624, two Catholic schools and one Christian school.}

One principal in Aalsmeer reported extensively about one incident, which illustrates the dynamics of such a confrontation. An NSB member complained that his son, an NJS member, was insulted at school. Therefore, the father threatened the school leadership. Ten days later, he visited the school again because his son was in a fight. According to the school principal, the student who was fighting with the NJS boy, was an NJS member himself; it was just an ordinary schoolboy fight. However, the NSB father told the school principal to immediately intervene whenever something similar would happen to his son, whenever the boy was “wronged.” He threatened to inform the NSB leadership about the incident. The principal notified all teachers; every political conversation or fight in or near the school was prohibited from then on.\footnote{NHA, access number 1949, file 624, May 19th 1941.} As in other confrontations, the school principal took the complaint seriously, while avoiding the political dimension of the bullying in which the message of the NSB member had been expressed.

After December 1941 when the NSB became the only permitted party, the number of complaints decreased. The reason for this development was probably not due to a more
pro-NSB climate but because the NSB’s political power base had increased. From 1942 onwards, NSB members complained only occasionally. In early 1943, an NSB member complained about the bullying of his daughter at a Catholic school in Leiden. He was especially irritated by the statements of the female history teacher, who according to the complainer, talked about the pillage carried out by the occupier. He even threatened the school principal, if he failed to “take radical measures with less pleasant consequences.” He urged the principal to fire this history teacher. This pattern corresponds with previous complaints. Unfortunately, the reaction of the school principal has not been preserved.

NSB members from the CABR sample also complained about the schools of their children. Two members removed their child to another school because of the bullying. One moved his daughter to a German school. In July 1941, a member from a village near Utrecht wrote a letter to the school principal about NSB children being bullied. A member in a coastal village near Haarlem did the same in the autumn of 1941.

Out of the NSB members in the CABR sample, five were teachers. These teachers could express their National Socialist affiliation within the classroom. At a school in Hilversum, the headmaster testified about the National Socialist propaganda of one of his teachers. This particular teacher admitted in his trial that he combined his gymnastic lessons with politics; he let his students march around singing National Socialist songs. Two teachers in Amsterdam reported anti-National Socialist behavior to the SD, one incident involving a fellow teacher in February 1942 and one involving children who refused to learn German in the spring of 1943. One female teacher – a former member of the national team - trained the girls from the NJS in hockey. Another teacher in Amsterdam was an active NSB member, but his former students testified in his favor in his judicial file. Thus, four out of these five were visible as National Socialists.
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671 Leiden, Slats, Noordwijk, February 11th, 1943 to the principal of the Barbaraschool in Leiden.
672 NA, CABR, files 55673, 52561, 62639, 11089, 42353, 37445, 23823.
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Non-NSB members wrote about National Socialists at schools as well. A schoolteacher in Amsterdam wrote in his diary about the impudent behavior of National Socialists at schools. In his opinion NSB employees as well as NJS students misbehaved. They provoked others at school, and whenever they were confronted with bullying or opposition, they used their membership to retaliate.681

The letters of NSB members to school principals and the diary of the school teacher illustrate the same pattern over and over again: an NSB member felt himself unfairly disadvantaged combined with a sense of overconfidence about his own new position. In other words, while the NSB member felt he had the right to demand and get everything he wished for – the New Order had come – he had the feeling that nonmembers constantly opposed him. He – most of the complaints came from men – expressed this querulous attitude in angry letters, in which he threatened to take severe measures against every opposition. On the slightest provocation a small group of NSB members reacted impudently and irritated, demanding immediate measures. As a result, many school principals did respond, however, mentioning other than political reasons for taking action. The reactions of school principals to complaints from NSB parents were most of the time non-political, emphasizing the apolitical atmosphere at school and the wish to simply maintain “order.” They argued on the basis of “order,” rather than on the New Order. A letter of a school principal in Utrecht in July 1941 exemplifies this reaction, stating that: “Since we are at school to educate the students, politics of any persuasion will be kept outside the school; and we do not know the political persuasion of the parents of any of our pupils.”682 National Socialism as ideology and argument for actions remained rejected by educational institutions.

The school was not the only institution where NSB members clashed with nonmembers. Churches were confronted with impudent NSB members as well. The relationship between the NSB and different churches in the Netherlands was complex. The Reformed (Gereformeerdd) and Catholic Churches were openly hostile towards the NSB from 1936 onwards; the other Protestant Churches were less explicit in their sentiments.683 Where NSB

681 NIOD, Van der Does, June 12th, 1941, January 14th, 1942.
682 “Daar wij hier in de school alleen zijn voor onderwijs aan de leerlingen, wordt de politiek van elke richting buiten de school gehouden en weten wij ook van geen der leerlingen, tot welke politieke richting zijn ouders behoord.”; Utrecht, July 19th , 1941; NIOD, file 123, 1473-1476.
members during the 1930s passively reacted to this rejection, they started responding actively and aggressively when their power base increased. In churches one can see a pattern similar to the one at schools: impatient NSB members refused to tolerate any rejection by the church.

Within the Netherlands, the largest religious community was Protestant. This group was divided into many subgroups. The main ones were the Dutch Reformed (Nederlands Hervormd, 31 percent of the Dutch population) and the Reformed Church (Gereformeerd, 9.7 percent of the population). The Dutch Reformed Church was less negative and rejecting than the Reformed Church. Members of the Reformed Church were overrepresented in the resistance against the German occupiers; members of the Dutch Reformed and Catholic Church were underrepresented. According to Jan Bank, the intense network of organizations and the decades of history of oppositional spirit against an established national church might explain the high percentage of Reformed people in the resistance.

Within the NSB group members of the Dutch Reformed Church (Hervormd) were overrepresented (43 percent of the NSB members compared with 31 percent nationally), Catholics (33 percent NSB members and 39 percent nationally) and Reformed (Gereformeerden, 2.6 percent compared with 9.7 percent nationally) underrepresented.

One of the openly opposing churches was the Catholic Church. The Catholics were a strong minority in the Netherlands, the majority living in the Southern part of the country. The highest church official, Archbishop Jan de Jong, was based in Utrecht. Before and even more so during the occupation, the Catholic Church actively banned NSB members from their church. From October 1940 onwards, tensions arose between the Catholic Church and the NSB. In April 1942, the archbishop stated that “the National-Socialist
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684 According to the 1947 census out of approximately 9.6 million inhabitants, roughly 3.8 million were Reformed Protestant; of them 2.9 million belonged to the Dutch Reformed Church, 900,000 to the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands and about 40,000 were so-called Remonstrant adherents, the liberal wing, about 70,000 Lutheran. Catholics: 3.7 million in 1947; Bank ‘Protestantism in the Second World War: The case of The Netherlands and France’, 226.

685 Also, cooperation between churches; Pieter van Gent, ‘De Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk’ in: Idem etal., Collaboratie of verzet. Accomodatie van het sociale leven in de Tweede Wereldoorlog (Utrecht 2000) 7-17, here 9-12.


687 De Jong, Het Koninkrijk VI, 385; Bank ‘Protestantism in the Second World War. The case of the Netherlands and France’226.

