

In 'dit dorp' komt Brijnen van Houten uiteraard weer terecht in het inlichtingenwerk en dreigt betrokken te raken bij het beruchte *Englandspiel*, waarbij vele Nederlandse agenten vanuit Engeland boven ons land werden gedropt. Op tijd haakt hij af omdat hij inziet dat de geplande opzet absoluut niet deugt en de hele onderneming wel op een fiasco moest uitlopen. Zo waren verschillende medewerkers die bij deze operatie betrokken waren, niet lang daarvoor nog lid van de NSB. Het resultaat is genoegzaam bekend, want de meeste gedropte agenten worden door de *Abwehr* en de *Sicherheitsdienst* gearresteerd.

Toch overtuigt zijn eindconclusie inzake het *Englandspiel* mij niet helemaal. Was nu alles te wijten aan fouten en blunders zowel aan Britse als Nederlandse zijde? Ik vraag het mij sterk af. Vooral omdat de laatste tijd toch meer en meer gegevens op tafel komen waaruit blijkt dat diezelfde Britse geheime diensten wel degelijk wisten waarmee ze bezig waren. De meest recente onthullingen wijzen er namelijk op dat al die agenten bewust zijn opgeofferd teneinde 'hogere' doelen te realiseren.

Brijnen van Houten blijft in Londen bij het inlichtingenwerk betrokken en bemoeit zich vooral met de veiligheid in de havens en speciaal op de Nederlandse schepen. Later in de oorlog gaat hij op het ministerie van binnenlandse zaken bij het bureau documentatie een enorm kaartsysteem aanleggen met gegevens over ruim 125.000 'foute' Nederlanders. Dit kaartsysteem had de basis moeten worden van de naoorlogse zuiveringen die volgens Brijnen van Houten op 'een droevig stemmende puinhoop' zijn uitgelopen. Na de bevrijding gaat hij zich actief bemoeien met die zuivering maar al snel haakt hij af. De 'kleintjes' worden gepakt en de 'groten' blijven vrij rond lopen. Deze frustratie van velen in het oud-verzet wordt door hem opnieuw bevestigd. Zijn ervaringen met de parlementaire enquête commissie voor de periode 1940-1945 komen dan ook overeen met die van vele anderen. De goede vragen werden nooit gesteld en men trok 'steevast het laasje naast het goede open'. Het zijn dit soort typering en vooral zijn fraaie schets van het tijdsbeeld in de Londense periode die het boek boeiend maken. Echte nieuwe feiten of onthullingen moet men echter niet verwachten.

C. Wiebes

R. G. Moore, *Refugees from Nazi Germany in the Netherlands 1933-1940* (Studies in Social History IX; Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1986, xiv + 241 blz., f150,-, ISBN 90 247 3276 X).

The study of refugees from Nazi Germany has developed intensely during the past fifteen years. Bob Moore's Ph. D. dissertation, on Jewish and political refugees in the Netherlands, illuminates the Dutch angle of the problem. It is composed systematically of two parts—the first concerning Jewish refugees, the second concerning political refugees. Each part is again subdivided into two: one subsection deals with numbers of emigrants and relief organizations, the other with government policies. Moore's basic assumptions are: 1. that the Netherlands provides the best test case for the checking of the problematics of the German refugee question in the 1930's (because of vicinity and links and because of the existing source material). 2. that 'the basic aim must-be to try and examine the 1930s without reference to the 1940s' (39). At first glance Moore's book could be considered a welcome and important contribution to 'Exil'-research. However, a more thorough examination leads us to another evaluation.

Although the book is entitled *Refugees ...in the Netherlands*, it concerns itself primarily with

'government policies' in a limited sense. A wide range of aspects and questions which are of decisive importance for understanding the problem are missing or remain unanswered primarily because Moore's sources — impressive as though they may seem at first glance — are quite restricted of scope. The author did not consult oral history, did not examine many archives of importance (such as the archives of Jewish communities in Holland and Jewish organizations whose archives are to be found in Israel), did not systematically check newspapers and periodicals and did not try to analyze 'Exilliteratur' (for example: Konrad Merz, Frits Heymann, Erich Kuttner).

This would not have been of decisive importance for our evaluation if this study would have been the first one in this field. However, most of the primary sources were checked and used in previous studies on refugees in Holland.

In this context another surprising fact catches the eye. Among the 128 titles which the author mentions in his list of secondary sources only ten were published after 1977, and of these, only three deal with the refugee problem in Holland. This can certainly not be due to lack of research on the topic after 1977. To mention only two important publications: H. Wuerzner, ed., *Zur deutschen Exilliteratur in den Niederlanden 1933-1940* (1977); J. A. Hoeksma, *Tussen vrees en vervolging. Een inleiding in het vluchtelingenrecht* (1982). A vast amount of comparative literature concerning German refugees in other countries, particularly France, has been published during this period. Of special importance are also general books and surveys such as those of H. Strauss, ed., *Biographisches Handbuch der deutschsprachigen Emigration nach 1933, I-III* (1980-1983), and W. Fruehwald, W. Schieder, *Leben im Exil* (1981).

