

Dealing with Jewish residents and Jewish property in the municipality of Nijkerk

DURING AND AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR



“

“I had to fight in order to be able to sell my parents’ property lawfully”

Research commissioned by the municipality of Nijkerk

This research was conducted by Dr Anton van Renssen of Historytelling of Nijkerk.

Researcher and author: Dr Anton van Renssen

The copyright of this publication belongs to the commissioning party: the municipality of Nijkerk

Illustration on cover: Synagoge Nijkerk, by Frans Kragt Hzn., 1955 (collection Jan Bijvank)

Table of contents

Chapter 1	Introduction.....	5
Chapter 2	Assignment and conclusions.....	7
Chapter 3	Justification of the research method used.....	11
	Step-by-step plan.....	11
	Verkaufsbücher and Jewish Farmlands Database.....	12
	Municipal archives and the (digital) land registry.....	13
	Netherlands Property Administration Institute.....	13
	Land registry ledgers.....	14
	Again: digital land registry.....	14
	Notarial archive.....	14
	NIOD: files of liquidated Nijkerk-based companies.....	14
	Joodsmonument.nl and Jokos files.....	15
	Jewish Agricultural Land Database.....	15
	Restoration of rights.....	15
Chapter 4	Deprivation of rights, clearance of houses and taxes.....	17
	Nijkerk and the occupying forces.....	17
	Reclamation along the river Laak.....	18
	Deprivation of rights.....	19
	Property transactions in the Gelders Archief (Gelderland Provincial Archive).....	21
	Vacant homes and clearances.....	22
	Role of Municipal Public Works Department in clearances.....	22
	Monitoring of vacant properties.....	23
	Rental of vacated homes.....	24
	Taxes paid.....	26
	Agricultural land.....	27
	Liquidation of Jewish businesses and property.....	27
Chapter 5	Restoration of rights.....	30
	Liberation and administrators.....	30
	Returnees in Nijkerk.....	31

Dealing with municipal staff	34
Tax assessments for the years of occupation	34
Cost of repairs	35
Restoration of rights and sale of immovable property	35
Restoration of rights of Jos de Liver	36
Restoration of rights Aaltje Speyer-Fortuijn.....	37
Restoration of rights various persons.....	38
Meiling family	39
Municipal councillor Klaas Visscher	40
Purchase of property and land by the municipality.....	40
Reversing the liquidation of companies	41
Affairs of E. Cohen's heirs	43
Closing words	44
Consulted sources and literature	46

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The mayor of Nijkerk, Zwaantinus Bruins Slot, knew it for sure in December 1947: the municipality of Nijkerk carried out ‘no works’ for the Germans during the war. It had, of course, received assignments that it should have carried out.¹ Bruins Slot himself had held off for as long as he could, and he only went into hiding – on two occasions – when he felt he had no other option. As soon as Nijkerk was liberated on 20 April 1945, he returned and resumed his duties as mayor. More than six years earlier, on 15 February 1939, he had taken office as mayor there at the age of 35. It was his first municipality.

It is known that immovable property owned by Jewish Dutch citizens was stolen by the occupying forces and forcibly sold. The central question in this research is how the municipalities of Nijkerk and Hoevelaken dealt with immovable property owned by Jewish Dutch citizens. Is Bruins Slot's assertion from December 1947 correct? Did the municipality of Nijkerk indeed refrain from buying and selling homes and commercial property and farmland belonging to Jewish Dutch citizens during the Second World War? Was the municipality involved in restoration of the rights of its Jewish residents? And how did the municipality behave towards survivors and relatives of victims after the liberation?

Municipal boundaries

To gain insight into the state of affairs within the municipality of Nijkerk, research was conducted into Jewish property holdings in the municipality of Nijkerk. This also covers properties in the former municipality of Hoevelaken. However, nothing appears to be known about Jewish property ownership in Hoevelaken. In contrast with Nijkerk, Hoevelaken had no Jewish residents during the Second World War. A search in the digitised Verkaufsbücher, an important source for property transactions during the occupation, showed no transactions in Hoevelaken. Only three files relating to Hoevelaken were found in the Netherlands Property Administration Institute (*Nederlandse Beheersinstituut*, NBI), but those files did not concern Jews. Two experts from Hoevelaken also argued that there were no Jews living in Hoevelaken, nor was there any immovable property in Jewish hands. While there may be more to this than meets the eye, it is highly unlikely that there were any Jewish properties in the former municipality of Hoevelaken.² The search for Jewish property during the war in Hoevelaken was therefore ended.

The researcher and the supervisory committee

This research was conducted by Dr Anton van Renssen, historian in Nijkerk. In his research, he was supervised by a committee. This consisted, in alphabetical order, of the following people:

- Sonja de Leeuw – emeritus professor of Media Culture, Utrecht University and representative of the *Nederlands-Israëlitische Gemeente Amersfoort* (Dutch-Israelite Community Amersfoort, NIGA)
- Ab van Straalen - physiotherapist and someone with a lot of knowledge on Jewish Nijkerk, author of several publications
- Dieter van de Castel – former civil-law notary
- Saskia van den Berg-Ebbenhorst – curator Museum Nijkerk and project secretary
- Marlous Diederiks – heritage adviser municipality of Nijkerk
- Dion van Hooren – archivist municipality of Nijkerk

¹ GAN, Minutes of the municipal council meeting, 3 December 1947, p.39.

² This is confirmed by the historian Maarten Doude van Troostwijk, MA from Hoevelaken and the former civil-law notary Aart Veldhuizen, LLM born in Hoevelaken: email to author, 26 October 2022.

- Stefan Staartjes - policy advisor municipality of Nijkerk, supervisory committee chairperson

Structure of this report

This report consists of five chapters. The structure was borrowed from the report on restoration of rights in the municipality of Apeldoorn.³ This introduction is followed by the assignment and conclusions in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 contains an explanation of the approach of this research. Chapter 4 deals with the deprivation of Jewish property rights and agricultural land rights, the clearance of homes in Nijkerk, the liquidation of Jewish businesses, the role of the Municipal Public Works Department and the handling of municipal taxes. Wherever possible, a chronological order of events will be used in this chapter. This applies in particular to the decision to first deal with the deprivation of property rights and thereafter the clearance of homes occupied by Jews. This choice means that components from various research questions are dealt with interchangeably. Chapter 5 deals with the restoration of rights after the war.

Wartime history and persecution of Jews in Nijkerk

As in the rest of the Netherlands, there is great interest in local history during and after the Second World War in Nijkerk. This applies to a great extent to the history of the Jewish community in this town in the Veluwe region. Ab van Straalen has written extensively about the history of the Jewish community in '*Van jubileum naar catastrofe. De Joodse gemeenschap van Nijkerk in de periode 1926-1945*' (From anniversary to catastrophe. The Jewish community of Nijkerk in the period 1926-1945). However, the attitude of the municipal authorities during the war was barely discussed for a long time, especially in relation to Jewish residents.

The municipality of Nijkerk, like all other Dutch municipalities, also complied with the request of the German occupying forces to provide the addresses of Jewish residents. In doing so, the municipality of Nijkerk also unwittingly contributed to the ingenious way – due to its concealed nature – in which the Germans structured the persecution of Jews in Dutch municipalities.⁴ Mayor Bruins Slot was unaware of the fact that the Germans were playing such a game, Rachel Hamburger argued in 2002.⁵ She was one of the few survivors of the Nijkerk Jewish community after the war.

People had known about the guiding role played by mayor Zwaantinus Bruins Slot for a long time, but it was not until 2020 that more detailed information about this was published.⁶ However, hardly anything was known about the handling of the property and possessions of the Jewish residents of Nijkerk who were murdered and of those who returned. It is one of the reasons why this research is taking place, following research conducted in other municipalities across the country.

³ W. van Meurs, P. Slaman and M. Oprel (et al.), '*Joodse burgers in Apeldoorn: onteigening en rechtsherstel*' (Jewish citizens in Apeldoorn: dispossession and restoration of rights) (Nijmegen, March 2022).

⁴ R. Schütz, De administratieve verhulling van het lot van vervolgd tijdens de Endlösung. Bureaucratische paradoxen bij het registreren, verhullen en vernietigen van persoonsgegevens, in: *Tijdschrift voor geschiedenis*, (The administrative concealment of the fate of the persecuted during the Final Solution. Bureaucratic paradoxes in the registration, concealment and destruction of personal data) 135.1 (2022) 44.

⁵ Jos Bouten, 'Wat is Nijkerk mooi geworden. Rachel Salomon-Hamburger op zoek naar Joods verleden', (How beautiful Nijkerk has become. Rachel Salomon-Hamburger looking for her Jewish past) publication medium unknown, 2002.

⁶ A. van Rensen, *Gekop. Hoe burgemeester Zwaantinus Bruins Slot Nijkerk de oorlog doorloofde*' (How mayor Zwaantinus Bruins Slot guided Nijkerk through the war) (Nijkerk, 2020).

Chapter 2

Assignment and conclusions

The grounds for this research into the role of the municipality with regard to deprivation and restoration of rights arose in 2019. At the time, the Central Jewish Council in the Netherlands (*Centraal Joods Overleg*) asked all municipalities with a former Jewish community to conduct such research. Six years earlier, a discovery in the Amsterdam archives had revealed that after the war, fines had been unjustly imposed on Amsterdam citizens returning from concentration camps, imprisonment or hiding for non-payment of ground rent.⁷ The City of Amsterdam started research into its own actions, conducted by the NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies. The municipalities of The Hague, Rotterdam and Utrecht followed suit. More and more municipalities are following the call for this research. In spring 2020, the journalistic platform Pointer published about the deprivation of rights and theft of Jewish property during the Second World War. This was a stimulus for many municipalities to commission such research.

Various studies have revealed that Jewish survivors and relatives often had to go to great lengths to recover their possessions.⁸ There were also instances where additional tax assessments were levied for periods in which the Jewish owners had been unable to occupy the properties due to deportation. The question is whether such situations also occurred in the municipality of Nijkerk. The research concerns homes owned by Jewish Dutch citizens, as well as commercial property and land ownership.

The research question is divided into four sub-questions. The first two questions concern the administrative responsibility of the municipality of Nijkerk in dealing with Jewish property during the war and other deprivation of rights, such as furniture theft. Did the municipality buy immovable property, including at an excessively low price, as often occurred? The last two questions focus on the attitude of the municipality of Nijkerk regarding the restoration of rights after the war. The research also covers people who were involved with the municipality of Nijkerk as employees or councillors. Because the ownership of immovable property of Jews in Nijkerk was limited, a decision was made to draw up an inventory of all the property.

Questions

1. In what ways was the municipality of Nijkerk involved in the sale, deprivation or acquisition of Jewish private and/or commercial immovable property during the Second World War?
2. In what ways was the municipality involved in the deprivation of rights of Jewish residents of Nijkerk during the Second World War? This may include (as an example, but not limited to) the role of municipal services such as the Municipal Public Works Department and the police. It also includes the role of the municipality as an employer.
3. If the municipality obtained properties through the forced sale or deprivation of rights of Jewish residents, what was its role in dealing with them after the Second World War? How did the municipality act after the Second World War in the case of the restoration of rights to immovable property belonging to Jewish residents of Nijkerk that had been sold or leased to third parties? This includes the role of municipal services, such as the municipal housing service and mental health services, and the reception of returned Nijkerk Jews.
4. Did the municipality impose any form of tax (such as street tax and sewerage charges) or other costs (for home improvements, for example) on Jewish survivors or families of victims after the Second World War? This concerns

⁷ <https://www.amsterdam.nl/bestuur-organisatie/organisatie/overige/stichting-ita/>

⁸ M.-J. Vos and S. ter Braake, *Rechtsherstel na de Tweede Wereldoorlog van geroofd Joods onroerend goed* (Restoration of rights to looted Jewish property after World War II) (Amsterdam, 2013) 25.

levies or payments calculated for the time when they did not (or could not) make use of the plots in question themselves.

Conclusions about the deprivation of rights during the Second World War

1. In what way was the municipality of Nijkerk involved in the sale, deprivation of rights to or acquisition of Jewish private and/or commercial property during the Second World War?

The research shows that the municipality of Nijkerk was not involved in the sale of Jewish property or commercial properties belonging to Jewish owners during the Second World War. The municipality of Nijkerk occasionally mediated between new tenants and the new landlord who had bought or was managing the houses. The latter was done by the *Algemeen Nederlands Beheer van Onroerende Goederen* (General Dutch Property Management Authority, ANBO). This organisation sold a number of properties. It remained the manager of other properties and continued to collect rent from them. The mayor of Nijkerk once sought permission from the ANBO to allow a property, the rights to which had been deprived, to be rented by one of the officers of the municipality of Nijkerk.

A councillor's wife bought two houses from a Jewish resident. The municipal councillor in question was Klaas Visscher. It emerged after the war that he made that purchase on behalf of his wife at the request of the Jewish family.

Jewish businesses in Nijkerk were liquidated by order of the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.* This concerned small businesses. They were not put under management like large companies, but their activities were completely terminated by the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.* These were often businesses of Jewish owners who had their business attached to or close to their house. The municipality of Nijkerk played no role in this, except for providing information requested on commercial property by the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.*

2. In which way was the municipality involved in the deprivation of rights of Jewish residents of Nijkerk during the Second World War? This may include (as an example but not limited to) the role of municipal services such as the Municipal Public Works Department and the police. It also includes the role of the municipality as an employer.

The municipality of Nijkerk did not purchase or confiscate movable property from Jewish residents. However, the research does show that the municipality was involved in the clearance of homes occupied by Jews after the residents had gone into hiding or were taken away. The house clearances were usually ordered by organisations such as the ANBO, the *Niederländische Grundstückverwaltung* (NGV) or the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.* Requests or orders from these kinds of organisations were what Mayor Bruins Slot referred to after the war.

The clearance of Jewish homes was in the hands of the Municipal Public Works Department of the municipality of Nijkerk. An inventory of household effects from various houses was drawn up and stored by this department, so that the cleared houses could be rented out. This was done by order of the German authorities.

The Nijkerk branch of the military constabulary sealed vacant homes of Jewish citizens of Nijkerk in 1942 and 1943. Mayor Bruins Slot no longer had direct authority over the military constabulary by that time. The Germans did hold him responsible for maintaining public order. One of these public order tasks was ordering the clearance and sealing of Jewish homes.

As an employer, the municipality had to lay off one Jewish officer on redundancy pay. As far as we are aware, that redundancy pay was paid out until the deportation of this officer.

As far as we know, the municipality itself did not rent out any houses to Jewish citizens of Nijkerk. The only Jewish municipal officer who was dismissed lived in a rented house owned by a private citizen. However, on or shortly after the day this Jewish official was forced to leave, a colleague of his did make a request to the German authorities to be allowed to rent the house to a newly appointed municipal officer.

Head of the Municipal Public Works Department Evert van Rootselaar secured the household effects of Samuël de Liver, owner and occupant of Spoorstraat 30, by hiding them.

The possessions of the butcher Isaäk Hammelburg were buried in a milk can by the Visscher family and returned to the family after the war.

Conclusions on the restoration of rights

- 3. If the municipality obtained properties from forced sales or the deprivation of rights of Jewish residents, what was its role in dealing with them after the Second World War? How did the municipality act after the Second World War when restoring rights to immovable property that had been rented out to third parties? We include the role of municipal services in this, such as the municipal housing service and mental health services.**

The research shows that, as far as we know, the municipality of Nijkerk did not endeavour to restore immovable property to any returnees. For questions about immovable property, the municipality referred to the *Politieke Opsporings Dienst* (Political Investigation Service) in Harderwijk, civil-law notaries or administrators appointed by the NBI.

In most cases, matters were brought to an end through amicable settlements, although this sometimes took several years. In this respect, the way Nijkerk dealt with stolen Jewish property and Jewish possessions is no different from that of most other Dutch municipalities.

Two homes were bought by Ms Visscher-Van Koeverden, wife of municipal councillor Klaas Visscher, at the request of the Hammelburg family during the war. Both homes were permanently acquired by her in 1952 in return for payment of the increased value.

At the same time, the research shows that several Jewish residents of Nijkerk said they were received with indifference or outright coldness after their return. Some heirs of Jewish property owners have had an extremely difficult time in Nijkerk. Some could not return to their (parental) homes because other people lived there who had not been or could not be evicted. In other cases, tenants were evicted after legal proceedings. There was also a Jewish heiress who missed out on part of the lost rental income from a house owned by her father and rented out by the ANBO during and after the war. Other tenants, including the municipality of Nijkerk, did not pay rent on time. In the case of the municipality, this concerned the rent paid by the Social Services Department for a tenant of Nieuwstraat 12, owned by the Fortuijn family and, after the war, after restoration of rights, owned by Aaltje Speyer-Fortuijn.

The mention of the name of the Meiling family in various records concerning goods belonging to the Cohen family, and the purchase of a warehouse from the Fortuijn family after the war relates to two sons of the alderman Anthonie Meiling.

4. Did the municipality impose any form of tax (such as street tax or sewerage charges) or other costs (such as for home improvements) on Jewish survivors or families of victims after the Second World War? This concerns levies or payments calculated for the time when they did not (or could not) make use of the plots in question themselves.

The municipality of Nijkerk collected taxes from new owners of dispossessed Jewish properties during and after the war. The ANBO also paid those taxes during the war for homes subject to deprivation of rights it had rented out.

Tax assessments from the war years were not charged to heirs of the murdered Jews.

After the war, taxes were collected for post-war years from the prepared accounts of the absent Jews. This is evident from financial balance sheets that were drawn up by administrators appointed on behalf of the NBI. At the same time, rents for those properties were credited to those balance sheets.

After the ANBO was liquidated, outstanding assessments were declared irrecoverable by the municipality in 1947. Assessments from post-war years that had not been paid by the ANBO were transferred to administrators who were appointed to preside over the estates of absent Jews, most of whom had been murdered.

One case emerged during the research in which a tax assessment was imposed for the year 1944. That concerned land tax on the properties Singel 20 and Singel 22 belonging to the E. Cohen family, though that was a state tax.

No further information was found which indicates that the municipality charged other costs, such as for home improvements. As far as the latter is concerned, these were paid after the war from the current accounts the administrators managed. Those costs were partly reimbursed by the Dutch government.

As for Mayor Bruins Slot's remark from December 1947, with which this report begins: it is largely correct. Most actions taken by municipal officers involved following regulations of the German authorities. However, the municipality did take action quickly by asking the German authorities to rent the vacant rental house of municipal officer Mozes Spanjar again to a newly appointed municipal officer. Bruins Slot's post-war remark also does not apply as far as the cool reception of some returned Jewish residents of Nijkerk is concerned.

CHAPTER 3

Justification of the research method used

The structure of this academically sound research is based on the structure of research with similar questions conducted for other municipalities.

Step-by-step plan

1. Mapping out owners of plots and Jewish owners and war buyers
 - a. Jewish property owners during the war
 - b. Jewish owners of farmland during the war
2. Theft or forced sale of Jewish property
3. Restoration of rights after the war

By consulting other research and talking to researchers, it was possible to quickly draw up an initial selection of archives to be consulted. There are various types of archives. The first choice was archives of political and administrative bodies, as well as administrative and judicial archives.⁹ After consulting, among others, Prof Wim van Meurs, professor at Radboud University Nijmegen, supplemented by data from Vos and Ter Braake, it was decided to consult the following archives if possible – not necessarily in the following order.¹⁰

- 1 Municipal Archives, Nijkerk: Minutes of the Municipal Executive and other relevant municipal files: minutes, lists of resolutions, annual reports and correspondence of the municipal council and the Municipal Executive - consulted
- 2 Land registry, can be consulted digitally via the municipality of Nijkerk - consulted
- 3 Database Joodse Landbouwgronden (Jewish Farmlands Database), Jewish Cultural Quarter Amsterdam - consulted
- 4 Netherlands Property Administration Institute (National Archives, The Hague) - Verkaufsbücher - files Nijkerk residents and owners of Jewish property outside Nijkerk - consulted
- 5 Archive of the Council for the Restoration of Rights (National Archives in The Hague) - consulted
- 6 Archives of the province of Gelderland - accessed
- 7 Algemeen Nederlands Beheer van Onroerende Goederen (General Dutch Management of Property - ANBO)¹¹ (NIOD, Amsterdam, Kadastermuseum (Land Registry Museum) Arnhem) - not consulted
- 8 Central Archives for Special Criminal Jurisdiction (National Archive, The Hague) - *not consulted*

There are two reasons why the latter two archives were not consulted. The first is that sufficient information could be extracted from the other archives to answer the research questions posed. The second is that exploratory research showed that the archives at the NIOD did not contain relevant information on the ANBO and the CABR provided little relevant new information.