688 Lieve Gevers, ‘Catholicism in the Low Countries During the Second World War, 210-211.

689 NIOD, Afweerdienst, October 16nd, 1940, Bussum; complaints about anti-NSB behavior of the Catholic Church.
worldview was diametrically opposed to Christianity and was a severe threat to our Christian faith and our Christian morals.\textsuperscript{690}

The NSB had doubts about how to respond to the rejections, as becomes clear from a proposal for a radio speech from September 1941. This aggressive anti-Catholic radio speech was banned.\textsuperscript{691} Perhaps it was regarded as counterproductive; according to a note written with pencil in the margins of the speech, the subject needed to be handled more “cautiously.” On May 30\textsuperscript{th}, 1942, the national NSB propaganda leader, Ernst Voorhoeve, wrote a letter to all regional NSB leaders, saying that many National Socialists, especially those on the front, sought and found relief in their faith. He accused all the people who had mislabeled these men as inferior.\textsuperscript{692} On a local level, the NSB leader in Noordwijk similarly rejected the negative attitude towards the NSB held by the Catholic and Protestant churches.\textsuperscript{693}

WA men reacted to church opposition as well. The church could refuse NSB members or their families the right to be buried in sacred ground. This led to discontent among NSB members and even to violent reactions from WA men. At least twice, in Utrecht and in Haarlem, this refusal provoked the WA men to forcibly enter the Catholic graveyard and bury their dead themselves.\textsuperscript{694}

The two Protestant communities combined formed the largest group in the Netherlands. While the Reformed Church openly opposed the NSB in 1936, the Dutch Reformed Church expressed the problems of Christianity with Nazism openly in October 1943.\textsuperscript{695} Fifteen Dutch Reformed clergymen belonged to the NSB.\textsuperscript{696} Two important Reformed ministers in the NSB were Wilhelm Theodor Boissevain in the Leiden area and Lodewijk Cornelis Willem Ekering in Amsterdam. Boissevain was an intellectual, whereas Ekering translated these ideas to a larger public and was more popular within his

\textsuperscript{690} April 1942, aartsbisschop en bisschoppen, file 259a: 72f.
\textsuperscript{691} Utrechts archief, Archief aartsbisdom, access number 449, file 150, September 1941, De Leeuw.
\textsuperscript{692} Letter Ernst Voorhoeve, 259b-11, Utrecht May 30th, 1942, , prescription nr. 13; Regionaal Archief Leiden.
\textsuperscript{693} Aan kringpropleider Tegelaar van Beukers: “Oude pol partijen kunnen nog steeds onbestraft het natsoc bestrijden, de levensmiddelenvoorziening saboteren e, het volk ophitsen, met de bijbel in de hand en een vroom gezicht.”; NA, CABR, file 215, 22 April 1942.
\textsuperscript{694} PG, April 17th, 1942, Utrecht and Haarlem.
\textsuperscript{696} Except Ekering; Tijsen, Dominee van de NSB, 113-114; NA, CABR, file 20294; Bank, ‘Protestantism in the Second World War: The case of The Netherlands and France’, 242.
community. In Ekering’s postwar file one of the police reporters wrote that being a “National Socialist Christian” was “a contradiction in terms.” However, his former colleagues, neighbors and acquaintances all testified in his favor.\(^697\)

NSB members could come into conflict with the Dutch Reformed Church. An example of such a confrontation is a meeting of the church officials in September 1942 in Bloemendaal, a coastal village near Haarlem and Amsterdam. One of the local National Socialists, Neumann, was allowed to speak at this assembly. He spoke while ignoring all interruptions. He took his time. He started off by stating that “times change” and as a National Socialist he declared himself as an “optimist.” He stated that the NSB is the “State Party” now and that the NSB “represents the will of our people.” Therefore, he declared the group leader of the NSB in Bloemendaal to be the leader of all villagers. He regretted the fact that the NSB still lacked the power to withdraw subsidies or arrest people. Neumann threatened the members of the church assembly with unrest in Bloemendaal and unpleasant consequences for all the men present. The audience responded negatively immediately. His mission had failed.\(^698\) His impudent, aggressive behavior had led to irritation and estrangement.

Individual members sometimes disagreed with the church institutions. Not every member chose an aggressive tactic like Neumann’s. An active NSB member from Utrecht wrote in a letter to the Dutch Reformed community that, because of the anti-National Socialist attitude within the council, he would temporarily voluntarily withdraw himself from active service.\(^699\)

As mentioned in chapter 1, only 4 out of the 327 NSB members clearly struggled with the combination of their NSB membership and membership in a religious institution. Two of them struggled with their Catholic faith, one Dutch Reformed and one Reformed. Most members were less attached to any of the church communities in the Netherlands.\(^700\) Many members did not care very much about their relationship with the church because they were only weakly if at all attached to religious communities; approximately 25 percent of NSB members were not aligned to any church at all, that is, more than the 17 percent of the
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\(^{697}\) Tijssen, Dominee van de NSB, 113-114; NA, CABR, 20294 and STPD, 41.
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\(^{699}\) Letter February 24th, 1942 to the Dutch Reformed church in Utrecht; NA, CABR, file 76881.

\(^{700}\) Kooy, Echec, 148; Vos, Ledenverloop, 51.
entire population.\textsuperscript{701} That may be the reason that NSB members complained more about the “anti-NSB” atmosphere at the schools of their children than about the behavior of religious officials.

\textit{Street 1. Kromme Mijdrechtstraat}

From the institutional level, we shift to the neighborhood and the street levels. The first street in this analysis is situated in the Southern part of Amsterdam: Kromme Mijdrechtstraat. It was a street with a high percentage of Jewish inhabitants.\textsuperscript{702} Approximately 350 people lived on the street.\textsuperscript{703} Of these residents, approximately 47 were members of the NSB in 1942.\textsuperscript{704} That leads to the ratio of 13 percent NSB members versus 87 percent nonmembers, which was significantly higher than in the rest of Amsterdam, where approximately 2 percent of the population was aligned with the NSB.

The high proportion of Jewish inhabitants is both interesting and a disadvantage to the researcher because 98 percent of these neighbors did not return to the neighborhood after the liberation and therefore could not testify in the postwar trials.\textsuperscript{705} However, the statements coming from many different neighbors present a rich and varied image of the street interactions during the German occupation.

I will first focus on the two most important NSB members in the street, before discussing the rest of the street dwellers. The first one, Wilhelmus Josephus Cornelis Nieuwenhuyse, was an NSB group leader. The second one, Christiaan F. Sluyter, was leader of a “bloc.” These two men were the highest-ranking NSB members in the street and therefore the local center of the NSB. Nieuwenhuyse’s position was one level higher than Sluyter’s.

Nieuwenhuyse was born in 1908. He became an NSB member in 1935 and remained a member until the end. His wife was an active NSB member as well. In 1940,

\textsuperscript{701}NA, CABR, Antonius Cornelis Johannes de Wit, 12499, 18303, 52561, 76881; Kooij, \textit{Echec}, 148. In this sample: 12 \% not aligned and 14 \% religion un-known; www.volkstellingen.nl.
\textsuperscript{702} Among the inhabitants many have Jewish last names; Street book, 1939 SAA.
\textsuperscript{703} List of the telephone book.
\textsuperscript{704} POD, Ledenlijst Amsterdam NSB.
Nieuwenhuyse had a permanent job at the Heineken brewery. When the threat of the German invasion increased in 1939, Dutch men were mobilized for the army. NSB members received an appeal on their doormat as well. Thus, many NSB members were mobilized in the Dutch army. Nieuwenhuyse was one of these Dutch NSB soldiers. According to his own testimony and that of his local tobacconist, Nieuwenhuyse was unhappy at the defeat of the Dutch army. However, he adapted quickly to the new situation. One week after the defeat, he marched down Kromme Mijdrechtstraat in his WA uniform. In these days, Nieuwenhuyse put his heart and soul into his activities for the NSB. He convinced his sister and brother-in-law to become NSB members by warning them about the alternative: working in Germany. He lured his neighbor with a location to sell his flowers.\(^{706}\) He enrolled his upstairs neighbors as well.\(^{707}\) Bringing in new members was an excellent fulfillment of his tasks as a local NSB boss.\(^{708}\)

Nieuwenhuyse was clearly anti-Semitic during the German occupation. In his position as NSB group leader he once reported the addresses of all the Jews in his group. According to his own postwar testimony, his attitude towards Jews had “changed” after the German occupation; his anti-Semitism grew and he acted accordingly. In addition to passing on Jewish addresses, he complained to a high-ranking NSB leader about a Jew who returned home after his arrest in September 1941 and added that this man “is one of the villains we would like to never see again.”\(^{709}\)

Nieuwenhuyse’s active National Socialist behavior led to various reactions in his environment. After the demobilization of the Dutch army, Nieuwenhuyse resumed working at the Heineken brewery till 1942. His coworkers were more or less positive about his behavior. However, one colleague showed open hostility towards the NSB, according to Nieuwenhuyse. In late 1941, he bullied Nieuwenhuyse about his NSB membership by limping out of the room and proclaiming that this kind of physical defect will be the fate of “all traitors.”\(^{710}\) The jeering coworker was imprisoned for eight months for this insult. Nieuwenhuyse claimed only to have testified and not reported the man to the police. In

\(^{706}\) NA, CABR, file 18844.
\(^{707}\) NA, CABR, file 86031.
\(^{708}\) NA, CABR, file 106559. Other peoples used his address as well for NSB mail; NA, CABR, file 86050, 86080.
\(^{709}\) Aan Kardoes “Dit is een van die schurken ie wij nooit meer terug willen zien.”; NA, CABR, file 14487, 85440.
\(^{710}\) NA, CABR, file 14487, 85440.
Nieuwenhuyse’s postwar trial, the coworker explained that Nieuwenhuyse had acted fairly during the trial and that he had liked him before.

