

National Board

Dr. Adri K. Olfendick, editor-in-chief (Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana, Amsterdam)
Henry Berg (Jewish Historical Museum, Amsterdam)
F. J. Hoogewoud (Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana, Amsterdam)
Dr. Emile G. J. Schrijver (Museum van Israël Institute, Amsterdam)

Advisory Board

Prof. Martin Aptowiz (Heinrich Heine University, Düsseldorf)
Prof. J. C. H. Blom (State Institute of War Documentation, Amsterdam)
Prof. Gidon Bnei (University of Venice)
Dr. Michael W. Croninberger (Library of Congress, Washington)
Dr. Ulf Haxen (Royal Library, Copenhagen)
Prof. Jonathan I. Israel (University College, London)
Prof. Yosef Kaplan (Hebrew University, Jerusalem)
Prof. David S. Katz (Tel Aviv University)
Prof. J. Kluwer (University of Groningen)
Dr. J. Meijman (Jerusalem)
Prof. Abraham Schindler (Jewish Theological Seminary, New York)
Prof. Abraham Schindler (Jewish Theological Seminary, New York)

Dutch Editor

Sammy Herman (Tilburg Translations)

Editorial Secretary

Jos Meihuizen

Index of Names

Janny Vechthuis

Studia Rosenthaliana is published twice yearly by
Amsterdam University Press

Postweg 141 1077 JG Amsterdam
tel: 00 31 20 420 0200
fax: 00 31 20 420 3211
e-mail: ajp@amup.nl
<http://www.ora.nl/ajp/amphool>

Subscription charges per 1498:

Within Holland
Institutions: Hfl 65 per year
Individuals: Hfl 100 per year
Students: Hfl 60 per year
Single issues: Hfl 30

Outside Holland

Institutions: Hfl 125 per year
Individuals: Hfl 140 per year
Students: Hfl 90 per year
Single issues: Hfl 65

Subscription rates include postage.

Subscriptions start in January or July. To cancel,
please notify in writing to Amsterdam University
Press by 1 November.

To advertise in *Studia Rosenthaliana*, please contact the
publisher.

Cover illustration: detail from Emanuel de Witte's *Interior of the Portuguese Synagogue (1697)*. With special thanks
to the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

ISSN 0029-3317
ISSN 0029-3317

E-ISSN: 1744-6595 (WWW.ROSENTHAN.NL)

© 1998 Stichting Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana
PO Box 9973, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands

The editorial board gratefully acknowledges the support of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), The Hague; Maatschappij van Nieuw der Israëlieten in Nederland and the Menaassech Beer Israel Institute for Jewish Social and Cultural Studies (Amsterdam) in making the publication of *Studia Rosenthaliana* possible.

Studia Rosenthaliana

VOLUME 32 -- NUMBER 2 -- 1998

confusion the case caused had been nipped in the bud by the resolute action of the *12thos* in their appeal to the States of Holland.

However, there are indications that the guardians had probably threatened to raise the matter much earlier. According to a receipt, dated 9 September 1654 and issued by the *pannassim* to Sheriff Cornelis de Vlaningh van Outehoorn,⁷⁵ he received 1,000 guilders: a fine paid by the *pannassim* for the illegitimate marriages, solemnized during the period he served as sheriff.⁷⁶ The sheriff subsequently promised not to trouble (*molesteren*) the *pannassim* about the marriages. However, the payment is not recorded in the *Manual*, the community's accounts. Another possible indication that the illegitimate marriages had already been raised, is that in January 1654 various notarial deeds were drafted, in which *Hakhan* Joseph de Faro translated a number of *ketubot* into Portuguese.⁷⁷ After Rebecca Naar's engagement, the threats were made openly. Saul Levi Morreira testimony of 30 March 1656, in which he declared that Sara Naar and Francisco Ramires Pina had married in 1639 according to Jewish law, with all the customary ceremony, was probably related to this. The marriage had been announced in synagogue, in the presence of witnesses.⁷⁸

The conflict surrounding the legacy of Francisco Ramires Pina and the broken promise of marriage to Sara Curiel were interlinked with disputes about business matters between Lopo Ramires and Manuel Dias Henriques on the one hand and Duarte Nunes da Costa, Ramires's brother, and his son Jeronimo Nunes da Costa on the other. Intermittent arguments about the payment for a frigate supplied to the king of Portugal and about the seizure of a diamond were dragged into the question of Rebecca Naar's legacy. While it was the Orphan Chamber's task to protect orphans, the guardians, Lopo Ramires and Manuel Dias Henriques, treated the Chamber with little respect. Their tactic was to resort at every turn to the Court of Amsterdam or the Court of Holland. They were like fish in water in this seventeenth-century lawyer's paradise.⁷⁹ Lopo Ramires and Manuel Dias Henriques had lost their sense of belonging to the community and had placed themselves on the outside. Eventually, they both became embroiled in conflicts with almost everyone. In their petition of 1656, the *pannassim* referred to them as *persons of a restless disposition*. It seems a fitting epithet.

Lydia Hagroort studied History at Utrecht. As a staffer at Amsterdam's municipal archive she is currently involved in research into Jewish history

⁷⁵ GAA, PIG, (inv. no. 411) 6.
⁷⁶ He had been sheriff since 1649.
⁷⁷ GAA, N.A. notary J. Thichmanns, 2115/746, 748,
750, 19 January 1654.
⁷⁸ GAA, N.A. notary A. Lock, 2271/205, 30 March
1656.

⁷⁹ S.J. Fockema Andrae, *De Nederlandse Staat onder de
Republiek* (Amsterdam 1973) p. 80. Quoted by
Leonard Blussé in *Bittere Band. Een koloniale
huwelijksdrama in de Gouden Eeuw* (Amersfoort 1997),
1656.

Preparing for occupation? A Nazi Sicherheitsdienst document of Spring 1939 on the Jews of Holland

Dan Michman

Historiographical background

The recently published book by Nanda van der Zee *Om eger te voorkomen* ('To avoid worse') which caused a minor storm in the Netherlands, states in its subtitle (on the cover – the subtitle inside the book is slightly different) that it proposes to deal with the preparation and execution of the annihilation of Dutch Jewry during the Second World War.¹ However, on reading the book it is clear that Van der Zee really only addresses the issue of preparation in one sentence:

Likewise in the Netherlands, the German occupier gradually drove its victims, as in Germany proper, to their final and inevitable fate.²

Such a laconic description seems surprising at first; however, as a closer analysis of the historiography of the Holocaust in the Netherlands and of Holocaust historiography in general shows, it fits a well-established pattern.