To gain insight into the types of ownership of plots, homes and business premises during and after the war, it was first necessary to clarify which property in the municipality of Nijkerk was Jewish-owned. A start in this regard was Ab van Straalen's

⁹ W. van Meurs, P. Slaman and M. Oprel (et al), 29.

¹⁰ Vos and Ter Braake, 32-47.

¹¹ *Algemeen Nederlands Beheer van Onroerende Goederen* (ANBO) headed by NSB members. According to the authors of the study on the municipality of Apeldoorn, the records of the ANBO are partly located at the NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust, and Genocide Studies in Amsterdam. Parts have also been recovered at the Kadastermuseum (Land Registry Museum) in Arnhem. See: W. van Meurs, P. Slaman and M. Oprel (et al), 30.

publication into the history of the Jewish community in Nijkerk from 1926 to 1945.¹² This publication contains an address list of homes of Jewish residents of Nijkerk. That list does not state which properties were owned by the residents and whether there were more Jewish property owners.

Verkaufsbücher and Jewish Farmlands Database

An initial source consulted for the research was the digitised Verkaufsbücher. These are 17 notebooks drawn up during the war by the German organisation in charge of managing homes subject to deprivation of rights.¹³ That was the *Niederländische Grundstückverwaltung* (NGV, also known as the *Nederlandse Administratie van Onroerende Goederen*)¹⁴ in The Hague. In sales ledgers, the NGV kept detailed records of all transactions of Jewish immovable property. A total of 7,109 transactions are listed in the Verkaufsbücher.¹⁵ This includes transactions in the municipality of Nijkerk.

In August 1941, the German occupying forces ruled that all Jewish residents in the Netherlands had to give up their property. After the Jewish owners were deported, the property was taken into management by the NGV. This organisation outsourced management of the property to various institutions. An important organisation was the *Algemeen Nederlands Beheer van Onroerende Goederen* (ANBO), founded in 1941 by estate agent and NSB member Dirk Hidde de Vries.¹⁶ De Vries sold some properties on behalf of the NVG and then collected a percentage of the proceeds. In other cases, it remained the ANBO administrator who collected rental income during the war. Some Jewish homes in Nijkerk were also sold by the ANBO on behalf of the NVG.¹⁷ Records in the land registry ledgers that were kept in the municipal archives show that houses were put under the management of the NVG, while the Verkaufsbücher states that the same houses were sold by the ANBO. NGV transferred the proceeds to the *Vermögensverwaltungs und Renteanstalt* (VVRA), which in turn transferred the money to the 'looting bank' Lippmann-Rosenthal (Liro). At that 'looting bank', Jewish property owners were obliged to hold an account, where they were required to deposit assets.¹⁸

The purchase of the houses the NGV stole from Jewish Dutch people was partly financed with the help of the *Landelijke Hypotheekbank* (National Mortgage Bank). The initial start-up capital of this bank was provided by the director of *De Nederlandsche Bank*, prominent NSB member Meinoud Rost van Tonningen.¹⁹ Apart from transactions of Jewish immovable property, the NGV also registered mortgages of Jewish individuals.²⁰ Several buyers of Jewish property arranged their mortgage

¹² A. van Straalen, *Van jubileum naar catastrofe. De Joodse gemeenschap van Nijkerk in de periode 1926-1945*, (From anniversary to catastrophe. The Jewish community of Nijkerk in the period 1926-1945) (Nijkerk, 2007).

¹³ Following M.-J. Vos, I have chosen to use the term deprivation of rights with regard to homes because expropriation is usually used by the government measure in spatial planning processes. Moreover, it corresponds to the term 'restoration of rights' used after the war. See: M.J. Vos, Maarten-Jan Vos, *Joods vastgoed in Winterswijk 1943-1950. Rapport over de roof en gedwongen verkoop van vastgoedbezit van Joden en de rol van de gemeente Winterswijk bij roof en rechtsherstel tijdens de Tweede Wereldoorlog en de jaren daarna*, (Jewish property in Winterswijk 1943-1950. Report on the looting and forced sale of property owned by Jews and the role of the Winterswijk municipality in looting and restoration of rights during World War II and the years thereafter) (Winterswijk, 2022) 8.

¹⁴ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.13, inv.no. 168595, Spinosa Cattela-Vorst, M.H.H., Arnhem, E.P. Reijers, civil-law notary, Deed of Restoration of Rights, 29 October 1946.

¹⁵ Spreadsheet Verkaufsbücher, downloaded from the website of the National Archives: <https://www.nationaalarchief.nl/onderzoeken/open-data/indexen>; <https://pointer.kro-ncrv.nl/verkaufsbucher-administratief-boekwerk-als-startpunt-voor-aangrijpende-oorlogsverhalen>; W. van Meurs, P. Slaman and M. Oprel (et al), 30; Vos and Ter Braake, 32.

¹⁶ R. te Slaa, *De houding van de gemeente Den Haag tegenover Joodse eigenaren van onroerend goed 1940-1955* (The attitude of The Hague municipality towards Jewish property owners 1940-1955) (zp., 2016) 17.

¹⁷ Archive Y. de Liver, Contract of sale Spoorstraat 30 and 32, 14 December 1943.

¹⁸ Vos and Ter Braake, 21, for link with Liro see note 43; NA, NBI, 2.09.16.03, inv.no. 55160, Cohen, E., Nijkerk, Overview initial assets 20 June 1945 and Cash Overview 1-1 to 31-12 1946; ¹⁸ Te Slaa, 10.

¹⁹ Vos and Ter Braake, 21-22.

²⁰ Vos and Ter Braake, 22.

loans through wealthy individuals.²¹ This was also the case in Nijkerk. The Verkaufsbücher provide an overview of the Jewish owners deprived of their rights, the war buyers and other parties involved.

Eleven property transactions of Nijkerk property are registered in seventeen preserved Verkaufsbücher.

Municipal archives and the (digital) land registry

The second step taken during this research was consulting the archives of the municipality of Nijkerk. What immediately stood out when preparing to consult them was the special inventory numbers created on topics concerning Jewish residents of Nijkerk during the war. For example, there is a separate file on the administration of homes and household effects.

The next step was to consult the digital land registry with the help of the municipality of Nijkerk. This should reveal who owned which homes during and after the war. Since the names of Jewish residents were known, it might have been possible to find more property in the land registry than they owned. Land registry ledgers often contain details on the management of the NGV, and later details of the new owners. They usually also reflect the post-war restoration of rights. However, some 'intermediary buyers' were not registered in the land registry, as homes sometimes changed hands on the same day of purchase.²²

Looking for the history of properties, a number of notarial deeds were consulted in the digital land registry. It soon became clear that research via the digital land registry is very laborious. To work more efficiently, a two-tier approach was therefore chosen: first, all relevant files in the NBI would be examined. It was expected that it would be possible to find owners of land and property in Nijkerk more easily in the NBI files, with possible indications of property sales and post-war rehabilitation of rights.

There are land registry ledgers in the municipal archive of Nijkerk showing the ownership history of properties. It is a kind of shadow register of the digital land registry. It was expected that, based on this register, it would be possible to trace Jewish owners of properties, including possible forced sales during World War II. Before consulting this source, the files of the Netherlands Property Administration Institute were consulted first.

Netherlands Property Administration Institute

The archive of the Netherlands Property Administration Institute (*Nederlandse Beheersinstituut*, NBI) is at the National Archives in The Hague. It includes records of twenty thousand administrators who were appointed for so-called 'absentees'. Those 'absentees' included thousands of Jewish Dutch citizens who were deported and murdered during the war. Many administrators prepared statements of assets at the instructions of the NBI. Those statements can be found in the files. Immovable property that belonged to the assets of an 'absentee' was also included in these. Besides these statements, correspondence with civil-law notaries can also often be found in the files. Various files show whether and which heirs claimed immovable property and whether restoration of rights took place. The latter often began with a certificate of succession, which can be found in various NBI files.

The inventory of the NBI archive is searchable by keywords via the website of the National Archives. A total of 19 NBI files were consulted in which Nijkerk appears. These included files of both Jewish residents of Nijkerk and Jews outside Nijkerk who owned property in the municipality, according to the Verkaufsbücher. In some cases, these files offer relevant information about the ownership of properties, but are sometimes very brief, such as that of Nijkerk municipal officer Mozes Spanjar.

²¹ Vos and Ter Braake, 99.

²² Vos and Ter Braake, 20-24.

Land registry ledgers

As expected, the NBI files provided much valuable information on Jewish property owners in the municipality of Nijkerk. There turned out to have been more Jewish-owned properties than was known up until now. With the collected data in hand, the land registry ledgers of the municipality of Nijkerk were then examined, which are organised according to name.

This research in turn revealed new addresses of property owned by Jews. As it turned out, the butcher couple Abraham and Sara Hamburger-Rood not only owned Oosterstraat 18, as known from Van Straalen's research, but also a barn and land on Oostereind. Incidentally, this shadow archive shows that after this couple's suicide in 1941, these properties were sold to Nijkerk business people: the butcher Gerrit Woukersz. Bos and the café owner Aart Willemszn. van den Bosch.²³ The same archive revealed that some Jewish residents of Nijkerk did not own their homes, such as the municipal inspector Spanjar and the vegetable trader Mok. That also confirmed a pre-existing suspicion.

Again: digital land registry

Having reached this point in the research, it had now become clear what happened to some properties during and after the war. In order to collect the necessary information from the remaining properties, the more intensive search of the digital land registry had to be resumed. Based on this research, new details were found. This was repeated after questions arose at the second meeting of the Supervisory Committee on 15 December 2022 about the exact course of events surrounding the so-called 'Jewish bath house', the mikveh, on Brink.

Notarial archive

The search for additional information about the mikveh in the digital land registry did not yield any relevant information. In order to nevertheless obtain the necessary information on possible transactions during the war involving the property in which the mikveh was located, committee member Dieter van de Castel consulted the archives of the Nijkerk firm of civil-law notaries Van der Weij at the request of the Supervisory Committee. This civil-law notary office holds the archives of Reijers, the civil-law notary at that time. With the same goal in mind, he then contacted the firm of civil-law notaries *Kuiper & Van 't Spijker Notariskantoor* in Putten, which holds the archive of Putten civil-law notary Neervoort. No records were found from either investigation relating to this location.²⁴

NIOD: files of liquidated Nijkerk-based companies

As in the rest of the country, Jewish businesses in Nijkerk were registered and eventually liquidated after the ordinance by the occupying forces on 12 March 1941. The question that can be asked here is whether commercial property was also part of these liquidations. Many Nijkerk businesses were small enterprises, often located in or next to residential houses. A lot of data about liquidated companies can therefore be found in personal files in the archives of the Dutch Management Institute. For more specific research on the liquidation of Nijkerk companies, the archives of the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.* and the *Deutsche Revisions- und Treuhand A.G.* were consulted. These turned out to contain four files of Nijkerk entrepreneurs that were consulted at the NIOD in Amsterdam.²⁵

²³ GAN, Land Registry ledgers, Ledger 11, article 6321.

²⁴ Emails from D.C. van de Castel to P.M. Cooper (cc to author), 6 February 2023; H. de Lange to D.C. van de Castel, 13 February 2023.

²⁵ NIOD, inv. no. 094, *Archive Omnia Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.* See also:

www.archieven.nl/nl/zoeken?miview=inv2&mivast=0&mizig=210&miadt=298&micode=094&milang=nl - consulted on 20 September 2022.

Joodsmonument.nl and Jokos files

The website Joodsmonument.nl yielded some good background information on individuals found in the above archives. Many Jewish owners of property in Nijkerk are listed there, and the files state whether they were murdered during the war, and if so when. This source was used insofar as the data was not already known, as was the case with the Van Esso family from Amsterdam.

For a number of the people listed on this website, the archive indicated that a so-called Jokos file (*Jokos-dossier*) exists for them. These files largely contain financial records and data on inventories of homes. At the third meeting of the Supervisory Committee, it was decided to consult three files, as there might be a link to the municipality in them. These were the files of municipal officer Mozes Spanjar, rag-and-bone men Izaak and Jetje Fortuijn, and shopkeeper Samuel de Liver.²⁶ To access these files, a written request was submitted to the director of *Joods Maatschappelijk Werk* (Jewish Social Work) in Amsterdam. That request was granted, but because the files were being digitised during the research period, we were only able to see the Jokos files of Fortuijn and De Liver.

Jewish Agricultural Land Database

Apart from examining forced sales of residential and commercial properties, research was also conducted into forced sales of (agricultural) land. The most important archive for this is that of the *Goedkeuring van Overdracht van Joodse landbouwgronden* (Approval of Transfer of Jewish agricultural land). On 27 May 1941, it had already been determined that Jewish-owned agricultural land had to be sold by 1 September of the same year.²⁷ To gain insight into the forced sale of Jewish agricultural land, the archives of the *Bureau voor de Goedkeuring van overdracht van Joodse landbouwgronden* (Office for Approval of Transfer of Jewish agricultural land) were consulted.

The archives of the *Bureau voor de Goedkeuring en Pachtbureaus/Grondkamers* (Office for Approval and Leasing Offices/Agricultural Tenancies Authorities) are in the National Archives in The Hague. The survey of Jewish agricultural land sold during the war is available digitally at the Jewish Cultural Quarter in Amsterdam.²⁸ This archive records one transaction in which a plot of land within the municipality of Nijkerk was sold.

Restoration of rights

A next step taken was to explore the restoration of rights. Previously mentioned archives such as those of the municipal archives, including the land registry ledgers, the digital land registry, but especially the files of the Netherlands Property Administration Institute, were sufficient for this. Brief research in the archives of the Council for the Restoration of Rights (*Raad voor het Rechtsherstel*) in the National Archives in The Hague did not yield any relevant information.

After an initial discussion with the Supervisory Committee (*Begeleidingscommissie*), some of the above archives were consulted once again. This was particularly true of the NBI files and the municipal archives. Intensive use was also made of Van Straalen's study on the Nijkerk Jewish community before, during and after the Second World War. Several entries in the *Gelders Archief* (Gelderland Provincial Archive) were also examined at the request of the Supervisory Committee.

²⁶ This concerns the Jokos files 18368 (Spanjar), 5999 (I. Fortuijn) and 9031 (S. de Liver).

²⁷ Vos and Ter Braake, 13.

²⁸ NA, 2.11.08.01 Inventory of the archives of the *Directie van de Landbouw: Afdeling Grond- en Pachtzaken* (Directorate of Agriculture: Department of Land and Tenancy Cases), (1906) 1935-1964; Jewish Cultural Quarter, '*Database Joodse landbouwgronden*' (Database of Jewish agricultural land).

A discussion was held with surviving former Nijkerk resident Louk de Liver from Amersfoort to obtain additional information and to find out if he knew any people who might need to be involved in the research.²⁹ In spring 2023, advertisements were placed for the same purpose in the *Nieuw Israëlitisch Weekblad* and the quarterly magazine *Benjamin* of the organisation *Joods Maatschappelijk Werk* (Jewish Social Work). These asked whether relatives of Jewish residents of Nijkerk could provide information on the municipality's handling of Jewish immovable property. Some surviving relatives were also contacted by letter.

There were ultimately three responses. The first was from Yaël de Liver, who shared information about her great-grandfather Levi de Liver and his brothers from Nijkerk, Philip and Samuel and their heiress Jos de Liver. A message was received from Benjamin Salomon, son of Roza Salomon-Hamburger, from Israel that he had no relevant information for the research. He did, however, thank me for the effort made with the research to shed light on the matter.³⁰ There was no substantive response from Ms Amalia Har-Toov, daughter of Jos de Liver, after initial email contact.³¹

²⁹ On September 26, 2023, just before the completion of this research, Louk de Liver died in his hometown of Amersfoort.

³⁰ Email from B. Salomon to S. Staartjes, municipality of Nijkerk, 3 June 2023: 'As far as I am aware, from conversations with my late mother (who passed away 4 years ago), I have no relevant information concerning the investigation. Nevertheless, I thank you for conducting such research and for approaching me.'

³¹ Email from M. Diederiks, municipality of Nijkerk, to Amalia Har-Toov, 13 September 2023.

CHAPTER 4

Deprivation of rights, clearance of houses and taxes

Now that it is clear which sources were consulted, we come to the actual research findings. In this chapter, we will first briefly discuss the role of mayor Bruins Slot and the attitude of the Nijkerk civil service and police. We will then discuss the deprivation of Jewish property rights. We will do that using the *Verkaufsbücher* and other sources, such as NBI files and the land registry ledgers in the Nijkerk municipal archives. We will then turn our attention to Jewish property that was managed but not sold. Next, the theft of commercial Jewish property and agricultural land will be discussed. We will then cover the clearing of homes occupied by Jews and the reallocation of empty homes. Finally, we will look at the taxation that took place during the war.

Nijkerk and the occupying forces

The municipality of Nijkerk was under the direction of mayor Zwaantinus Bruins Slot during the war. This young accountant from Hoogeveen had been appointed to his first municipality as mayor in 1939 and was explicitly anti-German. He was horrified that the local democratic order with city council and aldermen had to give way to an administrative apparatus under a monocratic leadership: his own.³² In 1941, this so-called 'führer principle' was introduced nationwide, replacing democratic constitutional law. From that time on, mayors were assigned all the administrative duties of aldermen, the municipal council and municipal committees. They were, however, under the supervision of higher bodies, such as the *Commissaris der Provincie* (Commissioner of the Province) - which later became the *Commissaris van de Koning* (King's Commissioner).³³ However, the mayor considered the aldermen to still be in office.³⁴ The same was true for the civil-law notary Reijers, as evidenced by two notarial deeds from 1942, by means of which Meiling sold agricultural land in the Arkemheen polder to his son Albert, and a house and a warehouse on Nieuwstraat to his son Gerrit, respectively. Both deeds identified Meiling senior as an alderman.³⁵

Jewish municipal officers had been suspended by then. All 'non-Aryan' government personnel had been dismissed in accordance with a circular letter dated 21 November 1940. The officers would continue to receive partial pay.³⁶ In Nijkerk, this measure affected one officer. That was municipal inspector Mozes Spanjar, who lived with his family at Van Delenstraat 15. He was initially a butcher in Rijssen, but moved to Nijkerk in 1938, where he entered the employment of the municipality as an assistant inspector that year.³⁷ As an inspector, his responsibilities included checking the hygiene in slaughterhouses. After his resignation, he was paid redundancy pay.³⁸

³² Van Renssen, 93-94.

³³ P. Romijn, *Burgemeesters in oorlogstijd. Besturen tijdens de Duitse bezetting* (Mayors in wartime. Local administration during the German occupation) (Amsterdam, 2006) 291.

³⁴ Van Renssen, 95.

³⁵ Digital Land Registry, Copy of the public register - Hyp4 dl 2298 no. 128 series ARNHEM. The premises in question were known as section B 2591. Those premises were not Jewish property.

³⁶ Romijn, 184-185.

³⁷ <https://www.Joodsmonument.nl/nl/page/129937/mozes-spanjar>; <https://oorlogsdodendinkelland.nl/slachtoffers/oude-gemeente-denekamp/spanjar-mozes/>

³⁸ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.02, inv.no 4872, Bartus Reuyl, H., file Spanjar, M., Nijkerk [PD10 1175], 18 January 1954, A. Gottschalk to the *Raad voor het Rechtssherstel* (Council for the Restoration of Rights), *afd. Voorzieningen Afwezigen* (Provisions for Absentees department), The Hague.