While some coworkers gave favorable testimony about Nieuwenhuyse, his neighbors offered rather negative views about his behavior and character. According to his neighbors he terrorized the street, using the full range of methods to spread NSB propaganda. One of his neighbors thought Nieuwenhuyse was a “villainous anti-Semite,” who was highly unreliable; for that reason she kept him at a distance. Both he and his wife were considered to be fanatic National Socialists and eager propagandists. However, their neighbors denied having experienced any treachery.

At the end of 1943, the Nieuwenhuyse family moved to another street in the same neighborhood but not out of sight. One of his old neighbors remembered seeing him on Mad Tuesday. At that moment, the entire neighborhood was in uproar because of the expected liberation. NSB members experienced these days rather differently: they became nervous because of the coming defeat. NSB members and their families gathered at a street corner to flee to the eastern part of the Netherlands. A jeering crowd surrounded the fleeing NSB members. The old neighbor spotted Nieuwenhuyse in this group. Nieuwenhuyse had a gun with him. According to his neighbor, he pointed his gun at the crowd and fired at them. Nieuwenhuyse testified that he fired in the air only. There are no casualties reported in the police documents of September 1944, but Nieuwenhuyse certainly must have scared the crowd at that time.

Nieuwenhuyse’s behavior in the Landwacht caused negative reactions. Until Mad Tuesday he had worked irregularly for the Landwacht, controlling identity papers and sometimes arresting people. After Mad Tuesday he worked permanently at the Landwacht, guarding railways and arresting suspects, sometimes even in his own street. In the meantime he also seized potatoes and other goods he came upon during arrests and controlling people. Because of his visible National Socialist activities his neighbors judged him unfavorably.

---

711 Translation: “doortrapte Jodenhater.”
712 NA, CABR, file 86201.
713 NA, CABR, file 86201.
714 In the end Nieuwenhuyse was wounded by Canadian fire and arrested and given eight years’ imprisonment; NA, CABR, file 14487, 85440.
Analyzing Nieuwenhuyse’s activities reveals something about the internal party culture of the NSB as well: while one had to fill in the name of the “bloc” leader, many failed to fulfill this requirement. Instead, Nieuwenhuyse signed the forms, confirming the idea that he personally brought in many new members and thereby skipping the organizational interlayer of the “bloc” leader, for example Sluyter. Another element is the level of contacts between members. Nieuwenhuyse was group leader of many street dwellers, and members visited him and other NSB members in their street. Apparently, people knew about each other’s membership and saw each other during and outside party meetings.

Christiaan Sluyter, a pharmacy assistant born in 1901, was subordinate to Nieuwenhuyse; he was “bloc” leader in Kromme Mijdrechtstraat. He became a member of the NSB and the WA in 1940. His wife was an NSB member as well. Although his membership dated from only two months before the German invasion, his house was searched in May 1940. His black shirt and belt were taken. Immediately after the German takeover he became an active NSB propagandist: hanging a flag, putting NSB posters in his window, selling newspapers on the street and marching with the WA. In his WA uniform Sluyter worked for the German Wehrmacht. Sluyter was an active National Socialist on all fronts. In his postwar statement he argued that he became an employee of the WA in the summer of 1941 in order to avoid working in Germany.

According to his neighbors, Sluyter flourished after the German takeover; he enjoyed his uniform and his new status. He used his new status to betray his Jewish neighbors. After a Jewish fishmonger told him a rumor about the negative attitude of a Jewish lady towards National Socialists, he wrote a letter to the WA, denouncing this lady in May 1940. In addition, he accused his Jewish neighbors of intimidating his wife.

In his postwar trial, his non-Jewish neighbors declared that Sluyter was an active NSB member during the occupation, though they believed he had not betrayed his neighbors [which he in fact had done]. While his neighbors were moderate in their opinions about Christiaan Sluyter, his wife Anna –of German origin– was regarded as a bothersome person. She behaved badly on many occasions, especially against her Jewish

---

715 NA, CABR, file 85848 and more.
716 NA, CABR, file 14487.
717 As many others; SAA, Politiearchief, May 1940.
718 NA, CABR, file 21491, 86142.
neighbors. On her porch she expressed her wish “that Hitler would exterminate all Jews.”

When her children quarreled with the neighborhood kids, she intervened. At one moment she even wanted to hit a little kid, and when a neighbor tried to prevent this, she shouted at her and called her a Jew. The Jewish neighbor replied that Anna Sluyter “should be ashamed of herself because the whole neighborhood detested her.” Another neighbor also argued with Anna Sluyter. After a heavy altercation, Anna supposedly threatened: “ugly bitch, the bullet is too good for you.” Because of the fights, Anna went to the SD since she simply could not stand her neighbors. Both neighboring women were summoned to the SD office, where they were told to never bother Anna Sluyter again. One of the SD men threatened to send the first, Jewish, neighbor to Poland. The second woman was accused of ignoring Anna and spitting on the ground. She was also threatened with being sent away since Anna Sluyter was “protected” because her husband worked for the German Wehrmacht. Afterwards, her neighbors kept their children inside to prevent quarrels with Anna’s children. This reveals how ordinary disputes between NSB members and their neighbors could have serious consequences during the occupation. And if NSB members actively provoked people, it caused negative reactions.

After having looked at the two most prominent local National Socialists, I will now turn to the other NSB members in Kromme Mijdrechtstraat. In general, young suspects could count on less hostility from their neighbors than could older National Socialists. A young steersman saw his dream of a sailing career disintegrate through a sequential series of disappointments. His parents were NSB members from August 1940, and his father enrolled him in the party in June 1943. His neighbors declared that he was very different from his parents; one of them testified “despite everything he had joined, I am sure that boy could do no harm to anyone. He is a good person in the neighborhood and I am sure that he was not able to resist to the power of his parents.”

---

719 "Ik wou, dat Hitler kwam en alle Joden uitroeide", testimony of a neighbor; NA, CABR, file 85302.
720 "Jodenzwijn", NA, CABR, file 85302.
721 "je mag je wel schamen want de hele buurt spreekt niet veel goed van je.", NA, CABR, file 85302.
722 "lelijk rotwijf, de kogel is nog te goed voor je, wacht maar, ik krijg je wel." NA, CABR, file 85302.
723 NA, CABR, file 85302.
724 “Ondanks alles waarvan hij deel heeft uitgemaakt, weet ik zeker dat die jongen niemand eenig leed zou kunnen doen. Hij is een hier in de buurt goed gezien persoon en ik weet zeker, dat hij op den duur niet op heeft gekund tegen de drijfkracht van zijn ouders”; NA, CABR, Antonie den Burger.
To see what contributed to a negative image, we can analyze the opinions towards the young steersman’s parents. What was it that led to a negative opinion? The attitudes of neighbors regarding his parents were significantly more negative than towards the young man. Several testified they were afraid of his father, Arie den Burger, who was an active NSB member. Arie had a criminal record because of a sex offense. According to his neighbors, his financial situation flourished during the occupation. His wife Catharina den Burger, an NSB member as well, was seen as a “difficult” and “fanatic” person, who had many contacts with Germans. The superintendent even talked about “orgies” at Den Burger’s place. They opposed Arie den Burger’s return to society. Several other witnesses described his violent behavior as a member of the *Landwacht*. One man testified that Den Burger took away his strawberries in January 1944 while declaring to this witness that these could be his last strawberries, before giving him 60 lashes and sending him to the prison camp at Amersfoort. The neighbors’ statements about this family reveal that these judgments depended heavily on whether somebody was “fanatic,” profiting financially, whether somebody was a “decent” person, and on his activities in the *Landwacht*.