H. Wielek, the first to write a history of the persecutions of the Jews in the Netherlands, spoke about a 'sudden tornado' that enveloped the country in 1940, and added, that 'the Nazis' generally intended at that time to expel the Jews, as they had done before – in Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia and Norway – without any special pre-planning for the Netherlands.³ J.C.H. Blom, who tried to analyse the reasons for the varying degrees of success of Nazi persecutions in the Western European countries, mentioned – with regard to the background and planning – the general 'urge to persecute', an urge whose object was 'to make all the territories occupied "free of Jews"', i.e. after occupation of a country had taken place.⁴ In *Pinkas*, written by my father and myself, it is stated – in a half phrase only – that 'soon [after the occupation] the Jewish problem was placed on the agenda', as was apparently the usual practice in occupied countries.⁵ G. Hirschfeld, in his contribution to

¹ N. van der Zee, *Om eger te voorkomen. De voorbereiding en uitvoering van de vernietiging van het Nederlandse jodenland tijdens de Tweede Wereldoorlog*, Molenhof, Amsterdam 1997, p. 96. The sub-title inside the book reads 'voorgeschiedenis' (preceding history/prelude) rather than 'voorbereiding' (preparation).

² H. Wielek, *De Oorlog der Hitler Won*, (Amsterdam 1947), p. 9, 10.

³ J.C.H. Blom, 'The persecution of the Jews in the Netherlands in a comparative international perspective', in J. Michman, (ed.), *Dutch Jewish History 2*, (Jerusalem 1989), p. 282, 278.

⁴ J. Michman, H. Beem and D. Michman, *Pinkas. Geschiedenis van de joodse gemeenschap in Nederland*, (Ede and Antwerp 1992), p. 171.

the Wolfgang Benz volume surveying 'Die Zahl der jüdischen Opfer des Nationalsozialismus', did not elaborate on the issue at all; apparently, it seemed clear to him that anti-Jewish policies were planned and applied in the Netherlands only after occupation.⁵

A.J. Herzberg, J. Presser, L. de Jong and P. Romijn said only slightly more. Herzberg stated that the persecution of the Jews in the Netherlands was part of the persecution of the Jews in Europe⁶ and continued with a seven-page description of the development of anti-Jewish policies as directed 'from Berlin',⁷ emphasising the general underlying anti-Semitic motive. The aim of these policies was, according to Herzberg, to establish a *Judenrein* Germany first (from 1933), and later – a *Judenrein* Europe. Within this context, the overall pattern of developing persecutions was applied in the Netherlands after the occupation in 1940.⁸ The German bureaucrat who actually initiated the application of this process several weeks after the occupation began, was *Generalkommissar* Schmidt.⁹

Presser began *Ondergang* with a brief, general outline of the development of Nazi anti-Jewish policies, in which the fact of constant radicalisation and the lack of a clearly focused design – until the decisions concerning the Final Solution in the beginning of the 1940s – was emphasised.¹⁰ Afterwards, when addressing the first anti-Jewish measures in the Netherlands, Presser consistently pointed to the uncoordinated measures taken in Holland as the result of orders coming from the power centre(s) in Berlin, after the occupation administration in Holland had established its hold.¹¹

De Jong followed a similar pattern. In volumes 1 and 4, he dedicated thirteen pages to a comprehensive description of Nazi anti-Jewish policies in the 1930s, which were aimed at driving the Jews out of Europe through pressure, first on individuals, later on the group as a whole – perhaps to be settled in Madagascar. Since Hitler's notorious speech in the *Reichstag* of 30 January 1939 the threat of *Verdrängung* (annihilation) was also looming, although pending a new and total war.¹² When focusing on Holland, however, De Jong emphasised that the first period of Nazi policies was vague and moderate as far as the Jewish Question was concerned; he also suggested that it was mainly Schmidt, and perhaps also *Generalkommissar* Wimmer, who initiated the anti-Jewish policies in the Netherlands during the summer of 1940.¹³ Elsewhere, De Jong stated, that:

with some exceptions, the only people who at that time fully realised what was going to happen to the Jews of the occupied Netherlands were the higher officials of the German administration [apparatus], which was headed by a man who had played some part in the *Anschluss* of Austria, Arthur Seyss-Inquart. In 1940 his aim was to reduce the Jews to the same low status to which the German Jews had been reduced since 1933, that is, to deprive them of the businesses they had built up and, more important, to isolate them in Dutch society. [With] the Holocaust having been decided upon in Berlin, in 1941, a second aim was super-imposed upon the first: to have the Jews deported to the extermination camps in Eastern Europe.¹⁴

Romijn, who wrote the chapter on the Holocaust in the recently published comprehensive history of Dutch Jewry, limited his description of the pre-occupation period to a methodological comment:

Historians still discuss the facts and character of this catastrophe. Some of the more prominent among them doubt if a consensus will ever be achieved. One focal issue is whether the Nazis, directed by Hitler, planned the mass murder intentionally and executed this enterprise systematically. Recently, emphasis has been placed on the systematic radicalisation of the persecutions, especially during the first months of the military campaign against the Soviet Union, which allowed the Nazi leaders to conclude that mass destruction was indeed within the realm of possibilities. Anyway, *it can finally be stated* [my emphasis, D.M.J.], that the all-encompassing system of persecutions crystallised only gradually in the Netherlands too. [...]'¹⁵

Indeed, the character of Nazi anti-Semitism was – according to Romijn – such, that it was intended to expand from the outset across Germany's borders. However, there were certain considerations which contrived to restrain the impulses that arose immediately after the occupation towards proceeding as fast as possible with anti-Jewish measures. Nevertheless,

the new rulers secretly discussed how to carry out the *Judenaktion* in the near future. As everywhere, they took their time organising the persecution of the Jews: [in 1940] they had not yet established their final goal, they could not immediately assemble enough personnel and means, and wanted – in the first phase – to avoid confrontations with local sensitivities in the occupied countries.¹⁶

The most recent publication presenting an overall view of the Holocaust in the Netherlands – *Victims and Survivors* by Bob Moore – states similarly:

In a pattern which had parallels with the Jews' experience in Germany after 1933, but in contrast to the immediate imposition of legislation which took place in Austria and the Sudetenland, the process of identifying, marginalising and finally isolating the Jews in the Netherlands was undertaken gradually and by bureaucratic means. This began in a relatively innocuous fashion on 1 July [1940]...'¹⁷

⁵ G. Hirschfeld, 'Niederlande', in: W. Benz (ed.), *Dimensionen des Völkermords. Die Zahl der jüdischen Opfer des Nationalsozialismus*, (Munich 1991), p. 137-165.

⁶ A.J. Herzberg, *Koninkrijk der Nederlanden: Aanhoren and Amsterdams 1951*, p. 7.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 35-42.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 43 ff.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹⁰ J. Presser, *Ondergang. De vervolging en verdringing van het Nederlandse jodendom, 1940-1945*, The Hague 1965.

¹¹ L. de Jong, *op. cit.*, vol. 4, p. 748.

