

Hans Derks

Victims and Perpetrators

Dutch Shoah,
1933/45 and beyond



Ferdinand Schönigh

Victims and Perpetrators

Victims and Perpetrators

Dutch Shoah, 1933/45 and beyond

By

Hans Derks

Ferdinand Schöningh

The author: Hans Derks is a sociologist and historian from Amsterdam. He lectured and publishes widely on historical and sociological subjects. In 2012, Brill published his highly acclaimed critical study *History of the Opium Problem. The Assault on the East, ca. 1600–1950*. www.hderks.dds.nl

Cover illustration: Gra Rueb (sculptor). *The Olympic salute*. c 1928, Amsterdam. Photo: author

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data available online: <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

© 2019 Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, an Imprint of the Brill Group
(Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands; Brill USA Inc., Boston MA, USA; Brill Asia Pte Ltd, Singapore; Brill Deutschland GmbH, Paderborn, Germany)

www.schoeningh.de

Cover design: Nora Krull, Bielefeld
Production: Brill Deutschland GmbH, Germany

ISBN 978-3-506-79218-1 (hardback)

ISBN 978-3-657-79218-4 (e-book)

*In memory of my old friends Dr. Hajo Meijer (1924–2014) and
Dr. Jules Schelvis (1922–2016) whose life in Auschwitz,
Sobibor etc. remained a life-long trip to
hell and back.*

•••

Race does not exist, but it does kill people.

COLETTE GUILLAUMIN (1972, 1995)

••
•

Contents

Acknowledgements x

Abbreviations xi

Preface 1

A Strange Mystery – Science as Legitimation – An Author’s Interest –
The Content

Definitions 12

Race – Rasse – Volk (Völker) – Jew – Jude – Antisemitism – Holocaust,
German Genocide and Shoah – Victim(s) versus Perpetrator(s)

PART I: THE PRACTICE OF BEING VICTIMS

1 *Jews in Amsterdam and Holland* 35

A Historical and Social Background – The Double-Dutch – Belgium
Divided into Two – As (Dutch) Jews? – “Inner” Jewish Life – Conclusion

2 *Tensions among Victims* 56

Introduction – How to Become a Shoah Victim? – ‘West’ is Rich and
‘East’ Poor – Ashkenazim and Sephardim – A Short History – How to
Change Rasse in a Rasse Society?

3 *City of Targets* 77

Introduction – I. How to Change Rasse in a Rasse Society, 2: Sonja
Souget-Blindeman (1910–2002) – II. Double-Dutchmen and their
Portuguese Jews – Zionism versus Jewish Religion – Religion in a
KZ – “Rasse” and “Volk” in Terezin – Pjs in Westerbork – The Dutch
in Terezin – A Double-Dutch “Chairman” in Terezin – A Double-Dutch
Ex-Chairman in Post-War Amsterdam – III. A Clarified Murder in
1943: Louis van Gasteren (1922–2016) – A Classical War-time Murder –
The History Which Followed – A Photo of a Film – A Zionist Film? –
An Amsterdam Film? – IV. A Privileged Victim: Harry Mulisch (1927–
2010) – A Small Biography – Eichmann in Amsterdam – Mulisch
Pariah – The Accusations – The Motives – World Famous

- 4 *The State and Its Victims* 130
 Introduction – I. A Second Occupation – How to Create Victims in the Second Occupation – Concluding Remarks – II. Definitions and Their Victims – Victims and Co. – Concluding Remarks

PART II: SCIENTISTS AS PERPETRATORS

- 5 *Dutch Historical Westforschung, 1940–1945 and After* 155
 Introduction – Science for the Enemy – A Dutch Collaborating Victim – A Meertens Row à la Hollandaise – A Debye Row on Top – Dutch Westforschung
- 6 *Flemish Historians as Jew Hunters* 176
 Introduction – A Myth and Its Report – An Official Jew Hunt – The Historian's Creation – An Effective Division of Labour MV-SS – A *Möbelaktion* in Antwerp – Talks on a High Level – Franz Petri “Kultur”-manager – Professor Petri: Profiteer – Conclusions
- 7 *The Perversions of Bio-Anthropology: The Case of Hans Weinert* 208
 Introduction – The Case of Charles Davenport – German Psychiatrists – German Biological Anthropologists – A Main Rasse-Institute: the KWG in Berlin – The Rasse Institute's Practice in Kiel – Who is Hans Weinert? – Hans Weinert after the War
- 8 *Scientists in the Dutch Polders* 239
 Introduction – The Dutch Anthropological Scene – A Social Scientist for All Seasons – Three Dutch Historians – (Lou de Jong (1914–2005) – Abel Herzberg (1893–1989) – Jacques Presser (1899–1970)) – How Jewish did Portuguese Jews Remain? – The Rescue Games
- 9 *The Case of Ariëns Kappers* 260
 Introduction – A Very Convincing Diary? – The Ariëns Kappers Rescue Version – A Telephone Call from Another World – Another Defender of the Dutch Nation
- 10 *The Case of De Froe* 280
 Introduction – A Parliamentary Inquiry after the War – A Shocking Polder Affair – European Nazi Cooperation – Health in the Polder –

A National Centre for a Healthy Nazi Europe – A Hero for All
Seasons – De Froe’s Postwar Rasse History

ii *The “Rescue”* 311

Introduction – Exclusive “Portuguese Jews” – Money – Hella and
Arthur – A Sequence of Events – The Tarnów Case or Biological
Anthropologists in Combat – Dutch Victims in Numbers – A Rasse
History

Bibliography 347

Index 364

Acknowledgements

This book was originally conceived as the last part of a trilogy with *Deutsche Westforschung*, 2001 and *Jew, Nomad or Pariah*, 2004. That idea has been abandoned since the present book became a very different one, but some links to the other two can still be found (mainly in Part 1).