The high number of Jews living in Kromme Mijdrechtstraat made it probable that its inhabitants witnessed the raids on Jews. Some neighbors indeed mentioned the raids. According to her neighbor, Catherina den Burger went out on the street, when there were raids although everybody was ordered to stay inside. The witness declared that Den Burger walked by houses of Jews to see if somebody was inside. Another NSB neighbor, Karel van Homburg saw the raids but did not betray his Jewish neighbors, according to his own testimony. However, a Jewish neighbor declared that van Homburg threatened to denounce him during a fight. Van Homburg acknowledged the fight with his neighbor – about his barking dog - but denied the threats.

Provocative behavior was an important element in the image of NSB members, as we have seen with Anna Sluyter. This element was even more important when political borders lay within households. Differences in political views occurred not only between households living in the same street; political disputes could flourish within families as well. A neighbor of Nieuwenhuyse, the florist Van de Hoek, was in his second marriage – with a
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725 NA, CABR, file 105494.
726 “zwelgpartijen”; NA, CABR, file 20834.
727 NA, CABR, file 105494.
728 NA, CABR, file 86138.
German woman—when the Germans invaded the Netherlands. The couple had different political convictions: his wife opposed National Socialism. According to his wife and neighbors, the florist kept his NSB membership to himself. His neighbor declared that Van de Hoek was a quiet man, without enemies and with good relationships in the neighborhood.  

While Van de Hoek’s positive image could suggest a correlation between active membership and negative interactions, analyzing other people’s relationships calls into question this connection. Johanna Lindeman-Blass, born in Germany and married to a Dutch man, decorated her house with posters and hung a portrait of Hitler on the wall as well as an NSB flag outside on the birthdays of Hitler and Mussert. However, her neighbors spoke favorably about her at her trial. They kept in touch and talked with each other, even though German officers visited Lindeman-Blass. Apparently, political conversations among NSB members and nonmembers were not uncommon. She even discussed the work of her husband, who as an NSB member working at the Auxiliary Police (Hulppolitie) participated in rounding up Jews. Another woman, of German origin, divorced from her Dutch husband, wore her NSB badge, had posters in her windows, and received the Amsterdam National Socialist paper De Daad, but according to her neighbors “acted correctly towards dissenters.” Apparently, the content of the neighbors’ statements mainly depended on whether or not the neighbor had personally suffered from the behavior of the suspect; party activity in itself was not a sufficient determinant.

This leads to the distinction between provocative and active membership. While active membership could lead to rejection by the neighbors, it was not a sufficient condition. Only when the active membership included provocative behavior; irritating or even harming his or her surroundings, did the behavior lead to disapproving reactions.

If NSB members refrained from causing any trouble to their neighbors – provoking them – the neighbors mainly made favorable statements. Hubertus Kemper was a very inactive NSB member, in his own words “a dead member”; his neighbors judged him
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729 NA, CABR, file 18844.
730 NA, CABR, file 12230.
731 Also: NA, CABR, file 18392, 107444.
732 “Gedroeg zich tegen andersdenkenden correct”; NA, CABR, file 87382.
favorably, and some did not even know about his membership. Only his friendship with a fanatic neighbor was frowned upon.\textsuperscript{733}

It was possible that NSB members helped people around them. A few NSB members undertook actions to support people. One of the street inhabitants was even praised for hiding the radio of his neighbors. He was in fact one of very few members who was a National Socialist as a cover-up for his work at a Jewish theater, the Van Swinden Theater. Because of his membership the company managed to keep their machinery.\textsuperscript{734}

The witness testimonies came from a wide array of street dwellers. One woman, Margaretha Jacoba Hartog – 37 years old – testified often. She was afraid of Den Burger but more neutral towards others.\textsuperscript{735} She was the one who was quite positive about her German divorced neighbor.\textsuperscript{736} Her varied testimonies – and those of others - may suggest that the character and behavior of the NSB member determined the nature of the testimony and not only the vindictive or forgiving nature of the testifying neighbor.

The interaction in Kromme Mijdrechtstraat, a street where the persecution of its Jewish inhabitants was never far away, shows the variety in contacts, even for the most fanatic NSB member. The analysis of this street also reveals that when there were any disputes, as in the case of Anna Sluyter, between NSB members and their neighbors, the consequences were far more severe than in other periods. In addition, the interactions reveal that active membership was frowned upon, but it was provocative membership, “coming in the backyard of neighbors,” which led to estrangement.

\textit{Street 2. Zacharias Jansestraat}

The second street to be analyzed is the Zacharias Jansestraat; a street in the east of Amsterdam. One of the persons discussed in chapter 1, Ernst Zilver, resided in this street, which was populated by mainly white-collar, middle-class people. The level of NSB

\textsuperscript{733} NA, CABR, file 85124, 105519.
\textsuperscript{734} NA, CABR, file 106415, 105999.
\textsuperscript{735} NA, CABR, file 33807, 20834, 106731, 86134, 105929, 87382.
\textsuperscript{736} NA, CABR, file 87382.
membership was much lower compared than in Kromme Mijdrechtstraat, approximately 11 in a population of 400, somewhat above the average in Amsterdam.\textsuperscript{737}

The father of Ernst Zilver, born in 1874, was an active National Socialist, who was constantly frustrated because his ambitious plans were obstructed. He saw the NSB as a second chance to be active in society. He applied for several jobs but was rejected because of his old age; following the lines of National Socialist ideology, the NSB preferred the youth above the old. After the rejections he turned his attention to his stamp collection, still in an NSB environment, only on a voluntary basis. The relationships of Ernst Zilver and his father reveal how the reactions of neighbors and different family members can differ. While his father was seen as a moderate man, a neighbor judged the son negatively as a “monstrosity” (\textit{kwal}) because the son bothered them and the father did not.\textsuperscript{738}

As in Kromme Mijdrechtstraat, the relationships of NSB members could differ per social circle. The majority of the inhabitants of this street were white collar and middle class. Thus many worked in offices, with nonmembers as colleagues. Bank employee and active National Socialist Willem Schoemaker was an NSB member from 1933, with a short interruption in April 1940 and had the function of “bloc” leader. He threatened his coworkers and was judged unfavorably by them. However, he was a “decent” man according to his neighbors.\textsuperscript{739} As a member of WA and “bloc” leader he was an active National Socialist. However, most of his activities occurred out of sight of his neighbors. He probably marched through the city center instead of his own neighborhood in the eastern part of Amsterdam. And as a \textit{Landwacht} member he worked in another part in Amsterdam and in September even outside Amsterdam, in a city up north.\textsuperscript{740}

The image of NSB members highly depended on whether someone could be trusted. Christiaan van Klaveren, a German teacher, joined the NSB in July 1940. He left the movement in 1941. However, he still acted as a National Socialist at his school. In 1943 he was suffering from problems with students, who refused to learn German. In order to solve his problem, he went to the SD, who did not react to his case. While his colleagues at school saw Van Klaveren as an NSB member, his neighbors perceived him otherwise. One distributor of the illegal paper \textit{Het Parool}, delivered this paper to Van Klaveren’s house and

\textsuperscript{737} 130 multiplied by 3, telephone list Amsterdam, Stadsarchief Amsterdam.
\textsuperscript{738} NA, CABR, file86639, 105976.
\textsuperscript{739} NA, CABR, file85329, 63904.
\textsuperscript{740} NA, CABR, file85329, 63904.
even collected money for it. Another neighbor, an opponent of the NSB, testified that Van Klaveren guarded the neighbor’s house against NSB vandalism.\textsuperscript{741}

National Socialist political activities were not a sufficient factor for ending connections and giving rise to negative opinions in Zacharias Jansestraat even less than in Kromme Mijdrechtstraat. Antje Koster, a widow born in 1877, became a member when she was 73; she read the NSB papers and attended NSB meetings. She even greeted with an NSB exclamation “Houzee” from her balcony when an NJS march passed through the street. Of her children, the youngest two did not align themselves with the NSB, but her two oldest sons did; one of them died in Narwa on the Eastern Front. Despite her political activities, her neighbors did not distrust her and testified that they did not encounter any problems with her.\textsuperscript{742} Perhaps nobody had to fear anything because she was an old lady, or people pitied her after the war.