¹² p. 3-9; translated into English as *Asken in the Hind. The Destruction of Dutch Jewry*, (Detroit 1988, reprint), p. 1-4.

¹³ J. Presser, *Ondergang*, p. 8, 10-20; *Asken in the Hind.*, p. 3, 11-13.

¹⁴ L. de Jong, *Het koninkrijk der Nederlanden in de Tweede Wereldoorlog*, vol. 1, (The Hague 1969), p. 451-458, 532-535; vol. 4, (The Hague 1972), p. 742-743.

¹⁵ L. de Jong, *op. cit.*, vol. 4, p. 748.

¹⁴ L. de Jong, *The Netherlands and Nazi Germany*, Cambridge, Mass. and London, (England 1990), p. 7.

¹⁵ P. Romijn, 'De oorlog (1940-1945)', in: J.C.H. Bloem, R.G. Foks-Blansfield and I. Schoffier (eds.), *Gedachtenis van Joden in Nederland*, (Amsterdam 1995), p. 314.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 316.

¹⁷ B. Moore, *Victims and Survivors: The Nazi Persecution of the Jews in the Netherlands 1940-1945*, (London and New York 1997), p. 53.

Thus, there is clearly agreement in principle in the historiography of the Holocaust in the Netherlands that the planning of anti-Jewish policies and persecutions in the Netherlands started only *after* the country was occupied, and that then the main components of the anti-Jewish policies which had developed first in Germany proper and in Austria were applied in the local theatre.

In fact, the historiography of the Holocaust in other occupied countries,¹⁸ as well as general histories of the Holocaust¹⁹, also follow the same pattern – at least with regard to the pre-1941 period. This pattern involves a grand design (according to the 'intentionalists') or an escalating development according to the 'functionalists',²⁰ which starts to be applied in each place from the start of the occupation – with German internal bureaucratic considerations and local circumstances having a certain, although not decisive, impact on the pace and form of application.

The problem: no preparations before occupation?

This perception, however, seems somehow incompatible with what we know about Third Reich policy-making in general and particularly with regard to Jewish issues. Even though many decisions were improvised, some preparations concerning administration and general goals were always made before military campaigns and occupations (as well as before other actions) were undertaken. Similarly, Nazi anti-Jewish policies in Germany in the 1930s and on the principal matters in general throughout the Nazi period, always included some sort of preparation – even if we accept the 'functionalist' approach. Why is it, then, that 'nothing' detailed was prepared within the framework of the pre-invasion plans for the apparently crucial issue of the Jews; why was it as if the Jews in the occupied countries were 'unexpectedly acquired', as Arno Mayer suggested several years ago?²¹

Several studies have shown that events had indeed taken a different turn. The activities of Adolf Eichmann in Vienna, starting just two days after the *Anschluss* 12 March 1938, were preceded – as Hans Salfman and myself have shown elsewhere –

¹⁸ It is impossible to present here even a basic survey of the historiography of all Nazi-occupied countries; for some insights one should consult I Gutman (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust*, (New York 1990); and I. Gutman and G. Greif (eds.), *The Historiography of the Holocaust Period*, (Jerusalem 1988).

¹⁹ For an analysis of this kind of historiography see D. Michman, 'The Holocaust in the Eyes of the Historians: The Problem of Conceptualization, Periodization and Explanation', in: *Modern Judaism* 13 (October 1995), p. 233-294.

²⁰ As for these approaches to the comprehension of the development of anti-Jewish policies, and the

coining of this terminology' by Tim Mason, see

A. Edelheit, 'Historiography', in: *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust*, (New York 1990), vol. 1; and the articles by O.D. Kulka, 'Major Trends and Tendencies in German Historiography of National Socialism and the Jewish Question', C.R. Browning 'Approaches to the 'Final Solution' in German Historiography of the Last Two Decades', and H. Mommsen ('Holocaust and the Pursue der Geschichtswissenschaft'), in: I. Gutman and G. Greif (eds.), *The Historiography of the Holocaust Period*, (Jerusalem 1988), p. 1-15.

²¹ A. Mayer, *Who Did The Heavens Not Darken? The 'Final Solution' in History*, (New York 1988), p. 188.

by brainstorming within the *Judenabteilung* of the SD and a decision to register all the important personalities of Austrian Jewry, already taken in 1937 and early 1938.²² The German historian Helmut Krausnick, who studied the *Einsatzgruppen*, states – concerning the invasion of Poland in September 1939 – that

The *Einsatzgruppen* must have had special secret orders concerning the Jewish Question before the beginning of the war, but they were not included in the [written] directives.²³

He demonstrates the point by showing the coordinated actions of the *Einsatzgruppen* with regard to the Jewish issue (issuing equivalent anti-Jewish orders, imposing registration, appointing Jewish *Kommissare* etc.) from the very moment of invasion – several weeks before the famous meeting of Heydrich with the commanders of the *Einsatzgruppen* in Berlin on 21 September 1939, which is usually seen by historians as the starting point for the coordinated anti-Jewish policies in occupied Poland.²⁴ And indeed, already in May 1939 Herbert Hagen of the SD *Judenabteilung* II 112 ordered two regional chiefs of the SD (*Oberabschnitte*) 'to find out all of the facts concerning Judaism in Poland'.²⁵

An unknown report of March 1939: 'Die Juden in Holland'

I wish to develop this view further by showing that similar planning was also undertaken for the Netherlands. A document I found several years ago in the *Bundesarchiv* in Koblenz reinforces this view.²⁶

The document, dated 28 March 1939, was sent by the *SD-Führer des SS-Oberabschnittes Nord-West* in Hamburg (signature unclear), on behalf of the Jewish section (II 112) in his office, to the *Zentralabteilung II 1* of the Main Security Office (*Sicherheitshauptamt*) in Berlin.²⁷ It consists of a letter and an attached report on 'The Jews in Holland' (*Die Juden in Holland*). The letter relates to a general directive for activities to be carried out in 1939, issued by the Jewish Department of the SD for its

²² See: D. Michman, 'De oprichting van de Joodsche Raad voor Amsterdam vanuit een vertelend perspectief', in: *Oorlogdocumentatie* 40-45, vol. 3 (1992), p. 77-79; H. Salfman *Eichmann und seine Gehilfen*, (Frankfurt am Main 1995), p. 27, who quotes a letter from Herbert Hagen to Dr Six of 8 June 1937: 'Erfassung der österreichischen Juden... alle wichtigen Mitglieder der verschiedenen jüdischen Österreichischen Organisationen' – BAK R 58/544, p.66; and also: M. Wildt (Hrsg.), *Die Judenpolitik des SD 1935 bis 1938. Eine Dokumentation*, (Munich 1995), p. 52.

²³ In der Judenfrage müssen den Einsatzgruppen vor Kriegsbeginn insgeheim besondere – in ihren 'Rechnungen' jedenfalls nicht enthaltene – Weisungen gegeben worden sein!