With regard to the police, other measures were taken. The Germans largely abolished the municipal police and the mayors were relieved of most of the responsibilities for local policing.³⁹

At the beginning of the war, the Nijkerk police force had five municipal rural constables led by an Inspector of Police.⁴⁰ During the reorganisation, that police force was merged with the military constabulary, whose headquarters for the Nijkerk division was in Arnhem. By March 1943, the entire reorganisation of the Dutch police force had been completed. Mayor Bruins Slot wrote about it in his diary that month:

*'The mayors have now become 'local leaders' and as such they are and remain in charge of the police, but organisationally they have nothing to do with the military constabulary. Orders are given to the highest in rank and this officer must carry out these orders as he sees fit. I will definitely be able to manage with Van der Krol. He is a good police officer and a likeable guy. Today (afternoon), I officially bid farewell to the municipal rural constables at the council chamber and addressed them in the presence of the military constabulary. The senior constable Peterkamp thanked me for everything on behalf of the rural constables and Van der Krol also promised good cooperation on behalf of the military constabulary. He saw in me, he said, the mayor and chief of police, and his attitude would be consistent with that.'*⁴¹

Van der Krol's words show that Bruins Slot was still seen by the Nijkerk military constabulary division as the chief of police. The mayor owed this mainly to his personal authority. Organisational changes did nothing to change that. *'The rural constables then transfer,'* Bruins Slot wrote in his diary on 6 December 1942 about the reorganisation. *'However, implementation decrees are yet to come. The mayor remains chief of police but can only give business orders.'*⁴² What did remain among his duties was maintaining public order. Consequently, in the war years that followed, the mayor was involved in actions by the rural constables, as evidenced by a report to the mayor by municipal rural constables Hendrikus de Graaf and Pieter van der Veer.⁴³ Actions by the rural constables were also reported to mayor Bruins Slot, such as sealing empty Jewish houses.⁴⁴

Reclamation along the river Laak

Bruins Slot took a special initiative in September 1942. This concerned a last-ditch attempt on his part to save Jewish residents of Nijkerk from deportation. His plan was to put the Jewish men to work at a reclamation project of the Heibid.ij near the Laak, the river between Nijkerkerveen and Hoevelaken, on the border of Gelderland and Utrecht. Through a good contact at the *Sicherheitsdienst* in Arnhem, SD Hauptscharführer Willy Bühe, he managed to arrange that they could stay in their houses and work on the reclamation project during the day. When this trick no longer worked and the families were nevertheless ordered to leave, he visited SS *Hauptsturmführer* Ferdinand aus den Fünften in Amsterdam. Among other things, the latter was responsible for the deportation of Jews from the Netherlands. This attempt failed, as he had more or less expected.⁴⁵ Bruins Slots' efforts do indicate the positive attitude he took towards Jewish residents of Nijkerk.⁴⁶

³⁹ Romijn, 425.

⁴⁰ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 588, personnel file H. Diepenbroek, BS to Secretary General of the Department of Home Affairs, 4 January 1941.

⁴¹ Van Renssen, 103-104.

⁴² Van Renssen, 103.

⁴³ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, municipal rural constables H. de Graaf and P.T. van der Veer, official report on the distribution of perishable foodstuffs from the homes of Jews, 12 April 1943.

⁴⁴ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, municipal rural constable J.A. Peterkamp to mayor Z. Bruins Slot, 29 October 1943.

⁴⁵ *Gelders Archief* (GA), Entry 0039 Provincial Executive, Inv. no. 6212 Expropriation of municipal property, 1850, 1946-1947 - 08.4. Municipalities, 6357 Nijkerk, 1925-1949, Gelderland Provincial Public Works and Water Management Department to the Provincial Executive, 26 September 1945.

⁴⁶ Van Renssen, 140-150.

But how did he and his officers deal with the property of Jewish residents of Nijkerk after their departure on 9 April 1943? The municipal archives, the land registry and the NBI provide the necessary information on this.

Deprivation of rights

The ANBO assumed management of several homes owned by Jews. The ANBO in particular, which included a Utrecht branch office of Hague-based estate agent De Vries, a member of the NSB, appears to have played an important role in managing and renting out dispossessed Jewish homes during and even after the war. This firstly concerned the 11 houses listed in the Verkaufsbücher.

Some properties sold by the NGV through the ANBO, which do appear in the Verkaufsbücher, were owned by the wealthy Amsterdam Van Esso family. This family owned the properties Spoorstraat 14 to 28 and also Stationsweg 20. The latter house was destroyed and demolished during the war.⁴⁷ Spoorstraat 14 to 24 were owned by Samuel and Sientje of Esso-Van Esso. Spoorstraat 26 and 28 were owned by their son Berthold Isador van Esso. Samuel and Sientje van Esso did not survive the war. Samuel died a natural death in Amsterdam on 26 May 1942. His wife died during a train transport from Bergen-Belsen to Theresienstadt on 18 April 1945. Their son was killed in Elburg on 13 April 1945. His wife Louise Roozendaal did survive the war.⁴⁸

Spoorstraat 14 and 16 were sold to 'V.d. Leck' from Amersfoort on 16 July 1943 on behalf of the NVG through the ANBO.⁴⁹ Spoorstraat 18 and 20 were bought during the war by J. Staal, who lived at Spoorstraat 20. He bought those houses on 15 June 1943, according to the Verkaufsbücher. That same day, Staal possibly resold those houses to Willem van Essen from Voorthuizen, although, according to a 1953 letter from Nijkerk civil-law notary Beekman, he bought them from the ANBO.⁵⁰ Spoorstraat 22 to 28 were bought by Arie Schakel in Soesterberg on 1 April 1943, according to civil-law notary Beekman in 1953. However, the Verkaufsbücher lists N. van Kuijk of Veenendaal as the buyer of numbers 22 and 24, but on the same date.⁵¹ However, it is known that the Verkaufsbücher are not complete, as not all dispossessed properties were sold. Further research at the NBI and in the municipal archives also shows that this concerns properties owned by Jewish owners in Nijkerk. This shows that a total of 43 homes and business premises in Nijkerk were Jewish-owned. In addition, seven more properties were found that were inhabited by Jews, but owned by non-Jews.

Some addresses were not listed in the Verkaufsbücher, but researched via the digital land registry. These are Holkerstraat 9 and 13. The first property was owned by the butcher Henri Hamburger. During the war, it was not sold but rented out by the ANBO.⁵²

⁴⁷ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv.no. 200633, Esso-van Esso, S. van, Amsterdam, administrator Meyer van Esso, Report File no. 4169/3629/div/Ny//es, 11 April 1946.

⁴⁸ www.Joodsmonument.nl/nl/page/154909/sientje-van-esso-van-esso - accessed 8 August 2022;

<https://www.Joodsmonument.nl/nl/page/675323/over-het-lot-van-louis-gast-en-berthold-isador-van-esso> - Two articles in *Oud Meppel*, March 2015 and June 2015, accessed 8 August 2022; NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv.no. 200633, Esso-van Esso, S. van, Amsterdam, civil-law notary C.E. Massee, Amsterdam, Declaration of inheritance and justice, 3 September 1951.

⁴⁹ NA, NBI, Verkaufsbücher, inv.no. 532.7, Algemeen laufnr. 2954; NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv.no. 200633, Esso-van Esso, S. van, Amsterdam, administrator Meyer van Esso, Report Dossier no. 4169/3629/div/Ny//es, 11 April 1946; GAN, GA 0876/02, civil-law notary Mr. D.J. Beekman to Officer of Social Affairs Municipality of Nijkerk, 18 April 1953.

⁵⁰ NA, NBI, Verkaufsbücher, inv.no. 532.6, General laufnr. 2562; GAN, GA 0876/02, civil-law notary Mr. D.J. Beekman, 18 April 1953.

⁵¹ NA, NBI, Verkaufsbücher, inv.no. 532.7, Algemeen laufnr. 2955; NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv.no. 200633 Esso-van Esso, S. van, Amsterdam, administrator Meyer van Esso, Report Dossier no. 4169/3629/div/Ny//es, 11 April 1946; GAN, GA 0876/02, civil-law notary Mr. D.J. Beekman, 18 April 1953.

⁵² NA, NBI, 2.09.16.06, inv. no. 85769, Hamburger, Nijkerk, J. Florijn, Wealth status of Hamburger family in 1947, 28 February 1947.

The second house was owned by Joseph (Joop) de Liever, co-founder of the clothing shop at Singel 28, along with his brother Louis. In 1946, Bruins Slot reported to the division of the NBI in Arnhem that the De Liever-Serphos family was the owner of Holkerstraat 13.⁵³

Records from the municipal archives show that the property at Stationsweg 18, owned by Levi de Liver Mozeszoon, was managed and rented out by the ANBO.⁵⁴ The archives of this branch of the De Liver family, which are held by Yaël de Liver, a great-granddaughter of Levi de Liver, show that he was also the owner of Stationsweg 16. That property too was seized by the Grundstückverwaltung and then rented out by the ANBO. That happened from 1 August 1942 to March 1946.⁵⁵ The ANBO also seized the De Liever family's home at Holkerstraat 13, as well as Hoogstraat 9, owned by Hartog de Rooij of Putten and Singel 28, owned by Louis de Liever.⁵⁶

One document from the municipal archives that provides insight into this concerns an official invoice entitled '*Gegevens betreffende onkosten van gemeenten terzake van het op transport stellen van Joden – 15 mei tot 1 oktober 1943*' (Details concerning expenses of municipalities regarding the deportation of Jews - 15 May to 1 October 1943). That title does not cover the full meaning. This invoice, dated 6 November 1943, concerns a cost overview, but it does not pertain to the transport of Jews. The costs mentioned relate to the repair and furnishing costs of houses in which Jews lived so that others could move into them.

The invoice shows that the ANBO was the point of contact and manager of the properties at Holkerstraat 13, Nieuwstraat 12 and Singel 28. Under the column '*Nota ingediend bij*' ('Invoice submitted to'), these properties state: '*A.N.B.O., Mariahoek 21, Utrecht.*' For example, this document shows that the municipality, at the request or by order of the ANBO, as well as the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft*, removed household effects from houses of Jews and sealed them and then prepared the houses for occupancy by 'Aryans'. Payment of the invoices submitted by the municipality to the ANBO would follow as soon as '*the revenue allows*'; states the drafter of the invoice at the Holkerstraat 13 and Nieuwstraat 12 properties. In doing so, he referred to

⁵³ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.09, inv.no. 123531, Liever, J.M. de, Nijkerk, Bruins Slot to NBI, Arnhem, 23 June 1949. The administrator of Joseph de Liever's estate from 12 February 1947 was his brother-in-law Isedore Serphos from Heemstede, who had already been appointed trustee by De Liever before his deportation, see: NA, NBI, 2.09.16.09, inv.no. 123531, Liever, J.M. de, Nijkerk, NBI, 12 February 1947; <https://www.Joodsmonument.nl/nl/page/129967/rika-sophia-de-liever-serphos>. On 31 October 1950, that became his brother Gerzon Serphos from Haarlem, see: NA, NBI, 2.09.16.09, inv.no. 5008, Liever, J., Nijkerk, NBI, Bureau Amsterdam, Statement of Assets and Liabilities 1945 to 1949, 31 January 1951.

⁵⁴ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, G. Wedekind, *Sachbearbeiter der Omnia Treuhandges.* M.B.H, Apeldoorn to Das Katasteramt p/A. Secretariat of the Municipality of Nijkerk, 31 March 1944; GAN, 191, Population Register 1936-1948, Housing Register Sparrenlaan - De Veenhuis; GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Municipal Secretary Nijkerk to Wedekind, *sachbearbeiter der Omnia Treuhandges.* Mb.H., Waltersingel 85, Apeldoorn, 18 April 1944.

⁵⁵ Archives Y. de Liver, S. de Liver-De Liver to Administrator A.N.B.O., 22 July 1946. The letter mistakenly mentions Stationsstraat 16. The same applies to the ANBO's letter to S. de Liver-De Liver, 4 February 1946.

⁵⁶ Holkerstraat 13: GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, *Ortskommandantur* Apeldoorn to Bruins Slot, 27 October 1943; Source owner: GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Municipal Public Works Department of Nijkerk, W. Postema, technical officer, Data concerning expenses of municipalities regarding the deportation of Jews - 15 May to 1 October 1943, 6 November 1943; Hoogstraat 9: GAN, Land Registry ledgers, ledger 9, section 5661 and Land registry ledgers, ledger 12, section 6466; Singel 28: GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, W.A. Aalbers to municipal secretary Nijkerk, 16 June 1943; *ibid.*, Secretary Nijkerk to ANBO, 10 December 1943; GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Municipal Public Works Department of Nijkerk, W. Postema, technical officer, Data concerning expenses of municipalities regarding the deportation of Jews - 15 May to 1 October 1943, 6 November 1943.

correspondence with the ANBO that year.⁵⁷ As mentioned, Holkerstraat 13 was owned by the De Liever-Serphos family.⁵⁸ Other properties, including Salomon Nihom's on Langestraat, were not seized and, as far as is known, were not sold, but rather rented out. Because they were not sold, they are also not listed in the Verkaufsbücher.

The central role played by the ANBO is also evidenced by the fact that during and shortly after the war, new tenants of Jewish housing often transferred their rent payments to the ANBO. This concerned the Nijkerk houses that had been confiscated by the *Niederländische Grundstückverwaltung* (NGV). Most of these were sold, after which those houses were rented out again by the new owners, as evidenced by the contract of sale of the houses at Spoorstraat 30 and 32 to Hendrik van Sweden. He bought both properties from the NVG through the ANBO, and then became entitled to collect the rents.⁵⁹ From January 1943 to January 1944, the ANBO had collected rent from both houses.⁶⁰ Van Sweden became entitled to collect rents, but as the new owner also had to pay municipal sewerage and road taxes, the contract of sale shows.⁶¹

It is noteworthy that after the liberation, the rent of some houses in Nijkerk was transferred back to the ANBO, which by then was under the management of the Dutch government. This applied, for example, to the rent for the properties Singel 16 and Singel 18, owned by the widow Johanna Van der Hoeden-Turksma, who by that time had been murdered. By 1943, both houses and also a third property owned by widow Van der Hoeden, Bagijnenstraat 10, had been bought by Arend Wassink, a Nijkerk NSB member. Wassink was an ironmonger who had enlisted in the SS. He was able to buy three residential houses and a warehouse thanks to a loan of 11,000 guilders, which he took out in September 1943 from his wealthy Nijkerk party colleague Pieter van Leeuwen Boomkamp.⁶² It is likely that he also collected the rental income himself from the sale. Nevertheless, after the war until May 1946, the rent was received by the ANBO.⁶³ It is unclear from what point that was.

Property transactions in the *Gelders Archief* (Gelderland Provincial Archive)

Neither the Verkaufsbücher nor the municipal archives revealed any data showing that the municipality of Nijkerk itself bought Jewish property during the war. If this had taken place, it should be possible to find these transactions in the archives of the province of Gelderland. No such transactions were found during research in the Gelderland Provincial Archive in Arnhem. However, some other transactions are mentioned, for example the sale by civil-law notary A. Colenbrander of Huize De Brink to the municipality in 1941 and then the rental of the same house to civil-law notary Colenbrander by the municipality for a period of three years.⁶⁴

The conclusion may therefore be that the municipality of Nijkerk did not buy any property from Jewish Dutch citizens during the war.

⁵⁷ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Municipal Works of Nijkerk, W. Postema, technical officer, 'Gegevens betreffende onkosten van gemeenten terzake van het op transport stellen van Joden - 15 mei tot 1 oktober 1943' (Data concerning expenses of municipalities regarding the deportation of Jews - 15 May to 1 October 1943), 6 November 1943.

⁵⁸ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, *Ortskommandantur Apeldoorn an den Bürgermeister der Gemeinde Nijkerk*, 27 October 1943.

⁵⁹ Archive Y. de Liver, Contract of sale Spoorstraat 30 and 32, 14 December 1943; NA, NBI, 2.09.16.09, inv.no. 119172, Liver, S. de, Nijkerk; NBI, Archive 2.09.16, Verkaufsbücher, inv.no. 536.7 General laufnr. 7003; GAN, GA 0876/02, civil-law notary Mr. de Liver, Nijkerk. D.J. Beekman, 18 April 1953.

⁶⁰ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.09, inv.no. 119172, Liver, S. de, Nijkerk, civil-law notary E.P. Reijers, Nijkerk, Initial report and accounts, 30 September 1948.

⁶¹ Archive Y. de Liver, Purchase deed Spoorstraat 30 and 32, 14 December 1943.

⁶² NA, NBI, 2.09.16, Verkaufsbücher, inv.no. 536.3, General laufnr. 4232; NA, NBI 2.09.16.16, inv.no. 193809, Wassink, A., Nijkerk, Joh. From Elfrinkhof to Secretary of the Apeldoorn Representation of the NBI, 6 September 1947

⁶³ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.06, inv.no. 91034, Hoeden-Turksma, S. van der, Nijkerk, J. Florijn, Nijkerk to NBI, Apeldoorn, 10 October 1947

⁶⁴ GA, Entry 0039 Provincial Executive, Rent and lease of municipal property, 1816-1949, inv.no. 6476 Nijkerk, 1867-1949, Decision Mayor of Nijkerk, 29 August 1941 and 2 March 1942.

Vacant homes and clearances

In the spring of 1943, all Jewish residents of Nijkerk had to report to Vught. Those who had not already gone into hiding left. Their homes thus became vacant. The homes were then cleared. An important role in clearing homes was played by the military constabulary, i.e. the municipal police of Nijkerk, which, as described, was formally no longer under the authority of mayor Bruins Slot. At the same time, however, the mayor was responsible for the course of events.

One of the duties of the mayor and the military constabulary was to oversee the empty houses of Jewish residents of Nijkerk. For this, the mayor had to answer to German authorities. The mayor was held accountable for his duties. He himself worked with municipal rural constables in carrying out the new duties. For example, municipal rural constable J.A. Peterkamp on 29 October 1942 was given the instruction to seal a residential/commercial house belonging to widow Van der Hoeden. In his report, he wrote: *'After obtaining instructions, the entrance doors of the widow S. v.d. Hoeden Singel 16 at Nijkerk, were closed and sealed, after an inventory had been drawn up of the household effects, etc., present in that home. I have been informed that the aforementioned widow. S. v.d. Hoeden was admitted a few days ago as a patient in the Ned. Israel. Hospital in Amsterdam, for which travel permission was granted through the Jewish Council in Arnhem.'*⁶⁵

Five days earlier, on 24 October, *'J. Dekker, municipal and unpaid national rural constable of and in Nijkerk had, by order of the Honourable Inspector of Police in Nijkerk, in connection with the arrest of non-Aryan persons, i.e. the Fontein family, living in Nieuwstraat No 12, sealed this property, , including 3 doors of the barn behind the house, above the windows, below the windows and all the doors. This sealing was done by seal and municipal stamp and paper or string.'*⁶⁶

Role of Municipal Public Works Department in clearances

Under the guidance of municipal supervisor Evert van Rootselaar, the Municipal Public Works Department played an active role in clearing the Jewish homes. This is evidenced, among others, by the invoice of 6 November 1943, already mentioned above. That shows that the municipality carried out work worth 414.70 guilders for *'transporting Jews'*. As mentioned, this did not concern actual travel costs allegedly paid by the municipality, but costs involved in clearing and sealing Jewish homes on behalf of the German authorities.

The work involved transporting the inventory of Louis de Liever's residential house Singel 28 and vacating 13 empty houses and making them habitable for the new residents. The bills were submitted to the administrators of the homes, such as the ANBO and the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft*, where the relevant employee G. Wedekind was employed as *Sachbearbeiter* and to whom the invoice was addressed. Other accounts were charged to the owners of properties or the new occupants.⁶⁷ This shows that the ANBO and the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft* looted movable property from dispossessed Jewish homes.