Hendrik Broekman, born in 1902, was a high school teacher who became an NSB member in 1935. His file reveals another example about how interaction patterns were unrelated to political activities. He was an active member, group administrator and group leader. He read NSB papers, sold papers on the street, attended NSB meetings, hung an NSB flag, and as a group leader he organized meetings every week. Despite all his NSB activities, he was still perceived as a “pleasant” person by his students, his neighbors and his boss.\textsuperscript{743} His family members and girlfriend declared they had many fights about his political affiliation; his membership was an “abomination” (\textit{gruwel}) but they never “rejected” (\textit{afgestoten}) Hendrik. All his neighbors were positive about him.\textsuperscript{744} His neighbors considered him to be a very fine, distinguished man. Even the principal of the downstairs school building, with Jewish children, was positive about Broekman’s behavior as a neighbor.\textsuperscript{745} Because he did not cause any problems and maintained his decency he was judged accordingly.

Sometimes, people saw the NSB membership of their neighbors as an opportunity. Some people actively tried to get in touch with NSB members in order to receive their help or to make use of their contacts at German institutions, such as the SD. The Okx-Zwart

\textsuperscript{741} NA, CABR, file23790, 85750.
\textsuperscript{742} NA, CABR, file85931, 106731
\textsuperscript{743} NA, CABR, file13374, 105454.
\textsuperscript{744} NA, CABR, file 106179, 86007.
\textsuperscript{745} NA, CABR, file 105454, 13374.
family became National Socialists in the fall of 1940. They had many contacts with other NSB members and Germans. Apart from one party with German soldiers in 1940, their neighbors spoke favorably about their behavior, especially about the man, Cornelis. One of his colleagues visited him to ask him to use his NSB membership in order to free some Jewish friends, who were caught by the SD. However, his efforts had no effect.

Analyzing the NSB members in the neighborhood produces a dynamic and scattered image of interaction. At all sorts of offices, in shops and in schools NSB members interacted with nonmembers. These different locations created arenas of identity: being a detested person in one arena did not necessarily lead to acquiring the image of a detested person in another arena (for example in the neighborhood). From the analysis of this street, the element of visibility of activities becomes evident: if these activities happened out of sight, they had less influence on opinions. Thus, different identities could exist side by side. Street dwellers often changed their political convictions and behaviors during the occupation, and the perceptions of their neighbors altered as well, sometimes as a result of the new behavior, sometimes not.

Street 3. Hudsonstraat

The third street of analysis is Hudsonstraat in the western part of Amsterdam. This street housed mainly workers, municipal officials, and the self-employed. Many self-employed had their own shops. Therefore, in the street were located at least six barbershops, four bars, a diamond cutter, a shoemaker, a milkman, greengrocers, a tailor and a baker. Approximately 900 people lived on Hudsonstraat, 29 of whom were members of the NSB.

Two of the NSB members living on Hudsonstraat had criminal pasts before joining the NSB. This background caused a negative image. One of these criminal NSB members living in Hudsonstraat was Marinus Voogd. He had a criminal past of embezzlement,
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746 After Mad Tuesday they moved to Weesperkarspel; NA, CABR, file 94786, 86213
747 NA, CABR, file 21042, 85878. Zacharias Jansestraat: May 18th, 1943, bomb number 20, Stadsarchief Amsterdam.
748 Thanks to Peter-Paul de Baar and his personal archive of streets in Amsterdam; Peter-Paul de Baar, ‘Terug naar de Hudsonstraat’, *Ons Amsterdam* 52:10 (2000) 282.
749 310 addresses, approx. 3 per house: 900 is an estimation of the author.
750 Of the sample: NA, CABR, file 20221, 106686.
swindle and mistreatment. He was a widower with six children and a very active National Socialist. He was rather unpopular. Both his fellow NSB members and his neighbors disliked him. He was regularly drunk and often ended up in a fight. In November 1940, he was beaten to the ground after a WA march in The Hague, after which he needed fourteen days of recovery. In 1941 he was beaten again by a police officer, after an NJS march. His house also suffered damage: his windows were smashed by opponents. In the meanwhile, Voogd pursued a criminal career, profiting from his NSB membership. His main criminal activity was cajoling money in the neighborhood bar. Voogd promised to arrange freedom for people in exchange for money. His methods included coercion and threats. He forced people to give money for Frontzorg, the institution for National Socialists soldiers.

According to records of the ATL – the NSB Secret services –, he threatened customers, swindled money without any exchange and had affairs with girls younger than his own daughters. His daughter, born in 1919, was a member of the National Socialist youth organization (NJS) and had, according to their neighbors, many contacts with Germans. Voogd’s entire family was seen in a bad light. One neighbor testified that no one interfered with the family because she thought it was dangerous. The NSB organization viewed Voogd unfavorably as well. Several times he was discharged from the NSB because of his bad behavior; in August 1941, in May and in June 1944; on May 10th, 1944 he was dishonorably discharged from the WA. He was thus disliked by everyone. However, the NSB gave him at least two second chances.

Sometimes the negative attitude of non-NSB members corresponded with the views of the Germans, as was the case when members exhibited criminal behavior. Like his neighbors, the Germans did not hold favorable views of Voogd. Early in 1944 he was arrested by the SD and sent to camp Amersfoort. The fact that German institutions disliked and punished criminal behavior of National Socialists is not uncommon; other NSB members encountered similar opinions and actions.

Untrustworthy behavior made members, including those who were not criminals, rather unpopular. Willem de Gans, born in 1889, worked for an insurance company and was
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751 NA, CABR, file106150.
752 NA, CABR, file86331.
753 NA, CABR, file 20221.
754 NA, CABR, file20022.
755 At least four: NA, CABR, file86395, 64311, 4825, 20109, 18330, 17918.
also sentenced to imprisonment during the German occupation. Both his coworkers and his neighbors detested De Gans: he was a “swindler,” who used his political advantage to denounce anyone he disliked. At his work, he was the “social leader” (sociaal voorman) of the National Socialist workers organization (Nederlands Arbeidsfront). Because of De Gans’ position, his boss did not dare to fire him, although their relationship worsened during the occupation. De Gans refused to serve under a Jewish man who worked in the company, and in the meanwhile De Gans tampered with the company documents. De Gans was not only obstructing the company internally; he also accused them in German court. De Gans testified in 1942 against his coworkers, claiming that they had listened to illegal English radio broadcasts; as a result his boss was sentenced to eighteen months’ imprisonment. In the same year, he went to the police because a watchmaker in Hudsonstraat failed in making his watch, and his wife accused a neighbor of listening to English radio broadcasts. De Gans was not only the subject but also the object in an indictment. A few months before his testimony against his colleagues, De Gans was sentenced to one month in prison himself because of benefit fraud.

