

'[Her sister] is not much more than a prostitute. Who dares to believe the complainant?'<sup>1</sup>  
Rape cases, experts and witnesses of respectability (1920-1933)

Lisanne E.R. de Ruiter  
Student number: 3786935

Master Thesis  
Cultural History  
Thesis advisor: dr. Willemijn Ruberg  
Second reader: drs. Fia Rongen-Dieteren

Deadline: June 26<sup>th</sup> 2015  
Number of words: 22 637

**Contents**

Introduction.....	3
Historiography and Dutch Disinterest .....	4
Main Question.....	8
Social Relevance .....	8
Theory.....	8
Methodology and Sub-Questions.....	13
Primary Sources.....	15
Chapter 1: Respectability in the Early Interwar Period .....	18
Feminists, Flappers and Feminine Conservatives .....	18
Some Particularities about Men.....	26
Chapter 2: Scientific Experts in the 1920s.....	30
An Apple a Day.....	30
Bedlam, Middle Class or State Asylum? .....	32
Reintegration and the Involvement of Judges, Doctors and Psychiatrists.....	35
Chapter 3: Of Cases and Dutch Courtrooms .....	37
General Overview of the Cases .....	37
Parole and Special Conditions .....	38
Evidence, Experts and Witnesses of Respectability .....	41
Of Cars and Kidnapping: Gertrud, Frederik, Michael and Marinus.....	43
Of ‘Retards’ and Pregnancies: Maria and Jan.....	45
Of Chairs and Hotels: Maria and Nathan.....	47
Of Essentially Good Girls and Men Who Disappear: Catharina and Jan .....	48
Of a Lack of Experts and Bicycles: Martha and Gerardus.....	53
Summary .....	54
Conclusion .....	58
Literature.....	62
Primary literature .....	62
Secondary literature.....	63

## Introduction

‘The hymen of the girl is not damaged; the penis therefore did not enter that far’

- Physician R.G.C. Schröder, after investigating Maria H<sup>2</sup>

‘[I have] seen the slim chair with the high edges, in which the witness H. would have experienced the violence. I consider cohabitation with the woman lying in that chair impossible if the woman resisted; of course sexual assault could happen with a woman in that position and ejaculation while one lies on top of the woman can of course happen as well.’

- Physician and lector of forensic medicine J.P.L. Hulst, after being asked on his opinion on the possibility of rape in the case of Maria H<sup>3</sup>

The above quotes both hail from the same investigation. Schröder and Hulst were asked to investigate the accusations of Maria H. Maria accused Nathan van Z. of raping her during the early 1920s. Nathan fiercely defended himself, saying he never touched nineteen-year-old Maria. However, doctor Schröder was quickly called to the police station to investigate Maria and Nathan. He examined both and concluded that Maria’s hymen was not ruptured and she therefore was not penetrated and not raped. She *did* seem to have been sexually assaulted, since she had fluid on her person and clothes, and alien pubic hairs were found on the suspect. Schröder collected the fluid, which turned out to be sperm, clothing and hairs and all were sent to Hulst, the aforementioned expert of forensic medicine, who did a series of tests and concluded it very possible that an assault had happened, even if not all his tests confirmed this suspicion.<sup>4</sup>

The district court of Alkmaar ruled, on the 20<sup>th</sup> of December 1921, that this had been a case of attempted rape and convicted Nathan to a prison sentence of four years. This was a harsh sentence, since Maria, according to the doctors, was not penetrated by the suspect, nor had this been a possibility according to Hulst (as seen in the quote above). Therefore, it would be expected that the suspect would have been convicted of the lighter offence of

---

<sup>1</sup> G. C. Bolten, *Een rechterlijke dwaling? Medisch-forensische beschouwingen over eene belangrijke strafzaak* (The Hague 1928) 114-115.

<sup>2</sup> Noord-Hollands Archief (NHA from here on), Archive Gerechtshof Amsterdam (GA from here on), inventory number 82 dossier 111, 1922.

<sup>3</sup> NHA, GA, inv. 82, d. 111, 1922.

<sup>4</sup> NHA, GA, inv. 82, d. 111, 1922.

sexual assault. When the suspect stood trial at his appeal about three months later, in front of the court of Amsterdam, the court accepted this particular interpretation of the experts' advice and changed the ruling to non-penetrative sexual assault. This made the sentence lower as well; one and a half years in prison instead of four years. In this ruling, they thus followed the experts' opinions. It is clear, however, that the first court did not give the same weight to the experts' information as the second did. Was this a regular occurrence? Or was this highly unusual?<sup>5</sup>

### ***Historiography and Dutch Disinterest***

It seems that ignoring experts' advice was not unusual in the nineteenth century. There was a regular disregard for the opinion of experts (mostly doctors and psychiatrists) called in for advice on rape cases. They were not always believed by the judge, since they did not always agree with one another on the same case. This is what cultural historian Willemijn Ruberg believes to be the situation in the period 1811-1920 in the Netherlands. However, no other research has been done on expertise in rape cases in the Netherlands, so we cannot be certain this is also the case for the period after that. It is interesting to note that the American historian Stephen Robertson sees the exact opposite happening in America. Psychiatrists and social workers did not have much pull in court, according to him. Physicians did, however, at least in the late nineteenth century.<sup>6</sup>

Joanna Bourke, a feminist historian, has studied rape in society at large. Bourke described how rapists came to be seen as degenerates or evolutionary failures, during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century. Their degeneration and predisposition towards rape then came into focus and became an immensely important factor in their identity (especially after the 1910s), in the same way homosexual tendencies became the basis of a new, homosexual identity during this period. Since being a degenerate was biological and this state affected identity, it could be a source of interest for both the medical and psychiatric professions, as we see happening in this period.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> NHA, GA, inv. 28, d. 111, 1922 and NHA, GA, inv. 52, d. 111, 1922.

<sup>6</sup> W. Ruberg, 'Onzekere kennis. De rol van forensische geneeskunde en psychiatrie in Nederlandse verkrachtingszaken (1811-1920)', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale en Economische Geschiedenis* 9 (1) (2012) 100, 106-107 and S. Robertson, 'Signs, Marks, and Private Parts: Doctors, Legal Discourses, and Evidence of Rape in the United States, 1823-1930', *The Journal of the History of Sexuality* 8 (3) (1998) 365-267, 373, 376, 385-388.

<sup>7</sup> J. Bourke, *Rape. A History from 1960 to the Present Day* (London 2007) 11, 92-110, 121-122, 140-154, 183-186.

It is possible that the kind of respect paid to doctors, as one sees in America, does not show up in the Netherlands at all (or later), because of the absence of a jury system in the Dutch judicial arrangement. Whereas ordinary American people had a certain regard for doctors, which they carried with them into the jury stand, this could not have been the case in the Netherlands. In the Netherlands, this regard could only have entered the courtroom through judges and possibly lawyers. (This last category might, however, not have as much influence on the final judgement as we would like to believe.) Since judges had other priorities than the juries, we can expect differences here. Another reason could be the fact that the Anglo-Saxon court was (and is) accusatory, meaning that an expert became part of the plea of a lawyer. In the Netherlands, judges asked experts to give advice, ensuring a relatively neutral expert, as opposed to the expert who was paid by either the accused or accuser.<sup>8</sup>

Worth mentioning within this framework is an argument that several early modernists have made. They believe that rape changed its meaning from the late 16<sup>th</sup> century onward. Before this change, rape was considered a crime against the property of a male, typically either the woman's father or husband. After the 16<sup>th</sup> century, rape became a crime against the woman herself and her individual being. Both Joanna Bourke and Georges Vigarello have argued that this change extended until at the very least the nineteenth, and in some cases even the twentieth century. Therefore, they claim, we see very little interest in the woman's psyche after the rape. Willemijn Ruberg, however, has argued that this might be more complicated in the Dutch situation. She showed that several discourses existed next to one another and that (psychological) trauma was talked about, even if it was not always separated from physical changes. In this, she believed, the history of rape mirrored the history of homosexuality, since the discourses on homosexuality were, likewise, multiple.<sup>9</sup>

It is, therefore, worth considering the history of homosexuality, since more has been written about homosexuality in a Dutch context than about rape. One of these studies, written by gay and lesbian studies theorist Gert Hekma, maps the way the homosexual as such became a subject of medicalization during the nineteenth century. It seems that while

---

<sup>8</sup> I. Weyers and F. Koenraadt, 'Toenemende vraag naar expertise – een eeuw forensische psychiatrie en psychologie', in: F. Koenraadt, C. Kelk and J. Vijselaar (ed.), *Tussen behandeling en straf. Rechtsbescherming en veiligheid in de twintigste eeuw* (2007) 61.

<sup>9</sup> W. Ruberg, 'Trauma, Body, and Mind: Forensic Medicine in Nineteenth-Century Dutch Rape Cases', *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 1 (2013) 85-87, 103-104, G. Vigarello, *A History of Rape: Sexual Violence in France from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge 2001) 130, 161, 197 and J. Bourke, *Rape*, 425-426.

Bourke sees a medicalization of the rapist in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-centuries, we can see the same in the 'degenerate figure' of the Dutch homosexual. Likewise, *Schuldige Seks*, a dissertation written by gender historian Anna Tijsseling, focuses on the way homosexuality was treated up to and during the Second World War and concludes that this war gave homosexuals a type of reprieve from prosecution, since the hunt for the homosexual and the rehabilitation of the abnormal was already a large objective before the war. Interesting for this thesis is her attention to the probation system which looked after both homosexuals and rapists who were released on parole and became more accessible during the interwar period. Besides this useful fact, it seems the history of homosexuality shows some of the same developments as the history of rape, such as the focus on degeneracy and medicalization. Thus, the studies already done by Tijsseling and Hekma can give more background information on the history of sexuality and the criminalization of it and show the connections which exist between the history of rape and the history of homosexuality.<sup>10</sup>

We can expect a change during the 1920s and 1930s, not only because of the template Tijsseling and Hekma hand us, but also because of the start of a 'modern' feel directly after the Great War, which was supposedly the 'war to end all wars'. It was a highly creative period but it also had to deal with the leftover feelings of the First World War. This is the era after the suffrage movement (the Netherlands adopted female suffrage from 1919 onward), the age of the 'new woman' in the form of the flapper and of a more modern medicine practice (made possible partly by the Great War). During this period, the use of psychiatrists in court became a more established practice, whereas it had been fairly new in the last decades of the nineteenth century. It would be interesting to see if lay knowledge came to be considered more important since women became more assertive, or less so, because the medical and psychiatric experts acquired more authority.<sup>11</sup>

This research will therefore need to take into account some other scholars who have looked at psychiatry, women, forensic medicine and sexuality. It is jarring that these subjects

---

<sup>10</sup> G. Hekma, *Homoseksualiteit. Een Medische Reputatie: de Uitdoktering van de Homoseksueel in Negentiende-Eeuws Nederland* (Amsterdam 1987) and A. Tijsseling, *Schuldige Seks. Homoseksuele Zedendelicten rond de Duitse Bezettingstijd* (Leiden 2009).