Thus, to our regret, no real new insights are suggested in this study. The division of government policies into stages (1933-1934, 1934-1937/1938, 1938-1940 with a subdivision after 'Chrystal Night') remains the same as in previous studies and information concerning relief organizations, their scope and forms of activity, is almost identical to that which had previously appeared. The chapters concerning the SPD and KPD are quite restricted, while exactly this part should have been extended, because research on leftist refugees was until now quite limited.

Some basic problems are not fully explored. Such for example, is the question of the true number of refugees who entered Holland (5). In this case Moore seems unaware of the most important, although somewhat problematic, source: *Statistiek der bevolking van joodschen bloede* (1942), which makes a clear distinction between 'Jews' who came to Holland before and after 1933. We miss also an in-depth analysis of the formation of government policies in the wake of 'Reichskristallnacht'. In the section dealing with political refugees we miss a critical approach to certain central documents, (such as Alfred Meusel's reports) or literature (the author quotes uncriticized a statement which claims that the further flight of political refugees from the Netherlands to the United States was an 'abandonment of the 'faith' and ... [a] surrender in the struggle against the Nazis' (112)). Methodologically wrong is Moore's tendency to use the term 'political refugees' only for left-wing activists, neglecting the tiny but important group of anti-Fascist intellectuals who were politically unorganized. Similarly, the section about Jewish refugees lacks an in-depth discussion of 'non-Aryan Christians' (although mentioned in the introduction). This is the result of the lack of elaboration on the problematics of the 'refugee dictionary' ('vluchteling', 'emigrant', 'uitgewekene' etc.) in the introduction.

Moore's claim to originality is that he regards the refugee problem of the 1930's as a problem unto itself, disregarding its impact on the 1940's. He is indeed correct that certain scholars, such as De Jong, deal with the problem as apart of the introduction to the occupation period. However, this is not true for all of them, and least of all for the present reviewer's Ph. D. dissertation (the

Hebrew University in Jerusalem, 1978). We have never implied or suggested in our dissertation — as Moore claims — 'a clear and direct line of progression from the 1 April 1933 boycott of Jewish shops to the extermination camps in Poland in 1942' (5) — otherwise, what would have been the reason for Germany to support emigration? But what becomes clear from his attitude is, that he denies the fact that the fate of the Jews fleeing from Nazi Germany in the 1930's belongs to the 'Holocaust *period*' (a now widely accepted 'terminus technicus' for the 'History of the Jews during the Nazi period'). The acceptance of our perception does not imply in any way that the shadow of the 1940's is necessarily cast upon the 1930's, and that before Moore's study the refugee problem had not been examined upon the background and in the framework of the 1930's.

This leads us to a point of academic relevance. When surveying former research literature on the refugee problem, Moore refers laconically to the reviewer's Ph. D. dissertation, and states that it 'deals in *some detail* (my underlining D. M.) with the organization of refugee relief, government attitudes and the role of public opinion, but in spite of an English abstract, the actual Hebrew text of the work makes it inaccessible to many scholars' (4).

One should note that our thesis, as one can read in its English list of contents, is much more comprehensive and extensive than mentioned by Moore; a *lengthy* English abstract was added; and articles based on it were published in English, German and Dutch. The apparatus, of which a great deal was written in Latin characters, is also open to scholars.

In conclusion, Moore's book is to be considered only as a useful handbook and introduction to the refugee problem in the Netherlands for those who are linguistically limited to English. It is a pity that a study which could have initiated a fertile debate on the Netherlands and the refugees is not revealing and not giving new interpretations; however — contrary to former studies — it is historiographically regressive, looking once again upon refugees as mere objects of policies and singling out 'political history' instead of exercising 'total history'.

D. Michman

D. C. L. Schoonoord, *De mariniersbrigade 1943-1949. Wording en inzet in Indonesië* (Dissertatie Universiteit van Amsterdam; 's-Gravenhage: Afdeling maritieme historie van de marine-staf, 1988, xvii + 413 blz., f25,-, ISBN 90 71957 13 6); A. P. de Graaff, *De heren worden bedankt. Met het vergeten leger in Indië, 1949-1950* (Franeker: T. Wever, 1986, 174 blz., f19,95, ISBN 90 6135 410 2); *Idem, De weg terug. Het vergeten leger toen en nu* (Franeker: Van Wijnen, 1988, 124 blz., f18,75, ISBN 90 5194 003 3); *Idem, Brieven uit het veld. Het vergeten leger thuis* (Franeker: Van Wijnen, 1989, 128 blz., ISBN 90 5194 030 0).

Het conflict in Indonesië tussen 1945 en 1950 was een complex gebeuren, waarin factoren van machtspolitieke en ideologische aard zich op vele niveaus deden gelden. Het gaf niet alleen ruim emploti aan politici, bestuurders en diplomaten, maar bood ook de militairen aan beide zijden van de demarcatielijnen volop gelegenheid om hun vaardigheden te demonstreren.

Het verbale karakter van het politieke bedrijfsleven er wellicht de oorzaak van, dat tot dusverre juist hiernaar de aandacht van de geschiedschrijvers is uitgegaan. Veel materiaal van hoog analytisch gehalte ligt als het ware in de archieven en publicaties gereed voor verdere evaluatie. Met de militaire kant van het verhaal is het anders gesteld. Zeker, er is veel en in de regel zeer gedetailleerd materiaal aanwezig over de afzonderlijke acties, maar het beredeneerde overzicht