The book is dedicated to my beloved family with whom I lived a large part of my life in the city described in this book. I want to thank in particular four eminent scholars who critically read the whole manuscript and/or provided strategically important support: Frank Bovenkerk (Amsterdam), Arnold Labrie (Maastricht), Earl Jeffrey Richards (Wuppertal) and Roy Rosenstein (Paris). It was, however, due to Dr. Diethard Sawicki of Ferdinand Schoeningh Verlag (Paderborn, Brill Germany) that this book could be published after a long and complicated gestation period. As usual Alison Fisher (Amsterdam) was very helpful in correcting my English as was Chris Jones for the American.

In some stage of the creation the following people have helped me tremendously with their information, documentation, discussions, comments and criticism on the whole or parts of these texts. Therefore, I thank Gerard Aalders (Neth.), Lily van den Bergh (Neth.), Richard Bessel (UK), Nol Bueno de Mesquita † (Neth.), Michael Fahlbush (Ger.), Wolfgang Freund (Fr.), Louis van Gasteren † (Neth.), Cisca Griffioen (Neth.), Ingo Haar (Ger.), Anna Hájková (USA, Czech.), Michel A. Hofman (Neth.), Louis Horowitz † (USA), Marti Huetink (Neth.), Konrad Jarausch (Ger.-USA), Ulli Jesserun d'Oliviera (Neth.), Carsten Klingemann (Ger.), Ian Kershaw (UK), Frank van Kolfschoten (Neth.), Gabriel Kolko † (Neth., USA), Dirk Martin (Belg.), Joke Meerman (Neth.), Bea Meyer (Ger.), Hajo Meyer † (Neth.), Matthias Middell (Ger.), Laurent Olivier (Fr.), Anne Radeff (Fr.), Machteld Roede (Neth.), Dirk Rupnow (Ger.), Gretchen Schafft (USA), Maria Teschler-Nicola (Aust.), Hans-Walter Schmuhl (Ger.), Jules Schelvis † (Neth.), Ivo Schöffer-† (Neth.), Bernhard Slicher van Bath † (Neth.), Sacha Talmor † (Isr.), Bonno Thoden van Velsen (Neth.), Tjebbe van Tijen (Neth.), Bruno de Wever (Belg.), Hans-Ulrich Wehler † (Ger.), Wim Wertheim † (Neth.).

Of course, I am only responsible for the content of the following texts, and reference to the above names does not imply acceptance of (all or part of) their and my views.

Abbreviations

AMC	Amsterdam Medical Center (AMC), Brain Institute (The Netherlands)
ASA	Amsterdam City Archive (The Netherlands)
AUL	Amsterdam University Library, Special Collections: Pieter Meertens Archive (The Netherlands)
CEGESOMA	Studie- en Documentatiecentrum Oorlog en Hedendaagse Maatschappij, Brussels (Belgium)
DW	Hans Derks, <i>Deutsche Westforschung</i> (2001)
GUA	Gent University Archive, Gent (Belgium)
HA	Hans Derks, <i>Jew, Nomad or Pariah. Studies on Hannah Arendt's Choice</i> (2004)
HOP	Idem, <i>History of the Opium Problem</i> (2012)
HVW	<i>Handbuch der völkischen Wissenschaften</i> , hrg. Ingo Haar, Michael Fahlbusch (München: Saur, 2008/2017)
R(N)IOD	Rijks (Netherlands) Institute for War Documentation, Amsterdam.
SLMO	Hans Derks, <i>Stad en Land, Markt en Oikos</i> (1986)
UUL	Utrecht University Library, Special Collections: Pieter Geyl Archive; Utrecht (The Netherlands)
WAA	Westfälisches Archivamt – Archiv LVVL, Münster (Germany)

Preface

The main geographical location of the following study is the Dutch capital of Amsterdam and its historical background of the elimination of Jews during World War II. Recent rows about the next 'Holocaust monument' or concerning unbalanced statements made by the city's mayor, prove that serious confusion still exists where we might expect agreement about rational knowledge, after 70 years.

The heirs of neither victims nor perpetrators are willing to explain the shameful facts and accept their specific fault or guilt, apparently being afraid of financial and other consequences: this city was the scene for almost the largest deportations of Jews to Auschwitz compared to other cities in occupied Europe; only Warsaw did it 'better'. The only excuse available, that both city and country were captured by the Germans and nobody could do anything to stop it, or that what 'we' did (resistance, anti-German measures etc.) was the best we could, has already been declared unacceptable in academic literature.

For a general or a political audience a well-researched explanation is still not available for the capture of about 75% of the Jewish population in the Netherlands (about 90% in Amsterdam) – compared with 0% in Denmark or Bulgaria; 23% in Germany itself, about 50% in Belgium etc. In the first chapter the veil surrounding this mystery will be lifted.

Striking balances between 'interests' is not a task of proper historiography. Always repeating what is well-known about the elimination of Jews, has a repulsive effect and is mostly counterproductive.

However, there exists the responsibility to uncover the still-unknown facts and perpetrator's stories like those discussed in, for instance, chapters 9 to 11, or the mutual tensions among the victims described in chapters 1 to 4. They also are important for those considered Jewish victims. In addition, there is still a remarkable lack of sensibility concerning the city's violent past. One example from many can clarify this.

At the entrance to the Olympic stadium (opened in 1928 at the Stadion place), in which many Nazi events were held and a lot of bragging Nazi-speeches were heard, there stands now, in 2018, the sculpture of a man who greets the visitors by means of the (in)famous Hitler-salute. Is this a bad joke? What is the story behind this sculpture?