<sup>11</sup> A. Kimyongür and A. Kershaw, 'Women in Europe between the Wars. A Culture of Contradictions', in: A. Kimyongür and A. Kershaw (eds.), *Women in Europe between the Wars. Politics, Culture and Society* (Aldershot/Burlington 2007) 14, D. de Ridder, 'Voorlichting van de psychiater aan de strafrechter rond de eeuwwisseling: diagnose of vonnis?', in: F. Koenraadt (red.), *Ziek of Schuldig? Twee eeuwen forensische psychiatrie en psychologie* (Arnhem 1991) 35 and K. Armstrong, *The Battle for God* (New York 2001) 167-168.

have not been thoroughly researched for the 1920s; very little about the Dutch situation has been published. However, there have been precedents, some of them fairly well-known. Those will be treated here. The next two chapters have a more in-depth analysis of the secondary literature on women and psychiatry. The general message in the literature on the history of psychiatry is that psychiatrists became a more permanent fixture in court cases during the early 1900s. Nevertheless, the research differs on the importance ascribed to these psychiatrists.<sup>12</sup>

Women's history in the Netherlands has hardly paid any attention to women's lives in the 1920s and what has been written about women is – in general – a few decades old. However, medicine tends to be spoken about in connection to women, since women still were seen as the keepers of the home. Therefore, they were considered responsible for a healthy environment. In the above mentioned publications, we thus tend to see the doctor in the guise of a supporter or helper of the housewife. Like with the history of women from the interwar period, fairly little has been written specifically about forensic medicine, since this type of medicine was still very much connected to the general types of medicinal practices, as it still is nowadays.<sup>13</sup>

Publications about sexuality in the Netherlands seem follow two paths. One is through demographics on birth, marriage and the like. Numbers and demographics are then used to find certain trends in for instance use of contraception or the number of illegitimate children. Another route taken by researchers is that of personal history, in which micro-histories on sexuality can give insight into the bigger whole. Clear answers about people's sexual acts are, even with these types of research, very hard to come by.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> F. Koenraadt, C. Kelk and J. Vijselaar (ed.), *Tussen Behandeling en Straf. Rechtsbescherming en Veiligheid in de Twintigste Eeuw* (Deventer 2007), F. Koenraadt (ed.), *Ziek of Schuldig? Twee Eeuwen Forensische Psychiatrie en Psychologie* (Arnhem 1991), T. Oei and M. Groenhuijsen (ed.), *Forensische psychiatrie en haar grensgebieden. Actualiteit, geschiedenis en toekomst* (Alphen aan de Rijn 2009). Other important researchers include Harry Oosterhuis and Marijke Gijswijt-Hofstra. For more of their texts, see the heading 'literature'.

<sup>13</sup> *Jaarboek voor vrouwengeschiedenis 1-30* (1980-2010), *Nemesis 6* (1999), *Een Tipje van de Sluier. Vrouwengeschiedenis in Nederland 1-12* (1978-2000) and W. Posthumus-Van der Groot a.o. (ed.), *Van Moeder op Dochter. De Maatschappelijke Positie van de Vrouw in Nederland vanaf de Franse Tijd* (Nijmegen 1977) all give little attention to the 1920s. An exception is: Els Kloek, *Vrouw des Huizes, Een Cultuurgeschiedenis van de Hollandse Huisvrouw* (Amsterdam 2009). The connection between women and medicine can be seen most clearly in: J. van Galen and A. Mevis, 'Zuigelingenzorg in Oost-Brabant 1918-1940', *Tipje van de Sluier. Vrouwengeschiedenis in Nederland 2* (1980) 73-83 and J. Spoorenberg, 'Bakerpraat of doktersadvies? Arbeidersvrouwen en zuigelingenzorg in Amsterdam tussen 1900 en 1914', *Een tipje van de Sluier 6* (1984) 78-96 and R. van Daalen and M. Gijswijt-Hofstra, *Gezond en Wel. Vrouwen en de Zorg voor Gezondheid in de Twintigste Eeuw* (Amsterdam 1998). On the connection between general and forensic medicine: B. Cohen, a.o. (ed.), *Forensische Geneeskunde, Raakvlakken tussen Geneeskunst, gezondheidszorg en recht* (Assen 1996).

<sup>14</sup> Examples of the first variety: J. Kok and J. van Bavel (ed.), *De Levenskracht der Bevolking. Sociale en Demografische Kwesties in de Lage Landen tijdens het Interbellum* (Leuven 2010), O. Boons a.o. (ed.), *Twee eeuwen Nederland Geteld. Onderzoek met de digitale Volks-, Beroeps- en Woningtellingen 1795-2001* (Den Haag 2007) and F. van Poppel, *Trouwen in*

### **Main Question**

Hence, it seems we can still make a number of new discoveries, not only in the history of rape, but by using a fresh perspective on women's history and the history of expertise as well. The research question I will attempt to answer will be: **During the period 1920-1933, did the way scientific expert knowledge was treated compared to lay knowledge in rape cases in the Netherlands change significantly?** By asking this question I will be able to build on Ruberg's, Bourke's and Robertson's research. If I find a difference during this period, this will corroborate the idea that the Dutch did in fact give more weight to the experts' opinions, but later than the period Ruberg studies. If not, this conclusion will tell us that this change either did not happen in the Netherlands at all, or later than the 1920s.

### **Social Relevance**

Besides highlighting the differences between America (where far more research on rape has been done) and the Netherlands, these conclusions might also help to start research on Dutch rape, a very important subject, not only from an academic point of view, but also from a societal. In 2013, twenty-four people a week reported a rape to the Dutch police. The actual number of rapes will probably be far higher; the Scientific Research and Documentation Centre of the Dutch Ministry of Justice estimates that it is eight times as high as that. By researching the history of rape in the Netherlands, we might be able to make it less of a taboo and remove some of the shame of reporting rape. It might also teach us about the way our predecessors dealt with rape and make us aware of old insights that could educate our own.<sup>15</sup>

### **Theory**

Many theories have been used on (the history of) rape. A feminist approach was one of the first ways of engaging with the topic. A well-known author using a (radical) feminist approach was the theorist Susan Brownmiller, whose basic argument was that all men hold women in a fearful grip because some men rape women. Joanne Bourke has also used a

---

*Nederland. Een Historisch-Demografische Studie van de 19<sup>e</sup> en vroeg-20<sup>ste</sup> Eeuw* (Wageningen 1992). Examples of the second variety: P. Stokvis (ed.), *Geschiedenis van het Privéleven. Bronnen en benaderingen* (Amsterdam 2007) and M. Bols and M. Noordman, *Moederschap als Balsem. Ervaringen voor Katholieke Vrouwen met Huwelijk, Seksualiteit en Moederschap in de Eerste Helft van deze Eeuw* (Amsterdam 1981).

<sup>15</sup> Algemeen Dagblad, 'Elke week 24 aangiften wegens verkrachting', <http://www.ad.nl/ad/nl/1012/Nederland/article/detail/3446461/2013/05/24/Elke-week-24-aangiften-wegens-verkrachting.dhtml> (version: 24-5-2013, last seen: 22-1-2015).



feminist approach, although hers has been far milder, as she included male victims and female perpetrators and rejected some of the basic ideas of, for instance, Brownmiller. Bourke also used a discourse analysis, in the vein of Foucault, in which she used a variety of sources to find out the dominant discourse in different societies. (Discourse in this case being the dominant, disciplining set of ideas and acts in one society.)<sup>16</sup>

Likewise, other theories have been used, such as the idea of rape as a social construct. This is something we see in the ideas of sociologist-historian Jeffrey Week about sexuality in general and thus for rape as well. Claiming a certain type of sexuality (or victimhood by rape) does, in this way, become a manner in which someone belongs to a group. Similarly, Eric Reitan uses the concept of rape as a contested concept, meaning different groups in society have a hand in creating the concept of rape, with some groups having more power in this determination process at certain times than others. Others have used a more biological approach and have found the causes of rape in biological factors, skipping the thought process about the construction of rape entirely.<sup>17</sup>

Two main theories will be used in this thesis, connected in part to the discourse analysis one sees in Bourke's work. Even so, this paper mostly builds on linguist Norman Fairclough's ideas on discourse. Fairclough considers discourse in a very specific way. He thinks that discourses – which he describes as every way of expressing, not just language – are underpinned by ideology. People act a certain way because they adhere to a specific belief system. Even though these belief systems are internal, most people will not be very aware of them and act them out unwittingly most of the time (but sometimes willingly). This combination of a belief system and a discourse is known in his theory as Ideological-Discursive Formation, or IDF (multiple: IDFs). Within a setting (in this particular case the courtroom) and society we generally find one dominant IDF. Some IDFs can be very peculiar to their setting, others can be found in society at large and particular settings as well. Although there is a dominant IDF in both society and in particular settings, there are more IDFs which are more or less suppressed but can be found in the same society or setting.

---

<sup>16</sup> Bourke, *Rape* and S. Brownmiller, *Tegen Haar Wil. Vrouwen, Mannen en Verkrachting* (Baarn 1989).

<sup>17</sup> J. Weeks, 'Questions of identity' in P. Caplan (ed.), *The Cultural Construction of Sexuality* (London 1987) 31-51 and E. Reitan, 'Rape as an Essentially Contested Concept', *Hypatia* 16 (2001) 43-66. Examples of biological factors can be found in: C. Palmer and R. Thornhill, 'Straw Men and Fairy Tales: Evaluating Reactions to "A Natural History of Rape"', *The Journal of Sex Research* 40 (2003) 253-255, C. Palmer, 'Is Rape a Cultural Universal? A Re-examination of the Ethnographic Data', *Ethnology* 28 (1989) 12 and C. Palmer, 'Rape in Nonhuman Animal Species: Definitions, Evidence and Implications', *The Journal of Sex Research* 26 (1989) 358-360, 367-368.

However, it takes some careful consideration to actually find these, since they tend to be blocked out by the main IDF.<sup>18</sup>

The concept of IDFs is very important in this research, since what the main question of this paper does, is look at two differing IDFs, a lay and a professional one, with a third – the judicial – being the facilitating and therefore dominant one in the courtroom, since the judicial IDF decides which of the other two gets most weight. This thesis tries to find out whether or not there is a switch from one IDF to the other. It investigates if the emphasis on the lay IDF shifts to the expert IDF during the 1920s and early 1930s.

The second theory needs to be explained a little more here, since it is a combination of two separate concepts. The best known of these is the theory of Bourdieu on the different forms of capital. Bourdieu tells us that there are several different forms of what he calls ‘capital’. This can be understood in the economic sense, but also in the symbolic sense. If someone has economic capital, this implies they are well off financially. If one has symbolic capital, they are, likewise, well off symbolically. Thus, if someone has social capital, which is a type of symbolic capital, they can be a socialite or well-liked within their field. The shape symbolic capital takes depends on the field in which it is acquired and used. Possible types of symbolic capital include cultural capital, scientific capital and linguistic capital.<sup>19</sup>

A specific concept that connects to capital in Bourdieu’s theories is particularly important for this research. This is Bourdieu’s concept of ‘habitus’. First, it is important to understand that capital can both be objectified (thus can be found in a museum, a book, or a painting), or embodied (thus can be found in people themselves). Habitus is something that can be found in between these different forms of capital. It is how a person (the embodiment) interacts with the object (the objectified). If someone has high cultural capital, they will interact with an object differently than when they have low cultural capital. Hence, a person with high cultural capital can be found at a performance of Mozart’s *Zauberflöte* and not found head banging at an *Iron Maiden* concert. Now it is clear that the terms ‘high’ and ‘low’ capital are very much subjective in the case of symbolic capital. That which can lead to high cultural capital in one setting can lead to derision in an environment rife with low cultural capital. The opposite can be true as well.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> N. Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language* (London 1995) 8-9, 23, 27-53.