²⁴ H. Krausnick, *Hitlers Einsatzgruppen. Die Tempel des*

Widerstandskampfes, 1938-1945, (Frankfurt a/M 1985), p. 58.

²⁵ 'Auf diesem Grunde wurden beide gebeten, sich heute schon intensiv um alle Vorgänge uober das Judentum in Polen zu bemühen' – note of Hagen, May 25, 1939, Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine, Paris, CCXXXIV-18, quoted by J. Billig, 'The Launching of the Final Solution', in: S. Klausfeld (ed.), *The Holocaust and the Neo-Nazi Mythomania*, (New York 1978), p. 29-30, 90 (note 6).

²⁶ Bundesarchiv Koblenz, R 58/954, p. 170-178.

²⁷ For a brief description of the administrative structure of the SD at that time see: S. Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews (I): The Years of Persecution*, (London 1997), p. 197-199.

Anlage BK R 58/1954

170
DN/12-4

II 112 00
C 41

Hamburg, den 22. April 1939

461481	20 APR 1939
11-119	11-119

An das
Sicherheitshauptamt
Zentralabteilung II 1

Berlin.

Betr.: Verstärkte Beobachtung des Judentums in den
angrenzenden Ländern.

Vorfr.: Arbeitsanweisung für II 112 1919 und
hier: Schreiben vom 22.12.1938 ob. AZ.

Anl. 1

In der Anlage wird ein Zwischenbericht über das Judentum in Holland in doppelter Ausfertigung übersandt. Weitere Ermittlungen laufen noch, deren Ergebnisse in einem Abschlussbericht nach dort Gegebenen wird.

Die Ermittlungen über das Judentum in den skandinavischen Ländern sind noch nicht soweit gefortschritten, dass ein Zwischenbericht zusammengestellt werden kann. Es wird hierfür um eine nochmalige Terminverlängerung gebeten.

Des SA Führers
des SS-Obergruppenführers Nord-Weichsel
i. D.
47. Stabschef
H. S. G. Müller

Figure 1 Letter of 28 March 1939 to the Sicherheitshauptamt in Berlin. Bundesarchiv Koblenz, R-58/1954

branches; this directive was based on a circular dated 22 December 1938. The order was to intensify the observation of so-called 'Jewry', i.e. of the Jewish communities in the countries bordering Germany (*Verstärkte Beobachtung des Judentums in den angrenzenden Ländern*). The letter explains, that

Attached we send two copies of an interim report [*Zwischenbericht*] on Jewry in Holland. More information is at present being collected, and will be passed on to you in a final report. Information about Jewry in the Scandinavian countries is not yet complete enough to warrant compilation of an interim report. We beg once again for more time for this purpose.²⁸

The report itself consists of eight pages and includes many mistakes – such as the mention of non-Dutch Jews Josef Spitzzak and Prof. S. Broderzky as representatives of the Dutch Zionist organisation in the executive committee of the Zionist (World) Organisation (p. 2: of Vladimir Horowitz as a Dutch Jewish pianist (p. 4); of the pro-Jewish activist 'Nurno [i.e. Menno] Ter Braak' as a Jewish *Kritiker* (p.4); of Th. van Lier as a prominent Jew in the Ministry of Employment (p. 6); of the Jewish industrialist S. van den Berg Jr and S. van Zwanenberg as *Regierungskommissare* at the Ministry of Trade; of the double mention of some professors both at the University of Amsterdam and the University of Leiden etc. However, these inaccuracies do not seem to detract from the basic importance of this report.

The first page of the report presents a survey of demographic, historical and other 'noteworthy' issues; the rest comprises lists of Dutch Jews and observations relating to Dutch Jewry in general and to the role of the Jewish population in Dutch public life. The first part opens, as mentioned, with some demographic data on Dutch Jewry at that time (total: 111,917, 1.41% of the Dutch population; in Amsterdam: 65,858, 8% of the city's population and 58.82% of Dutch Jewry) as compared to the situation in 1830 (46,397, 1.8%, 20,335, 9.5%, 18% respectively), with some conclusions regarding this issue. About the social classification, the document states *ist bis jetzt noch kein Material eingegangen* ('we have not received material yet', p. 1). As to denominational divisions it states that 7.3% of the Dutch Jews are Sephardim; and that the Ashkenazim, who comprise 92.7% of the community, have been the leading component since the beginning of the eighteenth century. The report emphasises the positive attitude of the Dutch elite towards the Jews, as expressed by the Queen and Prime Minister on the occasion of the third centennial of the Amsterdam Ashkenazi community (1939).²⁹

²⁸ 'In der Anlage wird ein Zwischenbericht ueber das Judentum in Holland in doppelter Ausfertigung übersandt. Weitere Ermittlungen laufen noch, deren Ergebnisse in einem Abschlussbericht nach dort gegeben wird.

Die Ermittlungen ueber das Judentum in den skandinavischen Ländern sind noch nicht soweit gefortschritten, dass ein Zwischenbericht zusammengestellt werden kann. Es wird hierfür um eine nochmalige Terminverlängerung gebeten.'

²⁹ For exact details about Dutch Jewry, Dutch Jewish history of the period and most of the personalities mentioned in the report, see Presser, *Ashkenazim in der Hölle*; De Jong, *Kennelijk*, vols. 1-14; Michman, Beem and Michman, *Pinkas*; Blom c.a., *Geschiedenis van de Joden in Nederland*; D. Michman, *The Jewish Refugees from Germany in the Netherlands 1933-1940*, PhD thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1978.

Afterwards, the report mentions A. Asscher as leader of the Amsterdam Jewish community (as well as his diamond cutting enterprise), the existence of a board (Keukeraad) of the community, and the fact that it has a special Contact Committee to attract immigrant Jews. About the Zionist movement the document states that its name is *Nederlandscher Zionsverbund* (NZB), that Abel J. Herzberg is its chairman, and that it has 31 local branches. Since 1938 there have been tensions within the NZB due to differences on policies concerning Palestine (obviously relating to the issue of partition). Then it continues:

The opposition is united under the leadership of Prof. Dr D. Cohen, who holds leading positions in several Jewish organisations in Holland, such as Keren Hayesod, the vocational retraining farm for youth Catharina[hoewel], the Association for Jewish Studies in the Netherlands etc.³⁰

In the context of the Zionist movement the report also mentions the Mizrahi (and its leader J.J. Davids), WIZO (*unter Führung der B. Fromen Snapper*), the vocational retraining centres and organisations (Deventer Vereniging, Werkdof Wieringen, Catharina[hoewel], Keren Hayesod (*unter der Leitung des Vizepräsidenten des Hohen Rates der Niederlande Mr. Dr. L.E. Visser, Amsterdam*, p. 3) and the National Jewish Fund.