It is erected in memory of a special man. He was an aristocrat, an important friend of the House of Orange, and the leader of the National Committee responsible for the building of the stadium by the architect, Wils. In 1924 this leader suddenly died: an event which apparently had to be commemorated

four years later by means of a Hitler salute. The man was indeed known as ‘The Leader’, a custom at the time not unknown in fascist Europe as Mussolini had introduced the title directly after World War I.

In Holland the next man known as ‘Leader’: the fascist party-boss Anton Mussert, still stood at the design desks of the National Ministry of Waterinfrastructure in 1924. Four years later, however, Mussert was well-known and a leader of a National Committee. That nobody protested against such a sculpture during the war is obvious. It gave the many Dutch fascist visitors of the stadium (and certainly the parading German military) the feeling of being ‘at home’.

However, it is self-evident that directly after the war many protests against it took place. They were ineffective. The statue not only remained there, but a *legitimation* for this piece of art was created in the form of a plate with inscriptions at the feet of the sculpture with the text in Dutch and English:

The statue depicts the Olympic salute, which was used during the Roman Empire. Since World War II, the outstretched arm has been associated with the Hitler salute, but this monument was created in 1928 and has no relationship with Hitler at all.

Inevitably, this leads to moral questions. What is worse: that this statue did not disappear after what happened in the war-years, the worst events in the city’s entire history? That this statue gave all passing sports-lovers the most adequate motivation? That the House of Orange apparently ordered that the statue of its aristocratic friend must not be altered? That the rich representatives of what is called the ‘jewish community’ in the neighborhood have accepted until today this embellishment of their neighbourhood? Or that this legitimising text is purposefully lying?¹

The relevant (!) answer to these questions was given recently after the city government intended to rename the Stadion Place ‘Johan Cruijff Place’. Under the spiritual leadership of Rabbi Simon Bornstein the neighborhood protested loudly with, among others, a petition signed by 525 people (March 2018). Rabbi Bornstein offered the following reasoning:

We are very attached to the name Stadion Place. Johan Cruijff is but a temporary commercial phenomenon, which does not fit at all to the architectonic unity of the Stadion neighborhood, as has been designed by the architect Wils for the Olympic Games of 1928.²

All this turns a realistic history about the elimination of the jewish population of Amsterdam into a book about a *Double Dutch Shoah*. This perspective does

not concern only the local fate of the Jewish inhabitants but the national situation as well and the fate of those who fled to the Netherlands. About 60,000 to 70,000 of them lived in Amsterdam, about 20,000 in Rotterdam and The Hague, and about 10,000 in the rest of the country. From 1933 to late in 1940, another 40,000 to 50,000 people had fled to the Netherlands and were vulnerable to extermination by the Germans and their Dutch collaborators. From this total nearly 80% lost their lives and, as such, it was a uniquely tragic record in the European Shoah.

In this book personal stories are told about perpetrators and victims, but only for specific purposes: *not* to unravel personal problems since I am not a lawyer, police officer or psychologist, but a sociologist and historian; and *not* for political reasons, since I am an independent scholar, not one allied with some -ism or ideology but only with the reconstruction of the historical (and not a juridical) truth.

A Strange Mystery

These personal histories will help us to discover the more general elements of the complicated *victim-perpetrator relationships*; they concern, of course, the short-term events during the war – but they refer, as well, to long-term historical developments without which genocides cannot be explained or understood. They concern, again, the subjects of my earlier publications like the role of *sciences* in the expansion of a *repressive government* as in the Third Reich and occupied countries,³ the reflections on the *classical victim-perpetrator question in European history*⁴ or the long-term and global changes of socio-historical contexts of *race conflicts*.⁵

There are, furthermore, enough signs today that the problems concerning all the italicised items in the previous sentence, will become of the utmost importance in the near future, as well: for the main subject of the following book, the *German Genocide*, one of its best German historians recently declared that “every comprehensive attempt to explain what happened from 1933 to 1945 failed until today.”⁶

This seems to be true, as well as relative, for a most relevant and still-universal concept in this genocide, *race-Rasse*. To do this seems, strangely enough, like entering a no-man’s-land (not due to a city mayor): the *German Genocide* must be invented anew because *race* has a rather mysterious quality: it does not exist!

This is the official declaration of many learned people and also UNESCO (1950 etc.). There are only a few things which do not exist but still ‘act’ as if ‘it’

could *or really* kill. Nobody in the history of mankind has ever seen a (racist) god. But thanks to their 'existence', it is likely that most of the people in history were killed, certainly in the West and its colonies, in the name of the Western monotheistic gods.

Over the course of time all kinds of priests, gurus, rabbis, mullahs or other divine agents urged people to tremble for fear of these 'Nothings' on pains of being killed anyway: at first it is unbelievable, later it is always true. Life was made very dangerous by these dark professions and their strategies to invent 'Nothings' themselves.

Race is one of them; it was invented in the period 1740–1840 in Western Europe and directly 'tested' in colonies with genocidal actions. They became really effective on a relevant world-wide scale from about 1900 onwards as machine guns were distributed in sufficient numbers. Indeed, *race* (*Rasse*, *ras*, *razza* etc.) is 'nothing' compared to its terrible consequences for every branch of humanity as foreign lives were valueless. And then came UNESCO's attempts to declare 'race' as a biological 'object' for anathema, thanks to the Nazi practices.⁷

Reality is unruly. An article written more than half a century later starts with the sentence:

Racial and ethnic inequalities in health have become a major focus of research across the social and biological sciences. This research is significant most of all because the stakes are so high.⁸

Here are four examples: in Brazil the infant mortality is about 70% higher for Afro-Brazilians than for whites; in Singapore *diabetes mellitus* is twice as common among Indians as among Chinese; in Canada the death rate for indigenous people is 50% higher than for the non-indigenous; in the USA "each year more than 83,000 African Americans die who would not if death rates for black and white Americans were equal."