Half of the costs mentioned in this invoice had actually been paid by the invoiced persons or authorities by 6 November 1943, the date of the invoice. Municipal council minutes from 1947 show that not all of the rest would ultimately be paid. The bill sent to NSDAP member Pellmann from Terschuur for the transport of the De Liever family's household effects was written off as

⁶⁵ GAN, 2.1.31, Cabinet, inv.no. 566b Administration Jews 1940-1943, report by Peterkamp to mayor of Nijkerk, 29 October 1942.

⁶⁶ GAN, 2.1.31, Cabinet, inv.no. 566b Administration Jews 1940-1943, J. Dekker, Nijkerk municipal police, 24 October 1942, report.

⁶⁷ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Municipal Public Works Department of Nijkerk, W. Postema, technical officer, *'Gegevens betreffende onkosten van gemeenten terzake van het op transport stellen van Joden – 15 mei tot 1 oktober 1943'* (Data concerning expenses of municipalities regarding the deportation of Jews - 15 May to 1 October 1943), 6 November 1943.

uncollectable that year, because Pellmann had died.⁶⁸ Like the ANBO and the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft*, Pellmann appears to have looted movable property from dispossessed Jewish homes.

On that same 6 November that the invoice was drawn up, Bruins Slot wrote a note to 'the Department of Home Affairs', listing the 'expenses of municipalities with regard to transporting Jews'. The costs, according to Bruins Slot, included the cost of transporting 'removed Jews' and specifically that of a sick woman by ambulance to Westerbork. That had cost 109.20 guilders. He further named the cost "of safekeeping, storage and guarding of inventories left by Jews: nil" and the "cost of evacuation of homes left by Jews at the time of their removal". The latter item amounted to 291.95 guilders.⁶⁹ The total was 401.15 guilders.

Meanwhile, municipal supervisor Evert van Rootselaar, employed by the municipality since 1919, was also assuming another role. He kept the household effects of Samuel de Liver safe by storing them.⁷⁰ De Liver owned and occupied Spoorstraat 30. This is evident from the initial report and accounts drawn up by Nijkerk civil-law notary Reijers after the war on the estate of this family. Following an announcement published in the *Nijkerksche Courant*, Van Rootselaar reported that he had stored that inventory 'in a Municipal building (now the attic of the Public School in Gasthuisstraat)'.⁷¹ We can assume that the goods were returned by the municipal supervisor because the report is recorded in the management file of the De Liver family.

Monitoring of vacant properties

The responsibility for monitoring the vacant houses did not rest with the chief inspector of police or the mayor, but with the German authorities. The *Sicherheitspolizei* from Arnhem wrote to Bruins Slot on 20 October 1942: '*Auf das Schreiben vom 17.10.42 teile ich Ihnen mit, daß eine Freigabe der Wohnung durch die Deutsche Sicherheitspolizei nicht mehr erfolgen kann. Es wird Ihnen anheim gestellt, sich mit dem Einsatzstab Rosenberg, Amsterdam, Telefon 38520, in Verbindung zu setzen. Diese Stelle ist allein berechtigt, über Wohnungen zu verfügen.*'⁷²

Control of Jewish property apparently lay with the Germans even before the final reorganisation of the Dutch police. An important role in this was played by F.H. Pellmann from Terschuur. He was held responsible by the Germans for removing furniture from Jewish residents, he wrote in December 1943. Among other things, Pellmann manned the Barneveld support centre of the German Nazi party, the NSDAP, '*Arbeitsbereich in den Niederlanden*'.⁷³ The *Arbeitsbereich* concerned the Dutch branch of the *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei*.

It has since become clear that the municipality took action once the 'Jewish houses', as they were called, became vacant. From several houses, the household effects were moved to other properties, so that the houses could be rented out. With this, the municipality of Nijkerk played a role in some NBI cases. In February 1944, technical officer Postema reported to mayor Bruins Slot: '*The Jewish furniture was stored by us in the plots below: Veenestraat 18, Singel 16, Singel 28, Nieuwstraat 17, Kruitstraat 1, Holkerstraat 9, Kloosterstraat 3, v. Deelenstraat 15, Stadswaag, Singel 22*'. This was followed by the announcement that 'all these

⁶⁸ GAN, Municipal council minutes, 3 December 1947, File no. 17.0, no. 31, p.2.

⁶⁹ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Bruins Slot to Mr Secretary-General of the Department of Home Affairs at Apeldoorn, 6 November 1943.

⁷⁰ GAN, Personnel file E. van Rootselaar.

⁷¹ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.09, inv.no. 119172, Liver, S. de, Nijkerk, Notary Reijers, Nijkerk, Initial report and account, 1, 30 September 1948; Ibid., Civil-law notary Reijers, Nijkerk, Initial report and account, 30 September 1948.

⁷² GAN, 2.1.31, Cabinet, inv.no. 566b Administration Jews 1940-1943, Krim, Commander of the *Sicherheitspolizei* and SD, Arnhem to mayor of Nijkerk, 20 October 1942.

⁷³ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, F.J. Pellmann to Gemeinde Nykerk, no date (received 3 December 1943 at Building Control Department Nijkerk).

assets are managed by Mr F.H. Pellmann from Terschuur'.⁷⁴ Pellmann had already removed several pieces of furniture, according to Postema. He could do that because he had the keys to the rooms where the furniture was stored.

Rental of vacated homes

Requests soon arrived at the municipality of Nijkerk to rent the vacant and vacated houses. This had to do with the existing housing shortage, which not only affected Nijkerk.

The municipality itself also arranged a vacant dispossessed Jewish home as a rental for one of its officers. This was Spoorstraat 26, the home of the De Liever family, but owned by Van Esso junior. The home was rented out by the ANBO. The ANBO gave permission for this to mayor Bruins Slot on 24 November 1942. Before that, the mayor had been in touch by phone with the ANBO's Utrecht branch office.⁷⁵ On 23 February 1943, Bruins Slot replied to the ANBO branch office that the new tenant was Niek de Boer, a Nijkerk box manufacturer.⁷⁶ Therefore, the new tenant was ultimately not an officer of the municipality, but an entrepreneur. De Boer had to find a new home, because his factory and residence had been requisitioned by the German *Kriegsmarine* in December.⁷⁷

Noteworthy is a letter from the *Ortskommandantur* in Apeldoorn. In it, Bruins Slot is more or less ordered to enter into an official rental contract with the new tenant of Holkerstraat 13, even though the property was actually rented through the ANBO. The tenant had been living there for several months and had been assigned the home by the '*Artilleriearsenal Nijkerk*' through the *Ortskommandantur* Amersfoort at the time.⁷⁸ The letter seems to suggest that the municipality of Nijkerk had some say in this. However, the archives do not reveal whether this was actually the case. The municipality seems to have mediated between new tenants and a new landlord on a few occasions. That landlord was the ANBO, but also the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft*, correspondence between the municipality of Nijkerk and this organisation in 1943 shows.⁷⁹

The aforementioned note of 6 November 1943 is also notable in this respect, as it shows possible involvement of the municipality of Nijkerk. Indeed, the column '*Nota ingediend bij* (Invoice submitted to):' notes: '*Aug. 4, Ontruimen en verzegelen der Joodsche goederen en het voor W. Versteeg bewoonbaar maken van perc. Brink 12 (Jodenbadhuis); Nota ingediend bij: Huuropbr. Gem. Werken, Betkamp 10. Betaald: ja. Bedrag: 3.15'* (4 Aug. Clearing and sealing of Jewish goods and making plot Brink 12 (Jewish Bath House) habitable for W. Versteeg. Invoice submitted to: Rent yield Municipal Public Works Department Betkamp 10. Paid: yes. Amount: 3.15').⁸⁰ '*Betkamp*' must have been a reference to Vetkamp, the address of Municipal Public Works Department.

⁷⁴ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Technical Officer to the Mayor of the Municipality of Nijkerk, 14 February 1944. German translation of this letter on behalf of Bruins Slot: GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E271, '*Bruins Slot an den Herrn Beauftragten des Reichkommissars für die Provinz Gelderland*', 1 March 1944.

⁷⁵ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E566b, ANBO to the mayor of the municipality of Nijkerk, 24 November 1942.

⁷⁶ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E566b, Bruins Slot to ANBO, 23 February 1943.

⁷⁷ 'Box factory N. de Boer', in: R. Beekman and M. Pater, '*Verdwenen bedrijven in Nijkerk en Nijkerkerveen*', (Vanished businesses in Nijkerk and Nijkerkerveen)(Nijkerk, 2015) 46.

⁷⁸ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, *Ortskommandantur Apeldoorn an den Bürgermeister der Gemeinde Nijkerk*, 27 October 1943.

⁷⁹ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Municipal Secretary Nijkerk to W.A. Aalbers, Sachbearbeiter der *Omnia Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.*, 7 July 1943.

⁸⁰ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, 6 November 1943, Nijkerk Municipal Public Works Department, W. Postema, technical officer, Data concerning expenses of municipalities regarding the deportation of Jews - 15 May to 1 October 1943, 6 November 1943.

A so-called 'mikveh' is a bath for ritual cleansing. A mikveh was Jewish property and was not a business. The bath was free or discounted for use by members of the Israelite congregation and was basically underground.⁸¹ At first, it seems as if this 'Jewish Bathhouse' was rented out by the Municipal Public Works Department to the new occupant. On closer inspection, it turns out that this was not the case after all because the address 'Betkamp 10' mentioned was thus the address to which the invoice should be sent. That bill concerned the clearance and sealing of the premises where the mikveh had been located and the goods present there, and then making the premises habitable for residential purposes. Whether the Municipal Public Works Department played any further role in this cannot be deduced from the municipality's archives. Further research in the archives of civil-law notary Van der Weij, who holds the archives of notary Reijers, also does not yield any further information about a possible sale of this property.⁸²

Even after extensive follow-up research, we have not been able to precisely reconstruct the course of events surrounding the property's ownership. In 1941, the property was owned by Hartog de Rooij from Putten, whom we encountered earlier as the owner of Hoogstraat 9. It then became the property of carpenter Albert Woutersz. van Koot, who sold it in 1955.⁸³ In the land registry ledger, a transaction appears to have taken place in 1941. It is unclear whether the property changed hands in the process.

As a result, exactly what the ownership situation was during the war remains unclear. A further search of the digital land registry to find out about this yielded nothing. For the sake of completeness, we checked whether there was a file on Van Koot in the archives of the *Centraal Archief Bijzondere Rechtspleging* (Central Archive of Special Criminal Jurisdiction), but this was not the case. It is highly unlikely that the municipality of Nijkerk was in any way involved in the sale or lease of this property.

The municipality was also involved in another property, although it was not Jewish property, but rather a home occupied and vacated by Jews. On a small sheet with the addresses of houses abandoned by Jewish residents of Nijkerk on 9 April 1943, the former home of inspector Spanjar is mentioned: '*Die Gemeinde Nijkerk möchte die Wohnung v. Delenstr. 15 zur Verfügung haben für den zu ernennen Buchhalter der Gasanstalt und Gemeinde-wasserleitung.*'⁸⁴ The document bears the stamp of the municipality of Nijkerk. Apparently, the request originated from the municipality itself. The owner of Van Delenstraat 15 was Gerrit Jan Wassink from Oegstgeest.⁸⁵ The municipality's land registry ledgers show that this Wassink had inherited the house from Albert Jan van Sweeden in 1941 and had therefore not bought it through the NGV or the ANBO.⁸⁶

After the Jewish Spanjar family had been taken away, the municipality made a request to rent the Van Delenstraat 15 property again for a newly appointed officer. That concerned the bookkeeper of the gas plant. This request was made within a month of 9 April 1943. The exact date is not known because the note is undated, but 9 April 1943 was the day the Jewish residents of Nijkerk handed in the keys to their homes and, on the orders of the Germans, took the train towards Camp Vught, to be deported from there to extermination camps. After consulting mayor Bruins Slot, Philip de Liver, co-owner of a slaughterhouse and butcher's shop, had collected the keys to the homes of Jewish residents of Nijkerk. Together with Salomon Nihom, owner of a clothes shop, De Liver fulfilled a prominent role in the Jewish community in Nijkerk. At about half past nine that morning, just before leaving Nijkerk station, he had handed the keys over to the '*municipal and unsalaried national rural constable*' Hendrik de

⁸¹ Communication from Prof Sonja de Leeuw, during discussion in Nijkerk, 6 October 2022.

⁸² Consultation of civil-law notary Reijers' draft repertories by former civil-law notary Dieter van de Castel, email to author, 29 December 2022.

⁸³ GAN, Land registry ledgers, ledger 6, article 5488, sequential number 6.

⁸⁴ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, *Gemeinde Nykerk, Judenhäuser von den Einwohnern am 9. April 1943 verlassen*, no date.

⁸⁵ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, G.J. Wassink, Oegstgeest, to Honourable Mr [Bruins Slot], 10 May 1943. In the NBI archives, two files in the name of G.J. Wassink were consulted, but there was no relevant information in them. These were individuals with the same initials, living in Apeldoorn, whose NBI records are: NA, NBI, 2.09.16.16, inv.no. 193827 and inv.no. 193828.

⁸⁶ Land registry ledgers, ledger 4, article 4113, see also *ibid.*, follow.no.68 (cont. 3); Land registry ledgers, ledger 11, article 6335, follow.no.3.

Graaf. The latter took possession of them 'after being instructed to do so by the Honourable Group Commander of the Military Constabulary in Nijkerk'.⁸⁷

Homes of Jewish residents of Nijkerk, after they became vacant, were sealed by order of the German authorities. Only after obtaining permission were the houses allowed to be occupied once again. Such a request was thus made by the municipality of Nijkerk after the Spanjar family left.

As mentioned, one possible explanation for this action is that there was a great housing shortage in the Netherlands at that time. The same was true for Nijkerk. While mayor Bruins Slot had managed to repair the war damage with widely admired speed and even had additional houses built in Tuinstraat with funding from the central government, this had not been the case in large parts of the Netherlands. Indeed, by August 1941, repair work had been centralised and then discontinued due to the severe scarcity of building materials.⁸⁸ Rotterdam, for example, remained in ruins until after the war. From October 1942, hundreds of thousands of people were evacuated from the coastal strip to the east, as the Atlantic Wall was being built there. Houses along the coastal strip were also cleared for this purpose.⁸⁹ Nijkerk also had to take in people from these areas. Added to that were the regular house moves, such as that of the new municipal officer.

Incidentally, the German authorities do not seem to have agreed to the municipality of Nijkerk's request to quickly make the home available for rent to a new official. This is evident from a letter dated 10 May 1943. Indeed, in it, homeowner Wassink asks the municipality if the still sealed house can be released. For part of the house, he had found a new tenant himself and another part of the house he wanted to occupy himself.⁹⁰

Furthermore, the municipality of Nijkerk does not appear in any way as a stakeholder in the management of Jewish homes or inventories. The municipal archives also reveal that although the municipality of Nijkerk was responsible for storing inventory of deported Jews, it was often instructed to do so by the German occupation forces. Except..

Taxes paid

... in the collection of municipal taxes. A number of NBI files mention taxes for water supply, land, sewerage and road tax.⁹¹ In almost all cases, these are tax assessments from the year 1945 onwards. The payments were all charged to the balances of those registered as 'absent' over which the NBI had appointed an administrator. Noteworthy is only the land tax assessment for 1944 imposed on Emanuel Cohen who lived at 22 Singel. Except: that was not a municipal, but a state tax and is therefore not relevant to this research.⁹² The 1946 cash statement shows that the assessment was actually paid in 1946, although it is

⁸⁷ Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, H. de Graaf, Military Constabulary Arnhem region, Group Nijkerk no. 291, Report on the receipt of keys of Jewish homes in Nijkerk on 9 April 1943, 15 April 1943; GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Collected keys of Jewish homes in this municipality on 9 April 1943, no date

⁸⁸ Van Renssen, 49-66; L. de Jong, *Het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden tijdens de Tweede Wereldoorlog 1939-1945, deel 6, juli '42 – mei '43, tweede helft* (The Kingdom of the Netherlands during World War II 1939-1945, volume 6, July '42 - May '43, second half) (The Hague, 1975) 768.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 765; <https://geschiedenisvanzuidholland.nl/verhalen/verhalen/de-grote-volksverhuizing>.

⁹⁰ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, G.J. Wassink, Oegstgeest, to Honourable Mr [Bruins Slot], 10 May 1943.

⁹¹ See, for example, the files of the Hamburger family, 9 Holkerstraat: NA, NBI, 2.09.16.06, inv. no. 85818, H. Hamburger, Nijkerk, Overview Nijkerksche Bank 1947 and the families A. Fortuyn and I. Fortuyn, NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv. no. 77594, Fortuyn, A., Nijkerk, no date., initial report as per 1946-10-01.

⁹² S.M.H. Dusarduij, 'De fiscale geschiedenis van Nederland in vogelvlucht' (A brief history of taxation the Netherlands), in: A. C. Rijkers (ed.), *Inleiding belastingheffing ondernemingen en particulieren* (Introduction to taxation of companies and individuals), 7-19 (Tilburg, 2012) 0.5.2. (13) 7-19.

unknown by whom.⁹³ As yet, that is the only payment of a tax assessment made for a period when the relevant property owner was no longer alive. The widower Emanuel Cohen was murdered in Sobibor on 21 May 1943.

Other payments from the war years recorded are four quarterly water supply bills for 1944 for Izaak Hammelburg, owner of Venestraat 18 and 20. That expense also went hand in hand with the collection of rental income over that period during the war.⁹⁴ We should note here that the person who kept the cash books, Mr Visscher, was the one who had bought Hammelburg's houses at his request. This was evident after the war.⁹⁵ As owner, Visscher collected rents and also paid municipal taxes.

The municipal archives show that the rent of some houses was collected by the ANBO. Municipal taxes were also paid from those revenues. This is shown, for example, by the financial statements drawn up by Mr J.W. van der Krol, son of a former commander of the military constabulary, as administrator of Emanuel Cohen's estate. A financial statement of that estate shows both taxes paid for the first half of 1945 and an operating surplus of the ANBO. Incidentally, Van der Krol considered the 'surplus' that would still be receivable from the ANBO negligible.⁹⁶

Also from a letter from the ANBO to the municipality of Nijkerk dated 3 April 1944, it appears that this organisation reimbursed the municipality for expenses incurred for the clearance of Jewish homes. That letter also shows that the ANBO paid road and sewerage taxes for 1942 to the municipality of Nijkerk.⁹⁷ This state of affairs is reconfirmed in the municipal council minutes of 25 June 1947. These state that some of the unpaid taxes of Jewish owners for 1946 could no longer be collected because the ANBO had been liquidated.⁹⁸

Agricultural land

The only transaction pertaining to a plot mentioned in the Jewish agricultural land database concerns a plot owned by Mrs Mietje Hartog Hyman Spinosa Cattela-Vorst of Arnhem. This plot with barn, shed, farmyard and arable land was located on Brink. It was bought during the war against the will of Mrs Hartog Hyman Spinosa Cattela-Vorst by her tenant, J. van den Akker from Nijkerk.⁹⁹ Van den Akker turned out to be reluctant to return the plot after the war. The justification given by civil-law notary Beekman in 1953 shows that this was eventually done. A similar issue played out with a property (Brink 21) and a plot of land that Ms Cattela-Vorst had been forced to sell to Arend Wassink.¹⁰⁰ Both properties were returned to her ownership. In both cases, the municipality of Nijkerk does not seem to have played a role.

Liquidation of Jewish businesses and property

A final component that needed to be investigated was the liquidation of Jewish businesses and whether, in this area, the municipality of Nijkerk may have bought property. Following the measures taken by the Nazis in Germany, Jewish businesses were liquidated. The liquidation of all smaller Jewish businesses was mandated on 12 March 1941.¹⁰¹ In Nijkerk, the liquidation mainly involved the retail trade, such as Jewish Salomon Nihom's ready-to-wear clothing shop at Langestraat 36 with

⁹³ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.03, inv.no. 55160, Cohen, E., Nijkerk, Overview of initial assets 20 June 1945 and Cash Statement 1-1 to 31-12 1946.