Among the Jewish assistance committees the following organisations are mentioned: ORT, OSE, Comité voor joodsche vluchtelingen (Committee for Jewish Refugees, 'sponsored by the American Joint Distribution Committee and the Hiem), De Joodsche Invalide and the *Verenigde Hilfskomitee für die notleidenden Juden Polens* (United Assistance Committee for the Suffering Jews in Poland). Again, Prof. Cohen is mentioned here as a member of the boards of ORT and OSE. This part of the survey concludes with a reference to the *Juedische Jugendföderation ... deren Vorsitzender L. Nordheim ist*, and Agudas Jisroel.

The report proceeds to 'the Jewish part in Culture, Economy and Politics'. First mentioned are the Jewish professors at Dutch universities, among whom professors Frijda, A.C. Josephus Jita and I. Kisch at the University of Amsterdam; then Jews in Dutch art and music, with special emphasis on the domination of Jews in this field; and some data on the percentages and importance of Jews in the different sectors of the economy. This chapter closes with a list of names of Jews in the state apparatus.

The final part of the report mentions 'pro-Jewish organisations' (in which assistance committees for non-Aryan Christians are included), anti-Jewish legislation (under which they include anti-immigrant laws), and anti-Semitic organisations (the NSB and a certain Nederlandse Volkspartij).

Altogether, the report provides a reasonable survey of Dutch Jewry for the re-

quirements of anti-Jewish policies³¹; in it we can already see the acquaintance of the compilers with those Jewish personalities who were to play a dominant role in the Jewish community during the occupation: Abraham Asscher, David Cohen and Lodewijk Visser.

Evaluation and conclusion

What, then, is the significance of this report? To be able to evaluate it, two issues are crucial: the nature of the development of anti-Jewish policies in Germany in the 1930s, and the anti-Jewish policies in the Netherlands between May 1940 and February 1941.

With regard to the first: anti-Jewish policies of the first six years of the Nazi regime, while having a general anti-Semitic goal, were not orchestrated by a single authority. On the contrary: different forces and power centres, all aware of the importance attributed to the Jewish issue by Hitler and most more or less virulently anti-Semitic themselves, competed for dominance in the field.³² However, they were not simply quarrelling about the proper way to handle the issue – through discriminative legislation, economic removal and expropriation, psychological intimidation

³⁰ The report does not state how the information was collected. However, from our knowledge about the working methods of the SD in general and especially of the SD II 112 department, the sources that were used were the following: (1) Dutch and Dutch-Jewish publications sent by German informers from Holland through the German embassy in The Hague; and from there to German Foreign Office headquarters in Berlin, which transferred material to the Gestapo – see, for instance an 'Aktennotiz' by Herbert Hagen, SD II 112, dated 11 January 1938, about a meeting between Hagen, Eichmann, Dannecker and Freytag on the cooperation between the Jewish Departments of the Gestapo (II B 4, and the SD (II 112) – Yad Vashem Archives 051/OSOBI/2. It is quite clear, for instance, that the demographic data in the report is based on E. Boekman, *Demografie van de Joden in Nederland*, Amsterdam 1936). For this aspect see also de Jong, *Koninkrijk*, *op. cit.* vol. 1, (The Hague 1969), p. 488–492, and Friedlander, *op. cit.* p. 200. (2) secret information relating to persons and organisations, supplied also by informers but through more secret channels, such as directly to the Gestapo – one important Gestapo channel was the Frontier Police (*Die Grenzpolizei der Geheimen Staatspolizei*; for the Netherlands for instance, the Gestapo office at Düsseldorf served as a centre for collecting information; see an example of such information forwarded on 16 May 1939 by this office to the *Zentralabteilung II/1* in Berlin – Yad Vashem Archives, 051/OSOBI/41, p. 120–127) and the *Auslandsorganisation* of the NSDAP. For possible informers and secret assembling of information see: De Jong, *Koninkrijk*, *op. cit.* vol. 1, (The Hague 1969), p. 335–337, 488–492; H. Buchheim, 'The SS – Instrument of Domination', in: H. Krausnick *et al.*, *Anatomy of the SS State* (New York 1968), p. 241–247, esp. p. 244; Friedlander, *op. cit.*, p. 200; A. Delbecq, 'De Auslandsorganisation in België (1932–1944)', *Cultuur/Bijdragen, Navorsings- en Studicentrum voor de Geschiedenis van de Tweede Wereldoorlog*, 10 (Brussel, November 1986), p. 115–151. In a personal remark at the conference on the History and Culture of the Jews in the Low Countries, held in London, 17–19 June 1997, H. Boas of Amsterdam drew my attention to the fact, that Abraham Asscher had a German maid working at his home during the 1930s; some German maids were recruited by German security services outside Germany.

³¹ See K.A. Schlemmer, *The Trained Road to Auschwitz: Nazi Policy toward German Jews 1933–1939*, (Urbana and Chicago 1990; 2nd edition), especially chapters IV–VI; D. Michman, 'Nazi Anti-Jewish Policies, 1933–1939', in: *Binei Shas UYhuda* [Ten Days of Holocaust and Reckoning] Unit 5, (Open University of Israel: Tel.-Aviv 1984), p. 22–103.

³⁰ 'Die Oppositionsgruppe einige sich unter Prof. Dr. D. Cohen, der in verschiedenen jüdischen Verbänden Hollands führende Stellen innehat;

z.B. Keren Hayesod, Jugendfarm Catharina, Gesellschaft für die jüdische Wissenschaft in den Niederlanden, usw.'

or pressure to emigrate – they also appear to have differed regarding direct intervention within the Jewish community. All forces tried to apply their policies with technical means, such as legislation, impersonal orders and propaganda, or by confronting individual Jews. Only the SS and police apparatus, led and conducted by Himmler, Heydrich and their associates, adopted a policy of dealing with the Jewish community as a whole, talking face to face with Jewish leaders at all levels and exerting pressure on them, penetrating into the organisational structures of the community, and observing, collecting updated information about and spying on them and their activities (through *Legaberichte* and other means) even in the most remote places. It was the SS and police apparatus and its extensions that constantly forced the horizons of anti-Jewish policies further by initiating new solutions based on their familiarity with the pulse of political reality and the situation inside the Jewish community. As a result, the SS and police eventually gained the lead in anti-Jewish policies (at that famous meeting, held – on 12 November 1938 – in the wake of *Reichskristallnacht*, at Goering's office at the Ministry of the Air Force).

Meanwhile, as the SS achieved its ascendancy, plans proceeded for imminent German territorial expansion – an objective first presented by Hitler to his generals in November 1937.³³ Parallel to this, Himmler developed his own ideas on the future geographical shape of the Reich.³⁴ The SD directive concerning intensified observation of the Jewish communities in neighbouring countries should therefore be seen in the double light of preparations for military expansion and the position of the SS in Jewish affairs by November 1938.