These examples show how people could fear their NSB neighbor, coworker or pub mate, especially when NSB members had a criminal background or expressed themselves in an untrustworthy manner. Trust was an important determining factor.

A new phenomenon in this street is that some street dwellers were members of the NSB, without their neighbors knowing it: for example, Aukje Baarslag, of whom her neighbor testified that she never could have taken Baarslag for an NSB member since she was such a “nice girl.” Another NSB member, a cabinetmaker, who irregularly read the NSB newspaper and visited three NSB meetings, was perceived as a “nice and abiding family man”: Nobody knew he was an NSB member. Also, a third NSB member in Hudsonstraat, Martinus van Damme was never identified as such. The neighbors marveled when he was arrested. According to their testimonies, he always helped his neighbors out. Apparently, the least noticeable, quiet NSB members received more favorable testimonies.

756 NA, CABR, file107630, 86446.
757 Also: family Van Lee: NA, CABR, file21360, 85747, 17832, 85774.
758 NA, CABR, file106113.
759 NA, CABR, file85976, CABR 314.
760 NA CABR, file 20914, 85407.
As in the other streets, expressing one's NSB membership openly did not always lead to negative reactions either. Petrus Keizer, a Hudsonstraat greengrocer, regularly read NSB papers, was subscribed to two National Socialist newspapers, displayed NSB posters in his windows and marched in his black WA uniform. He also served in the Landwacht, although he didn’t have to do many outside shifts because he suffered from a limp. His neighboring potato-dealer stated that Keizer was a “good human being,” always willing to help someone. Keizer had told the neighbor personally about his NSB membership. Every day they spoke with each other at the vegetable market, though they never discussed politics. According to the testimonies of several neighbors, Keizer was definitely no “traitor”; he warned his neighbors whenever it was better to turn their radios down.\(^\text{761}\) Another active NSB member, Sipke Westenborg, read the NSB papers and even attached a poster to his window, stating that people could enroll in the NSB at his address. However, his neighbors testified favorably about Sipke – a “decent” guy.\(^\text{762}\)

One Hudsonstraat NSB member, Dirk Kors, was an exceptional NSB member.\(^\text{763}\) He worked as an undercover NSB member for the Amsterdam police from 1933 till May 1940. In his postwar trial, he first tried to convince the court that he continued his activities until 1945. He even presented fake testimony from a deceased police official. However, gradually it became clear that in May 1940 he turned from being an undercover member to a real NSB man. He joined the National Socialist workers organization and worked for Dutch and German National Socialist organizations. Opponents once attached a poster to his window to indicate his position in the NSB. According to his neighbors, Kors was an active NSB member, and a policeman testified that he was absolutely convinced of his trustworthy behavior, but only till May 1940. Afterwards he became, in Kors’ own words a “purebred” (rasechte) NSB member. His family profited financially during the occupation: they received coal, money and food, which was all noticed by his neighbors and judged negatively.\(^\text{764}\)

Profiting financially was often a reason for negative reactions.

In the case of criminal NSB members, membership increased their already negative image. Once again, we can distinguish a pattern of an indirect relationship between political

\(^{761}\) NA, CABR, file21816, 87382.

\(^{762}\) While in general NSB members were perceived as “worse than Germans”; Van der Boom, We leven nog NA, CABR, file85582.

\(^{763}\) Also very different from the files of NSB members in other cities.

\(^{764}\) NA, CABR, file106709.
activities and broken relationships. The provocative behavior of NSB members towards people in their direct environment was more relevant than NSB membership in itself in determining interpersonal relations. Secondly, criminal behavior led to rejection by non-NSB neighbors, coworkers and German authorities. And thirdly, trust was an important distinctive element in determining people’s opinions.

Noordwijk aan Zee

To compare the results of the capital city with a village, I will examine the NSB community in Noordwijk. In Noordwijk there lived 100 NSB members out of a population of more than 10,000 people, approximately one percent.765

Because of its coastal location, many inhabitants of Noordwijk had to be evacuated for the construction of the Atlantikwal, the Nazi defense system. Perhaps contrary to what one might think, the position of the NSB members was not very privileged. Of the evacuees, the percentage of NSB members was a little bit below average; some NSB members succeeded in being exempted from evacuation.766

Pieter Beukers, born in 1900, was the main NSB official in Noordwijk aan Zee. He had joined the NSB in 1934 and became active in a wide range of National Socialist organizations: as leader of the WA in Noordwijk, as “bloc” leader of the NVD and as social leader of the NAF, and he also joined the Landwacht. Beukers’ moment of glory was when Mussert visited Noordwijk in the summer of 1944. Beukers maintained many contacts with NSB members in and outside Noordwijk; he corresponded with National Socialists from Noordwijk who went to the front. In many letters to schools, church institutions and NSB officials, Beukers expressed his National Socialism and his impatience and dissatisfaction with opponents of National Socialism. His confident and headstrong behavior provoked

---

765 1930 www.volkstellingen.nl, consulted on December 27th 2012; RAL, collectie Slats, January 1st, 1943; inhabitants: 13161.
766 Romijn, Burgemeesters in oorlogstijd, 541-542; RAL, collectie Slats, Noordwijk doos 1, map5, installatie Musegaas; doos 3, map 6: 4662 out of 13161 inhabitants stayed in Noordwijk, of the NSB members and members of related organizations the figure was 90 out of 270. See also same pattern in Zandvoort: Aby Grupstra, “Zon, zand en NSB” (unpublished Masters’ thesis).
much disapproval. He made himself very unpopular by denouncing many villagers. His untrustworthy behavior caused negative reactions. He reported the publication of a Catholic paper to the police in 1942 because it might have triggered smashing windows of NSB households in Noordwijk. And as a member of the Landwacht, he seized many cars. He admitted to having taken a can of meat as well. He made himself popular among NSB members but rather unpopular among everyone else.\footnote{NA, CABR, file 37445.}

Other NSB neighbors provoked different reactions among nonmembers. As in Amsterdam, youth was an important element. Teun van de Niet, born in 1923, was a young carpenter. He was raised in a National Socialist family and joined the NSB and WA himself when he was 18 years old. His former schoolteacher testified favorably about him, as did his coworkers. He also maintained his contacts at the local soccer club.\footnote{NA, CABR, file 37223.} It was not only the youthful members who received favorable testimonies. Gijsbert van der Wiel (1888), a painter, joined the NSB in 1934, and one of his sons became an NJS member. He had some minor functions within the NSB. In his file one can find a list of approximately 100 people who signed a letter in which was stated that he was a good-hearted person because he had helped them to escape deportation for work in Germany.\footnote{NA, CABR, file 91225.}

Jan Muyser, born in 1908, was an active National Socialist; he joined the WA and the Landstorm. According to Muyser himself and many of his letters, he was an “inveterate idealist” who completely lost himself in the NSB. However, his neighbors and coworkers still maintained good relationships with him. His chief, the director of public works, saw Muyser as a “good officer,” who never encountered any problems and never acted provocatively; he even attempted to spare Noordwijk from German violence. In his letters from Veenendaal, where he served in the Landwacht, to his mother in Noordwijk, he expressed his National Socialist feelings regularly.\footnote{“Muyser was een goed ambtenaar. Nimmer hebben wij eenige last van hem gehad. Hij was een rechtvaardige idealist. Hij heeft altijd, zooveel als in zijn vermogen was, getracht Noordwijk voor het geweld der Duitschers te sparen. Nimmer is hij provocerend opgetreden.”; NA, CABR, file 37267. He helped his mother to get a new tobacco card by mentioning his work the Landwacht.} According to her neighbor, they still talked with each other during the occupation and Muyser’s mother never expressed any
National Socialist ideas. Slats, the collector of the archival material, assessed her as “harmless.” 771

One of the other National Socialist women in Noordwijk was Elisabeth Bosman (1891), who never discussed politics with her neighbors and interacted with both NSB and non-NSB neighbors. 772 According to one of the latter, she never made any trouble. Another female member, Anna Dallinga, born in 1916, expressed her National Socialism in many letters to friends and family. Despite her National Socialism, her neighbors still gave positive or neutral statements about her. 773 Apparently, she did not express her anti-Semitism to her neighbors, or her anti-Semitism was not a reason for her neighbors to detest her.