⁹⁴ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.06, inv.no: 85989, Hammelburg, I., Nijkerk, Bank statement of Hammelburg estate 1944-1949 by K. Visscher, January 1950.

⁹⁵ Digital Land Registry, Copy of public register - Hyp4 dl 2612 no 105 series ARNHEM.

⁹⁶ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.03, inv. no. 55160, Cohen, E., Nijkerk, initial assets E. Cohen, 20 June 1944; J.W. van der Krol, notes (sd.).

⁹⁷ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, ANBO to Nijkerk municipal authorities, 3 April 1944.

⁹⁸ GAN, Minutes of the Municipal Council, 25 June 1947, file 16.5, no. 21.

⁹⁹ Ter Braake, *Database Joodse Landbouwgronden* (2011), inv. no. M29. See: [https://data.jck.nl/page/aggregation/jhm-literatuur/20110474;GAN 0876/02, civil-law notary Mr. D.J. Beekman, 18 April 1953.](https://data.jck.nl/page/aggregation/jhm-literatuur/20110474;GAN%200876/02,civil-law%20notary%20Mr.%20D.J.%20Beekman,18%20April%201953)

¹⁰⁰ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.13, Inv. no. 168595, Spinosa Cattela-Vorst, M.H.H., Arnhem, E.M. Reijers to NBI, Harderwijk, 11 September 1946; GAN, GA 0876/02, Civil-law notary Reijers. D.J. Beekman, LLM, 18 April 1953.

¹⁰¹ http://www.oorlogsgetroffenen.nl/thema/rechtsherstel/03_01_Bedrijven - accessed 8 August 2022.

'manufactures, women's ready-to-wear clothes, men's ready-to-wear clothes, children's clothing and fabrics'.¹⁰² Nihom owned both Langestraat 36 and 38. As a result of the liquidation of the company and confiscation of both Nihom's homes, the Jewish couple Van der Hoeden had to leave their home in the upstairs flat at 38 Langestraat. The elderly couple rented the upstairs flat from Nihom. They were 64-year-old Samuel and his 69-year-old wife Elisabeth Van der Hoeden-Fortuijn. The order to do so was given by mayor Bruins Slot, who gave it at the instructions 'of the Verwalter of family J. Nihom of Nijkerk (A. Melis) appointed for that purpose by the German authorities'.¹⁰³

The business of brothers Philip and Samuel de Liver was also liquidated. The final liquidation of the company took place in April 1944.¹⁰⁴ The business consisted of a butcher's shop and a calf slaughterhouse. The calf slaughterhouse was located at Stationsweg 18. That was a residential house from which, according to mayor Bruins Slot, the calf slaughterhouse was run.¹⁰⁵ A 'Metzgereigeschäft', according to Bruins Slot, i.e. a butcher's shop, was located next door, at Stationsweg 20. It had previously been located on Nieuwstraat.¹⁰⁶ According to a 1932 advertisement in the *Advertentieblad voor Limburg*, it was an export butcher's shop. Through this export butchery, the De Liver brothers transported and sold their 'freshly slaughtered fasting and fattened calves' as far as Limburg.¹⁰⁷ In the butcher's shop, Philip de Liver had a telephone connection, reported G. Wedekind, *Sachbearbeiter* of the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft* in early 1944.¹⁰⁸

The liquidation of the De Liver firm and also the associated ownership relationships was quite a puzzle for the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft*. Initially, the Germans had assumed there were two separate businesses. One in the name of Philip de Liver and the second in that of his brother Samuel. In early 1944, however, it emerged that both firms had been dissolved on 8 November 1941 and been replaced with the joint company. That company was ultimately liquidated in April 1944.¹⁰⁹

The question of who actually owned both business premises also proved difficult for the Germans to answer. On 8 May 1944, the municipality of Nijkerk stated that Stationsweg 18, the premises of the calf slaughterhouse, was rented by the De Liver firm.¹¹⁰ This matches what the municipality had passed on a month earlier, on 18 April. That was the announcement that Stationsweg 18, land registry number B 3413, was owned by Levi de Liver Mozeszoon of Amsterdam and managed by the

¹⁰² Van Straalen, 19.

¹⁰³ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, A. Melis to s., 23 March 1943; The Mayor of Nijkerk to s., 24 March 1943.

¹⁰⁴ NIOD, Archive 094f, Collection of files originating from the archives of the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.*, inv. no. 4116, S. de Liver, Spoorstraat 30, Nijkerk, G. *Weedekind an die Wirtschaftsprüfstelle*, Arnheim, 21 April 1944.

¹⁰⁵ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Bruins Slot to W. Weidenbörner, *Sachbearbeiter der Omnia Treuhandges.* M.B.H, Arnhem, 8 May 1944.

¹⁰⁶ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Bruins Slot to G. Wedekind, *Sachbearbeiter der Omnia Treuhandges.* M.B.H, Apeldoorn, 26 January 1944. Incidentally, a map with addresses shows that a butcher's shop was actually located at Stationsweg 18, see: GAN, 190, Population register 1936-1948, Housing register - De Veenhuis, Stationsweg 18.

¹⁰⁷ Advertisement in *Advertentieblad voor Limburg*, 4 June 1932, Delpher.nl - accessed 3 February 2023.

¹⁰⁸ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, G. Wedekind to 'Herrn Bürgermeister der Gemeinde Nijkerk', 22 January 1944, in handwritten note in the margin of this note.

¹⁰⁹ NIOD, Archive 094f, Collection of files originating from the archives of the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.*, inv.no. 4116, S. de Liver, Spoorstraat 30, Nijkerk, G. *Weedekind an die Wirtschaftsprüfstelle*, Arnheim, 21 April 1944; GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Municipal Secretary Nijkerk to Wedekind, *sachbearbeiter der Omnia Treuhandges.* Mb.H., Waltersingel 85, Apeldoorn, 18 April 1944; *Ibid.*, Z. Bruins Slot to W. Weidenbörner, *Sachbearbeiter der Omnia Treuhandgesellschaft* M.B.H., Arnhem, 8 May 1944.

¹¹⁰ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Bruins Slot to W. Weidenbörner, *Sachbearbeiter der Omnia Treuhandges.* M.B.H, Arnhem, 8 May 1944.

ANBO.¹¹¹ So, the premises of the calf slaughterhouse were indeed officially in the name of a De Liver, although it belonged to their brother Levi from Amsterdam and not either of the two Nijkerk brothers.¹¹²

The premises of the butcher's shop at Stationsweg 20 was not in the name of a De Liver, the municipality of Nijkerk wrote to G. in April 1944. Wedekind, the *Sachbearbeiter* of the *Omina Treuhandgesellschaft* in Apeldoorn.¹¹³ That's right because, as shown above, Stationsweg 20 was owned by the Jewish Van Esso family.

The reason *Sachbearbeiter Wedekind* was keen to know the ownership relationships, so that the properties could then be rented out or sold through the ANBO. But in April 1944 that had already been the case for some time. The firm Möring & Steenaart Machine- en Apparatenfabriek had occupied the two premises for more than a year.¹¹⁴ Indeed, over a year before the liquidation of the De Liver brothers' business, the buildings on Stationsweg were already empty. In December 1942, the firm Möring & Steenaart was already renting the premises of the calf slaughterhouse at number 18.¹¹⁵ The building at Stationsweg 20 was leased by the same firm a month later, with effect from 1 January 1943. As mentioned above, the latter property was destroyed during the war. Möring & Steenaart leased the premises from the ANBO.¹¹⁶

Another firm that was liquidated was the clothing shop of Louis de Liever and his brother Joop, located at Singel 28. In the digital ledgers, the house, warehouse and yard are listed in the firm's name, with land registry number B 3420.¹¹⁷ A 1986 notarial deed shows that this was indeed Singel 28.¹¹⁸ Louis and Bela de Liever lived in that house. After this couple went into hiding in 1943, Singel 28 was managed by the ANBO and rented to an 'Aryan'. This tenant had to remit rent to the NVG.¹¹⁹

The Jewish clothing firm of Emanuel Cohen Jzn. en Kinderen at Singel 22 was also liquidated.¹²⁰ Another Jewish business that met that fate was that of the baker Abraham (Bram) Fortuijn and his sister Kaatje. Their residence at Nieuwstraat 17 was placed under the management of the ANBO and subsequently that too was rented out by that organisation.¹²¹

The liquidated Jewish companies in Nijkerk were small businesses. Therefore, they were not put under management, but the activities were terminated completely. These were often businesses of Jewish owners who had their business attached to or close to their house. The municipality was not involved in this. However, the municipality did provide information on addresses of business property owners when asked by German authorities.

¹¹¹ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Secretary municipality of Nijkerk Vroegop to Wedekind, *sachbearbeiter der Omnia Treuhandges.* Mb.H., Waltersingel 85, Apeldoorn, 18 April 1944.

¹¹² https://www.maxvandam.info/humo-gen/family/1/F1420?main_person=l3883 - consulted in spring 2023 and on 31 May 2023.

¹¹³ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, P. Vroegop to G. Wedekind, *Sachbearbeiter der Omnia Treuhandges.* M.G.H, Apeldoorn, 18 April 1944.

¹¹⁴ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, G. Wedekind, *Sachbearbeiter der Omnia Treuhandges.* M.B.H, Apeldoorn to Das Katasteramt p/A. Secretariat of the Municipality of Nijkerk, 31 March 1944.

¹¹⁵ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, J.B. Möring to G. Wedekind, *Sachbearbeiter der Omnia Treuhandges.* M.B.H, Apeldoorn, 20 April 1944.

¹¹⁶ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Bruins Slot to G. Wedekind, *Sachbearbeiter der Omnia Treuhandges.* M.B.H, Apeldoorn, 26 January 1944.

¹¹⁷ GAN, Land registry ledger, ledger 10, article 5962.

¹¹⁸ Digital Land Registry, Property information Nijkerk_Gelderland_B_3420; Copy of public register - Hyp4 dl 8363 no 25 series ARNHEM.

¹¹⁹ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, W.A. Aalbers, *Sachbearbeiter der Omnia Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.* to Nijkerk municipal clerk, 16 June 1943.

¹²⁰ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.03, inv.no. 55160, Cohen, E., Nijkerk, Military Authority, 20 June 1945.

¹²¹ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Bruins Slot to ANBO, 18 February 1944. Elsewhere, the firm M. Fortuyn is mentioned: GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Seized keys from Jewish homes in this municipality on 9 April 1943.

CHAPTER 5

Restoration of rights

After the war, the statutory order Restoration of Rights E100 came into force. It stated that regulations introduced by the German occupying forces around the sale of agricultural land and property were nullified retroactively. They were regarded as never having existed. An exception applied to those transactions where the buyer of agricultural land or property had acted in good faith and had not known it was Jewish property.¹²² In this chapter, we will first consider which Jewish families returned. We will then describe the municipality of Nijkerk's dealings with the heirs of the municipal officer Spanjar, who had been taken away and murdered. We will then describe how the municipality dealt with municipal taxation after the war. We will also describe some cases in which the municipality bought agricultural land from Jewish owners after the war. We will then turn to several cases of restoration of rights of individuals and then of Jewish businesses.

The restoration of rights was in the hands of the *Raad voor het Rechtsherstel* (Council for the Restoration of Rights). That included the Property department. The aim was to reverse transactions through amicable settlements. That is, the parties involved tried to reach an agreement out of court. To that end, delegates of the *Raad voor het Rechtsherstel* (Council for the Restoration of Rights) were active across the country. If an out-of-court settlement failed, legal action was then taken. This involved an application for restoration of rights that had to be submitted to the *Raad voor het Rechtsherstel* (Council for the Restoration of Rights) by June 1951 or, in special cases, by June 1955.¹²³ Of course, the former owners or their heirs first had to be aware of the existence of the former property ownership.

Supervision of the properties managed by the ANBO during the war was partly taken over by the Military Authority after liberation. In '*all these cases*', namely those of the Fortuijn-Vos family, of Samuel de Liver and of the Hamburger family, the management had been carried out by the ANBO. Nijkerk civil-law notary Reijers wrote on 19 September 1945 regarding the properties of these families: '*Apparently this management was taken over by Military Authority in Utrecht after the liberation. So, I will definitely have to turn to the latter now, to get information about these Jewish properties.*'¹²⁴

Research shows that relations between the pre-war Jewish owners and the new owners were not always equal. It raises the question of whether administrative restoration of rights, insofar as it took place, also met moral standards. And which standards we are talking about: those from right after the war or those from the 21st century.¹²⁵

Liberation and administrators

On Friday 20 April 1945, Canadian troops liberated the city of Nijkerk. Before and during the liberation, a few more properties were badly damaged or even completely destroyed. One of the buildings destroyed was Oosterstraat 7, owned by the sisters Betsy and Lina de Rooij. According to Red Cross statements in the NBI archives, both had been gassed in Sobibor almost two years prior to this. This must have happened on or around 28 May 1943.¹²⁶

¹²² Vos and Ter Braake, 28.

¹²³ Vos and Ter Braake, 29.

¹²⁴ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv.no. 77594, Fortuyn, A., Nijkerk, Reijers to *Adviescommissie voor Rechtsherstel en Beheer* (Advisory Committee on Restoration of Rights and Management), Harderwijk, 19 September 1945.

¹²⁵ Vos and Ter Braake, 31.

¹²⁶ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.12, inv. no. 145588, Rooy, L., Nijkerk, Red Cross, two statements dated 23 August 1949.

Only a few of the deported Jewish residents of Nijkerk returned. Around 72 per cent of Nijkerk's Jewish population was murdered during the war. That is almost as high as the national percentage of victims of 73 per cent. In an interview in 1981 - nearly 40 years after their forced departure - Bruins Slot recalled, painfully, the good spirits in which some people left for Vught on 9 April 1943:

'What I did not mention about when the Jews left was the farewell of all the men in the Council Chamber. They thanked me for everything I had done and tried to do. On my part, I promised that as soon as the war was over, I would pick them up again wherever they might be in Germany or Poland. And I meant it! And they were eager to believe it. Spanjar, the municipal inspector, said: "Mayor, it has been good that we have been working on the Laak. We are trained people who can stand it for now and the war cannot last that long now anyway." I never saw any of them again. Those German murderers!!! My life is too short to forget that!'

The handling of the estates of the Nijkerk 'absentees', as the NBI archives refer to the non-returned Jewish residents, was mainly in the hands of Nijkerk notables. These included Mr Van Elfrinkhof and Mr Visscher, for example, but bank director Jacobus Florijn in particular appears in several files as an administrator. In some cases, family members took over the administration after some time, such as Heinz-Leopold Speyer Salomonszoon, who took charge of the estates of his parents-in-law and his wife Aaltje Speyer-Fortuijn's uncle and aunt. The same happened regarding the estate of Joseph de Liever. The person who took over the administration of Florijn's estate was Isedore Serphos from Heemstede, who had already been issued power of attorney by De Liever before his deportation.¹²⁷

Returnees in Nijkerk

How the few surviving Jewish residents of Nijkerk were received in their city is known mainly from the memories of survivors, not from archives. On 16 and 18 July 1945, two reports came in about three Jewish women from Nijkerk. They came from Apeldoorn from the *Bureau Opsporing en Informatie vermiste Nederlanders in Duitsland* (Office for Information on and Tracing of missing Dutch citizens in Germany). These were 19-year-old Mathilde Josephina (Jos) de Liver, 22-year-old Roza Hamburger and 28-year-old Betty (Bep) Hammelburg, who had been traced in Sweden.¹²⁸ Jos de Liver and Roza Hamburger arrived together in Nijkerk in 1945.

Jos de Liver lived from 4 August to 6 November 1945 at Langestraat 36, one of the houses of her uncle and aunt Nihom-De Liver. She was 20 years old at the time and still considered a minor by law. In November 1945, she moved to Utrecht.¹²⁹ There we find her in 1948 as a nurse at the *Stads- en Academisch Ziekenhuis* (City and University Hospital).¹³⁰ Her interests in Nijkerk at the time were looked after by civil-law notary Reijers.

Several Jewish residents of Nijkerk, including Jos de Liver, experienced their return as an ice-cold shower. There was hardly any expression of sympathy from the residents or the government.¹³¹ Fifty years later, Jos recounted: *'In Nijkerk, orthodox Christians had respect for Jews. On the Sabbath and Jewish holidays, no one made a big deal about us not going to school. Conversely, we*

¹²⁷ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.09, inv. no. 123531, Liever, J.M., Nijkerk, NBI, 12 February 1947.

¹²⁸ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 356, Repatriation of residents of Nijkerk from Germany, folder miscellaneous, Van Cleef, *Bureau Opsporing en Informatie vermiste Nederlanders in Duitsland* (Office for Information on and Tracing of missing Dutch nationals in Germany) to Municipality of Nijkerk, 12 July 1945. The messages arrived on 16 July (Mathilda (Jos) de Liver) and 18 July (Roza Hamburger and Bep Hammelburg).

¹²⁹ GAN, Person Cards from 1945 onwards; Van Straalen, 27, where Jaap Nihom refers to Jos(ephina) de Liver as his niece.

¹³⁰ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.09, inv. no. 123531, Liever, J.M., Nijkerk, Notary E.P. Reijers, Nijkerk to Commissariaat Militair Gezag district Harderwijk, 10 September 1945; NA, NBI, 2.09.16.09, inv.no. 119172, Liver, S. de, Nijkerk, Certificate of Inheritance, 18 January 1949; 'Personal victory over Hitler', *Amersfoortse Courant*, 25 April 1998.

¹³¹ Van Straalen, 49.

observed Sunday rest and Christian celebrations. A minister sent a truant Jewish child to the shul (synagogue) and the rabbi sent a Christian child to church.'

However, this pre-war tolerance and forbearance struck Jos as a sham afterwards.¹³² In particular, the fact that she and her friend Roza Hamburger never received a response to a telegram saying they were both still alive stung them both. They sent that telegram from the Skatos reception camp near Gothenburg in Sweden in the summer of 1945.¹³³

Her disappointment after returning was great. *'I am the only one of our family who survived the war,'* Jos told the Nijkerk resident Ab van Straalen. *'My return to Nijkerk was a disillusionment. We had expected support from the local authorities, but they were not interested in us. Meanwhile, my parents' house had changed hands. I had to struggle to sell my parents' property lawfully. In doing so, I had to enlist the help of a lawyer friend. The house was sold but unfortunately far below the price.'*¹³⁴

Earlier, in April 1998, she had said: *'Nobody has ever responded. I still blame the residents of Nijkerk who were responsible for that at the time.'*¹³⁵ That responsibility lay with the municipality of Nijkerk, the addressee of the telegram. Roza Hamburger also experienced the municipality's failure to respond as painful: *'I had hoped for a word of welcome.'*¹³⁶ The telegram in question is not in the municipal archives. It is unknown whether the telegram arrived.

However, it was not only the municipality of Nijkerk that remained silent. The population of Nijkerk also distanced themselves from the returnees, or that is how they experienced it in any case. Roza Hamburger – after emigrating, she changed her name to Rachel – in 2002: *'Acquaintances we met turned their heads away. Maybe out of shame, I don't know. Possibly they suffered from the realisation of having done nothing.'*¹³⁷

Roza Hamburger had already been invited to Sweden by her uncle from Boskoop, a doctor, with whom she took up residence temporarily.¹³⁸ In Nijkerk, she found her childhood home, Holkerstraat 9, occupied by and rented to new residents. She requested the Council for the Restoration of Rights (*Raad voor het Rechtsherstel*) in The Hague to give her management of the house. She herself stayed in Enschede in September 1945.¹³⁹ She married Mr Wijler and emigrated to Palestine in December 1947.¹⁴⁰ The appraisal value of the house at 9 Holkerstraat was increased by 10,800 guilders by a real estate agent in 1950 compared to the value as recorded in the previous years in the Florijn administrator's balance sheets.¹⁴¹ In 1951, the property

¹³² 'Persoonlijke overwinning op Hitler' (Personal victory over Hitler), *Amersfoortse Courant*, 25 April 1998; Van Straalen, 45.