With regard to the second: returning to the historiographical survey with which we began, there is general agreement among researchers that anti-Jewish policies were gradually applied in the Netherlands during the summer of 1940 and some have emphasised the role of *Generalkommissar* Schmidt in promoting these policies. There is, however, one fact to which insufficient attention has been paid: the failure to establish a special bureau for, and the absence of any expert on Jewish affairs in the Netherlands during the period May 1940 to April 1941. Anti-Jewish policies were indeed carried out – but this was done by several authorities, and generally following the legal state of affairs in Germany proper. This was done along the lines of the non-personal approach seen in the development of anti-Jewish policies in the 1930s. There was no representative in the Netherlands of the alternative approach, that of the Jewish Department of the SD – a quite astonishing phenomenon, given the usual eagerness of this department to be present on the spot immediately after occupation (this had been the case in Vienna in March 1938, in Prague in March 1939, in Poland in September 1939, and in France parallel to the occupation of the Nether-

lands).³⁵ It is hard to avoid concluding that the Jewish Department was somehow prevented at first from establishing a base in Holland – perhaps (and probably) by *Reichskommissar* Arthur Seyss-Inquart, who was keen to gain control of every aspect of life under his jurisdiction, having witnessed the conflicts of competencies in the *General-Gouvernement* while serving as Governor Hans Frank's deputy (October 1939–May 1940).

This situation was to change in February 1941, in the wake of the violent clashes between Dutch Nazis and Jews in the Jewish neighbourhood. As I have shown in my study of the establishment of the Joodsche Raad in Amsterdam, the impetus to establish this body must have come from the SS and police apparatus: they used the crisis to introduce the organisational tool most favoured by the SD Jewish experts everywhere – the *Judenrat*. This organisational body was their means of gaining direct and constant intervention across the length and breadth of the Jewish community – the approach developed by the SD and Gestapo Jewish experts in Germany in the 1930s.³⁶

And who would be the Jews to participate in the Jewish Council and to chair it? Unfortunately, we have no precise records of the negotiations and developments on 12 February 1941, when Senator Boehmecker summoned Abraham Asscher and the two chief rabbis to his office and ordered them to establish the Jewish Council, and when, afterwards, Asscher called Prof. David Cohen, asked him to co-chair the Council, and together with him chose its members. It is therefore impossible to prove that the report of March 1939 had any direct impact on these affairs. However, it seems probable that it was disseminated within the SD and other circles belonging to the security apparatus, and that its findings served the experts who were to deal with Holland in general and with the Dutch Jews in particular. This view is supported by another document, an undated secret report on 'Holland' of the *Reichsicherheitshauptamt/AmI 17* written some time before the invasion of Holland (the *RSHA* itself was established in late September 1939). This report also includes information about the Jews of Holland, most of it similar to the data in the 1939 report, some of it different – suggesting that the March 1939 report was used and updated) by the compilers.³⁷ Therefore, even if the 1939 report was not actually used to

³³ K. Hildebrand, *Deutsche Ausserpolitik 1933-1945: Kalkül oder Dogma?* (2nd edition), Stuttgart, Berlin, Cologne and Mainz 1973, p. 55; M. Broszat, *Der Staat Hitler* (Munich 1978; 7th edition), p. 364.

³⁴ Hildebrand mentions especially a speech by Himmler to his 'Leben Mannen' on 8 November 1938 – Hildebrand, *op. cit.* p. 79.

³⁵ In the French case, where Eichmann's associate Theodor Dannecker played the dominant role, see: J. Billig, *Le Commissariat Général aux Questions Juives (1941-1944)*, vol. 1, Paris 1955, p. 41-42; J. Adler, *Face à la Persecution: Les Organisations Juives à Paris de 1940 à 1944*, (Paris 1983), p. 42-44; R. L. Cohen, *The Burden of Conscience: French Jewry's Response to the Holocaust*, Bloomington and Indianapolis 1987, p. 26-27; J. Lezowski, *Multicultural The Nazi Security Police and the Banality of evil*, PhD thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1995, p. 148-149.

³⁶ Michman, 'De oprichting van de Joodsche Raad voor Amsterdam', *op. cit.*, *passim*.

³⁷ Reichsicherheitshauptamt/AmI VI, 'Holland' (Gehem., Rijksinstituut voor Oorlogsdocumentatie [Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation], Amsterdam, Coll. 215, no. 75). This report includes – apart from general information about the history, demography and composition of Dutch Jewry – lists of prominent Dutch Jews mentioned according to their organisational affiliation (such as the Zionist Federation, the Portoguese and Ashkenazi community associations, chief rabbis etc., and with precise addresses. The names of A. Asscher and D. Cohen, and rabbis Sarlovis and Frances are all included.

impose certain Jewish personalities on the community, it may have very well served as the necessary background information the German authorities needed in order to decide whether the persons proposed by Asscher and the rabbis to participate in the Joodsche Raad – especially Prof. Cohen – were indeed the type of leaders they needed.

Appendix

Document from the Bundesarchiv Koblenz, R-58/954.
Pages numbered by frame and original page number.

[170]

Sicherheitsdienst des Reichsführers-SS
SD-Führer des SS-Oberabschnittes Nord-West

II 112 00

Hamburg, den
28. MRZ. 1939

C 41
Vg.

An das Sicherheitshauptamt
Zentralabteilung II 1
B e r l i n .

Bitte verstärkte Beobachtung des Judentums in den angrenzenden Ländern.
Vorgl. Arbeitsanweisung für II 112 1939 und hies. Schreiben vom 22.12.1938 ob.
AZ.

Anlage 1

In der Anlage wird ein Zwischenbericht über das Judentum in Holland in doppelter Ausfertigung übersandt. Weitere Ermittlungen laufen noch, deren Ergebnis in einem Abschlussbericht nach dort gegeben wird.

Die Ermittlungen über das Judentum in den skandinavischen Ländern sind noch nicht soweit gediehen, dass ein Zwischenbericht zusammengestellt werden kann. Es wird hierfür um eine nochmalige Terminverlängerung gebeten.

Der SD-Führer des SS-Oberabschnittes Nord-West
i. V.
(Unterschrift)

SS-Sturmabführer u. Stabsführer

[171-1]

Die Juden in Holland.

In Holland wohnen insgesamt 111 917 Juden, das sind 1,41 % der Gesamtbevölkerung Hollands. Davon leben allein in Amsterdam 65 858 Juden, gleich 8 % der Amsterdamer Bevölkerung und 58,82 % der Judenschaft Hollands überhaupt.

Im Jahre 1830 gab es in Holland 46 397 Juden, die etwa 1,8% der Bevölkerung ausmachten. Von diesen lebten 20 335 Juden in Amsterdam, gleich 9,5 % der arischen Bevölkerung Amsterdams und 18 % der Judenschaft Hollands. Es zeigt sich daraus, dass die jüdische Stadtbewölkerung neben der absoluten Zunahme noch eine solche von etwa 10 % aufweist. Allerdings ist der Prozentanteil der Juden an der Bevölkerung Hollands um 0,4 % gefallen, was auf den Anteil des Jahres 1830 einem prozentualen Rückgang von 22 % gleichkommt.