<sup>19</sup> R. Moore, ‘Capital’, in: M. Grenfell, *Pierre Bourdieu. Key Concepts* (Durham 2008) 103-204.

<sup>20</sup> Moore, ‘Capital’, 105, 107.

Habitus is a way of interacting which has an underlying belief system about what one should encourage and what should be discouraged and thus connects to the concept of IDF. Habitus is learned. What one likes can be influenced by others, like parents and friends, but this is a process that takes time. At this point, however, it is time to introduce a second theory.<sup>21</sup>

Here Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham's thesis on the politics of respectability is of relevance for this paper. Higginbotham did research on the history of black Baptist women and came up with the idea of a politics of respectability for this particular subject. She drew on Darlene Clark Hine, who did research on the rape of black women during the early twentieth century. For that reason, I will first explain Hine's ideas, which Higginbotham connects to her own thesis. Hine argued that during the early twentieth century, black women had a self-imposed culture of dissemblance, meaning that they actively kept things to themselves, so that they would not adhere to stereotypes that followed black women in that particular period. An example of this would be the idea that black women were promiscuous. Black women would keep everything that could possibly encourage this idea to themselves. They however, did project an air of openness, creating a new way of dealing with the world, or, as I would like to say, a new habitus.<sup>22</sup>

This new habitus seems even clearer in Higginbotham's thesis, even if she does not use that particular word. She speaks of the politics of respectability used to oppose older discourses that claimed black people were evolutionary less than a white person. The black Baptist women she researched emphasized respectable behavior. Respectable behavior could give these women a type of symbolic capital (at the very least within their own communities) and gave them self-esteem and self-determination independent of their race and income. Respectability thus connects to the nineteenth-century idea of civilization of the masses. However, this was a type of self-civilization. Self-civilization included the whole of the community, meaning that not every black person in a respectability community was free to do as they pleased. Afro-Americans thought this type of politics was only possible if the

---

<sup>21</sup> Moore, 'Capital', 109-110.

<sup>22</sup> E. Higginbotham, *Righteous Discontent. The Women's Movement in the Black Baptist Church 1880-1920* (Cambridge 1993) 193-194 and D. Hine, 'Rape and the Inner Lives of Black Women in the Middle West: Thoughts on the Culture of Dissemblance', in: *Unequal Sisters*, ed. E. Du Bois and V. Ruiz (New York 1990) 292-297.

whole race followed them. They who did not follow in respectability politics, ruined the chances for the whole of the race.<sup>23</sup>

There is a downside to this way of manipulating one's habitus. It implicated that those who did not follow in this new, respectable habitus hindered the whole community and not just themselves. Not only did they make problems for the community, they deserved everything that is coming for them, because they did not behave respectably and did not adhere to the same habitus as the rest of the community. Their low capital did not fit with the rest of the community and this person was consequently seen as the Other and ousted from the community. In this way, the panopticon of the dominant IDF was strengthened by the (seemingly opposing) IDF.<sup>24</sup>

People who did not fit with what was considered proper by the dominant IDF would accordingly be excluded from the subgroup of society to which they normally would have belonged. I believe this to be the case with raped women as well. If a woman behaved well in daily life, she would most likely still be respected in the courtroom, leading to a conviction on her behalf. If she had behaved in a sexually promiscuous way, or not particularly respectably before the rape, it would be expected that her rapist did not get convicted. The judicial system would turn on her, since it would be shaped by the dominant IDF (to which she did not belong, and neither did she belong to a subgroup, losing all support). The same can be said for a man accused of rape, however, the difference between these two is that the woman would be intersectionally disadvantaged, simply because she was a woman. If a woman and a man were more or less on the same level in other sections (race, class, age), we can expect the woman to have lost the case, since she was not quite on equal footing. If we factor in the popular idea that some women lied about being raped, thereby tainting the respectability of women as a group, the picture seems bleak.<sup>25</sup>

Since respectable men would have high chances of winning the case against them, it was very important that a man would be able to prove himself to be respectable. The same can be said for a woman, since not being seen as respectable made it very hard to win her case. Consequently, it seems that the judges would ask for what I would like to call 'witnesses of respectability'. These witnesses could be anyone, a friend of the accused, the mayor of the city in which the accused lived, et cetera.

---

<sup>23</sup> Higginbotham, *Righteous Discontent*, 191-196, 203-204.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibidem*, 191-196, 203-204.

<sup>25</sup> Ruberg, 'Onzekere kennis', 95.

Ideally, however, one would use some type of ‘hard proof’, or ‘scientific proof’ and ask scientific experts (doctors, psychiatrists and the like) for their professional opinion. Although this indeed happened in the period that Willemijn Ruberg investigated (1811-1920), the scientific proof did rarely play a crucial role. She found two main problems for this. The first problem was the instruments of the scientists not being good enough to give any firm conclusions. This, however, changed during the period she studies, but did not (yet) affect the way this evidence was treated. Secondly, she found that the professional outlook of both the judicial and expert disciplines differed and that different experts sometimes gave different opinions on the same case. Nevertheless, in the 1920s, both the psychiatrists and doctors had become more appreciated as actual experts, and their importance in society at large had increased. This can for instance be seen in the psychopath laws of the late 1920s, which enabled judges to enforce a psychiatric treatment for people who were considered psychopaths and had committed crimes. The judge however, had the final say in this type of measure. The psychiatrist had an advising role and in certain cases this meant that his diagnosis could act as a sentence. It is imaginable that the judges would give more weight to the experts’ opinions as time went on, as opposed to the opinions from witnesses of respectability. As a result, laymen might have become less important and doctors might have become more so.<sup>26</sup>

### **Methodology and Sub-Questions**

The methodology I will use in this paper is based on anthropologist Clifford Geertz’s thick description. Geertz drew, while coming up with his theory of thick description, on the work of philosopher Gilbert Ryle. Both argued for the existence of two types of descriptions. One kind can be a plain observation, like ‘the child throws a ball to a child on the other side of the street’. This type of report is an example of thin description. This sort of narrative can be lengthy and complicated, but it is still something that can be glanced from observation. The

---

<sup>26</sup> J. van Galen, A. Mevis, ‘Zuigelingenverzorging in Oost-Brabant 1918-1940’, *Tipje van de Sluier. Vrouwengeschiedenis in Nederland 2* (1980) 73-83, H. Oosterhuis, ‘Psychiatrie, geestelijke gezondheid en burgerschap (1870-2006)’, in: F. Koenraadt, C. Kelk and J. Vijselaar (ed.), *Tussen behandeling en straf. Rechtsbescherming en veiligheid in de twintigste eeuw* (2007) 144, I. Weyers and F. Koenraadt, ‘Toenemende vraag naar expertise – een eeuw forensische psychiatrie en psychologie’, in: Koenraadt, Kelk and Vijselaar (ed.), *Tussen behandeling en straf*, 18-21, 23-24, J. Spoorenberg, ‘Bakerpraat of doktersadvies? Arbeidersvrouwen en zuigelingenverzorging in Amsterdam tussen 1900 en 1914’, *Een tipje van de Sluier 6* (1984) 78-96, Ruberg, ‘Onzekere kennis’, 106-107, J. Feldbrugge, *Wat iedere Nederlanders zou moeten weten over tbs. Geschiedenis, achtergronden en werkwijze van een uniek systeem* (Nijmegen 2007) 15 and D. de Ridder, ‘Voorlichting van de psychiater aan de strafrechter rond de eeuwwisseling: diagnose of vonnis?’, in: F. Koenraadt (red.), *Ziek of Schuldig? Twee eeuwen forensische psychiatrie en psychologie* (Arnhem 1991) 35-39, 45.

other type of description is that with a certain thickness. This type of report draws on explanation. It would be most prudent to characterize a thin description as observation and the thick description as an analysis (of that first observation). An example of this second type would be: 'the child throws the ball because it wants to play with the child on the opposite end of the street'. Ryle believes that the differences in these descriptions come solely from the description.<sup>27</sup>

Geertz, however, believes the description and observation to influence one another and that the lines tend to blur. I agree with this and can most easily explain this by using the above example. The child throwing the ball has most likely learned from its environment that this is playful behavior and so expects the other child to throw it back. The fact that the child learns this by socialization shows that thick descriptions influence the way a child thinks and learns. Coming up with one's own rules would work adverse, since not all would understand these. Thick descriptions and meanings can only be learned through universal agreement and experience, or a similar IDF. So, thick and thin descriptions are not mutually exclusive and one (however subconsciously) involves the other. Thus, Geertz concludes, all actions and stories have actively been made and have thick descriptions lurking beneath the seemingly thin surface.<sup>28</sup>

By making a context for the object to be studied, one can try to understand the IDFs governing a society. If one then studies the object, one can find that the IDFs either apply to this object, or not, in which case the researcher will have to come up with a new set of rules or thick descriptive analyses, after explaining why the rules do not apply to this particular observed object. This is exactly what I will be doing in this research. I will first look at the position of women (and in connection with them, men) within Dutch society. This is very important to understand what was seen as (dis)reputable and will be used to counter women's respectability. Some background information will need to be given about male-ness during the 1920s and early 1930s and the economic position of Dutch males during this period, so we can understand the way these IDFs came into being. Since others have been studying the IDFs of the interwar period, I will use secondary literature to establish the basic IDFs of the 1920s and early 1930s Netherlands. I will connect these findings to some of the

---

<sup>27</sup> C. Gallagher and S. Greenblatt, *Practicing New Historicism* (Chicago 2000) 23-25.

<sup>28</sup> Gallagher and Greenblatt, *Practicing New Historicism*, 25-28.

findings made from the rape cases I will use in this thesis. This will be done in the last chapter.

The next step I will take is look at the IDFs surrounding scientific experts. Were doctors and psychiatrists held in high regard or not? And why would this be the case? Could the doctors influence this themselves? It is especially vital not to focus solely on the thick description of the Netherlands in the 1920s, since it was expected in the courtroom that these professionals behaved in a certain way. The IDF of the doctors had to be adjusted to that of the judicial administration to fit into the courtroom. This cannot necessarily be said about lay witnesses, since they were self-appointed witnesses of respectability in most cases and were not professional witnesses, as opposed to the doctors of whom one would expect a certain type of behavior. The findings of the secondary literature on scientific experts will, again, be connected to my own findings in the last chapter.

The main question of this thesis has been mentioned above. This will be the question that spans the whole of this research, but will be especially important in the third chapter. The first and second chapters have different sub-questions which give support to the main question. The first chapter will look at the IDFs concerning women and, to a smaller extent, men, giving us the sub-question: What were the IDFs concerning (wo)men's respectability in the 1920s Noord-Holland? The second chapter will similarly look at the scientific experts, which gives us the sub-question: What were the IDFs surrounding scientific expertise in 1920s Noord-Holland?

Lastly, I will look at the primary source material and compare the thick descriptions and especially the IDFs I have found in the secondary literature about (lay) experts with the actual historical sources. This will enable me to find out whether or not certain attitudes about expertise carried over to the courtroom. Since (as said above) it seems that doctors became more revered during the 1920s, this could mean that this attitude would carry over to the courtroom, and would make experts' opinions more important than opinions on (dis)repute.