Already these four examples represent "a devastating scale of suffering", while *race* and *ethnicity* are now among the most commonly used concepts and their use is on the rise. However, "the concepts of race and ethnicity are seldom defined or justified for inclusion as study variables."⁹ This concerns not just USA practices in medical services, it is well-known in Europe as well.¹⁰ If the R-word is used in Europe today, it does not take long before the apartheid-regime in South Africa and the events during the Second World War, certainly in Europe, are brought up.

A new assessment of *race* (*Rasse*, *ras*, *razza* etc.) has been developed which suggests that a watershed took place 'before' and 'after': until the *Shoah* and

German Genocide happened race etc. 'existed' and thereafter 'it' and 'they' were abandoned. Many millions of people, therefore, have been slaughtered and victimised for 'Nothing', and its perpetrators and collaborating scientists are carrying it out as if it is a mere formality. I become highly indignant at objections made about the sciences involved as if they are nothing but a god's works and thoughts.

It is this terrible paradox of modern European history, as well as world history, which haunts this book: those apocalyptic events paled beside the shocking genocides and other atrocities afterwards, as if 'Nothing' changed. It makes no sense to prohibit the use of this R-word without having first discussed origins, meanings, contexts and whether the replacements for this R-word cover the same meanings and worst practices.

The killing fields were and always will be real. There must have been inventors of this 'Nothing'; there must have been perpetrators as executioners of the 'Will' of this 'Nothing'; there must have been people who are ultimately somehow legitimised by this 'Nothing' to kill and create a non-existent universe. A strange dichotomy of heaven (non-existent) and hell (existing) is created in these ways.

We probably need to perceive this problem the other way round: there were/are people or institutions who/which are intending to kill others and were/are in need of some legitimation to do this, whereupon they (or the supporting scholars) invented *race* (*Rasse, ras, razza* etc.), hoping that there were enough people who would believe the myth. Only in one (!) European country did people or institutions launch a *claim* in 1933 based on 'Nothing', intending to eliminate others if they did not believe this claim.

Victims and perpetrators form a typical *relationship*. What is at stake when it is discovered that they are killed or respectively are killing for 'Nothing', for a 'non-existent item'? Sometimes massive organisations are established to do the killing, creating victims who do not know what is going on, except dying. What is at stake when victims become perpetrators, or the reverse? What happens when the normal modalities for perpetrators as well as victims are negated: when the latter intend to become 'willing victims' (martyrs) and the former 'willing perpetrators' (of people with the wrong religion)?

There is also the other perception of the relationship between race and killing derived from our own historical experience, i.e. the Second World War in which the Nazi regime used the race 'argument' to kill astounding numbers of people, because they came from the wrong race or had the *wrong Rasse* which immediately presupposes the (non) existence of a *right race/Rasse*. Which one?

Another important thesis worth considering should be: because *race* (*Rasse, ras, razza* etc.) does not exist the perpetrators eliminated their victims for the

wrong reasons, and the Shoah and German Genocide are not at all what everybody thinks they are: racial genocides i.e. because jews cannot be a Rasse, they were killed because of a wrong definition. In particular for the German Genocide, in which numerous different victims are represented and not only jews, this thesis must lead to a completely new interpretation of what happened at the time.

Also, take into account the following complication: the Nazi use of *Rasse* was not at all an exclusive habit, but was widespread in the Western world, having been invented by English and French scientists after about 1820; it was more popular and practiced in the USA long before the German 'specialists' exploited it in their terrible way.

And afterwards: is it not the daily life experience in the USA at present, which is still impregnated with racism in nearly every field of activity, as its prisons demonstrate, like nowhere else? Will their primitive prison system change if they realise that *race* does not exist at all ?

Next complication: among these *inventors* etc. belonged quite a few people, who later became the victims. We can also pose the intriguing question of whether the Nazi's were only doing the dirty work that others invented, wanted, had legitimated by a non-existing "item". Who were the real victims and who were the perpetrators in the largest killing fields in Western history?

All these horrible questions provide backgrounds, discussions and historical analyses of memory-politics of the *German Genocide* and *Shoah*. In the extensive literature available, these questions are not discussed. The beginning of an answer will start to lead us "back to basics".

Science as Legitimation

The aims given above are too general to cover everything in a relevant way below. Therefore, we want to deal with them through the perspective of the problematic role of science in the *race problem* (*Rasse, ras, razza* etc.). The inventors were specifically natural and social scientists. Physical or biological anthropologists and medicines on the natural sciences side and cultural anthropologists and psychologists on the social sciences side made up the strongest supporters of the perpetrators until the end of the Second World War.

Afterwards, social scientists and historians criticised their own past too slowly. Apparently, by way of compensation, they were the fiercest critics of the natural sciences for trying to penetrate into the strict domain of the social sciences. This resulted in the serious debates about the *nature – nurture* antagonism, the question of biological determinism or something like 'socio-biology'

(Wilson) as a contradiction in terms. Whatever else these debates demonstrate, the inflexibility of the natural scientists to intellectually acknowledge the mistakes of their past is evident as was also experienced while writing this book.

The stubborn denial, lasting decades, of the management of the Max Planck Society to open its archives is symptomatic enough. It harbours excellent performers in the natural sciences, but was also the heir of the most notorious pre-Nazi institute: the Kaiser Wilhelm Gesellschaft. It took until 2000 for the first results of the historical investigations to be published, but scandals are still occurring.¹¹

Declarations like the following were published:

Nowadays, physical anthropologists consider 'race' as an artificial, obsolete concept. It became obsolete not only because of its fallacious use by the Nazis, but also because it has no biological significance and explains little: although there is a dramatic genetic variability within the species *Homo sapiens*, discrete, discontinuous groups exist nowhere. There are no sharp boundaries but instead gradual changes, such as in skin colour ... Nowadays, (sub)populations of living peoples are mainly distinguished by analyses of the gene frequencies of blood group systems and other polymorphisms.¹²

Indeed, race does not exist but it still kills, so that many things should be clarified before these scientists simply change some definitions and words or use incomprehensibly abstract language and continue in the same old way.