Der jüdische Geburtenüberschuss Hollands ist sehr gering, er beträgt 9,6 o/oo. Über die soziale Schichtung der Judenschaft Hollands ist bis jetzt noch kein Material eingegangen, aber die Prozentzahlen über die Beteiligung der Juden in den verschiedenen Wirtschaftszweigen geben eingermaßen Aufschluss über die soziale Struktur der holl. Juden.

Die Juden Hollands setzen sich aus 7,3 % sephardim und 92,7 % Aschkenasin

Dan Michman, professor of Modern Jewish History and chairman of the Arnold and Lorna Finkler Institute of Holocaust Research at Bar Ilan University in Ramat Gan, is a member of the board of the Yad Vashem International Center for Holocaust Studies. He has written extensively on Dutch Jewish history and on various aspects of the Holocaust and the postwar Jewish world.

zusammen. Bis zu Beginn des 16. Jahrhunderts hatten die sephardischen Juden in Holland die Führung, die aber nur Restlos von den Ostjuden übernommen wurde. Zum 300-jährigen Bestehen der Amsterdamer aschkenasische Gemeinde wurde Königin Wilhelmine [sic] ein in zentralen Worten gehaltenes Glückwunschtelegramm. Das "Nieuw Israëlietisch Weekblad" brachte als Leitartikel einen Aufsatz des holländischen Ministerspräsidenten Dr. H. C. J. J. n. In dem dieser erklärte, das Jubiläum habe nicht nur für die Juden, sondern auch für ganz Holland Bedeutung, da die Juden Amsterdams für dieses Land und diese Stadt soviel getan hätten.

Der Vorsitzende der Amsterdamer jüdischen Gemeinde ist der [1172-2] Mitinhaber der Diamantenschleifer Assessor - A. A. S. C. H. E. R. - der gegen Ende 1937 zum Offizier der Ehrenlegion ernannt wurde. Der "Verkerke de Amsterdamer Handelszorg" besteht aus den Juden Salomon und Jules Foss. Salomon ist Verwaltungsrat der Kontaktkommission und Jules Foss deren Vorsitzender. Die Kommission hat die Aufgabe, gute Beziehungen zwischen der Gemeinde und den zugewanderten Juden herzustellen.

Am 30.11.1937 wurde in der Leidsstraat eine neue Synagoge eingeweiht, die besonders stark von aus Deutschland emigrierten Juden besucht wird. Als Rabbiner ist dort J. H. Donner tätig. Die Zionistische Organisation Hollands nennt sich "Niederländischer Zionistenbund" (NZB). Vorsitzender ist Abel. J. H. E. R. Z. B. E. R. G. Amsterdamer. Der NZB hat in Holland 31 Ortsverbände. Zu Beginn des Jahres 1938 waren Sparungen in der NZB aufgetreten, die durch verschiedene Auffassungen über die Palästinapolitik entstanden waren. Die Oppositionsgruppe einigte sich unter Prof. Dr. E. C. H. E. n, der in verschiedenen jüdischen Verbänden Hollands führende Stellen innehat: z. B. Keren Hajessed, Jugendfarm Catharina, Gesellschaft für die jüdische Wissenschaft in den Niederlanden, usw..

Leiter des niederl. Misrachi ist Dr. D. E. V. I. D. S. Als Vertreter des Exekutiv-Komitees wurden bisher Josef Sprinzak und Prof. S. Brodetsky bekannt. Die Zionistische Frauenorganisation "WIZO" steht unter Führung der B. Verman S. n. a. p. e. r. und hat in Holland 22 Ortsverbände. An Umschulungsorganisationen besetzen in Holland die "Deventer Vereniging", mit dem Werkhof Wieringen und die Jugendfarm "Catharina" in Gouda. Das Werkhof Wieringen steht auf [1173-3] dem Gelände des früheren Zuider-See. Der Grund und Boden wurde von der Regierung zur Verfügung gestellt. Die Jugendfarm "Catharina" dient zur Schulung von Juden im Gartenbau. Zur Verfügung stehen 2 1/2 ha. Land mit Wohnhaus und Fischbassins. Es könne pro Jahr etwa 20 Schüler aufgenommen werden. Der holländische Peter Hajessed steht unter der Leitung des Vizepräsidenten des Hohen Rates der Niederlande Mr. Dr. L. E. V. I. S. S. E. R. Amsterdamer.

Leiter der Nationalfondsarbeit Hollands ist Dr. A. van E. a. l. e. n, Direktor des Gemeindeforschungsdienstes Amsterdams. Im April 1936 fand ein Festabend im Kgl. Theater in Den Haag zu Gunsten des jüdischen Nationalfonds statt. Dem Zentralrat der "Ort" und "Ges." Gesellschaft gehören Prof. Dr. D. Cohen, J. E. Hillen, Dr. A. van Raalte und H. van Nuzen an. An sonstigen Hilfsorganisationen bestehen das "Comité voor Joodsche Vluchtelingen", unterstützt von American Joint Distribution Committee und der Hicem, die Vereinigung "De Joodsche Invalide" [sic], die zur Feier des 25-jährigen Bestehens von der Königin Wilhelmine eine Geldspende erhielt und das "Vereinigste Hilfskomitee für die notleidenden Juden Polens".

An Jugendorganisationen ist bisher die "Jüdische Jugendföderation" bekannt, deren Vorsitzender L. Nordheide ist. Im Vorstand der Aguda Jisroel sind Dr. Maximilian Landau und Harry Goodmann.

Jüdischer Anteil an Kultur, Wissenschaft und Politik.

In den verschiedenen Hochschulen Hollands sind folgende Juden tätig:
Universität Amsterdam.
 Dr. F. J. J. Dr. nat. ök., Rektor der Universität Amsterdam
 A. C. Josephus-Jittu, Prof.
 I. Kisch, Privatdozent für vergleichende Rechtsbetrachtung. [174-4]
 Prof. van Gelder, Dozent
 Prof. Polak, Dozent
 Prof. Kohnstamm, Dozent

Universität Utrecht.
 L. S. Ornstein, Prof. Dr.
 van Gelder, Prof.
 H. Kelsen, Jurist
 H. Freundlich, Chemiker
 M. Goldschmidt, Geologe
 E. Panofsky, Kunsthistoriker

Universität Leiden.
 M. David, Dr. a.o. Prof. der Rechtshistorik
 Prof. van Gelder, Dozent
 Prof. Polak, Dozent
 Prof. Kohnstamm, Dozent.
Handelshochschule Rotterdam.
 Prof. Polak.