### **Primary Sources**

The primary sources that will form the last part of this research will be the transcripts of court cases from the period 1920-1933 from the *Gerechtshof Amsterdam* (court of Amsterdam). These particular cases can be found in the *Noord-Hollands Archief* in Haarlem

but are not open to the general public. They can be entered with special permission. Because of the conditions for acquiring this special permission and for the privacy of the people involved, the last names of the victims and perpetrators will be cut off at the first letter.

Within these archives of the *Gerechtshof*, one can find three objects connected to a case. The first, which is available for every single case, is the *arrest*, the judgement of the Amsterdam judge on the case. This mostly names the old verdict and recapitulates the ins and outs of the case. The next, which is available for all cases as well, is the *procesverbaal*, which is a document that explains all the happenings of the case and the courtroom. The last, and luckiest find for the historian, is the file which one will only find if the accused has been committed to a penitentiary for at least a year. It holds all the reports from the police, experts (if they were involved) and information on evidence, witness reports and the like.

Since there are over a hundred cases of sexual abuse in the *Gerechtshof Amsterdam* archives of the 1920s, there needs to be some type of selection criterion, since this thesis would be simply too small to look at all cases. Since cases without scientific experts can give us information on why an expert was *not* invited, it would not do to consider the presence of experts a criterion. However, a survey of the particular cases does give us something to work with, since most of the cases deal with minors. Therefore, I will look at those cases which deal with adult women, since they can be expected to testify themselves and will receive a treatment following IDFs concerning adult women. I will however, take adult to mean sixteen years of age here, since this is the age of consent in the Netherlands during the period studied here. We can also expect witnesses of respectability to testify, something we most likely will not see happening in cases involving children, since they are not truly part of the subgroup of women yet. Because of their young age, one can expect them to be respectable if raised in a good home. This selection criterion leaves us with twelve cases involving adult men and women and two special cases that I will use as a foil. These cases concern victims and perpetrators who were below the age of consent.

These cases will be supplemented with a manual on forensic medicine, *Leerboek der gerechtelijke geneeskunde voor de scholen tot opleiding van Ind. Artsen*. Besides this, an expert on forensic medicine published a book on what he thought to be a judicial mistake, concerning a case he was involved with as an expert. This book, *Een rechterlijke dwaling? Medisch-forensische beschouwingen over eene belangrijke strafzaak*, will be used here as



well. All these sources will be investigated and the most important findings will be presented here. However, the next two chapters will first try to carve out a picture of respectability in the 1920s and experts in that same time period.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> H. F. Roll, *Leerboek der gerechtelijke geneeskunde voor de scholen tot opleiding van Ind. Artsen. Deel III* (The Hague 1927) and G. C. Bolten, *Een rechterlijke dwaling? Medisch-forensische beschouwingen over eene belangrijke strafzaak* (The Hague 1928).

## Chapter 1: Respectability in the Early Interwar Period

This chapter will engage with the politics of respectability of the interwar period. The most important question of this chapter will be what Dutch women and men considered respectable during the 1920s and early 1930s. What were the IDFs engaging with respectability and in what way were they used or encountered? Because of the Dutch neutrality during the First World War, we see some differences between Dutch and European society. However, since the Dutch were quite engaged with the rest of the world, especially with Germany, during this time period, we will see that certain thought processes of especially the Germans can be found within Dutch society. This gives us a problematic IDF which seems to fight against a conceived problem of female emancipation that did not necessarily exist in the way it was perceived.

The second part of this chapter will take a look at the (economic) position of Dutch males. Again, things are done differently in the Netherlands, not in the last place because far less males were forced to enter the Great War to fight (and if necessary die) for their country. This makes for an entirely different economic configuration in the Netherlands when one compares this country with Germany. The chapter closes with a brief look at the gendering of scientific expertise.

### ***Feminists, Flappers and Feminine Conservatives***

Feminism did its job. Dutch women had the right to vote from 1919 onward. The war was over. A new type of woman could be found everywhere, right? She was in Germany, in the guise of the *neue Frau*, in France, known as the *garçonne* and in America and Britain, named 'flapper'. Seems like this new type of woman, who loved to dance wildly, was sexually liberated, wore make-up and had her hair bobbed, dressed in short skirts with tan stockings to show off her legs and worked for her own keep was omnipresent. Surely she could be found in the Netherlands as well?<sup>30</sup>

And that is where trouble comes in. It is very clear that the Netherlands were influenced by the foreign countries surrounding them. The Dutch were a people that used to

---

<sup>30</sup> Posthumus-Van der Groot a.o. (ed.), *Van Moeder op Dochter*, 131, 134-135, Nancy Cott, 'De Moderne Vrouw op z'n Amerikaans', in: G. Duby and M. Perrot, *Geschiedenis van de Vrouw (deel 5). De Twintigste Eeuw* (Amsterdam 1993) 78-81, 81-82, Anne-Marie Sohn, 'Seksele Rolpatronen in Frankrijk en Engeland. Een Vage Overgang', in: G. Duby and M. Perrot, *Geschiedenis van de Vrouw (deel 5). De Twintigste Eeuw* (Amsterdam 1993) 91-93 and M. Vogel, 'Middelaars en moderniteitsdiscoursen. Over DE VROUW VAN MORGEN en de verhoudingen van Duitsland en Nederland in het interbellum', in: F. Boterman and M. Vogel, *Nederland en Duitsland in het interbellum* (Hilversum 2003) 37-51.

trade as a source of living. The largest trade partners of the Netherlands were England and Germany in the early 1900s. So an economic connection between these countries and the Dutch certainly existed. This wasn't the only connection between the Germans and the Dutch.<sup>31</sup>

Cultural historian Frits Boterman, for example, explained how the Dutch exchanged ideas with the Germans during the earlier 1900s. Artists, writers and the intelligentsia were exchanged between both countries and brought back ideas to their home country. Before the interwar period, the Dutch were culturally mostly influenced by the Germans, since this was the more powerful of the two countries. During the interwar period this changed, because the Germans needed the Dutch to vouch for them. The Germans had lost goodwill because of the Great War, and they somehow needed to get back into the graces of the other great powers. They believed the way to do this was through the Dutch.<sup>32</sup>

So, through many channels, the Dutch had connections with countries that contained some type of New Woman. A new type of woman that was considered more masculine. These 'strange' women became symbols of modernity. Modernity, however, did not only cause the idea of progress towards a better time. It caused considerable anxiety, because women were supposed to 'stay in the kitchen' so to say. In the same way that the modern developments caused unease, the women who ended up representing these modern developments were also considered with ambiguity. This double interest was transferred to the Netherlands as well, for instance through books.<sup>33</sup>

At first glance, this anxiety does have some basis, even in the Netherlands. The word flapper was known in the Netherlands during this period, and the associated behavior and dress code as well. Likewise, sports became a more accepted way of spending one's time in the Netherlands, even if one was female. This can be seen in the make-up of the Dutch Olympic team of 1928 – when Amsterdam would host the Olympics – which contained women as well as men. (Marie Braun, a female swimmer, even won a gold medal.) As historian Erik Jensen argues, performing in sports on a high level is an emancipating force for women. Similarly, the number of Dutch women working was quite high – about 44% in the 1920s. This changes, however, when we look at older women. Almost half of the women

---

<sup>31</sup> R. Schuursma, *Vergeefs Onzijdig. Nederlands neutraliteit 1919-1940* (Utrecht 2005) 31.

<sup>32</sup> F. Boterman, 'Inleiding', in: F. Boterman and M. Vogel, *Nederland en Duitsland in het interbellum* (Hilversum 2003) 7-19.

<sup>33</sup> Vogel, 'Middelaars en moderniteitsdiscoursen. Over DE VROUW VAN MORGEN en de verhoudingen van Duitsland en Nederland in het interbellum', 37-51 is an example of this.

worked – if they were under 24 years of age. The number of Dutch women participating in paid labor while married was actually far less than was the case in Germany and France.<sup>34</sup>

Thus, even though the dominant IDF's seemed to believe there were a lot of Dutch women behaving in the same way the flapper, *garçonne* and *neue Frau* acted, this does not truly seem to have been the case. Most Dutch women became even more oriented on their home lives during the 1920s, something which would extend into the 1930s and even worsen in this period because many employers preferred firing women during the financial crisis. (This can be explained, according to researchers Maria Henneman and Marja Oomens who looked at the experiences of female teachers, by the prevailing idea that women did not have to take care of their families financially.) During this period, it was expected a woman would marry, get a few children and take care of the house-work. This attitude was especially clear in the provinces.<sup>35</sup>

There was some difference in the big cities like Amsterdam, The Hague and Rotterdam, however. Here we see things we would not encounter (as much) in the provinces. An example of this is what is in Dutch called *afdrijfsters*, an euphemism for abortionists. In the middle of the 1920s, one would encounter about a hundred of these in each of the big cities. However, abortions were not legally allowed. Another example of a 'modern' phenomenon would be the girls' hotels. Within Amsterdam especially, places were opened where higher-class, unmarried women – most of them with well-paying jobs, since we are dealing with the generation of women who got the opportunity to go to college and because these hotels were quite expensive – could live. Their households would be mostly taken care of by the managers of the apartment building. The fact that this type of hotel existed did not mean it was entirely common and accepted for women to live here. This can

---

<sup>34</sup> M. Schwegman and J. Withuis, 'Moederschap: Van Springplank tot Obstakel. Vrouwen, Natie en Burgerschap in Twintigste-Eeuws Nederland', in: G. Duby and M. Perrot, *Geschiedenis van de Vrouw (deel 5). De Twintigste Eeuw* (Amsterdam 1993) 564, E. Jensen, 'Sweat Equality. Sports and the self-made German', in: J. Wilhams, *Weimar Culture Revisited* (New York 2011) 183-198, J. Oudhof, A. Boelens, 'Arbeidsdeelname van 50-plus vrouwen 1849-2006', in: O. Boons e.a. (ed.) *Twee Eeuwen Nederland Geteld. Onderzoek met de Digitale Volks-, Beroeps- en Woningtellingen 1795-2001* (Den Haag 2007) 211 and E. Kloek, *Vrouw des Huizes*, 195-196 and Jurryt van de Vooren, 'Sportief Huwelijk Was Vaak het Einde van de Loopbaan. Trouwende Sporters Trekken Altijd Veel Volk', <http://www.npogeschiedenis.nl/nieuws/2010/juli/Sportief-huwelijk-was-vaak-het-einde-van-de-loopbaan.html> (version 15-07-2010, last seen 12-05-2015).