Not all female members were perceived as pleasant neighbors. Provocative behavior was particularly disapproved of. Catharina Hoffman, born in 1911, was an active NSB member. She insulted the Dutch royal family and the Dutch government in England. She reported many complaints about anti-NSB behavior and expressions to the police. According to one of her neighbors, who was visited by a policeman because of a complaint, she was a woman of the lowest – and an NSB member of the meanest – kind. 774 Hoffman regularly quarreled with neighbors. She testified that she indeed hated the Dutch government. After her internment in May 1940, she became more fanatic than before and expressed to her neighbors that “her time finally had come.” Hoffman quarreled not only with her non-NSB neighbors but also with fellow NSB members. In the fall of 1940 she was expelled from the NSVO. She admitted having “a passionate (driftig) nature.” 775 This is an example of the same anti-social behavior we have seen with some male NSB members in Hudsonstraat: if somebody was aggressive, criminal or less than decent, NSB membership was an extra reason to despise that person.

In conclusion we can say that the patterns of interaction of NSB members in Noordwijk did not significantly differ from those in Amsterdam A person’s “decency” was more important than his or her party membership. In the case of maladjusted people, their membership increased the negative opinions; likewise, provocative, aggressive behavior and

771 NA, CABR, file 95061.
772 NA, CABR, file94785. Also: file110122, 94620.
773 NA, CABR, file 74278.
774 “was een vrouw van het laagste en een NSBster van het gemeenste soort”; NA, CABR, file 94817.
775 NA, CABR, file 94817 (PRA Leiden 3827).
open denunciations led to negative statements. An analysis of members of other small cities suggests the same dynamics.  

**Different patterns of interaction**

The previous case studies of three streets in Amsterdam offer insight into the patterns of interaction among different groups living in Amsterdam. However, one may hypothesize that interaction strongly differed between and in communities. The interaction in a more “anonymous” city life might be different from that in small villages. First, I will consider some of the general patterns of interaction before focusing on a sample drawn from a small village.

In the analysis of the larger sample several patterns become clear. As in the three streets, higher political participation did not necessarily lead to a lower level of interaction with nonmembers. Many members, active and non-active, maintained their prewar relationships with non-National Socialists.

The workplace was one of the social circles where people with different political views met. Work relations could still function despite party membership. Martinus Kriekaard, who owned a vegetable shop in Utrecht, had many non-NSB customers at his shop.  

Stephen Jansen, a conductor in Amsterdam, maintained his position with his orchestra. Theodor Esser, an NSB member in Haarlem from 1936, was viewed favorably: his former boss testified that “he behaved himself properly, including after May 1940.”

And an NSB pharmacist in Leiden did not generate offense. According to his colleagues, he would never betray anyone; he only looked a little bit angry when he was confronted with patriotic remarks but did not cause any nuisance.

The neighborhood is the second social circle. Neighborly relations could endure. In his postwar trial, the neighbors of a local NSB leader in Hilversum assessed him as a “very

---

776 Zeist, Zuilen, Bussum, Naarden, Zandvoort, Naarden, Maartensdijk.
777 NA, CABR, file 97135, 55699.
778 NA, CABR, file 18825. Others fired him.
779 “Ook na mei 1940 gedroeg hij zich zeer behoorlijk.”; NA, CABR, file64563.
780 NA, CABR, file 37024.
humane man and a good patriot.” Even Hendrik Schuilenburg, the man who established
the National Socialist Museum had good contacts; one of its neighbors (not an NSB
member) even visited this museum.  

What determined prolongation of interactions or estrangement? If it was not political
behavior, and if it was not related to social circles, what was it then? One of the
distinguishing factors was criminal behavior. The troublemakers in the neighborhood were
most of the time bothersome figures in all social circles, before and during their NSB
membership. We can see this by looking at the criminal NSB members. Gerrit den Hartog
from Amsterdam was one such notorious troublemaker. He terrorized the neighborhood.
Moreover, he had problems within the NSB and was expelled six times; thus, he rejoined the
party regularly. One female NSB member declared in an NSB report about him: “He is a
spoiled boaster with brooding evil thoughts and an impure character.” He also
encountered problems with the Germans, who disliked any disobedience and robbery, and
with the National Socialists. He was sentenced to one year in prison because of his attempt
to rob Jews by presenting himself as a German policeman.  

Some NSB members were just notorious troublemakers. Not all marital troubles
were politically related. The file of a very active NSB member in Woerden is filled with
troubles and fights. From 1941 till 1944 he wrote letters to his neighbors, his wife, the
mayor, a colleague and other NSB members; many of these letters have been saved in his
postwar file. Apparently the troubles with his wife became so intense that she threatened
him with a saw. Whereas the fights with his wife and his neighbor were non-political, he had
many political troubles and fights with fellow NSB members as well. He quarreled with
almost everyone around him, with each one about the subject their relationship was based
upon.  

As mentioned in the street samples, some political divisions lay within families. At
least two thirds of the NSB members of the CABR sample had family members who
belonged to the NSB. Thus, a minority of members did not have any support for their


781 NA, CABR, file 61151.
782 NA, CABR, file 64233.
783 “Het is een over het paard getilde zwetser met broeiende slechte gedachten en een onzuivere inborst”; NIOD, file 316c.
784 NA, CABR, file 20109.
785 Letters of Johannes Oldenbroek from 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944; NA, CABR, file52561.
786 NA, CABR, 221 out of 322 members.
NSB membership from family members. In Utrecht, the political opposition of the wife of an NSB member even led to the termination of his membership. A fine example of a politically torn apart family is that of a director of a large company, mentioned in the introduction to this dissertation. The director, Willem Hoebee, had sympathized with the NSB in the 1930s but turned against the NSB in May 1940. However, his wife, daughter and son remained active NSB supporters. Their housekeeper could closely follow all developments within the household. She stated after the war that the relationships between family members before 1940 were rather good, but after May 1940, the battle started. At one moment, Mrs Hoebee threw a silver pitcher at her husband’s head and her daughter expressed the hope that her father would be arrested. When his health deteriorated significantly, his wife announced that she would rather see him die today than tomorrow. The hatred was mutual. At the end of the occupation, Mr Hoebee named one of his friends as his heir.

In addition to criminal behavior, provocative behavior led to rejection. Johan Wopkes was a “terror neighbor.” He was born in 1902, a teacher in Amsterdam, who propagated National Socialism at every occasion; he talked about his three children as National Socialists. Many street dwellers feared and hated him. They testified that Wopkes was the worst NSB member in the neighborhood, provoking people in the street. In 1942, Wopkes had a political discussion on the street with one of his neighbors, whom he threatened to report to the intelligence service.