¹³³ Van Straalen Collection, Edwin Pol, 'Jos de Liver over haar thuiskomst in Nijkerk: 'Gedesillusioneerd, maar niet verbitterd'', (Jos de Liver on her homecoming in Nijkerk: Disillusioned, but not bitter) in: unknown, no date.

¹³⁴ Van Straalen, 45.

¹³⁵ Zn., 'Persoonlijke overwinning op Hitler', *Amersfoortse Courant*, 25 April 1998.

¹³⁶ Jos Bouten, 'Wat is Nijkerk mooi geworden. Rachel Salomon-Hamburger op zoek naar Joods verleden' (How beautiful Nijkerk has become. Rachel Salomon-Hamburger on looking for her Jewish past) publication medium unknown, 2002.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ Huib de Vries, 'Overleven in het beloofde land' (Surviving in the Promised Land). Roza Salomon-Hamburger: 'I was alone in the world, that made me indifferent to danger', in: *Reformatorisch Dagblad*, 4 October 2002; Van Straalen, 44; Van Straalen, 44.

¹³⁹ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.06, inv. no. 85818, Hamburger, Nijkerk, R. Hamburger to *Raad van Rechtsherstel en Beheer* (Council for the Restoration of Rights and Management), 14 September 1945.

¹⁴⁰ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.06, inv. no. 85818, Hamburger, Nijkerk, Administration Erven H. Hamburger to NBI, Apeldoorn, 19 November 1947; Ibid., J. Florijn to NBI, Arnhem, 8 August 1949.

¹⁴¹ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.06, inv. no. 85818, Hamburger, Nijkerk, J. Florijn to NBI, Apeldoorn, regarding Administration absentees H. Hamburger, E. Hamburger-Jacobs, S. Hamburger and A. Hamburger, 24 February 1950.

was sold on behalf of Roza Hamburger to butcher T. Knevel.¹⁴² The certificate of succession, drawn up in 1949, listed Roza Hamburger as sole heir. She actually received her parents' inheritance, including the proceeds from the sale of Holkerstraat 9. This is according to correspondence from her administrator Florijn with the NBI.¹⁴³

Roza Hamburger was extremely positive about Florijn's involvement, which was later confirmed by her friend Jos de Liver, also from Israel.¹⁴⁴ Roza Hamburger also experienced little interest from the Nijkerk community after her return. The only person who did take an interest in her experiences was Mr Jurriaanse, a teacher at the public primary school.¹⁴⁵ However, she had been dismayed to see how her parents' butcher's shop had been handled: *'The ground floor was occupied by people, who had no permit for it. The doors had been demolished and made into pieces of firewood. In short, it looked terrible.'*¹⁴⁶ At the same time, she was later pleased that the Jewish monument in Nijkerk had been placed on Bruins Slotlaan after the war, because mayor Bruins Slot had worked for Jewish residents of Nijkerk during the war.¹⁴⁷

Betty Hammelburg lived in Ter Apel, in the province of Groningen, a year after returning to the Netherlands.¹⁴⁸ It is unknown whether and when she arrived in Nijkerk, or how she was received in the town. She later married Mr Stein and lived in Emmen, where she died in 1988.¹⁴⁹

The Nihom family, owners of several properties on Langestraat, survived the war by going into hiding. One son was killed. The Nihom couple emigrated to the United States of America with their other son and their daughter. After the war, they regained control of their houses and the properties were sold. From the family of Emanuel Cohen, daughter Johanna and son Alex returned. Their brother Joseph was already living in Israel.¹⁵⁰ More on the restoration of rights of these and other families will follow later.

One family that returned to Nijkerk was that of Philip and Heintje de Liever-van Gelderen. Both had survived the war by going into hiding, as had their second son. Their eldest son Louk survived two camps.¹⁵¹ His parents moved back into their former rented house, Spoorstraat 26, owned by the Van Esso family. After the war, Philip de Liever bought that house. A few years later, he sold property number 26 and bought the house next door, Spoorstraat 24.¹⁵² Philip de Liever's parents, Louis and Bela De Liever-Van der Hak, also returned. They were initially in hiding in Nijkerk, but were rounded up and taken to Westerbork. There they were liberated and returned to Nijkerk.¹⁵³

¹⁴² GAN, Land registry ledgers, ledger 3, article 3593, sequential no. 2; Ibid., Land registry ledgers, ledger 8, article 5211, sequential no. 2; Land registry ledgers, ledger 15, article 7505, sequential no. 5 and 7.

¹⁴³ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.06, inv. no. 85818, Hamburger, Nijkerk, J. Florijn to NBI Arnhem, 24 February 1950.

¹⁴⁴ Van Straalen, 44; Van Straalen Collection, Jos Kellner - De Liver to Van Straalen family, 19 October 2006.

¹⁴⁵ Van Straalen, 44.

¹⁴⁶ Jos Bouten, 'Wat is Nijkerk mooi geworden. Rachel Salomon-Hamburger op zoek naar Joods verleden' (How beautiful Nijkerk has become. Rachel Salomon-Hamburger on looking for her Jewish past) publication medium unknown, 2002.

¹⁴⁷ Announcement by Ab van Straalen during Supervisory Committee meeting, 2 February 2023.

¹⁴⁸ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.06, inv. no. 85989, Hammelburg, I., Nijkerk, B. Hammelburg to *Adviescommissie voor Rechtssherstel en Beheer* (Advisory Committee on Restoration of Rights and Management) at Harderwijk, 6 May 1946.

¹⁴⁹ Van Straalen, 51; Jewish Monument, see: <https://www.Joodsmonument.nl/nl/page/307588/betje-bep-stein-hammelburg> - accessed 12 January 2023.

¹⁵⁰ Van Straalen, 51-52; NA, NBI, 2.09.16.03, inv.no. 55160, Cohen, E., Nijkerk, H.A. de Jongh, civil-law notary in Utrecht, Certificate of Succession, 8 July 1950.

¹⁵¹ <https://www.verhalenoverdeoorlog.nl/nl/interviews/louk-de-liever> - accessed spring 2023.

¹⁵² Communication from Louk de Liever, conversation in Nijkerk, 3 November 2022.

¹⁵³ Van Straalen, 49.

After his return, young Louk de Liever tried to do something about the partly destroyed interior of the synagogue. The synagogue had been spared during the war, partly due to a rash but heroic action by mayor Bruins Slot. He had single-handedly pulled out a bunch of drunken Germans who threatened to vandalise the synagogue on a Saturday – the Sabbath.¹⁵⁴ Nevertheless, damage had been caused by a bomb, leaving a hole in the roof. However, the interior of the synagogue was still in place. Young Louis de Liever tried to do something about it. Louk: *'The damage was not caused by antisemitism, because nothing would have remained of the synagogue. Together with my Jewish friend, I tried to clean up the shul, until my grandfather said: "It doesn't make any sense, because most of the Jews did not survive the war and therefore the shul will never be used again." We then just stopped. I think it must have been around 1949.'*¹⁵⁵

Two people who did not return were married couple Joop de Liever-Serphos. According to De Liever's NBI file, their home at 13 Holkerstraat was put up for public sale in 1951.¹⁵⁶ A deed from the digital land registry dated 1 June 1951 confirms this, as does the fact that the property was bought five days later by a local shoemaker.¹⁵⁷ The digital land registry does not show that the property changed hands in the period 1945 to 1951, or that anything else happened to it.

Dealing with municipal staff

In 1954, the *'boedelgevolmachtigde'* (person with power of attorney to administer the estate) of municipal inspector Mozes Spanjar asked the municipality of Nijkerk whether there were salary arrears that needed to be paid. This would be referring to salary from the date of Spanjar's forced dismissal in December 1940 to the day of his death, 9 July 1943 at Sobibor concentration and extermination camp in Poland. The answer the municipality gave to that question is unknown. There is no mention of it in the minutes and annexes of the municipal council. In view of the letter A. Gottschalk from Almelo wrote to the NBI as Spanjar's next-of-kin, it seems he got no response from the municipality.¹⁵⁸ No further information on the case has been found. The Jokos file that was requested was not available at the time of the research in connection with digitisation.

Tax assessments for the years of occupation

Precise data on the collection of municipal taxes after the war can no longer be retrieved. That data has been destroyed in the course of time. Going through the minutes of the municipal council meetings, including the annexes, it appears that in June 1947, the municipality proceeded to waive some outstanding assessments. That was because they turned out to be *'uncollectable'*.

Sometimes it involved a resident of Nijkerk who could not pay the assessments because the breadwinner had been rounded up and interned as an NSB member. This concerned a claim for 1946. However, several other assessments for 1945 could no longer be collected, because the ANBO, which managed the relevant looted homes, had already been liquidated by June 1947. As a result, in 1947, part of the unpaid taxes from *'various plots of Jewish owners'* who had been assessed for road and sewerage taxes could no longer be collected. However, the appointed trustees were still assessed here for 1946 taxes.¹⁵⁹ On

¹⁵⁴ Van Renssen, 126.

¹⁵⁵ Van Straalen, 50.

¹⁵⁶ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.09, inv.no. 123530, Liever, J.M. de, Nijkerk, Civil-law notary J.P.F. Messer, Haarlem to NBI, Amsterdam, 31 January 1951.

¹⁵⁷ Digital land registry, Copy of public register - Hyp4 dl 2564 no 92 series ARNHEM.

¹⁵⁸ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.02, inv. no. 4872, Bartus Reuyl, H., file Spanjar, M., Nijkerk [PD10 1175], A. Gottschalk to the *Raad voor het Rechtsherstel* (Council for the Restoration of Rights), *afd. Voorzieningen Afwezigen* (Provisions for Absentees department), The Hague, 18 January 1954.

¹⁵⁹ GAN, 003, Municipal Administration of Nijkerk, 1920-1947, 2.1.2, Municipal administration and civil service, Government documents, inv. no. 33, Minutes of municipal council meeting, 25 June 1947, p.39, File. 16.5.

other occasions, road and sewerage taxes for post-war years were also waived, as in the case of 'Miss L. de Rooij' – although it took until 1953 for the municipal council to decide on this. The ANBO was also referred to in this case.¹⁶⁰

Other outstanding road and sewerage tax assessments of Jewish owners from the war years 1943 and 1944 were waived '*due to the extraordinary circumstances of the time*'. This indicates that the municipality of Nijkerk asserted that municipal taxes from confiscated property that had not been paid during the war were the responsibility of the ANBO and not the deported Jewish owners or their heirs. Other archive documents also show that the ANBO was charged for these taxes by the municipality where it involved property managed by this organisation. This applied, for example, to the 1942 sewerage and road tax on various properties, according to a letter from the ANBO dated 3 April 1944.¹⁶¹ The associated costs were paid by the ANBO from rental income if possible.

Cost of repairs

Costs spent on home improvement were sometimes charged to the assets of the deported Jews. A clear example concerns the repairs to the properties Singel 16 and 18 by widow Van der Hoeden. The facades of both properties had been severely damaged during the liberation of Nijkerk. The repair costs were paid after the approval of their administrator, bank manager Jacobus Florijn. Compensation for the repair costs incurred was then sought from the *Commissariat voor Oorlogsschade* (War Damage Commission).¹⁶² As part of the regular maintenance of the properties Singel 20 and 22, owned by the Cohen family, painting work was sorely needed in 1948. Lawyer J.W. van der Krol asked the Netherlands Property Administration Institute for an advance to cover these costs. That advance was supposed to come from an outstanding claim with the Lippmann-Rosenthal bank.¹⁶³ The municipality of Nijkerk played no role in these repairs.

The municipality of Nijkerk was involved with the reimbursement of repair costs for the residential houses Spoorstraat 30 and 32, owned by Jos de Liver after the war. Records in the possession of Yaël de Liver, granddaughter of Jos' niece Sophia de Liver, show that the municipality reimbursed Jos de Liver for the repair costs. As a nurse, she was unable to meet the expenses incurred, wrote her representative, Utrecht civil-law notary J.C. Verhoeff on 30 April 1948 to Nijkerk Municipal Public Works Department, Building Control Department¹⁶⁴ A year later, on 9 May 1949, technical official for Postwar Reconstruction E. van Boeijen confirmed to 'zr. de Liever' – including the frequently made spelling mistake 'ie' instead of just an 'i' – that the municipality of Nijkerk would pay her the repair costs of 2856.27 guilders.¹⁶⁵ The damage concerned war damage, as evidenced by the invoice of construction company J. Petersen from 1949. By that point, he had already been waiting two years for payment of his invoice. He therefore charged Jos de Liver 109.20 guilders in interest on the unpaid bill.¹⁶⁶ As the repair work came under postwar reconstruction, it was reimbursed by the government.

Restoration of rights and sale of immovable property

It was by no means always immediately clear whether and who were heirs of the murdered Jews, consistently referred to as 'absentees' in the NBI archives, because, certainly in the early years of this institute, it was not certain who were still alive and

¹⁶⁰ GAN, 004, Municipal Administration of Nijkerk, 1948-1978, 2.1.2, Municipal administration and civil service, Cabinet documents, inv. no. 38, Minutes 21 December 1953, decision 5.

¹⁶¹ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, ANBO to Nijkerk municipal council, 3 April 1944.

¹⁶² NA, NBI, 2.09.16.06, inv. no. 91034, Hoeden-Turksma, S. van der, Nijkerk, Administrator J. Florijn, Nijkerk to NBI, Apeldoorn, 10 October 1947.

¹⁶³ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.03, inv. no. 55160, Cohen, E., Nijkerk, J.W. van der Krol to NBI, Arnhem, 24 June 1948.

¹⁶⁴ Archive Y. de Liver, J.C. Verhoeff to Nijkerk Municipal Public Works Department, Building Control Department, 30 April 1948.

¹⁶⁵ Archives Y. de Liver, E. van Boeijen to Sr. de Liever, 10 May 1949.

¹⁶⁶ Archives Y. de Liver, J. Petersen - Construction company to Ms. J. de Liever, June 1949.

who were not. Several properties are known to have been subject to restoration of rights. This was not necessary for all properties, as the ANBO had not sold all dispossessed properties for the NVG.

This applied, for example, to one of the properties that was badly damaged during the liberation, Oosterstraat 7. It was confiscated, but not sold. The property was owned by the Jewish sisters Betsy and Lina de Rooij, but they had been killed in the war.¹⁶⁷ In November 1945, the building was completely demolished. Its tenant during the war was Mr H. Gijtenbeek, who had a drapery shop there. By his own account, Gijtenbeek had been offered the house for sale during the occupation years, but he had 'of course' refused. He had subsequently continued to rent the property.¹⁶⁸ Who the landlord was is not mentioned in the archives. In November 1945, Gijtenbeek made attempts to gain possession of the property on Oosterstraat through the municipality, while he himself lived at Singel 33, the former home of interned NSB member Arend Wassink.¹⁶⁹

'Heirs to said plot cannot be found either so that, if the sale is proceeded with, we would greatly appreciate your cooperation in this matter,' Gijtenbeek wrote to mayor Bruins Slot on 8 November 1945.¹⁷⁰ Bruins Slot gave him no definitive answer, but referred him to the administrator of the estate and, should he fail to track down the administrator, to the Putten civil-law notary Neervoort.¹⁷¹ Through the NBI, Gijtenbeek contacted the administrator of the De Rooij sisters' estate, Pieter Berg in Putten. After a long wait, Gijtenbeek did indeed manage to acquire the property through Berg. On 4 December 1947, Berg received permission from the NBI to sell the plot of land on Oosterstraat to Gijtenbeek.¹⁷²

A similar stance was taken by the municipality a month later when the ANBO attempted to recover overdue rent for Spoorstraat 20, owned by the Van Esso family. The house had been bought by J. Steel, but the letting of it to new residents immediately after the war was apparently in the hands of the ANBO. In November 1945, Bruins Slot referred a request by the ANBO to the municipality of Nijkerk to help collect rent arrears to the *Politieke Opsporingsdienst* (Political Criminal Investigation Service) in Harderwijk. This concerned rent owed by 'a Police Department and from which we as Managers have not received any monies', the ANBO wrote.¹⁷³ It is unknown which police department this was, but it will not have been the local military constabulary, as they had no control over the homes.

Restoration of rights of Jos de Liver

The properties Spoorstraat 30 and 32 had been bought by Hendrik van Sweden with the permission of owner Samuel de Liver. Sole heir Jos de Liver stated in writing in her half-yearly report as administrator of her parents' estate: *'Restoration of rights of houses Spoorstraat 30 and 32 took place 30 April 1948 at the office of civil-law notary J.C. Verhoeff, Utrecht. It was decided on an amicable settlement as the late Mr Van Sweden bought these properties after prior consultation with and with permission from my father Mr S. de Liver, with the intention of keeping these houses out of enemy hands. Mr Van Sweden was mortgage holder.'*¹⁷⁴ Officially, Jos de Liver was granted sole ownership of all her parents' properties in January 1949. This is stated in a certificate of inheritance dated 18 January 1949, signed by Nijkerk civil-law notary Reijers.¹⁷⁵

¹⁶⁷ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.12, inv. no. 145588, Rooij, L. de, Nijkerk, P. van den Berg to NBI Apeldoorn, 5 March 1947.

¹⁶⁸ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.12, inv. no. 145588, Rooij, L. de, Nijkerk, H. Gijtenbeek to fa. K. v. Gelder, Harderwijk, 20 November 1945.

¹⁶⁹ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, H. Gijtenbeek to mayor of Nijkerk, 8 November 1945.

¹⁷⁰ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, H. Gijtenbeek to mayor of Nijkerk, 8 November 1945.

¹⁷¹ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Z. Bruins Slot to H. Gijtenbeek, 13 November 1945.

¹⁷² NA, NBI, 2.09.16.12, inv.no. 145588, Rooy, L., Nijkerk, 4 December 1947.

¹⁷³ GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, ANBO to Nijkerk Municipal Administration, 22 November 1945 and Bruins Slot to ANBO, Utrecht, 19 November 1945.

¹⁷⁴ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.09, inv. no. 119172, Liver, S. de, Nijkerk, J.M. de Liver, financial report first six months 1948 (hand-written, signed), 24 August 1948); NA, NBI, 2.09.16, Verkaufsbücher, inv. no. 536.7 *Algemeen laufnr.* 7003; GAN, GA 0876/02, Civil-law notary Mr. D.J. Beekman, LLM, 18 April 1953.

¹⁷⁵ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.09, inv.no. 119172, Liver, S. de, Nijkerk, Civil-law notary Justus Verhoeff, Utrecht, Certificate of inheritance, 18 January 1949.

However, the fact that Jos de Liver received that commitment in an official deed does not mean that she was able to exercise those rights. Indeed, that does not seem to have been the case, judging from her own recollections. She said the eventual sale of the two houses on Spoorstraat owned by her parents was only realised after a long legal battle. Moreover, according to her, the houses had to be sold quickly and at far too low a price.¹⁷⁶ The reason for the trouble was that Van Sweden had died in 1946. Jos de Liver initially failed to reach an agreement with his heir. She only succeeded in doing so two years later, as evidenced by the note dated 24 August 1948. The houses were sold in 1949.¹⁷⁷

There was no question of any involvement of the municipality of Nijkerk in these matters. How the two houses were ultimately sold cannot be properly traced. The documents relating to the amicable settlement do show that she regained ownership of her parents' two houses. Furthermore, the De Liver family's Jokos file shows that compensation was paid from Germany for the lost household effects of Spoorstraat 30. The compensation was paid to Jos de Liver as the sole heiress of her parents.¹⁷⁸ There was no involvement of the municipality of Nijkerk in this case. As shown above, immovable property was looted by the ANBO, the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.* and the German NSDAP's Pellmann.