<sup>35</sup> L. Flapper and T. Zijlstra, 'Friese meisjes en hun toekomstperspectief in de jaren 1920-1940', in: F. Backerra, *Vrouwen van het Land. Anderhalve Eeuw Plattelandsvrouwen in Nederland* (Zutphen 1989) 112, A. Gielen, 'De "Natuurlijke Bestemming" van een boerendochter. De Opvoeding van Boerenmeisjes in Horst in het Begin van de Twintigste Eeuw', in: F. Backerra, *Vrouwen van het Land. Anderhalve Eeuw Plattelandsvrouwen in Nederland* (Zutphen 1989) 101, P. Stokvis, "'Huisvrouwelijke" arbeid. Technologie en Tijdbesparing Sinds het Interbellum', in: Stokvis (ed.), *Geschiedenis van het Privéleven*, 128, M. Henneman and M. Oomens, 'Onderwijzeressen tussen de Twee Wereldoorlogen', *Tipje van de Sluier. Vrouwengeschiedenis in Nederland 2* (1980) 32-35 and Bols and Noordman, *Moederschap als Balsem*, 16-22.

be seen in the way the flat building called 'Het Nieuwe Huis' (The New House) was treated. In Amsterdam, where it was built during the late 1920s, it became quickly known as 'De Laatste Kans' (The Last Chance), since most people who lived here were unmarried women.<sup>36</sup>

So we see women living on their own, but also more married women choosing to focus on their households. This might be connected with changes in the household during this time. Demands made on women considering both the quality of their households and the care for their children became higher than ever. If we first consider the households, this can be explained by what can be called the new professionalization. Running a household became a job in and of itself. The standards rose, because households were considered elementary for good health. Since new ideas about health and sanitation began to spread, women were fundamental in keeping their homes sanitary and therefore not only livable, but hygienic as well. This was considered a very important task, since women had a key role in keeping the society strong and sound. Connected to this was the rationalized household, as historian Margrith Wilke explains it on the basis of housewives' guides. Scientific management was important in this time. This meant that the whole management of factories and other production places needed to be completely rationalized and where possible mechanized. This is something Wilke sees happening in the household as well. New apparatuses like vacuum cleaners and electric irons started their advance in the interwar period. Interesting in this context is technological theorist Harry Lintsen's notion that the Netherlands were the most 'electrified' country in the world. This means that the Dutch had most houses connected to the energy grid and thus most opportunities to enact this new scientific, rationalized household.<sup>37</sup>

The new ideas about raising children likewise gave a different expectation pattern to the behavior of women. The number of births in this period had decreased. Whereas in

---

<sup>36</sup> W. de Blécourt, 'Kaartlegsters, helderzienden en afdrijfsters. Stedelijke genezeressen in het begin van de twintigste eeuw', in: R. van Daalen and M. Gijswijt-Hofstra, *Gezond en Wel. Vrouwen en de Zorg voor Gezondheid in de Twintigste Eeuw* (Amsterdam 1998) 176-177, 187, H. Lintsen a.o. (ed.), *Techniek in Nederland in de Twintigste Eeuw (Deel 4: Huishouden en Medische Techniek)* (Zutphen 2001) 42-43, L. van Molle, "'Ik hèb geen man!' Celibaat en Echtscheiding tijdens het Interbellum, Vertogen en Praktijken', in: Van Bavel and Kok (ed.), *De Levenskracht der bevolking* (Leuven 2010) 405-406 and Linders, "'Frappez, frappez toujours!'", 62-64.

<sup>37</sup> Posthumus-Van der Groot a.o. (ed.), *Van Moeder op Dochter*, 131-132, M. Spijkerman and L. Hagoort, 'Een Liefdesgeschiedenis, of: Hoe de Liefde 100 Jaar Lang Heeft Huisgehouden', *Tipje van de Sluier, Vrouwengeschiedenis in Nederland 2* (1980), 85-87, Lintsen a.o. (ed.), *Techniek in Nederland*, 41, 44-47, M. Wilke, 'Kenniss en Kunde. Handboeken voor Huisvrouwen', in: R. Oldenziel and C. Bouw (ed.) *Schoon Genoeg. Huisvrouwen en Huishoudtechnologie in Nederland 1898-1998* (Nijmegen 1998) 72-77, H. Makkink, "'Met een Stofzuiger Hoorde Je Erbij'". *Geschiedenis van een Nieuw Apparaat*', in: R. Oldenziel and C. Bouw (ed.) *Schoon Genoeg* (Nijmegen 1998) 91-93.

1880, women would have 5.5 children, this number diminished significantly and in 1937 women only got 2.5 children. In the 1920s, the fertility rate had dwindled to about 3.5 children per woman. In 1920, this number was slightly higher because of a 'marriage boom', shortly after the War – I will go into the War some more later on, since some things need to be said about the Great War and its effects. According to Jan van Bavel and Jan Kok, the closer people lived to what they considered to be modernity – public utilities and shops, so basically city life – the smaller their families were. The lower birth rate can partly be connected to the neo-Malthusians, who gained in popularity in this period and considered the use of contraceptives to prevent pregnancies a good practice. Children were still considered a source of honor and status, but one did not need as many children as before to achieve this effect.<sup>38</sup>

As we can see in some one-child families nowadays, if one has less children, but still the same expectations, all these expectations are placed upon a smaller number of children. Women clearly felt the need for all their children to succeed. Doctors seem to have sensed this anxiety within women, and used it for their own gain. If mothers lost their babies to an illness or such, they were the ones being blamed. They were the ones taking care of the precious children, and thus needed to be educated and, for lack of a more positive word, controlled. This was a unique perspective, since especially poorer women – those in the lowest working class – were not used to asking doctors for advice on their children. If they were having problems, they would ask their (grand)mothers, neighbors, aunts or the Dutch *bakers*, dry nurses who still followed certain superstitions and rituals connected to birth and child-care. Especially these last, semi-professional nurses were a thorn in the eyes of the doctors and professional nurses, since they tended to view certain practices as essential, even though the health professionals saw them as not only useless, but in some cases even harmful.<sup>39</sup>

The professionals' battle against the *bakers* and other nosy women was mostly centered in the big cities and western provinces in the 1920s. For instance in Oost-Brabant, according to local historians Annette Mevis and Josefien van Galen who base their findings

---

<sup>38</sup> J. van Bavel and J. Kok, 'Uitstel en Afstel van Ouderschap tijdens het Interbellum in Nederland', in: J. van Bavel and J. Kok (ed.), *De Levenskracht der bevolking* (Leuven 2010) 197, 201-203, 220, Van Poppel, *Trouwen in Nederland*, 560-561 and Th. Engelen, 'Vergrijzing in Nederland 1889-2000. De Historische Wortels van een Modern Probleem', in: O. Boons e.a. (ed.) *Twee Eeuwen Nederland Geteld* (Den Haag 2007) 53-54.

<sup>39</sup> J. Spoorenberg, 'Bakerpraat of doktersadvies? Arbeidersvrouwen en zuigelingenzorg in Amsterdam tussen 1900 en 1914', *Een tipje van de Sluier* 6 (1984) 79-80 and Van Galen and Mevis, 'Zuigelingenzorg in Oost-Brabant 1918-1940', 73, 78-81.

partly on personal documents of both the nurses and locals, very little trained care was available. During the later years of the decade, the Catholic *Wit-Gele Kruis* (a cross association connected to the Catholic belief system dominant in Brabant) started making professional care available. Spoorenberg explains that this was not without difficulty, since the mothers were used to following the old rites and advice of their female relatives, friends and the *bakers*. This process had happened earlier in Amsterdam as well. In 1920, the infant care system was taken under the wing of the local government instead of the charity organizations that set the system up. (These were comparable to the *Wit-Gele Kruis* in Brabant.)<sup>40</sup>

Before 1920, already some hundreds of women would go to the consultation bureaus. This heightened in the 1920s, with 7 250 women going to these in 1930. Over half of the babies were thus under inspection every so often. The reasons these women had for subjecting themselves and their babies to these bureaus differed, historian Jacqueline Spoorenberg argued, using the notes of the consultation bureaus. Poor mothers sometimes went for a short time, so that they would get a free crib and some free milk. These women did not want the advice of the doctors and considered them a nuisance. Other women would go to the doctor's to get advice, since they lived in newly-built houses that lacked the social cohesion of the older working-class neighborhoods. These mothers, who came from the upper working classes, were also the women who were stay-at-home housewives and mothers and thus poured their energy onto their children. Getting advice was what being a good mother involved, according to them. A third group of women were not particularly distrustful of the doctor (like the poor women were), but did not do anything they didn't deem necessary and carefully considered the doctor's advice. Health professionals thus gained more control of mothers' practices but gave more credibility to the mother as well, since she had a doctor as an ally and friend.<sup>41</sup>

One thing doctors did not seem able to control, however, was the way children were raised by their parents. Doctors believed in discipline. Children needed to be disciplined, something that parents should start with very early, from the crib, on. If, for instance, a baby cried between feeds, it should just be left to cry. This focus on discipline was not (always)

---

<sup>40</sup> Spoorenberg, 'Bakerpraat of doktersadvies? Arbeidersvrouwen en zuigelingenzorg in Amsterdam tussen 1900 en 1914', 79-80 and Van Galen and Mevis, 'Zuigelingenzorg in Oost-Brabant 1918-1940', 73, 78-81.

<sup>41</sup> Van Galen and Mevis, 'Zuigelingenzorg in Oost-Brabant 1918-1940', 81-83 and Spoorenberg, 'Bakerpraat of doktersadvies?', 85, 87-93.

followed by parents. Children were raised in a more friendly way, with parents behaving more like friends than discipline dealers. An example of this is the flapper, who had far more freedom and entertainment than young women had ever had, not in the last place because she had a job.<sup>42</sup>

Especially in the cities, new possibilities for entertainment had arisen. Dancing the new, American dances, like the Charleston and Shimmy, was fashionable and going to the cinema was a popular way of spending time, as was going out to cafés, terraces and going shopping. This had become a possibility because of new regulations making a day's work eight hours, thus stimulating even those from the working class to have some fun. Many cafés strove to open spaces to dance and movie theatres were keen on showing certain movies. However, sometimes local government blocked this. Harm Kaal, historian of European political history, explained that the cities of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Den Haag and in some cases Utrecht would then work together and try to keep something censored in all cities.<sup>43</sup>

Kaal explained that the mayor could have a large influence on this censorship. He used Amsterdam as an example. Amsterdam, the worldly, busy city, had a Dutch reformed mayor called Willem de Vlucht. De Vlucht and his police chief Aart Marcusse kept a tight reign on the dance floors. They only gave a few licenses and thus unwillingly stimulated the use of illegal dance places, which Marcusse and his men then would try to suppress. In the end, this would not do. Public opinion in 1924 pressured the mayor into giving more permits. However, particular organizations would try to get youngsters into more respectable alternatives. The municipality encouraged this.<sup>44</sup>

The reason the burgomaster tended to avoid giving dancing places free reign, was that these were considered places of (sexual) destruction and horrible manners. Even though the neo-Malthusians tended to promote birth control, sex before marriage was simply 'not done'. It was considered bad taste and if done without proper protection, there were officially no ways to stop pregnancy. (Unofficially, all big cities had *afdrijfsters* of course, who could take care of this problem, even though it might be dangerous for the

---

<sup>42</sup> Spoorenberg, 'Bakerpraat of doktersadvies?', 84 and Posthumus-Van der Groot a.o. (ed.), *Van Moeder op Dochter*, 134-135.

<sup>43</sup> G. Meershoek, 'Beheersing van de Samenleving. De Preventie van Geweld 1918-1940', in: P. de Rooy a.o. (ed.), *Waakzaam in Amsterdam. Hoofdstad en Politie vanaf 1275* (Amsterdam 2011) 386-389 and H. Kaal, *Het Hoofd van de Stad. Amsterdam en zijn Burgemeester tijdens het Interbellum* (Amsterdam 2008) 109-121.