Therefore, the role of the natural and social scientists in the past and today in the perspective of *race* (*Rasse, ras, razza* etc.) is one focus of this book. Obviously, perpetrators use science but victims also rely on science to support and defend their position. Is there actually something like a perpetrators' or a victims' science? Or is it enough to provide concrete material from several backgrounds and from both the victims' as well as perpetrators' points of view, hoping to support the development of a more realistic way of thinking about the relationship?

An Author's Interest

From the above it can be concluded that this book has chosen to represent the victims' interests in the perpetrator – victim *relationship*. More specifically, we may perceive in the following texts a defence of the victims of genocides in the 20th century, and the reason why this book is dedicated to the Dutch *Shoah* victims, my old friends, Hajo Meijer and Jules Schelvis.

Why defence? The genocides in question were exploited in the most cynical way by controversial perpetrators for financial aid and as legitimation to commit new crimes against humanity. For this the victims must not suffer.

A second reason is that these perpetrators, by definition, do not need a historical defence (probably a juridical one) and certainly not from historians known as *Mythenjäger* as expressed by my supervisor, Bernhard Slicher van Bath. He once wrote a text, in the darkest period of the Second World War (14th of May 1941), that I also used as a motto for another book:

If in historical research commitment implies sacred cows for the historian, sacred fields which he is not allowed to enter, where one has to speak about with a certain scruple and where a fixed truth should be observed, in those cases the historian's research is worthless: the so-called truth is condemned to become a lie. In particular today there is a great chance to arrive at this situation in areas like patriotism, Volk character [volkse aard], Rasse [race] etc. The danger exists that one is obliged to do historical research from which the end-result is already fixed and that such a result will be used in the political struggle. The historian should be liberated from all this.¹³

This confession of one of the best historians in the postwar period reflects my intellectual position as scholar.

Also inspiring was Peter Novick's work about the reception of the Shoah problem in the USA. He has done a good job helping to eliminate the childish 'Holocaust'-adoration of some Jewish and non-Jewish sects and institutions.¹⁴ It received, among others, an extensive and excellent review from Eva Hoffman.¹⁵

To her surprise, the author complained later that Hoffman critically judged the 'politicisation' of the Holocaust memory by some Jewish organisations as a 'misuse'. An incomprehensible reaction, which Hoffman rightly rebutted, because Novick himself provides page after page of examples for it. He apparently wants to express that, whatever the stupidity of these opinions, they are not outrageous to him personally and that people/institutions who/which express them show still "sincerity and good faith".

In my view, Novick demonstrates here that he is only willing to play the neutral bookkeeper of all these opinions and interventions for whatever reason. Eva Hoffman is clearly and rightly dissatisfied with this attitude and urges us to investigate the reasons why this misuse occurred in the USA Jewish communities. They are too serious to be accepted.

To support all the above expressed intentions, this preface is followed by a series of definitions of the concepts often used, which must speak for themselves.

The Content

In Part I the foundation of the most 'mysterious society': the Dutch, is sketched. For most people, the contradictions still remain incomprehensible about how a society with only superficial forms of antisemitism could send the largest proportion of Jewish citizens to the gas chambers. The solution of this drama is given in chapters 1–4. They describe how one can become a victim of a genocide in a most 'peaceful and tolerant country'.

Part II is devoted in its entirety to the other side of the picture, the perpetrator's side, and to another aim of the book, the support of it by all kinds of social and natural sciences: from history to bio-anthropology. Not only is the concrete support these sciences gave to the Nazi-theory and practices discussed, but it is also shown how even in 2017 several of them are promoted by Dutch public authorities from war criminal to war hero for which a monument should be erected.

Chapters 5 and 6 demonstrate in details how the Nazi-German historians were met with a most enthusiastic welcome in the Netherlands and Belgium and how, even today, historians in these countries do not accept them as collaborators or perpetrators.

In the 19th century a *scientific* race-theory also replaced the theological one as a consequence of an emancipation from Christian religions unto secular reasonings. It had new consequences. Chapter 7 shows how the support for this scientific race theory was not only widespread (including the left wing), but also that they strongly supported the Nazi theories and practices. Hans Weinert is chosen as 'medium' because he was both a high-ranking Nazi scholar and collaborator of the Dutch anthropologists discussed in the chapters 9–11.

Chapter 8 prepares the road for the last part of the study by showing the Dutch scientific context in which perpetrators such as anthropologists and the like could act during and even be honoured *after* the war. Two developments of the utmost importance in Dutch scientific history come together: the colonisation of The East and the colonisation of the new polders in Holland itself. Not only the same scientists but also the same racist sciences were applied in *both* colonisations. They were fulfilled under the guidance of the *crème de la crème* of the national Dutch elite: several (prime) ministers, representatives of the Royal family and of the Royal Academy of Sciences.

The next two chapters discuss the concrete research of physical anthropologists through the biographies of the professors Ariëns Kappers and De Froe. The reality was that, based on their work, most Jews were condemned to go to Auschwitz and only few were not. Were the latter rescued or not? Who were

these scholars? What did they do to reach their goals? Which kind of research was conducted in Holland as players in an European Nazi network? How were they be honoured after the war?

In the concluding chapter 11 the realities behind the chances of rescuing Jewish victims from deportations and killings are discussed and also the rescue of the perpetrating and over-ambitious scientists implementing these actions from the 'ordeal of history'. A relationship between Vienna and Amsterdam underscores the suggestions already made in the previous chapters that the scientists involved collaborated with the Germans (and are certainly no "Righteous Among the Nations" as stated in postwar heroic messages).