Restoration of rights Aaltje Speyer-Fortuijn

After the war, the Nijkerk civil-law notary Reijers was appointed as administrator for both Fortuijn families. At the family's request, Heinz-Leopold Speyer took over that task. Speyer was married after the war to the sole heir of both families, Aaltje Fortuijn.¹⁷⁹ She was the daughter of Izaak and Jetje Fortuijn and sister of Leo Fortuijn. She worked as a nurse in Leiden and survived the war by going into hiding.¹⁸⁰ On 3 October 1946, her husband Speyer was already appointed administrator of her uncle and aunt, the baker Bram and his sister Kaatje Fortuijn. As of 5 December that year, he also became administrator of her parents' and brother's estates.¹⁸¹

As for her aunt and uncle's property, those were the properties at Nieuwstraat numbers 17 and 19.¹⁸² Neither properties had been sold during the war, as far as is known. The properties Nieuwstraat 17 and 19 were sold in 1949 by the heirs to Hendrik Motshagen, fishmonger in Nijkerk and occupant and tenant of number 19.¹⁸³

Like several other properties, Nieuwstraat 10 to 14 were managed and rented out by the ANBO after the Izaak and Jetje Fortuijn family and their son Leo had been taken away.¹⁸⁴ After the war, management was taken over by the Military Authority, which had

¹⁷⁶ Zn., 'Persoonlijke overwinning op Hitler' (Personal victory over Hitler) *Amersfoortse Courant*, 25 April 1998; Dylan de Gruijl, 'Jos de Liver uit Israël even terug op geboortegrond in Nijkerk. Ik heb geen ander land' (Jos de Liver from Israel briefly back on native soil in Nijkerk. I have no other country) *Amersfoortse Courant*, 20 April 2002.

¹⁷⁷ Land registry ledgers, Ledger 12, article 6601.

¹⁷⁸ Jokos file 9031, Samuel de Liver, Spoorstraat 30, Nijkerk; *Ibid.*, Dr. T. Kotsch, RR, *Interne Kennziffern* 115, 9031, 'Bescheid in der Rückerstaattungssache', De Liver, 6 May 1960.

¹⁷⁹ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv. no. 77594, Fortuyn, A., Nijkerk, J.A. Smit (NBI, Harderwijk) to NBI, The Hague, 30 September 1946.

¹⁸⁰ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv. no. 77594, Fortuyn, A., Nijkerk, Reijers to *Adviescommissie voor Rechtsherstel en Beheer* (Advisory Committee on Restoration of Rights and Management), Harderwijk, 6 September 1945.

¹⁸¹ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv. no. 77594, Fortuyn, A., Nijkerk, B.E. van Tijn to NBI, Apeldoorn, 25 November 1956.

¹⁸² NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv. no. 77594, Fortuyn, A., W. Verploegh Chassé, director NBI to representation of NBI Arnhem, 7 November 1949; *Ibid.*, E.P. Reijers, Accountability Report,

¹⁸³ NA, NBI, W. Verploegh Chassé, director NBI to representation of NBI Arnhem, 26 October 1949; *Ibid.*, Th.J.C. Vosskuhler, NBI representative to NBI The Hague, 7 November 1949; GAN, Land registry ledgers, ledger 9, article 5729 and Land registry ledgers, ledger 12, article 6670.

¹⁸⁴ GAN, Land registry ledgers, ledger 8, article 5217; GAN, Municipality of Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Municipal Public Works Department of Nijkerk, W. Postema, technical officer, 'Gegevens betreffende onkosten van gemeenten terzake van het op transport stellen van Joden - 15 mei tot 1 oktober 1943' (Data concerning expenses of municipalities regarding the deportation of Jews - 15 May to 1 October 1943), 6 November 1943.

been established after the liberation.¹⁸⁵ The rent for the houses was also collected by the ANBO after the liberation, according to an account by civil-law notary Reijers dated August 1947.¹⁸⁶

The municipality of Nijkerk appears to have been involved in the letting of Nieuwstraat 12. It concerns the statement that rent for this property was paid irregularly. The rent should have been paid by the municipality's Social Affairs department for one of the tenants of Nieuwstraat 12. In August 1947, the municipality of Nijkerk had paid the rent up to September of the previous year.¹⁸⁷ It is unknown whether the municipality also paid the rent during the war.

After the war, it emerged that there was a double mortgage on the property at Nieuwstraat 12 and that the total assets of the Izaak and Jetje Fortuijn family were negative. Besides the fact that it had been definitively established that Mr and Mrs Fortuijn and their son Leo had died, the administration by Speyer was cancelled for that reason in July 1950.¹⁸⁸ The properties on Nieuwstraat were sold by the Fortuijn heirs during a public auction in 1951, according to the land registry ledger of the municipality of Nijkerk.¹⁸⁹ The municipality of Nijkerk was not involved in this.

Furthermore, the Fortuijn family's Jokos file shows that compensation was paid from Germany for the lost contents of Nieuwstraat 12, including lost rental income. The compensation was paid to Aaltje Speyer-Fortuijn as the sole heir of her parents.¹⁹⁰ There was no involvement of the municipality of Nijkerk in this case.

Restoration of rights various persons

Hoogstraat 9 was sold on 16 August 1957 to Lambertus de Ridder, on behalf of the heirs of Hartog de Rooij.¹⁹¹ Singel 28 was owned by Louis and Bela de Liever-Van der Hak. This couple moved back in there after the war.¹⁹² Louis de Liever was given back eight one thousand guilder notes by Jacobus Florijn, the director of the Nijkerksche Bank, which he had deposited with him for safekeeping.¹⁹³ Langestraat 34, 36 and 38, owned by Nihom, were sold on his behalf by the bank director Jacobus Florijn to shopkeeper Arend Compagne in 1962.¹⁹⁴ The residential house with shop on Schoolstraat in Nijkerkerveen, also owned by Nihom, was returned to him by Aalbert Doppenberg on 9 March 1950. He had bought the property on 7 September 1943 from messrs Van den Brom and Ramselaar from Amersfoort. They, in turn, had bought it from the NGV on 12 August the same year.¹⁹⁵

The properties bought by Arend Wassink at Singel 16 and 18 came into the possession of the heirs of Ms Johanna van der Hoeden through an amicable settlement. Arend Wassink's purchase of Bagijnenstraat 10, not mentioned in the surviving *Verkaufsbücher*, was reversed in 1947. However, the property was already included as of 1 January 1946 in the estate inventory

¹⁸⁵ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv.no. 77594, Fortuyn, A., Nijkerk, Reijers to *Adviescommissie voor Rechtsherstel en Beheer* (Advisory Committee on Restoration of Rights and Management), Harderwijk, 19 September 1945.

¹⁸⁶ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv.no. 77594, Fortuyn, A., Nijkerk, Accountability Report, appendix to: E.P. Reijers, to NBI, Apeldoorn, 15 August 1947.

¹⁸⁷ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv. no. 77594, Fortuyn, A., Nijkerk, E.P. Reijers, Accountability Report as administrator of the assets of married couples I. and K. Fortuijn-Vos, sd.; *Ibid.*, Speijer to NBI, Apeldoorn, 24 February 1947. This file contains documents about the family A. Fortuyn, as well as documents from his brother and sister-in-law I. Fortuyn-De Vos and their son Leo Fortuyn.

¹⁸⁸ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv. no. 77594, Fortuyn, A., Nijkerk, G.H. Nijenhuis, NBI Arnhem to Speyer, Leiden, 13 July 1950.

¹⁸⁹ GAN, Land registry ledgers, ledger 8, article 5217.

¹⁹⁰ Jokos file 5999, Izaak Fortuijn, Nieuwstraat 12, Nijkerk; *Ibid.*, Work form S.E.C. Rotterdam, reg.no. "JOKOS" 5999, reg.no. 150, 1 March 1958, annex including rental value.

¹⁹¹ Digital land registry, Copy of public register - Hyp4 dl 2847 no, 14 series ARNHEM.

¹⁹² Land registry ledgers, ledger 10, article 5962; Digital land registry, Copy of public register - Hyp4 dl 8363 no 25 series ARNHEM.

¹⁹³ Statement Louk de Liever, conversation Nijkerk, 3 November 2022.

¹⁹⁴ Digital land registry, Copy of public register - Hyp4 dl 3124 no 67 series ARNHEM.

¹⁹⁵ GAN, GA 0876/02, Civil-law notary D.J. Beekman, 18 April 1953.

of 'the late S. v.d. Hoeden-Turksema', which was drawn up by the administrator J. Florin in October 1947. By that time, the administrator Florijn had received 800.44 guilders, from the ANBO in Utrecht, in surplus rents received up to May 1946.¹⁹⁶ In 1955, that plot was sold to Mr Doggenaar.¹⁹⁷

Singel 37 was not Jewish property, but belonged to Mennonite watchmaker David van der Waag. He left Nijkerk in the 1930s and then rented his house to the Van der Hoeden-Fortuijn couple, who moved out in the spring of 1942.¹⁹⁸ In their place came Henri Dragt, who opened a pastry shop at that address that year.¹⁹⁹ Dragt bought the property from Van der Waag's heirs in 1949. Because the house was not owned by Jews, it was not put under the management of the ANBO. Kloosterstraat 3 did belong to Jews, and to the Israelite congregation. Jewish minister Sander Colthof lived in the building until 9 April 1943.²⁰⁰ It is not clear to whom the tenant, who subsequently moved in, paid rent. The property was sold to the Reformed Church in Nijkerk in 1955. The property was sold by Salomon Nihom and Louïis de Liver, both of whom owned half of the property according to the land registry records.²⁰¹

The synagogue on Singel and also a house next door were owned by the Dutch Israelite congregation. The damage, including a hole in the roof caused by a bomb during the war, was repaired after the liberation. This work was done by, among other people, Heimen de Jong, who had a contracting firm with his father and talked about that at an advanced age in 2022.²⁰² However, the Nijkerk Israelite congregation had become so small due to the war that it was no longer possible to hold shul. The synagogue was therefore sold in 1955 to shoe merchant Jan Jacob Bijvank, who established a shoe shop there. Six years later, he also bought the adjacent property from the Israelite congregation.²⁰³ Since he also wanted to sell pig skin leather shoes in his shoe shop, Bijvank had to get prior permission from the relatives. One of those who gave permission was Nihom, who had emigrated to America.²⁰⁴ After the sale, the synagogue's inventory was transferred to the synagogue in Amersfoort, with which the Nijkerk synagogue was merged.

Meiling family

Apart from the properties at Nieuwstraat 10 to 14, Izaak and Jetje Fortuijn also owned a warehouse at Koetsendijk 69 as rag traders. The sale of this property deserves special attention. That is because linked to it in the archives is the surname of a prominent resident of Nijkerk, namely cattle feed trader, councillor and by that time former alderman Anthonie Meiling. In 1948, the firm G.A. Meiling bought the warehouse at Koetsendijk 69 from the estate of Isaak Fortuijn for 1,800 guilders.²⁰⁵ However, further investigation shows that it did not concern the then 81-year-old former councillor Meiling, councillor and alderman in

¹⁹⁶ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.06, inv. no. 91034, Hoeden-Turksma, S. van der, Nijkerk, J. Florijn to the NBI Apeldoorn, 10 October 1947.

¹⁹⁷ Land registry ledgers, ledger 12, article 6457, sequential numbers 1 to 4; Land registry ledgers, ledger 13, article 7093, sequential number 1.

¹⁹⁸ GAN, 190, Population Register 1936-1948, Housing register Schraasserstr. - Smidsteeg, Singel 37; Family cards Nijkerk 1921 - 1937 (David van der Waag)

¹⁹⁹ GAN, Permit under the Nuisance Act Singel 37, 10 September 1942.

²⁰⁰ GAN, Municipality Nijkerk 1920-1947, E 271, Municipal Public Works Department of Nijkerk, W. Postema, technical officer, 'Gegevens betreffende onkosten van gemeenten terzake van het op transport stellen van Joden - 15 mei tot 1 oktober 1943' (Data concerning expenses of municipalities regarding the deportation of Jews - 15 May to 1 October 1943), 6 November 1943.

²⁰¹ Land registry ledgers, ledger 13, article 6993 and ledger 4, article 4001, sequential number 45.

²⁰² Collection Museum Nijkerk, interview with H. de Jong, 27 July 2020.

²⁰³ Land registry ledgers, ledger 8, article 5396, 2, J.J. Bijvank, shoe merchant; *Ibid.*, ledger 6, article 4464, 5 and Ledger 8, article 5396, 7, J.J. Bijvank, shoe merchant

²⁰⁴ Communication from former civil-law notary Dieter van de Castel, LLM to the author.

²⁰⁵ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv. no. 77594, Fortuyn, A., Nijkerk, Loth, NBI board of directors, 5 September 1947; *Ibid.*, H.L. Speijer, Application for authorisation to sell Immovable Property (attached to letter dated 5 Aug. 1947) 12 August 1947; *Ibid.*, P. Reijers to NBI, Apeldoorn, 15 August 1947.

Nijkerk from 1910 to 1945. It concerned his son, grain merchant Gerrit Albertus Meiling.²⁰⁶ The warehouse at Koetsendijk 69 had been bought by the aforementioned ironmonger Arend Wassink during the war, but had been returned to Aaltje Speyer-Fortuijn after the war.²⁰⁷

Municipal councillor Klaas Visscher

The person most closely associated with the municipality of Nijkerk was ARP councillor Klaas Visscher. Visscher was a Nijkerk gentleman farmer who lived in town and was good friends with his peer, mayor Bruins Slot. He had become a councillor in 1939 at the age of 36 and would be a councillor and alderman in Nijkerk until 1974.²⁰⁸ His wife was Evertje van Koeverden Aartsdochter, nicknamed 'Gouden Eefje' (Golden Eefje). She was very wealthy and had obtained numerous houses from her parents' inheritance. In December 1943, she bought the houses at Venestraat 18 and 20 from the NVG through the ANBO for 8,200 euros. Both these houses had been seized by the NVG on 16 December 1941 from Isaäk Hammelburg, who himself lived at 18 Venestraat and had his butcher's shop there.²⁰⁹

The notarial deed dated 12 November 1952 shows that Ms Van Koeverden's purchase at the time took place 'in consultation with and at the request of' the butcher Hammelburg. Should he or his wife survive the war, they would get the houses back. Neither of them returned from Germany, but were murdered. In consultation with Hammelburg's three children, who did survive the war, it was decided to consider the 1943 sale as legally valid. They thereby waived their 'right to restoration of rights'. Ms Van Koeverden did, however, compensate for the increase in value of both houses. She also reimbursed rents received less the taxes paid, fire insurance premium and maintenance costs.²¹⁰

That relations between the Visscher-Van Koeverden couple and the Hammelburg family were indeed good is clear from I. Hammelburg's file at the Netherlands Property Administration Institute. His daughter Betje or Betty Hammelburg requested the *Adviescommissie voor Rechtsherstel en Beheer* (Advisory Committee on Restoration of Rights and Management) in Harderwijk to appoint Klaas Visscher as administrator in 1946.²¹¹ Belongings of the butcher Isaäk Hammelburg were buried in a milk can by the Visscher family and returned to the family after the war.

This case does not show any questionable role of the municipality of Nijkerk.

Purchase of property and land by the municipality

For the purpose of building a few workers' houses and public facilities, the municipality bought some plots of land, including a small farm that stood at Brink 21 (B 2118). These properties were owned by Ms Spinosa Cattela-Vors. They were possessions she had gained possession of only a few years before, having lost them involuntarily during the war. During the war, Arend Wassink had bought the small farm and restoration of rights for that had taken place in 1946.²¹² Wassink renounced both the

²⁰⁶ Land registry ledgers, ledger 11, article 4606, no. 5, G.A. Meiling Antonus'zn; Ibid., Land registry ledgers, ledger 8, article 5217, Isaac Fortuyn, sequential no. 2; NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv. no. .77594, Fortuyn, A., Nijkerk, P. Reijers to NBI, Apeldoorn, 15 August 1947

²⁰⁷ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.04, inv. no. 77594, Fortuyn, A., Nijkerk, Management I. Fortuijn, J. Fortuijn-Vos, L. Fortuijn, sd. [Possible enclosure to letter by E.P. Reijers to NBI, The Hague, 30 September 1946].

²⁰⁸ Street name booklet, municipality of Nijkerk. See: https://www.nijkerk.eu/_flysystem/media/straatnamenboekje-met-fotos-versie-25nov13.pdf.

²⁰⁹ Digital Land Registry, Copy of public register - Hyp4 dl 2342 no 29 series ARNHEM; Notes archive civil-law notary

²¹⁰ Digital Land Registry, Copy of public register - Hyp4 dl 2612 no 105 series ARNHEM.

²¹¹ NA, NBI, inv. no. 2.09.16.06, 85989, Hammelburg, I., Nijkerk, B. Hammelburg to *Adviescommissie voor Rechtsherstel en Beheer* (Advisory Committee on Restoration of Rights and Management) at Harderwijk, 6 May 1946.

²¹² GAN, GA 0876/02, Civil-law notary D.J. Beekman to Officer of Social Affairs Municipality of Nijkerk, 18 April 1953.

property and the agricultural land, and transferred all rents collected since 1943 to Mrs Spinosa Cattela-Vors. Only the maintenance costs paid in the meantime were deducted from the total sum.²¹³

The municipality paid exactly 8,000 guilders for this small farm with some land in 1949.²¹⁴ Wassink had paid only 3,800 guilders for it in 1943, according to the *Verkaufsbücher*.²¹⁵ The plots B 1076 (4,880 m²) and B 2817 (8,570 m²) were two pieces of agricultural land. The municipality bought this arable land from Ms Spinosa Catella-Vorst for a total of 1.25 guilders per square metre. The total amount for both plots was 16,812.50 guilders. During the war, its tenant Van den Akker had paid only 2,500 guilders for B 2817.²¹⁶ In 1949, the municipality paid more than four times that for that arable land measuring over 8 hectares. By comparison, the municipality made a similar purchase in the same year for the same project. It bought three plots of land of 16,235 square metres for 13,000 guilders from Ms Annetje ten Haven of Hilversum. In this sale too, the municipality paid 1.25 guilders per square metre.²¹⁷

Records in the *Gelders Archief* show that investigation of these and similar transactions was thorough. First, the Provincial department in Gelderland of the Central Department for Reconstruction and Public Housing, part of the Ministry of Reconstruction and Public Housing, investigated the case. It agreed in early September.²¹⁸ Then, in early October, the chief engineer and director of the Gelderland Provincial Public Works and Water Management Department approved the purchase.²¹⁹ In mid-August, the municipality of Nijkerk had informed the Provincial Executive of Gelderland that the Head of the *Prijzenbureau voor Onroerende Zaken* (Pricing Agency for Immovable Property) in Harderwijk had also agreed to the 'quid pro quo', i.e. the price the municipality paid for Ms Spinosa Cattela-Vors's land.²²⁰

Reversing the liquidation of companies

After the war, liquidated Jewish businesses in Nijkerk were also included in the restoration of rights. In some cases, this will have involved nothing more than an observation that the liquidated companies no longer existed and that the business owners in question had been murdered. This was the case, for example, for the liquidation of the business of vegetable trader Mok, who occupied a rented house at 7 Torenstraat.

What happened to the properties that belonged to the firm of L. and Ph. de Liever & Co is not entirely clear. According to the collection of the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.*, the property at Singel 28, where Louï's and Bela de Liever lived, was owned by Emanuel Cohen and not by De Liever, as Bruins Slot had claimed.²²¹ After the war, however, the property was found to be owned by Louï's de Liever.

²¹³ NA, NBI, Archives 2.09.16.13, inv. no 168595, Spinosa Cattela-Vorst, M.H.H., Arnhem, E.P. Reijers, civil-law notary, Deed of Restoration of Rights, 29 October 1946.

²¹⁴ GAN, 004, Nijkerk Municipal Council, 1948-1978, Minutes of the Municipal Council 27 July 1949, decision no.7.

²¹⁵ NA, NBI, Archives 2.09.16, Verkaufsbücher, inv. no. 536.3, General laufnr. 4376.