<sup>44</sup> De Rooy (ed.), *Waakzaam in Amsterdam*, 386-389 and Kaal, *Het Hoofd van de Stad*, 109-121.



mother-to-be.) Women and sexuality were a problematic combination. Spinsters were considered frustrated, infertile and sex-less. Women who were unmarried were considered strange, girl-like and immature, something that seemed to be connected to their sexual position as well. However, we don't know that much at this point about sex in the 1920s. Historian of sexuality Dirk Noordam argued that many people had had sex before marriage in this period. However, the questionnaires on which he based these findings were from after the sexual revolution of the 1960s. This might have influenced the results, since people answering the survey used might not want to come off as prudish or old-fashioned. People were discouraged from learning anything about sexuality (before marriage) in the interwar period and especially daughters were not educated about anything considering sexuality. In general, the rate of illegitimacy went down in this period. This might either be explained by a better availability of contraceptives, or by a lower number of people having sex out of wedlock.<sup>45</sup>

Thus, it would do best to describe the 1920s as a period of contradictions. Some things were changing – for instance the fashions and female involvement with sports. Especially within the cities, we do see a new culture arise, both for men and women, which administrators tried to suppress. When it comes to women, it seems that their position did not change that much. We find some 'flapper-like' women within the big cities, but they seem to have been the exception to the general rule of women as housewives and mothers. The fact that the Dutch only sent about 100 000 soldiers to defend their neutrality during the Great War can be seen as an important reason Dutch women still found their position as mothers and housekeepers most important. Even though women were bombarded with images of the 'modern woman' from foreign countries, they simply did not have the same experiences these women had had during the war.<sup>46</sup>

The IDFs governing the behavior of women during the war, however, were very much focused on the idea of the new flapper, since they came partly from other European countries and the United States of America. These IDFs were either positive about the modernity of the new women, or negative about these masculine women. In this last case,

---

<sup>45</sup> Linders, "*Frappez, frappez toujours!*", 55-56, D. Noordam 'Lust, Last en Plezier. Vier Eeuwen Seksualiteit in Nederland', in: R. Kistemaker (ed.), *Een Kind onder het Hart. Verloskunde, Volksgeloof, Gezin, Seksualiteit en Moraal van Vroeger en Nu* (Amsterdam 1987) 164 and Bols and Noordman, *Moederschap als Balsem*, 55-56 and A. de Graaf, 'De Vruchtbaarheid van Vrouwen in de Twintigste Eeuw', in: O. Boons e.a. (ed.) *Twee Eeuwen Nederland Geteld* (Den Haag 2007) 112-113.

<sup>46</sup> A. de Graaf, 'De Vruchtbaarheid van Vrouwen in de Twintigste Eeuw', in: O. Boons e.a. (ed.) *Twee Eeuwen Nederland Geteld* (Den Haag 2007) 101.

the IDF would encourage women to be mothers who took care of their precious 3.5 children and concentrated on their healthy household. If a girl was not married yet, she was not supposed to know anything about sexual practices. Nor was she supposed to have a job after being married and since she was proper, she should not go to such worldly places such as a café, theatre or cinema. She could enjoy sport, but she could not go out and dance, and if she wanted to have entertainment, she should find this at the approved societies. It seems like this last IDF was most dominant in this period.

### ***Some Particularities about Men***

Now that we have encountered the IDFs about women, it is time to cast our glance at the men. We have one big problem in doing so. Whereas women have been considered by historians in a gendered way, men often have not. They either are a footnote in women's history as the repressor – or in the case of a rape 'the rapist', even if men and boys were and are raped as well – or they can be considered as part of the woman's family, the husband who brings home the bacon and has little to do with what is still the woman's paradise and kingdom, the private sphere. This type of man is the opposite of the woman, but nothing more. Most of the time, they aren't even named as male, though. This does not mean men don't have a history. It means that history is still very much geared towards disembodied men and, if we use a gendered angle, this angle tends to be focused on women, because they are the 'abnormality'.<sup>47</sup>

Thus, if we want to make a picture of the IDFs governing men, this is going to be even harder on the basis of secondary literature than is the case with women. First of all, maybe the most important consideration in the Netherlands is the fact that Dutch men did not – in general – fight in the Great War. Historian Hein Klemann tells us on the basis of demographic research that only 100.000 soldiers were called forward to fight if need be. Thus, the Dutch economy was not as disrupted as was the case with the economies of the other Western countries that did fight in the War. Because of this, men could just keep doing their jobs and their wives could still stay at home. Even so, with all these men still being able to work – meaning no new workers had to be trained, a clear advantage to the Dutch economy – there

---

<sup>47</sup> The first example can be most easily seen in Brownmiller, *Tegen Haar Wil*. The second example can be found in: Vogel, 'Middelaars en moderniteitsdiscoursen. Over DE VROUW VAN MORGEN en de verhoudingen van Duitsland en Nederland in het interbellum', 37-51. Van Galen and Mevis, 'Zuigelingenzorg in Oost-Brabant 1918-1940', 73-83 do not even consider men.

were some problems with the economy. The Dutch economy used to be not much more than an extension of the German Rijnland economy, Klemann explained. This caused the Dutch to be highly affected by the end of free trade, which was caused by the War. Because of this, the Dutch economy had to become more autarkic, which it was able to do fairly well and which strengthened it after the War. During the Great War, however, the Dutch also had to deal with about a million Belgian refugees. This also had a great impact on the economy and the Dutch themselves. The Dutch were, therefore, not able to feel a growth in their economy until after Germany started to do better economically as well, which happened in 1924. Then, in 1929, the economic crisis started in America. This did not affect the Netherlands immediately, but when the Germans began having economical trouble, they pulled the Dutch down with them. This took some time and only happened in 1931.<sup>48</sup>

So, until 1924, the Dutch economy was not broken, but weak because of all the problems the World War had caused. This meant that men were having a hard time holding onto their jobs as it was, and could not have women barging onto the job market, offering their services for far lower prices. This could explain some of the hostility we find towards the Dutch new woman. In England, cultural historian Lucy Bland found, through research on several court cases, that the women's suffrage could be seen as a kind of compromise. Those women who were seen as deserving of the vote, were the good and sturdy matrons. In the Netherlands, likewise, giving women the vote was a type of negotiation. Women kept complaining about the vote, even in the late War. It was believed that giving women the vote would be better than letting them revolt. Even so, very few women used their vote. In 1922, only one in twenty-one women would use her ability to vote in the Netherlands. Women's suffrage was a great deal, since it effectively silenced Dutch feminism as well, until the Second Wave Feminism of the late 1960s. After all, these women had achieved their objectives, right? They had the vote, no need to keep on complaining. And most women concurred.<sup>49</sup>

Since Dutch men had not entered the Great War with as much zeal as most other European men, they had not lost their lives, limbs and masculinity. In Germany, for instance, since women seemed to become more masculine during the War because of their

---

<sup>48</sup> H. Klemann, 'Neutraliteit in de Eerste Wereldoorlog en de Economische Gevolgen in de Jaren 20 en 30', in: Van Bavel and Kok(ed.), *De Levenskracht der bevolking* (Leuven 2010) 51-66.

<sup>49</sup> Posthumus-Van der Groot a.o. (ed.), *Van Moeder op Dochter*, 155-159, 200-201, Linders, "'Frappez, frappez toujours!'", 71 and Lucy Bland, *Modern Women on Trial. Sexual Transgression in the Age of the Flapper* (New York 2013) 43-45.

(economic) positions and men had felt less so, because of their horrible experiences that left them badly scarred both physically and emotionally, we see problems arise. Men felt the need to put an ultra-masculine ideal against women's new attitude, which seems to have provided some of the basic ideas of the Nazi ideology. This is something we most likely don't see to such a great extent in the Netherlands, since, even though some ideas about the *neue Frau* did enter the Netherlands, the positions of both men and women were, at least before the crisis of the 1930s not as bad as was the case in Germany. During the crisis, we see the fascist ideas that were found in the National Socialism of Germany coming to the fore in the Netherlands as well, since democracy seemed to have failed. In 1931 the NSB was founded by Anton Mussert, which encouraged the type of sexist ideology found in the German Nazism. However, as Zonneke Matthée points out, there was a big difference between the influence of these ideologies in Germany and the Netherlands. In the Netherlands, the NSB wasn't nearly as big or as influential as the Nazi Party was in Germany. It seems, however, that during bad economic periods any lingering sexism became clearer, since Carl Romme, minister of social affairs and employment, tried to forbid married women from entering the labor market in the late 1930s.<sup>50</sup>

The last point I want to consider is the fact that most doctors were still men. Since Aletta Jacobs, some women had gone on to study medicine, some encouraged by male professors, like the gynaecologist Hector Treub (1856-1920), even if these professors weren't feminists. However, with this support, only two hundred sixteen female doctors had been trained in 1926 of whom forty-seven worked as GPs. Others worked in for instance psychiatry (ten doctors) or woman's health (eleven doctors). Compared to the total number of GPs (2450 in 1920), this was fairly low. (The number of specialists – specialists still being a vague term in 1920, since specialization was only just starting and some considered themselves to be specialized in more than one area – was 707.) Assuming that the number of GPs did not dramatically shrink or grow in six years, the chance a person would meet a female GP instead of a male one would be less than one in ten.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> S. Sewell, 'The Party Does Indeed Fight Like a Man. The Construction of a Masculine Ideal in the Weimar Communist Party', in: J. A. Williams, *Weimar Culture Revisited* (New York 2011), 163-165, Z. Matthée, *Voor Volk en Vaderland. Vrouwen in de NSB, 1931-1948* (Amsterdam 2007) 20, 27-30, 70-71, 82-83, 91-93 and Bols and Noordman, *Moederschap als Balsem*, 55-56.

<sup>51</sup> N. Beyens, *Immer Bereid en Nooit Verlegen. Hector Treub, Vrouwenarts in een Mannenmaatschappij* (Amsterdam 2013) 225, 234, 241-242, H. Marland, 'Opleiding en Carrière van de Tweede Generatie Vrouwelijke Artsen in Nederland', *Gerwina* 16 (1993) 228 and R. Melker, 'De Huisarts en "De Spaansche Griep" 1918-1920', in: *Huisarts en Wetenschap* 48 (13) (2005) 685.

We can conclude two things. The first is that there was a discourse on Dutch masculinity. This discourse became clearer and possibly stronger during the 1930s. In the 1920s this type of discourse seems to have been available as well, but since the Dutch economy was doing fairly well, it was not that abundant or, alternatively, it was not spoken about as clearly. It seems that, considering the fact that Dutch men were not soldiers, this discourse on masculinity used to be focused on the husband who brought home the bacon. (Something that can be seen in the relatively low numbers of married women working.) This might have changed in the 1930s, with the more fascist discourse of the NSB gaining some acceptance. The idea that men still were the ones bringing home the bacon can be found in the fact that most scientific experts were still men as well – after all, not that many women worked. This will most likely have affected the way people looked at the expert, and this notion thus should be taken into account while looking at the scientific experts of the 1920s and early 1930s in the next chapter.

## Chapter 2: Scientific Experts in the 1920s

This chapter will look at the scientific experts of the early interwar period. It will start off by looking at doctors, who, in this period, had become respected figures in society. After that, one special category of doctors, psychiatrists, who were in this period still closely connected to the neurologists or *zenuwartsen* will be analyzed. They, like doctors, had become more important in this period. This part will end with a consideration of the Dutch system of *reclassering*, a system which enabled released (ex-)criminals to reintegrate back into society and helped them by assigning assistance during their parole. Since 1915 this system had been more closely related to the government, something that will be interesting for the purposes of this paper.