The example of the troublemaker in Woerden was mainly based on letters written during the occupation. Letters and diaries from the period of 1940-1945 from National Socialists and nonmembers reveal similar patterns of interaction. A fanatic National Socialist girl, from an NSB family, kept a diary from 1942 till 1944. While she was an active NJS member and dated many German soldiers, she also had friends outside the National Socialist community. In 1943 she was sent to a boarding school in Hilversum. In Hilversum, she did not tell her friends about her NSB family and made friends with anti-NSB girls. Back in her hometown, Gouda, she returned to her mainly National Socialist friends. She adjusted

787 NA, CABR, file 17828.
788 At that time, his son had died in the German army; NA, CABR, file 17828; Damsma and Schumacher, Hier woont een NSB'er, 53.
789 NA, CABR, file 86527. In 1942 a mother prevented a letter of a son of a National Socialist front soldier from reaching her daughter by tearing the letter up; Heemstede gemeentepolitie, July 1st-2nd 1942.
790 NIOD, dagboekencollectie 244, files 714, 591, 1264, 1179, 1362, 1141, 1263, 1096, 1002.
herself to the political environments she was in. When she was back in her National Socialist environment in Gouda, she dated an anti-NSB boy, who tried to convince her – unsuccessfully – of the coming German defeat. While the affair ended before the liberation, the political dispute between the two short-term lovers was not the reason the affair ended.\textsuperscript{791}

\textit{Institutional exclusion versus individual interaction}

Interactions between NSB members and their surroundings were dynamic over time. These dynamics were mainly visible in the interaction of NSB members within institutions and in the image of NSB members held by outsiders. First, the German invasion had led, especially among long-term NSB members, to strong feelings of superiority, which caused friction between NSB members and their surroundings. In the first year of the occupation, the deferred grant of political power led some frustrated NSB members to behave impudently and imprudently, which in turn led to irritation of the persons they complained to. The position of the NSB improved in the fall of 1941, and NSB members could enhance their power in local politics. While their struggle to the political top seemed to be rewarded with Mussert becoming the “Leader of the Dutch people” in December 1942, in reality, the political power base and membership shrank. For outsiders, the continuous “threat” of an NSB government was something to reject and fight against.\textsuperscript{792} However, despite the negative image of the NSB, the party was able to attract new members in the first two years of the occupation.\textsuperscript{793} Not every individual was deterred by this image.

In the meanwhile, the interactions developed in time more in a centrifugal than centripetal direction. Unlike nonmembers, NSB members were exempted from handing in their radios and bicycles. Over one third of NSB members of the CABR sample kept their radios.\textsuperscript{794} Non-members had to guard NSB buildings and German institutions, whereas the

\textsuperscript{791} NIOD, Dagboekencollectie 422, file 1002.
\textsuperscript{792} Hirschfeld, \textit{Bezetting en collaboratie}, 246.
\textsuperscript{793} Hirschfeld, \textit{Bezetting en collaboratie}, 232.
\textsuperscript{794} NA, CABR 132 out of 322 files.
NSB members were exempted.\textsuperscript{795} From 1943 onwards, the discrepancy of duties between NSB members and nonmembers increased further. Initially, NSB members were excused from the \textit{Arbeitseinsatz}.\textsuperscript{796} In addition, NSB members were more often permitted to stay in their houses, while others were evacuated.\textsuperscript{797} And in 1944, the generally detested \textit{Landwacht} was established. All these political decisions and social developments created a framework in which the NSB group and non-NSB group became further estranged on a group level, though not on an individual level.

This study reveals that NSB members often continued their relations with neighbors, family members and coworkers. There is evidence that even active members were not necessarily viewed unfavorably by those around them. The nature of the reactions may be related to the setting in which NSB members expressed their National Socialist behavior. Some of the NSB member activities were easily noticed by neighbors: members hung NSB flags from their flagpoles, placed posters in their windows, and/or wore their NSB uniforms. Other member activities were less easily noticeable, such as party meetings, which were often held inside and out of public view. Many activities also took place outside the National Socialists’ own living environment: large party gatherings were held on squares all over the city or in surrounding villages. Neighbors, family members and coworkers were not always aware of member activities.

Because NSB members were not always recognizable as such in all contexts, they could behave like non-NSB members. They had possibilities to work and have identities outside their NSB membership. Along with his or her National Socialist identity, a member could be a pleasant colleague, a fine neighbor or a decent person. This “mixed” identity of NSB members relates to the findings of Bosworth and Passmore, historians who argue that other identities such as being a husband, wife, coworker, Catholic or Protestant, determined the identity of a fascist as well. The identity of NSB members was highly related to circumstances as was their image among those around them.

Another factor that should be considered is the status of the NSB members’ prewar relationships. Some members were already more isolated or rather nonconformist before joining the NSB. An indication of this nonconformist lifestyle is the high number of

\textsuperscript{795} Heemstede gemeentepolitie, February 2nd, 1943, 74; De Jong, \textit{Het Koninkrijk deel}.; Hirschfeld, \textit{Bezetting en collaboratie}., 231.
\textsuperscript{796} Romijn, \textit{Burgemeesters in oorlogstijd}, 494.
\textsuperscript{797} See Noordwijk.
divorces among NSB members. Unlike today, divorces were rare in the 1930s and 1940s in the Netherlands. The chances that an NSB member was divorced were approximately five times higher than those of an average Dutchmen, in the sample for this research. Former “misfits” maintained their outsider status. However, this outsider status may not have been fully caused by their membership.

Under certain conditions NSB membership led to negative reactions. For example, criminal NSB members were viewed unfavorably by those around them. In their case, NSB membership was a catalyst of previously held negative opinions. Witnesses testified negatively when an NSB member hassled or denounced people. In these cases, the testimonies corresponded with the general negative image of the NSB.

Beyond criminal behavior, there were a few other reasons for negative testimonies. The main determinants of individual rejection are: aggressive behavior, fanaticism, denunciations (unreliability), financial prosperity and provocation. Thus, negative reactions followed when an NSB member terrorized his neighborhood, denounced his colleagues, profited from his membership financially or provoked people surrounding him. However, if an NSB member refrained from these behaviors, the testimonies were mostly neutral or positive. NSB membership was not a sufficient reason to detest someone.

When an NSB member did behave violently, aggressively, or provocatively, his or her NSB membership was seen as a very negative factor. Such a judgment is also related to the general opinion about NSB membership that is visible or implicit in the testimonies. NSB members were indecent, “horrible” people. For that reason, favorably judged people were described in terms such as “despite their NSB membership, he was still a decent person.” The negative image of the NSB member is widespread and visible in every statement of neighbors, colleagues and family members.798

There are many attenuating variables and reasons for neighbors and coworkers to testify favorably about NSB members. In general, extenuating circumstances included helpfulness, being young and growing up in a National Socialist family, quiet behavior, being “normal” and not causing any trouble.799 The positive or negative opinion was largely related

798 General negative image: Damsma and Schumacher, Hier woont een NSB’er; Hirschfeld, Bezet en collaboratie, 246-247; Van der Boom, We leven nog.
799 This pattern of social interaction and connections with the “outside world” is also visible in the lives of Dutch and British communists from 1901 till 1970; Elke Weesjes, Children of the Red Flag. Growing up in a communist family during the Cold War (Sussex University 2010) 24.
to the extent to which his or her NSB membership affected the activities of the NSB member and thus the non-NSB member personally. Many postwar testimonies seem rather indifferent about the National Socialist character of their neighbors, family members or friends, which they regarded as less important than deeds. Therefore, the ideological differences seem less important than provocative behavior. Thus, if NSB members did not create any problems, witnesses exempted these members from the general, negative image.

As long as the personal sphere was respected and people were not personally offended, the statements of their neighbors were positive. This element is also present in the judicial decisions. The jurist Belinfante concluded in his study of the prosecution of collaborators that those who had harmed others were punished more harshly than those who were “only members of the NSB.” Judges treated “normal” crimes such as murder or maltreatment more severely than political deeds. 800

This result may say something about the level of fear within Dutch occupied society. A sociologist’s analysis of East German society reveals how a high level of fear in a totalitarian society can destroy relationships and trust between citizens; apparently, this mechanism was not fully operational in the Netherlands. 801 This difference may also be related to the early belief in a German defeat; the first thoughts about the punishment of former NSB members dated from the fall of 1940. 802 The belief in an Allied triumph increased with the victory at Stalingrad in February 1943.

The situation for every individual National Socialist would change dramatically after Mad Tuesday, in September 1944. Approximately half of the National Socialists fled to the (north-) eastern parts of the Netherlands or to Germany and the internal party organization collapsed, while at the same time, the internal police organ, the Landwacht, became more active and violent than ever before. These developments, of course, affected the patterns of interactions. Because of the interconnection between all these levels, they will be discussed together in the chapter about the final stage.

800 Belinfante, In plaats van bijltjesdag, 479.
802 Van der Boom, We leven nog, 41, 102, 105