Notes

- 1 *Wikipedia* is clear enough under "Nazi salute" or "Hitler salute". "The salute gesture is widely believed to be based on an ancient Roman custom.... However, no surviving Roman work of art depicts it, nor does any extant Roman text describes it". Or: The salute was made a popular gesture in early films "This included the silent film *Cabiria* (1914), whose screenplay was written by the Italian ultra-nationalist Gabriele d'Annunzio, arguably the forerunner of Benito Mussolini. In 1919, when he led the occupation of Fiume, d'Annunzio adopted the style of salute depicted in the film as a neo-imperialist ritual; and it was quickly adopted by the Italian Fascist Party." The inventors of the Olympic Games, the ancient Greeks did not know this salute, while the Romans even prohibited these "Greek Games". So, it concerns here a pure Italian fascist custom, adopted by Hitler and the Dutch fascist party (NSB) from 1925 onward and as Olympic salute it was the best advertisement for Mussolini et al. It is, therefore, impossible that three years later, even in socialist Amsterdam, the authorities were unaware of this Europe-wide custom. It is quite mysterious why one defended this *after* 1945 by means of a series of lies and did not listen to the protests. *Wikipedia*: "Use of this salute is currently a criminal offense in Germany, Slovakia and Austria." Not in Amsterdam directly after 1945 and still not in 2018.
- 2 Quoted on the front-page of the popular Amsterdam paper *De Echo-Zuid*, 7 March 2018. The protest and its rabbinical legitimation is accepted by the Neighborhood Council (Wijkraad) in its meeting of the 26th of February. The protest has been forward now to the city government and the central Community Council; to be continued.
- 3 Hans Derks, *DW* (2001), with numerous interesting reactions. See my website www.hderks.dds.nl under "Biography", "Bibliography" and "discussions-1.html".
- 4 *Idem*, *HA* (2004).
- 5 *Idem*, *HOP* (2012).
- 6 See the René Schlott review of Reinhard Rürup's new publication in: *H-Soz-u-Kult* 29-0-2014.
- 7 Anthony Hazard Jr (2012) describes the history of the anti-racism campaigns of the UNESCO from the 1950's declarations onwards, of the continuous and serious criticism from, in particular, the USA which lead to a revision in 1951 and to a third declaration on race/Rasse/razza etc. in 1967. The serious race and racist troubles in the USA (Little Rock etc.) lead to the *Civil Rights Act* (1964), which in turn made the new UNESCO declaration possible. Until today the relationship UNESCO – USA remains troubled (since 2011 the USA has not paid its obligatory financial support): *race* remains at the center of this antagonism.

- 8 Clarence Gravlee, Elizabeth Sweet (2008).
9 Idem, p. 29.
10 This is in any case appropriate for the medicine of the Dutch *Sandoz* company I am invited to take now (Lisinopril, made in Germany). The insert claims that the following persons must be more careful with it: “negroid people from Afro-Caribbean origin do have a greater risk of developing sudden concentrations of moisture in the skin ... difficulties with respiration ... itching ... and therefore a less effective Sandoz medicine.” etc. What luck that I belong to the ‘white race’ so that I have to scratch less!
- 11 Doris Kaufmann (Ed., 2000). See in ch. 5 the scandals surrounding the Debye case and Philip Ball (2013).
12 Machteld Roede (2002). Still there remain hardliners like the forensic anthropologists. See Jonathan Marks (2008), p. 258 note 9. Now Myriam Spörri (2013) provides the latest research on the direct relationship blood – race (Rasse) and its metaphorical use with all possible consequences.
13 Bernhard Slicher van Bath (1941, 1949), p. 5.
14 Peter Novick (2000).
15 Eva Hoffman, The Uses of Hell, in: *The New York Review of Books*, 9-03-2000, p. 19 ff. The reactions to her review from Peter Novick, the reporter Tad Szulc and the unavoidable Steven T. Katz are given in *Idem*, 15-06-2000, p. 78 ff. In fact, Katz’s contribution was more remarkable, as he is the inventor of the much criticised idea, “The German Genocide is unique” (published in a 1994 book as the Rwanda genocide happened and several other 20th-century genocides could have been discussed). He is also one of the US-supports behind the Yad Vashem policies (see end of this book). In Peter Novick’s book (p. 196 ff.) Katz is very harshly criticised with the right arguments, but here Katz does not spend a single word on his defence, but starts to attack Eva Hoffman about a miniscule remark. It is a pity that he blunders again, according to Hoffman, by using a wrong definition of genocide.

Definitions

It is self-evident that in the following book many concepts are needed to present the arguments and the problems concerned. A few of them have been contextualised or scrutinised so often that their basic characteristics should be given beforehand. Repetition will be avoided in this way and the aim of the book can be confirmed. In particular, it is hoped that one of the evils of much academic work (including my own) can be minimised: to produce dangerous, abstract generalisations, let alone those beyond every proof or reasonable proportionality.

In a book about the basic features of the dramatic relationships between perpetrators and their victims in our time generalisations are too often used as tools of the former with serious consequences for the latter. To be concrete as possible is one remedy against it; another is to be clear and consequent in the language used.

The following definitions should be seen as *preliminary* in several respects. Some of them like *race*, are excellently discussed in *Wikipedia* with wide-ranging explanations. It is unavoidable that some are the same as given below, but mostly they are different. It is, therefore, advisable to consult this source before reading or using the following definitions. They are also scrutinised in the chapters to come.