### ***An Apple a Day...***

In the last chapter, I mentioned the way in which Dutch doctors (ab)used the anxieties of mothers to get them to make a type of pact with them. This pact involved the loss of freedom to do with her child as she wanted, but gave her a considerable amount of respect in turn, since she could rely on the doctor as her ally. The reason women wanted to give up their own agency in return for more respect can be found in the changed balance between these two things. Women must have believed doctors to have more expertise than they themselves had and therefore became willing to give up their agency. The respect for doctors and those associated with them must have grown in this period as well, since otherwise women would not receive more respect because of having a doctor as an ally.

The reasons for this can be partly found in the Great War and, in the Netherlands especially, the Spanish flu pandemic of 1918-1919, since these happenings enabled doctors to learn a great deal, not only in the treatment of battle wounds, but also in the prevention of infections and the like. This does not mean that knowledge about antisepsis was not available before this period. Discoveries in this area had been made during the late 1800s. However, the Great War and pandemic that followed it enabled these discoveries to be used on a large scale.<sup>52</sup>

Social historian of medicine Edward Shorter could thus claim in the early 1980s that women's bodies had become less damaged and caged in the period between 1900-1930.

---

<sup>52</sup> Beyens, *Immer Bereid en Nooit Verlegen*, 63 and J. Williams, 'Foreword', in: J. Williams, *Weimar Culture Revisited* (New York 2011) XIII.

They had gotten more say in their own fertility (thanks to the birth control methods that became available in this period). Certain 'women's ailments', like rickets, could be better prevented because of an improved food supply and the lowered popularity of corsetry. However, the most important thing here might have been better health care, enabling women to have a chance at surviving their deliveries. Because of these changes, women were prepared to not only give up their agency when it came to their children's health care, but also give it up when it came to themselves. They were prepared to stop their home remedies – although it must be said here that Shorter does not really consider regional differences, but paints the picture in fairly big strokes – and willing to trade these in for 'doctor approved' ways of treatment.<sup>53</sup>

Another important reason for the increased importance of doctors might have been the Dutch Thorbeckian law considering the training of doctors. This law, which was introduced in 1865, required doctors, apothecaries and midwives to receive special training. This type of state supervision strengthened the medical profession and enabled a legal rejection of quacks. However, this law did not make a separate forensic medical profession and Dutch forensic medicine therefore became a strange beast in Europe according to Science and Technology Studies researcher A.H.M. Kerkhoff. Those who practiced forensic medicine in the Netherlands tended to do this as a 'side job' besides their normal specialization. The specializations which slowly began to form during the late nineteenth century, thus had forensic offshoots, but no separate forensic specialization.<sup>54</sup>

A third reason for the larger influence of doctors can be found in the hygienists. This group of physicians wanted to enlighten the larger population and thus better their physical conditions by educating the public about the dos and don'ts in particular situations. This resulted in the consultation bureaus mentioned above. However, these were not the only types of consultation bureaus we find in the Netherlands during this period. Others included bureaus against, for instance, alcoholism. Through these bureaus, people encountered

---

<sup>53</sup> E. Shorter, *Geschiedenis van het Vrouwelijk Lichaam* (Baarn 1984) 10, 27-38, 199.

<sup>54</sup> A. Kerkhoff, 'Over de Verhouding tussen Gerechtelijke Geneeskunde en Openbare Gezondheidszorg. Een Historisch Overzicht', in: B. Cohen a.o. (ed.), *Forensische Geneeskunde. Raakvlakken tussen Geneeskunst, Gezondheidszorg en Recht* (Assen 1996) 7-31.

doctors and their expertise more often and, most likely, granted them the expertise they needed to stabilize their position in society.<sup>55</sup>

Thus, we can conclude that through all these different channels, doctors presented themselves as experts and seem to have been accepted as such. This is quite interesting, since, especially in women's medicine, doctors were still fairly new and learned some things in practice that some of the midwives and *bakers* might have known for quite some time. However, as has been mentioned in Joris Vandendriessche, Evert Peeters and Kaat Wils' edited volume on expertise, expertise has to be granted by the expert's audience. This seems to have been the case with doctors in the interwar period in the Netherlands as well. Their expertise was thus not only recognized by the patients – especially the women – they treated, but this audience also helped create their expertise in this way.<sup>56</sup>

To conclude: although doctors were not necessarily better educated than for instance *bakers* or midwives in this period, they *were* however awarded a public that believed them to be experts and thus they became experts in their fields. As such, the ruling IDF allowed them to make certain claims. It might have been the case that, since specialization had started, doctors were supposed to stay in their own field, meaning that their claims were most valued within a particular field. However, since, as said before, forensic medicine was not a 'real' specialization, most doctors could say something in court and be taken seriously. Some doctors were, however considered more trustworthy than others because of their specialized knowledge. This is something that I will get back to in the next chapter.

### ***Bedlam, Middle Class or State Asylum?***

The Dutch either were crazy or they weren't. At least, that's what the Code Pénal of 1811, instituted in the Netherlands under the French occupation, made them out to be. And clearly, anyone truly crazy could be qualified as such by a layman. Judges could determine for themselves whether or not someone was out of their minds and thought they would not

<sup>55</sup> R. van Dalen, 'Honderd Jaar Vrouwen en Gezondheidsdeskundigen', in: R. van Dalen and M. Gijswijt-Hofstra, *Gezond en Wel. Vrouwen en de Zorg voor Gezondheid in de Twintigste Eeuw* (Amsterdam 1998) 15-29 and M. Daru, 'Hygiënisering en Moralisering van de Gezondheidszorg', in: Van Dalen and Gijswijt-Hofstra, *Gezond en Wel*, 32-34.

<sup>56</sup> L. Saarloos, 'Because They Say So. Expertise and Traveling Knowledge in the Case of the Dutch Psychiatrist Gerbrandus Jelgersma', Unpublished MA Thesis (University of Utrecht 2013) 3, 74, R. van Dalen, 'Verloskundige Oefeningen. Een Student in Leiden 1919', in: Van Dalen and Gijswijt-Hofstra, *Gezond en Wel*, 205-212, J. Vandendriessche, E. Peeters and K. Wils, 'Introduction. Performing Expertise', in: J. Vandendriessche, E. Peeters and K. Wils (ed.), *Scientists' Expertise as Performance. Between State and Society, 1860-1960* (London 2015) 1-13 and Beyens, *Immer Bereid en Nooit Verlegen*, 73-75.



need a psychiatrist to do that for them. Not only that, but psychiatry was a very new specialization and little appreciated at that during the nineteenth century. So, with the Code Pénal and the way psychiatrists were treated in the early 1800s, their place certainly did not seem to be the courtroom.<sup>57</sup>

This changed somewhere in the late nineteenth century. This was partly caused by the change in regulations, which happened as early as 1886 and enabled judges to impose a year in a mental institution instead of an actual punishment. As early as 1911, a new proposition for the Dutch *psychopatenwetten* (psychopath laws) followed. These would enable psychiatrists to take so-called psychopaths under their wing. In 1911, these laws would not make it. They did in 1925, even though it would take until 1928 before they were actually implemented. This new law enabled the judge to enforce a period of *ter beschikkingstelling aan de regering* or tbr, which meant that a person would be taken into a mental institution for at least two years and treated (though the amount of treatment was nothing near the type one would encounter nowadays). This period could be lengthened by the judge. However, this tbr worked so well, that in 1933, the *Stopwet* or Stop Act needed to be instated. This meant that the requirements for tbr were made more severe, since the state asylums associated with the law were becoming overfilled.<sup>58</sup>

Connected to this new legislation was the *Nieuwe Richting* or New Direction that could be seen in the judicial circles. This was an ideology that believed that offenders needed to be seen for their own person and for their own deeds, as opposed to the *Klassieke Richting* or Classical Direction. The Classical Direction thought that people in the Netherlands didn't need to know the personal circumstances of a felon. They just had to know what he had done wrong and he could be judged for those mishaps. These two ideas were fighting for dominance within the judicial system at the time and, especially during the twentieth century, the New Direction was gaining ground, something that we can see in the new psychopath laws of 1928.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> H. Oosterhuis, 'Treatment as Punishment. Forensic Psychiatry in the Netherlands (1870-2005)', *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry* 37 (2014) 38.

<sup>58</sup> Weyers and Koenraadt, 'Toenemende vraag naar expertise – een eeuw forensische psychiatrie en psychologie', in: Koenraadt, Kelk and Vijsselaar (ed.), *Tussen behandeling en straf*, 11, 23-25, 27 and Oosterhuis, 'Treatment as Punishment. Forensic Psychiatry in the Netherlands (1870-2005)', 39, 41-43 and C. Fijnaut, *Criminologie en Strafrechtsbedeling. Een Historische en Transatlantische Inleiding* (Antwerpen 2014) 445-446.

<sup>59</sup> Fijnaut, *Criminologie en Strafrechtsbedeling*, 454 and Oosterhuis, 'Treatment as Punishment. Forensic Psychiatry in the Netherlands (1870-2005)', 41 and Saarloos, 'Because They Say So', 30.

Besides this change in the legal position of psychiatrists, we see a change in their societal position too. Edward Shorter has done research on psychiatry as well and concluded that at the dawn of the twentieth century, psychiatry began being viewed differently. Before 1900, the colleagues of psychiatrists looked down on them, because they tended to work within what basically were 'nuthouses'. People were packed into these and hardly treated and psychiatry was mostly meant to keep all the 'weird people' in check and normal society safe. After 1900, a more biological type of psychiatry acquired influence. People with psychiatric problems were not just crazy, but they were biologically challenged; their nervous system did not work as it should. This meant that psychiatrists (especially those who presented themselves as *zenuwartsen* or neurologists) could get involved with the middle classes, because they could be treated without thinking themselves crazy. They, after all, were biologically 'abnormal', not mentally. Psychotherapy, based on the psychoanalysis forwarded by Sigmund Freud, fitted into this picture, because this meant that the hysterical, hypochondriac and nervous could talk with psychotherapists. These types of therapy had a 'scientific' basis and were presented as such and thus fitted within the ideas the middle classes liked.<sup>60</sup>

This shift from madhouse to the middle classes can be seen in the Netherlands as well, where ideas about hysteria and nervousness were also adopted. Hysteria was seen as a typically female illness and was believed to be mostly found in higher-class women who were prone to having big, emotional outbreaks that were typical in hysterics. The Dutch psychiatrist Gerbrandus Jelgersma, who is seen as one of the founding fathers of Dutch psychiatry, wrote a lot on hysterics. He, likewise, started using and promoting Freud's ideas on psychotherapy, thus spreading those in the Netherlands. It seems that not only the American psychiatric profession grew to larger appreciation. This was the case for the Dutch psychiatrists as well.<sup>61</sup>

Thus, in the interwar period, Dutch psychiatrists seem to have become experts, at the very least to the middle classes. The psychiatrists had risen from the madhouse to treating those who were more or less border cases, and could thus claim a certain status because several of their clients were middle class. The law – partly guided by the New Direction in

---

<sup>60</sup> E. Shorter, *Een Geschiedenis van de Psychiatrie. Van Gesticht tot Prozac* (Amsterdam 1998) 45-46, 77-84, 128-160.