²¹⁶ Ter Braake, Jewish Agricultural Land Database (2011), inv. no. M29.

²¹⁷ GAN, 004, Nijkerk Municipal Council, 1948-1978, Minutes of the Municipal Council 29 June 1949, decision no. 4.

²¹⁸ GA, Entry 0039 Provincial Executive, Inv. no 6212 Expropriation of municipal property, 1850, 1946-1947 - 08.4. Municipalities, 6357 Nijkerk, 1925-1949, Chief engineer and director, 9 September 1949.

²¹⁹ GA, Entry 0039 Provincial Executive, Inv. no 6212 Expropriation of municipal property, 1850, 1946-1947 - 08.4. Municipalities, 6357 Nijkerk, 1925-1949, Chief engineer and director Provincial Water Board of Gelderland to the Provincial Executive, 6 October 1949.

²²⁰ GA, Entry 0039 Provincial Executive, Inv. no 6212 Expropriation of municipal property, 1850, 1946-1947 - 08.4. Municipalities, 6357 Nijkerk, 1925-1949, Municipality of Nijkerk to Provincial Executive of Gelderland, 19 August 1949.

²²¹ NIOD, Archive 094f, Collection of files derived from the archives of the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.*, inv.no. 5842, Firma E. Cohen Jzn. and Children, Nijkerk, Singel 22, (probably Aalders) to *Wirtschaftsprüfstelle*, Arnheim, 23 November 1943.

The slaughterhouse at Stationsweg 18, which housed the calf slaughterhouse of the brothers Philip and Samuël de Liver, came into the hands of their niece Mrs Sophia de Liver-de Liver of Amsterdam after the war. She was the daughter of their brother Levi. He had been the owner of the commercial premises, but had been killed in Auschwitz during the war. Sophia de Liver was thus a full cousin of Jos de Liver.²²² The records of the De Liver family show that through that inheritance, the residential house at Stationsweg 16 also became the property of Sophia. She complained to the manager of the ANBO assets that she was owed 1,103.99 guilders in rent arrears from the war years.²²³

After the liberation, one K. Mostert wanted to reopen the De Liver slaughterhouse. Before this could happen, he had to wait until the Möring & Steenaart firm found alternative accommodation. With a view to reopening the slaughterhouse, Mostert applied to the municipality of Nijkerk for a new permit under the Nuisance Act in February 1946.²²⁴ The property had since been returned to Sophia de Liver, as the heir of Levi de Liver.²²⁵ The Housing and Building Control Department of the Nijkerk Municipal Public Works Department wrote to Ms De Liver that it was necessary to apply for a new permit under the Nuisance Act. A special scheme introduced by the government in July 1945 could be invoked by her only in a special situation, according to the municipal officer. That regulation applied to companies '*which were forced to shut down for a long time due to war conditions*'. An exemption provision in that Act stated that a company could be out of business for a maximum of four years. That meant, in the case of this slaughterhouse, that it had to be put back into operation before 29 April 1946, the municipality wrote on 7 February 1946. Indeed, 29 April 1946 marked the fourth anniversary of the last slaughter at Spoorstraat 18.²²⁶

However, municipal councils were authorised to '*make further provisions in this regard*'. What provisions those were and how that would work out is unknown. It is also not known whether the municipality of Nijkerk took such measures. In any case, the result was that the municipal council of Nijkerk asked Mostert to contact officer Postema to settle formal matters. Incidentally, it is noteworthy that the letter is addressed to the tenant Mostert and not to Ms De Liver herself, who, according to earlier letters, should have applied for the permit as the owner of the slaughterhouse.²²⁷ Nevertheless, Mostert eventually managed to reopen the slaughterhouse at Stationsweg 18. The permit under the Nuisance Act was also transferred to his name, without the need to apply for a new one. This is evident from a letter from the municipality of Nijkerk to the firm of Mostert and Van Koot dated 9 September 1963.²²⁸ Whether this was because he had started slaughtering before 29 April 1946 or whether the municipality of Nijkerk still made an exception is unknown.

A second related matter is that the firm Möring & Steenaart argued that it could not vacate Stationsweg 18, which it rented from 1 January 1943, so quickly. Through their lawyer, the firm therefore requested a deferral from Ms Sophia de Liver in March 1946, in light of the economic interest it fulfilled as an employer of a large number of employees.²²⁹ Whether that delay was granted is unknown. The municipality of Nijkerk had nothing further to do with the case as it was an issue between a tenant and landlord.

²²² https://www.maxvandam.info/humo-gen/family/1/F1420?main_person=I3883 - accessed spring 2023.

²²³ Archives Y. de Liver, S. de Liver - De Liver to Administrator ANBO, 22 July 1946.

²²⁴ GAN, Permit under the Nuisance Act, Stationsweg 18, K. Mostert to the honourable mayor and aldermen, February 26, 1946. There is sometimes confusion over the correct names as far as Stationsweg and Stationsstraat are concerned. This applies, for example, to the correspondence, in the possession of Mrs Y. de Liver, which talks about Stationslaan (Archive Y. de Liver, Firma Mostert & Van Koot to Tj. Pen, 2 July 1952), but also from Stationsstraat (Archive Y. de Liver, Director telephone district Utrecht to S. de Liver - De Liver, 19 March 1948).

²²⁵ Joodsmonument.nl, accessed 1 June 2023.

²²⁶ GAN, Permit under the Nuisance Act, Stationsweg 18, Nijkerk Municipal Public Works Department, Building Control Department to Nijkerk Municipal Executive, 7 March 1946, quoting letter to Ms S. de Liver dated 14 February 1946.

²²⁷ GAN, Permit under the Nuisance Act, Stationsweg 18 (1930-1946), Municipal Council of Nijkerk to K. Mostert, Stationsweg 20, Nijkerk.

²²⁸ GAN, Permit under the Nuisance Act, Stationsweg 18 (1963-1978), Nijkerk Municipal Executive to firm Mostert and Van Koot, 9 September 1963.

²²⁹ Archives Y. de Liver, Möring and Steenaert to S. de Liver - De Liver, 4 March 1946; *Ibid.*, Lawyer and Local Counsel W. Vermeulen (name omitted, cf. Ditto, S. de Liver - De Liver to W. Vermeulen, 2 April 1946) to S. de Liver - De Liver, 20 March 1946.

The same applies to a difference of opinion between K. Mostert and Sophia de Liver regarding the rebuilding costs of the butcher's shop at Stationsweg 18. That was an issue in 1949.

A third property matter related to the plot at Stationsweg 18 concerns the construction of temporary premises. In 1945, the Municipality of Nijkerk built two temporary premises, one of which was on this plot at Stationsweg 18. The municipality set the record straight three years later, in April 1948, after Ms De Liver-De Liver granted permission to the municipality of Nijkerk to build temporary premises for K. Mostert on the plot of Stationsweg 18 in October 1947.²³⁰ The building was already there, in other words. However, by order of the Department of Reconstruction and Public Housing, the right of superficies had to be negotiated retroactively from 1 June 1945. Otherwise, the municipality would not own the home. The municipality paid Ms De Liver-De Liver 12 guilders a year for the right of superficies.²³¹

The temporary premises were built by the central government, but they were placed under the management of the municipality of Nijkerk.²³² Formally, construction could have taken place only if all the owners, the heirs of Levi de Liver, had signed off on that. As late as 26 July 1948, however, the municipality of Nijkerk was still unclear as to whether Sophia de Liver's parents and also any brothers and sisters she had had died. Until that was completely clear, the municipality had to get permission from the Netherlands Property Administration Institute for the right of superficies - building the temporary premises.²³³

At the same time, Sophia de Liver was able to claim the damage caused to the slaughterhouse at Stationsweg 18 from the municipality of Nijkerk. The technical officer of the municipal building and housing supervision department of the municipality of Nijkerk informed her of this in a letter on 30 August 1948. In the same letter, he asked her to settle an outstanding bill of 160.86 guilders for roof tiles of the building.²³⁴ Thus, the settlement of repair costs took place at the same time as the construction of temporary premises on the same plot.

Affairs of E. Cohen's heirs

Emanuel Cohen's heirs took several cases to court after the war. First, they addressed the case where Albert Meiling Jr. had taken over the company stock of the Cohen firm. He appeared to have sold them at the request of the Distex.²³⁵ The case involved another son of alderman Meiling. It was a case '*concerning recovery of unjustly enjoyed profits from the sale of the drapery business of E. Cohen*'.²³⁶ Albert Meiling junior took over Cohen's textile goods through his textile firm for 7,876.21 guilders. The amount, less administrative expenses, was transferred to Lippmann-Rosenthal, the looting bank where all Jewish assets were collected.²³⁷

²³⁰ Archives Y. de Liver, Municipality of Nijkerk to S. de Liver - de Liver, 11 October 1947; *ibid.*, E.P. Reijers (civil-law notary) to S. de Liver - De Liver, 6 March 1948; GA, Entry 0039 Provincial Executive, Lease and tenancy of municipal property, 1816-1949, inv. no. 6476 Nijkerk, 1867-1949, Decision Mayor of Nijkerk, Council resolution Municipality of Nijkerk, 7 April 1948.

²³¹ GA, Entry 0039 Provincial Executive, Lease and tenancy of municipal property, 1816-1949, inv.no. 6476 Nijkerk, 1867-1949, Chief Engineer and Director Gelderland Provincial Public Works and Water Management Department to Provincial Executive of Gelderland, 12 May 1948 (copy).

²³² Archive Y. de Liver, Municipality of Nijkerk to S. de Liver - De Liver, 11 October 1947.

²³³ Archive Y. de Liver, Municipality of Nijkerk to S. de Liver - De Liver, 26 July 1948.

²³⁴ Archives Y. de Liver, Technical officer W.O. E. van Boeijen to S. de Liver - De Liver, 30 August 1948.

²³⁵ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.03, inv. no. 55160, Cohen, E., Nijkerk, Report on the years 1947 and 1948 regarding the administration of Emanuel and Theodora Cohen.

²³⁶ NA, NBI, J.W. van der Krol to NBI, Arnhem, 6 September 1950.

²³⁷ NIOD, Archive 094f, Collection of files derived from the archives of the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.*, inv. no. 5842, Firma E. Cohen Jzn. and Children, Nijkerk, Singel 22, (probably Aalders) to *Wirtschaftsprüfstelle*, Arnheim, 23 November 1943.

The Distex was a Government Agency which had been established in 1940. It was intended to promote trade in all kinds of fibres, yarn and textile goods.²³⁸ On behalf of Cohen's three children, Johanna, Joseph and Alex, Nijkerk lawyer Van der Krol argued a case against Meiling jr. at the Council for the Restoration of Rights in Amsterdam. He accused Meiling of '*unjustly enjoying profits from the sale of the drapery business of E. Cohen*'²³⁹ The case ended with a settlement, with Meiling refunding only ten per cent of the original value. This, according to the Council for the Restoration of Rights, was in line with its case law in similar cases.²⁴⁰ For the family, this was important partly because Johanna Cohen, together with her husband, had continued the clothes shop which had belonged to her parents before the war, at Singel 20.²⁴¹ Further research in the archives of the Council for the Restoration of Rights in the National Archives in The Hague did not yield any additional information.

A second case concerned that against Nijkerk resident Johannes Snapper, who had custody of a sizeable consignment of drapery goods (fabrics and textiles) of Emanuel during the war. That lot had gone missing and the family sought compensation of 8,600 guilders including expenses through the district court in Zutphen. Just before the verdict, Snapper died. Further research revealed that he was short of money. In the end, the case was settled with Snapper's heirs with compensation of 3,000 guilders to Cohen's heirs. While the case was pending, preliminary relief proceedings forced the tenant of the upper floor of Singel 20 to leave because the Blankevoort-Cohen family needed the space for storage and family expansion. According to lawyer Van der Krol, this eviction took place '*with the cooperation of the Municipal Council*'.²⁴²

The tenant of Singel 22, the second building owned by Cohen, was G. Gijtenbeek. He was forced by Mr Van der Krol to pay off his rent arrears in instalments after the war.²⁴³ This Gijtenbeek, not to be confused with textile merchant H. Gijtenbeek who rented Oosterstraat 7 and bought it after the war, rented this house from Cohen. He transferred the rent to the account of Cohen's liquidated company at the *Bank voor Nederlandschen Arbeid N.V.*²⁴⁴ This was a bank set up by the Germans to manage the assets of liquidated companies.²⁴⁵ After the war, Gijtenbeek continued to live at Singel 22 and transferred the rent to the rightful owners whose rights had been restored.²⁴⁶

Closing words

This concludes the research into the deprivation of Jewish property rights in the municipality of Nijkerk. The main conclusions are recorded in Chapter 2. The most important conclusion, however, is that movable and immovable property of Jewish Dutch citizens was not deliberately appropriated by the municipality.

²³⁸ <http://www.oorlogsgetroffenen.nl/archiefvormer/DISTEX>

²³⁹ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.03, inv. no. 55160, Cohen, E., Nijkerk, J.W. van der Krol to NBI, Arnhem, 6 September 1950.

²⁴⁰ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.03, inv. no. 55160, Cohen, E., Nijkerk, Report for the years 1947 and 1948 regarding the administration of Emanuel and Theodora Cohen.

²⁴¹ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.03, inv. no. 55160, Cohen, E., Nijkerk, Advisory Committee on Restoration of Rights and Management, 3 September 1945; *Ibid.*, W. van de Krol to Netherlands Property Administration Institute Arnhem, 24 June 1948.

²⁴² NA, NBI, 2.09.16.03, inv. no. 55160, Cohen, E., Nijkerk, W. van der Krol to NBI, Apeldoorn, 10 December 1947 and *Ibid.* to NBI, Arnhem, 24 June 1948.

²⁴³ NA, NBI, 2.09.16.03, inv. no. 55160, Cohen, E., Nijkerk, Report on the years 1947 and 1948 regarding the administration of Emanuel and Theodora Cohen; *Ibid.*, J.W. van der Krol to NBI, Arnhem, 6 September 1950.

²⁴⁴ NIOD, Archive 094f, Collection of files derived from the archives of the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.*, inv.no. 5842, Firma E. Cohen Jzn. en Kinderen, Nijkerk, Singel 22, [probably Aalders] to *Wirtschaftsprüfstelle*, Arnheim, 23 November 1943. The *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft* stated that G. Gijtenbeek rented Singel 22, while after the war it turned out he had been renting Singel 20. According to the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft*, the tenant of Singel 22 was M. Versteeg, although after the war it turned out that he had actually occupied the top floor of Singel 20.

²⁴⁵ https://www.oorlogsgetroffenen.nl/archiefvormer/Bank_Nederlandschen_Arbeid - accessed 1 June 2023.

²⁴⁶ See, inter alia, NA, NBI, 2.09.16.03, inv. no. 55160, Cohen, E., Nijkerk, Initial assets E. Cohen, 20 June 1945, Singel 20 Nijkerk and *ibid.*, Balance sheet 1/1 '46 E. Cohen.

However, it is clear that the reception given to returning Jewish residents was disgraceful by any standard. Even considering that this was prevalent throughout the Netherlands, it is an unpleasant observation. It was not until the second half of the 1960s that attention was paid to the suffering endured by Jewish Dutch citizens. This followed publication in 1965 of Jewish historian Jacques Presser's study '*Ondergang*', on the persecution and division of Dutch Jewry during the war years.²⁴⁷

This research is a late consequence of Dr Presser first calling attention to this dark page in the history of the Netherlands and also of Nijkerk.

²⁴⁷ J. Presser, *Ondergang. De vervolging en verdelging van het Nederlandse Jodendom 1940-1945* (Downfall. The persecution and extermination of Dutch Jewry 1940-1945), 2 volumes (The Hague, 1965).

Consulted sources and literature

Interviews held

Louk de Liever, Nijkerk, 3 November 2022.

Literature consulted

R. Beekman and M. Pater, *Verdwenen bedrijven in Nijkerk en Nijkerkerveen* (Nijkerk, 2015).

J. Bouten, 'Wat is Nijkerk mooi geworden. Rachel Salomon-Hamburger op zoek naar Joods verleden' (zp., zd. [2002]).

S.M.H. Dusarduij, 'De fiscale geschiedenis van Nederland in vogelvlucht', in: A. C. Rijkers (ed.), *Inleiding belastingheffing ondernemingen en particulieren*, 7-19 (Tilburg, 2012).

L. de Jong, *Het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden tijdens de Tweede Wereldoorlog 1939-1945, deel 6, juli '42 – mei '43, tweede helft* (The Hague, 1975).

W. van Meurs, P. Slaman and M. Oprel (et al.), *Joodse burgers in Apeldoorn: onteigening en rechtsherstel* (Nijmegen, March 2022).

J. Presser, *Ondergang. De vervolging en verdelging van het Nederlandse Jodendom 1940-1945*, 2 parts (The Hague, 1965).

A. van Renssen, 'Gekkop'. *Hoe burgemeester Zwaantinus Bruins Slot Nijkerk de oorlog doorloopte*' (Nijkerk, 2021).

P. Romijn, *Burgemeesters in oorlogstijd. Besturen tijdens de Duitse bezetting* (Amsterdam, 2006).

R. Schütz, *Kille mist. Het Nederlandse notariaat en de erfenis van de oorlog* (Amsterdam, 2016).

R. Schütz, 'De administratieve verhulling van het lot van vervolgd tijdens de Endlösung. Bureaucratische paradoxen bij het registreren, verhullen en vernietigen van persoonsgegevens', in: *Tijdschrift voor geschiedenis* 135.1, 43-62 (2022).

R. te Slaa, *De houding van de gemeente Den Haag tegenover Joodse eigenaren van onroerend goed 1940-1955* (zp., 2016).

A. van Straalen, *Van jubileum naar catastrofe. De Joodse gemeenschap van Nijkerk in de periode 1926-1945* (Nijkerk, 2007).

M.-J. Vos en S. ter Braake, *Rechtsherstel na de Tweede Wereldoorlog van geroofd Joods onroerend goed* (Amsterdam, 2013).

M.-J. Vos, Maarten-Jan Vos, *Joods vastgoed in Winterswijk 1943-1950. Rapport over de roof en gedwongen verkoop van vastgoedbezit van Joden en de rol van de gemeente Winterswijk bij roof en rechtsherstel tijdens de Tweede Wereldoorlog en de jaren daarna* (Winterswijk, 2022)

Archives and collections consulted

Municipal archive of Nijkerk (GAN)

Digital land registry - via www.kadaster.nl

De Liver family archive, Y. de Liver Amsterdam

Gelders Archief (GA)

JMK, Jokos files archive

National Archives, Netherlands Property Administration Institute.

National Archives, Council for the Restoration of Rights: Judicial Division

NIOD, Archive 094f, Collection of files originating from the archives of the *Omnia-Treuhandgesellschaft m.b.H.*

Collection A. van Straalen

Diary Zwaantinus Bruins Slot 1939-1945 (author's private collection, version censored by the Bruins Slot family)

Websites consulted

<https://www.amsterdam.nl/bestuur-organisatie/organisatie/overige/stichting-ita/>

<https://www.archieven.nl/nl/zoeken?miview=inv2&mivast=0&mizig=210&miadt=298&micode=094&milang=en>

<https://data.jck.nl/page/aggregation/jhm-literatuur/20110474>

www.geldersarchief.nl

www.Joodsmonument.nl

https://www.maxvandam.info/humo-gen/family/1/F1420?main_person=I3883

https://www.nijkerk.eu/_flysystem/media/straatnamenboekje-met-fotos-versie-25nov13.pdf.

<https://oorlogsdodendinkelland.nl/slachtoffers/oude-gemeente-denekamp/spanjar-mozes/>

<http://www.oorlogsgetroffenen.nl/archiefvormer/DISTEX>

http://www.oorlogsgetroffenen.nl/thema/rechtsherstel/03_01_Bedrijven

<https://www.verhalenoverdeoorlog.nl/nl/interviews/louk-de-liever>