As a starting point, I want to give the following example. In an otherwise interesting and relevant study, an American sociologist recently defined three of these concepts as follows:

The terms *race*, *ethnicity*, and *nationality* ... are related social categories ... By *ethnicity* I refer to differences between individuals and groups in skin colour, language, religion, culture, national origin/nationality, or sometimes geographic region. Ethnicity subsumes both nationalism and race. Current notions of *race* are centred exclusively on visible (usually skin colour) distinctions among populations, although its historical origins and usage were broader and included religious and linguistic groups (such as Jews or the Irish) who were considered to be "races". *Nationalism* commonly is viewed as a particular kind of ethnically based social identity or movement generally involving claims to statehood or political autonomy, and most often rooted in assertions of cultural distinctiveness, a unique history, and ethnic or racial purity."¹

Let's scrutinise these definitions, and in the following chapters many kinds of detail and new (counter)arguments shall be discussed.

Race

The definition of the concept: *race* is hardly discussed in zoology, but complications arise thanks to its application to human systems. Its history starts, first and foremost, not with German theories and practices, but with American or Anglo-Saxon scholars like Francis Galton (1822–1911), Houston Chamberlain (1855–1927), Madison Grant (1865–1937), Charles Davenport (1866–1944; see chapter 7), Lothrop Stoddard (1883–1950), their many influential American pupils and the thinking and practices they introduced.²

Its daily use in words like ‘race-riots’ or ‘racism’ is not very complicated. It cannot be defined logically and technically as *Wikipedia’s* main definition: “Race is a classification system used to categorise humans ...”. It will be possible eventually to create some classification system by means of races or racial characteristics, but that is *not* in itself a race: apparently, its application to humans became so controversial that it remains empty!

The OED or Webster’s provide so many uses over time that they confuse more than they enlighten. The latter dictionary tries to do this by discussing a synonymous relation between “Race, Nation and People”, but cannot indicate what is similar among the three items, except that they are all mixed up in popular use. This is not very helpful without an in-depth discussion. In addition, the English/American language distinction creates special difficulties.

Whatever it is, in our case here it concerns “the common physical characteristics of a rather large human population”, but, for instance, all people with brown hair or eyes do not form a race. Something should be added to this definition; not even all brown dogs form a race. What if brown hair stems from a specific genetic combination? Or: are people with brown hair deemed “less valuable” – say, “typically cowards” – compared to people with black, blond or red hair? Should they all be killed because of this quality? Do they then form a race? It is only a matter of definition, but there must be a chance to make one!

How it is defined in Cashmore’s dictionary is a good example of how complicated the case is.³ Its development is divided here over two articles called ‘perspective one’ (Michael Banton) and ‘perspective two’ (Pierre L. van den Berghe). The authors are both social scientists and experts on the subject.

The first describes the history of the concept in the sense of not what ‘race’ is but the way it is used from the beginning of the sixteenth century when it first appeared in the English language.⁴ From then until early in the 19th century “it was used primarily to refer to common features present because of shared descent.” The chief paradigm for explaining this was given by the Old Testament, which furnished genealogies tracing the peopling of the world as

part of God's design, as caused by environmental differences or as arising from different original ancestors.

In the 19th century secularisation changed all this definitively: not theology but new secular sciences took over the *power to define* as the first step to creating all kinds of categories for various aims, as differentiated as there were sciences available. A fundamental element was the controversy between the supporters of Lamarck and Darwin.⁵ Making zoological classifications fit legal or social purposes became a large part of every scientific work, and *race* became the subject of it as well.

In anatomy and biology, the French (Cuvier, Lamarck etc.) developed race "in the sense of type as designating species of men distinct both in physical constitution and mental capacities".⁶ Types were thought to be permanent, while the origin of these types depended to a substantial degree on environmental (external) influences.

This approach remained largely an intellectual activity, but formed "the core of the doctrines often designated 'scientific racism'". It is mainly a continental European way of thinking and was largely superseded in the 1880s by the Anglo-Saxon Darwinian model: in Cashmore's dictionary Lamarckism is not mentioned at all, notwithstanding the fact that it was much more popular than Darwinism until about 1860 and later had influential supporters like Hackel, Spencer etc.⁷

Darwin's work became of pivotal importance for the spread of *race*. Contrary to the French approach, Darwin demonstrated that no forms in nature were permanent, while "the physical differences between people stem from their inheriting different genes" (internal condition). *Race* became a synonym for subspecies or a subdivision of a species, distinctive only because its members are geographically isolated from other individuals of the same species.

Darwin's theory of natural selection and the modern establishment of genetics resulted in many kinds of classifications used to racially profile people according to physical and psychological characteristics.

Because Darwin's theory was adapted for social and legal purposes as *Social Darwinism*, which was not the case with Lamarckism, it became much more important for the development not only of *race*, but for *Rasse* as well (see below). Lamarckism was ridiculed in the well-known picture of the giraffe which got his long neck thanks to reaching always to the highest leaves in the trees. Guillaumin, therefore, concluded rightly:

The idea of race as a natural group was given legal status in the twentieth century, especially, but not exclusively, by the countries practising Nazism and apartheid. But it began in the racial classification of the nineteenth century.⁸ [And earlier she stipulated as present situation in this history] ... the present

fashion for introducing biological considerations into the human sciences is not so much a new approach as a survival of the traditional naturalist attitude. Such an attitude makes groups into fetishes, frozen into some intrinsic form of 'being' and possessing qualities which – whether flattering or damaging – are in any case eternal. This is what lies at the heart of the idea that human groups are 'natural' entities or 'races' ... genetically distinct and therefore ... closed entities fixed unchangeably both in nature and in law ...⁹

In Pierre L. van den Berghe's second perspective the immanent intellectual difficulties with *race* become apparent. He defines the actual use of the concept rather than the historical development. Two highly important warnings are mentioned first:

- a. Over the last forty to fifty years ... it became increasingly clear that no meaningful taxonomy of human races was possible. Not only were numerous groups not classifiable ... physical anthropologists could not agree ... as to where the genetic boundaries between human groups were to be drawn, or even on how many such groups there were.
- b. It is also important to note that not all societies recognise social races. In fact, the great majority of human societies have not used physical phenotypes as the basis of group distinctions ... Societies that recognise social races are invariably racist societies ... Race and racism thus go hand in hand.