In der holländischen Kunst sind bisher folgende Juden bekannt
 Leon Holmann, Zeichner und Illustrator
 Eugen Spiro, Maler
 Prof. Kurt Tuch, Landschaftsmaler
 Wolfgang Fraenkel, Komponist
 Bruno Walter, Dirigent
 Willem Mengelberg, Dirigent
 Paula Salomon, Sangerin
 James Simon, Pianist
 Wladimir Horowitz, Pianist
 Nathan Milstein, Geigenvirtuose
 Stefan Sakenase, Lehrer am Konservatorium Rotterdam
 Nino Rossi, Kritiker
 Dr. Ludwig Berger, Filmregisseur [sic] und Kunstl. Leiter der Filmproduktionsgesellschaft "Neerlandia"

[175-5] Am 30.12.1938 schrieb der "Telegraaf" "Amsterdamer Wohlfahrt und Amsterdamer Kultur sind ohne die Juden undenkbar. Den hochentwickelten portugiesischen Juden hat Amsterdams einen Teil seines Stils, seines Gehabens und den Juden im allgemeinen seine Wärme, seine Farbe und seine fesselnde Beweglichkeit zu verdanken. Das Judentum hat den Handelshelfer, die geistigen Kräfte und den flammenden Kunstsin von Amsterdams angeht."

Am 11.2.1939 schreibt die Zeitung "Arbeit, Freiheit und Brot" das Organ der SDAP auf Seite 2:
 ".....man braucht nur auf die Ankündigung von Konzerten zu achten um sich davon zu vergewissern: Der Solist oder der Konzertgeber ist fast immer Jude."

Direktor des physiol. Lab.
 Abteilungsleiter des 300-jährigen Bestehens der Universität Utrecht wurde ihnen das Ehrendoktorat verliehen.

Die prozentuale Beteiligung der Juden am Wirtschaftsleben Hollands ist aus folgender Aufstellung zu ersehen.

Bauern	0,11 %
Seefischerei	0,28 %
Bankwesen	4,08 %
Einzelhändler	5,22 %
Textil- und Kleiderhandel	6,11 %
Gross- und Zwischenhandel	7,99 %
Kaufhäuser	8,60 %
Händler und Konkursmassenhändler	8,61 %
Handlungsreisende	17,50 %
Markthandel und Güterbörsen	23,27 %
Diamantenschleiferei	57,11 %

Wie aus vorstehender Aufstellung ersichtlich, ist der Diamantehandel vorwiegend in jüdischen Händen. Kunstseide, Margarine und Tabak-Großhandel ist ebenfalls zum grossen Teil in jüdischen Händen. Jüdische Exportfirmen sind die Niederl.-Guyana, Gebr. Frank, Klatscher & Co. und Fa. Ben Meyer in Soerabaya und Singapur.

Die bedeutendste jüdische Firma des Textilhandels ist die Fa. Spanjaard in Borneo.

[176-6] Im Tabakeinzelhandel steht die Fa. Weintal & Co. mit 42 Ladengeschäften an der Spitze.

Die grössten jüdischen Warenhäuser sind Unilever und de Bienenkorf in Amsterdam und Hema (Einheitspreisgeschäft) in Rotterdam und Den Haag.

Juden im Staatsapparat.

Hoher Rat der Niederlanden

Mr. Visser, Vizepräsident, Leiter des KH (Keren Hayesodi)

Mr. Polak

Mr. S.E.J.M. van Lier

Rad (sic) van Staaten.

Mr. Limburg

Mr. Kan

Einanzministerium

Mr. Elwe, Schatzmeister

Handelsministerium.

Dr. Hirschfeld, Directeur General

Mr. Hart, Direktor für den Export

Dr. Buchmann, Regierungs-Kommissar

S. van den Berg jr., Regierungs-Kommissar

S. van Swanenberg, Regierungs-Kommissar

Ministerium für Arbeit und Gewerbe

Mr. Polak, Patent-Rat

Mr. Th. van Lier, Referendar

Justiz und Unterrichtsministerium

Mr. Simons, Kabinettschef

Mr. Spanjaard, Justiz

Frau Mr. Schonfeld-Polano, Justiz und Unterrichts

Ministerium für Kolonien

Dr. van Gelder, Adviseur, Prof. in Utrecht, Mitgl. d. II. Kammer

Volksbundkommissariat für Adressen.

Mr. Limburg

Prof. Francois

[177-7] Gouverneur, Provinz- und Stadtkerkaltungen.

Mr. van Rosenthal, Gouverneur der Provinz Utrecht

Dr. Simons, Provinzialrat von Süd-Holland

Dr. Belinfante, Abteilungsleiter

Ed. Polak, Mitgl. der Deputierten Staaten von Nordholl.

Boekman, Ratsherr von Amsterdam

de Miranda, Ratsherr von Amsterdam

Mr. van Lier, Gemeindefinanzverw. (von Amsterdam)

J. Walch, Gemeindefinanzverw. (von Amsterdam)

Mr. van Zaanen, Direktor des statistischen Büros

Mr. Cammis, Richter in Amsterdam

Mr. van Crefeld, Kantontreiber in Amsterdam]

Gesundheitswesen.

Dr. N.M. Josephus-Jitta, Vors. des Gesundheitsrates

S.W. van Praag, Chef des Sanitätswesens

Dr. Heyermans, Chef des Gesundheitsdienstes in Amsterdam.

Frau M. van Lier-Schippers, Gemeindevorw. Wohnungsfürsorge

Dr. Boasson, Gemeindevorw. von Den Haag.

Dr. H.E. van Gelder, Direktor des Dienstes "Kunst und Wissenschaft".

An prosemittischen, nichtjüdischen Organisationen bestehen in Holland das "Protestantische Hilfsomite für um Rasse und Glauben Ausgewanderte" mit dem Sitz in Amsterdam, das "Römisch-Katholische Comité für die Opfer um Glaubensverfolgungen" in Utrecht und das "Hilfsomite für ausländische Kinder" Sitz in Amsterdam. Als antijüdische Gesetzgebung sind das Gesetz über den Genehmigungsanspruch für die Beschäftigung ausländischer Arbeitnehmer und das Gesetz zur Regelung der selbstständigen Ausübung von Gewerbebetrieben und Barufen durch Ausländer zu werten.

Trotzdem in diesen beiden Gesetzen die Bezeichnung "Jude" [178-8] vorsichtig umgangen wurde und das Wort "Ausländer" dafür gesetzt wurde, so richten sich die beiden Gesetze doch nur gegen die jüdischen Einwanderer.

An antisemitischen Bewegungen gibt es in Holland die NSB unter Mussert und die "Niederländische (sic) Volkspartij". Letztere Bewegung wurde von früheren Mitgliedern der Mussert-Bewegung gegründet und hat beschlossen, grundsätzlich keine Juden als Mitglied aufzunehmen.