In particular the performance of the physical or biological anthropologist in forming the race-concept (and, therefore, racism) is highlighted; the 'argument' for the superiority of one group over another. This is often called 'pseudo-science' and not without good reason.

Earlier, all anthropologists spoke of races in the sense of subspecies within the popular overall tripartite division of Negroid, Mongoloid and Caucasoid; nowadays the physical anthropologists mostly qualify race as a nonsensical concept.¹⁰ Van den Berghe points, however, to the following characteristics:

The essential condition for subspeciation is breeding isolation, often maintained by ecological barriers. Humans, on the contrary, have migrated over large distances and interbred extensively for thousand of years. Especially with the maritime expansion of Europe starting five centuries ago, this process of interbreeding has greatly accelerated, thereby blurring 'racial' boundaries, and contributing more than ever to the genetic homogenization of our species.¹¹

In the following texts, this bio-anthropological approach in particular, partly modernised through DNA research, will be scrutinised historically, politically and practically because the backgrounds of the contexts used are still not well known.

Since the UNESCO declarations of about 1950–75 the physical or biological anthropologist officially may have dropped the race concept as a consequence of the terrible practices in the past committed by earlier colleagues so famous for their skull and other measurements or ideological standpoints, but they are only active to defend their abandonment of *race* by accident.

These physical anthropologists do not define *race* as a group of people who are *socially* defined in a given society as belonging together because of *physical markers*, such as skin pigmentation etc. For example, ‘blacks’ in South Africa or Australia, whatever the similar *social* position, are “no more closely related genetically to each other than each of them is to the whites”. If, nowadays, *social* scientists should, for instance, use the *race* concept other than in the several literary senses mentioned in Webster’s (which also refers to “great popular misunderstanding or misuse”), they use it only in the sense of “a social group defined by somatic visibility”.

In the following texts, therefore, I prefer the use of *Rasse*, because the basic material of my stories is derived mostly from the historical period of the Nazi regime (1933–45). In those cases it is impossible to perceive it as a biologically nonsensical concept, because it ‘killed’ far more than six million people (see below under *German Genocide*).

Rasse

The excellent lexicon of Cornelia Schmitz-Berning defines *Rasse* as “Zentrales Schlüsselwort des Nationalsozialismus ... Grundpfeiler nationalsozialistischer Weltanschauung, die Ideologie der Höchstwertigkeit der Arier, des Untermenschentums ... und für die Rassenhygiene mit ihrem nordischen Zuchtziel.” (‘*Rasse* is the central keyword of National Socialism ... basis of the National-Socialist world-view, the ideology of the superior value of the Aryans and of the inferiority of other humans ... it is, as well, a keyword for the racial hygiene [eugenics] aimed at a Nordic way of breeding.’).¹²

Hans-Walter Schmuhl extrapolates this and arrives at:

In the last resort, the Third Reich aimed as such to command life. In accordance with Michel Foucault it is possible to perceive National Socialism as a bio-political dictatorship – in-development aiming to control birth and death, sexuality and procreation ... to purify the genetic basis of the population from all ‘uncleanliness’ in order to create the most perfect ‘Volks-body’.¹³

This may be exaggerated, but it was the logical consequence of the combination of military power and bio-politics; in other words, of the combination of

any authoritarian and scientific (medical, biological etc.) power. This is often compared with the much-discredited combination of Stalinism plus Lysenko: Lysenkoism was built on theories of the heritability of acquired characteristics applicable to agriculture. This is *already* similar to the present gen-technical manipulations of Monsanto and related companies using loopholes in political arrangements to drive home their products against all possible opposition in order to gain a monopoly in agricultural production.

Schmitz-Berning provides a long article about the history of the German *Rasse* concept in which she drew attention to the role of Moses Hess (1812–1875), who is considered a forerunner of zionism. She quoted extensively from Hess's main work, *Rome and Jerusalem*, as he was a true *Rasse*-theoretician: one of the first to point to Aryans and Semites as mutually complementing factors in social life.

The mixture of *Rasse* should be the basis of the modern world; the hate against jews is a racially-based hate; his cultural historical theory was based on the “natural antagonism of the *Rasse* among the world-historical Völker”; or: “The Germans hate the jewish religion much less than their *Rasse*, their original belief less than their original nose.”¹⁴

This kind of pseudo-scientific usage appeared earlier than the political keyword *antisemitism* (*Antisemitismus*; used as such for the first time after 1870). As the lexicon indicates, after 1933 nearly 40 words with *Rasse* were used in daily speech each with a specific aspect or function.¹⁵

They were added to an already existing stock of concepts like *Rassenhygiene* coined in 1895 by the internationally well-known biological-anthropologist Alfred Ploetz as “science of the optimal sustenance and development of *Rasse*”.¹⁶

It is the German translation of *Eugenics* which was coined in 1883 by Francis Galton (1822–1911), a nephew of Darwin and the one who ‘translated’ Darwin’s concepts into social politics with all its possible pseudo-scientific consequences: instead of Darwin’s ‘natural selection’ came Galton’s, Ploetz’s etc. ‘artificial selection’ organised by scientific and state-bureaucratic interests. This was in no way confined to the subject of ‘jews’.

Mainly through the eugenic channels in *all* Western countries, the ideas and practices related to *superior(ity) versus inferior(ity)* antagonisms in the race-question were spread with devastating consequences in both directions. The first *Rasse*-law in the new Germany was related to eugenic measures; *das Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses* of July 1933.

Large-scale programmes for sterilisation, castrations, euthanasia, and killings were carried out in the hope of getting rid of criminals, sick, deaf, blind, alcoholics etc. in order to purify the *Rasse*.