<sup>61</sup> E. Müller, 'Van Apathie naar Overbelasting. Over Modeziektes, Gender en Moderniteit', *Jaarboek voor Vrouwengeschiedenis* 30 (2010) 44, W. Meerstadt, "'Het Ligt Geheel in het Vrouwelijke Karakter.'" Gerbrandus Jelgersma over hysterie', *Jaarboek voor Vrouwengeschiedenis* 30 (2010) 160-167 and Saarloos, 'Because They Say So', 5-6.

law – likewise accorded them status, something that became especially clear with the new psychopath laws. These enabled the judges to make decisions considering the (partial) (in)sanity of the suspect and also enabled them to get advice of the psychiatrists, since now the judges could be dealing with the border cases, as they had not before.<sup>62</sup>

Therefore, both the law and society had given psychiatrists a new place. The IDF – in general – acknowledged them as experts, just as it had done with the doctors. Judges could actually ask for a psychiatric evaluation, something which they did not need in the period 1811-1886, since only those completely insane could be forced into a mental institution. All in all, we can expect our sources to reflect a certain acceptance of both the medical and the mental specialists.

### ***Reintegration and the Involvement of Judges, Doctors and Psychiatrists***

An important discovery I made during this research was the weight people gave to the reintegration of (ex-)criminals into society. I learned that parole officers (though *avant la lettre*) already existed during this period, something I wasn't aware of and which seems to be very little researched. Anna Tijsseling made some remarks on it during her research on homosexuality. She believed the law on reintegration made in 1915 to be extremely important, with which I agree. From the end of 1915 onward, it was possible for a judge to give a conditional punishment. This meant that the felon was found guilty, but would not have to serve (all of) his sentence in prison. Since the judge would be basically releasing a convicted offender back into society, there needed to be some sort of guidance. The *reclassering* would have to give this guidance.<sup>63</sup>

Of course, the government wanted to have some kind of control over this type of help, since it would be impossible to keep the criminals in check without it. The government therefore made the law of reintegration of 1915, so that they sponsored all the different *reclasserings*-organisations and thus gained a greater grasp on the whole system. The system was very diffuse, since it consisted of several different organizations which were in most cases highly pillarized. Some of these were connected to the consultation bureaus for alcoholics, others solely focused on criminal behavior. It is interesting to note that the

---

<sup>62</sup> Weyers and Koenraadt, 'Toenemende vraag naar expertise – een eeuw forensische psychiatrie en psychologie', 15-16.

<sup>63</sup> A. Tijsseling, *Schuldige Seks*, 68.

bureaus for alcoholics were connected to a psychiatrist or a regular doctor and thus gained psychiatric and medical advice.<sup>64</sup>

This whole fad of using conditional punishments and reintegration was very much connected to the *Nieuwe Richting* of this period. However, there was a society that had been dealing with reintegration for a long time. This society, called *Genootschap ter Zedelijke Verbetering der Gevangenen* was – before the law of 1915 – the most important player on the reintegration field. However, with this law, the society had less of a monopoly in this particular field. An example of this would be the *Centrale Vereeniging ter behartiging der Maatschappelijke Belangen van Zenuw- en Zielszieken* (established in 1924), which began to specialize in those who were mentally ill or disabled. This umbrella organization used consultation bureaus with an unpaid psychiatrist and social workers, not unlike the bureaus for alcoholics did.<sup>65</sup>

So, during the 1920s, the *reclassering* became highly subsidized. This stopped for a moment in the 1930s, since the economic crisis made the government press on the breaks when it came to the reintegration of felons. However, the amount of money given to the *reclassering* stayed on about the same level as in the late 1920s. We can therefore expect that the reintegration system worked at least at the same level in the 1930s as it did in the 1920s. Since costs lowered in the 1930s (because of the crisis), we might even expect the system to be able to take on more cases than it was able to in the 1920s.<sup>66</sup>

We can thus conclude that medical and psychiatric experts became more important in the interwar period. They were interconnected with the whole system of *reclassering* and we can therefore expect the IDFs surrounding them to contain the reintegration system as well, which most likely was seen as a professional system with expert connections. In the next chapter, we will take a look at the actual court cases and the way they treat the psychiatrists and doctors and, not in the last place, since we will find that this system was very important, the reintegration system and the (mind)doctors connected to them.

---

<sup>64</sup> A. Tijsseling, *Schuldige Seks*, 68, J. Heinrich, *Particuliere Reclassering en Overheid in Nederland sinds 1823* (Arnhem 1995) 102-127 and J. van der Stel, *Drinken, Drank en Dronkenschap Vijf Eeuwen Drankbestrijding en Alcoholhulpverlening in Nederland* (Hilversum 1995) 189, 208.

<sup>65</sup> J. Heinrich, *Particuliere Reclassering*, 102-106, 119-120.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibidem*, 138.

### **Chapter 3: Of Cases and Dutch Courtrooms**

This chapter will take a look at the court cases concerning the rape of women aged sixteen and up. (The age of consent was sixteen in the Netherlands during this period, which is the reason for this choice.) These cases, covering the period from 1920 up until 1933, the year the Stop Act came into being, vary in the amount of information given and the length of sentence. Some cases ended in acquittals but most resulted in a conviction. All had at the very least a conviction of one of two courts, the local court or the appellation court in Amsterdam. The roles of the various experts differed, and in some cases there is no proof for any involvement of experts. What we do encounter in most cases, however, is the politics of respectability. Interesting in this context is the fact that we even encounter these in cases where experts are called in; several experts engage in these politics.

#### ***General Overview of the Cases***

As said above, we are dealing here with fourteen cases, covering the period from 1920 up until 1933. All cases except two contain an adult perpetrator and an adult victim. These two exceptions have both an underage perpetrator and victim, and therefore are interesting as well, since in both these cases, we can expect to see the connection between innocence and childhood Louise Jackson found in her work on child sexual abuse in Victorian England. Jackson made the argument that – especially young – children were considered innocent because of their age and childhood. She uses, as I do, the idea of respectability of both the perpetrator and the victim. Nevertheless, she does not directly make the connection between scientific evidence and respectability as I will do. Neither does she specifically consider cases with adult victims.<sup>67</sup>

Both rapist and victim are underage in these cases. Because of this, these two particular cases can be used as a foil for the cases involving adults. We will find one big difference in the next part: underage, Dutch youngsters were considered corrigible and thus sent to a correction institute. This might be connected to the innocence believed to be a part of childhood described by Jackson. It might also be influenced by the New Direction, which encouraged reform over punishment. More information on these cases will be given in the next subchapter.

---

<sup>67</sup> L. Jackson, *Child Sexual Abuse in Victorian England* (London 2000) 1-2, 125-127 and 155.

Of the fourteen cases considered here, six involved the probation system in the Netherlands. Three lacked any type of connection to expertise. Five cases seemed to contain some sort of expert connection or scientific evidence besides the parole organizations. These varied from a midwife expert to several doctors. Interesting to consider is the fact that none of the cases directly involved psychiatrists. This is something that can be seen in the book by Bolten, mentioned before, as well. Bolten firmly believed that an evaluation of the victim's psyche in the case in which he was involved, should be done by a well-known professor of psychiatry, something the court declined. However, it seems very clear that – if we take Roll's educational book as an example – the (general) doctors were aware that they were no psychiatrists. At one point, Roll tells us he won't be going too deep into forensic psychiatry, 'since it will not be asked about at the final exam'. As we will see in these cases, however, psychiatrists were not called into the courtroom during the early interwar period all that often either.<sup>68</sup>

### ***Parole and Special Conditions***

Let us start off by looking at the cases that ended in some type of parole and involvement of the *reclassering*. There were six cases out of our of total fourteen that involved some kind of special probation. The conditions for this parole varied widely. One case, in which the accused claimed to have been 'very drunk when that of which [he] had been accused happened' and thus could not assure the court of the trustworthiness of his first confession, ended in a probation period of three years, with 'as special condition, that the convict needs to behave in the way the consultation bureau for alcoholism in Amsterdam tells him to'. A very interesting verdict, considering that these bureaus were connected to psychiatrists and these experts thus became involved with this felon as early as 1921.<sup>69</sup>

Another interesting point is that the court would sometimes condemn those below the age of eighteen to a short period spent in a correctional institute for youths. This can for instance be seen in the case of Tijmen A. The first court that made a judgment in his case believed him to be best off in a such an institute and thus out of incarceration. The appellation court believed that he would do better when jailed for a period of three months

---

<sup>68</sup> Roll, *Leerboek der gerechtelijke*, 57 and Bolten, *Een rechterlijke dwaling?*, 231. More on the professor Bouman Bolten mentioned can be found in: H. de Waardt, *Mending Minds. A Cultural History of Dutch Academic Psychiatry* (Rotterdam 2005) 98.

<sup>69</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 24, d. 169, 1921 and NDA, GA, inv. 49, d. 169, 1921.

and with a probation of three years. The parole organization that would take care of him during this period was Pro Juventute, an organization specialized in the help of problem children and those youngsters who needed parole officers.<sup>70</sup>

A period in correctional facilities was given to Hendrikus H. as well. Hendrikus was sixteen and had been convicted of sexual assault. Because of his young age, his sentence was six months in a correctional institute. In the appellation another punishment was added onto this particular sentence 'because of the personal circumstances of the suspect'. Interesting is that the idea of reformatory was horrible to Hendrikus' father, since he believed that the boy would not be able to get any work after having finished this type of reformation. It seems that time spent in correctional facilities was seen as a dark page in someone's life.<sup>71</sup>

The cases of Tijmen and the drunk convict can be found in the earlier years of the period studied here. Most instances of *reclassering* are from 1927 and after, though. Albertus van de H., whose case was decided on in 1927, for instance, was referred to the 'Reclasseerings-vereeniging' (organization for probation). The cause for this was the testimony of ds. A.F.L. van Hengel, a vicar who was involved with this particular *Vereeniging* and thus could offer the help and support of the *reclassering*. Ds. Van Hengel believed that 'if the suspect would be freed on parole, something can be done with him, if he is steered well'. Interesting is the fact that this specific court did not seem to deal as much with this particular parole organization as one could expect, since they, at first, wrote the name of the organization wrong.<sup>72</sup>

Sometimes, appellation could get very tough on the suspect, especially if the suspect did something that would not reflect well on his character. An example of this is Casparus M. Casparus decided to come to court carrying arms. Whereas his first conviction was only incarceration, the weapons brought to the courtroom spurred the judges to force another three years of parole onto Casparus. The *Nederlandsch Genootschap tot Zedelijke Verbetering der Gevangenen* was decided to be the best choice of probation organization for this particular suspect.<sup>73</sup>

This same organization was forced onto Johannes T. as well. In 1930 Johannes was convicted of two assaults. Interesting is the fact that, although the *Genootschap* was a logical

---

<sup>70</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 34, d. 138, 1925 and NDA, GA, inv. 34, d. 138, 1925 and Fijnaut, *Criminologie en Strafrechtsbedeling*, 153, 161.

<sup>71</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 45, d. 268, 1929 and NDA, GA, inv. 66, d. 268, 1929.

<sup>72</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 42, d. 539, 1927 and NDA, GA, inv. 53, d. 539, 1927.

<sup>73</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 43, d. 318, 1928 and NDA, GA, inv. 64, d. 318, 1928.

choice in the case of a 'normal' convict, one could suspect the aforementioned *Centrale Vereeniging ter behartiging der Maatschappelijke Belangen van Zenuw- en Zielszieken* to have been called in in the case of a neurologically abnormal suspect. Although Johannes' mother claimed that her son was 'retarded and could not work well with normal co-workers', this claim never was investigated. The fact that the suspect told the court he would 'become a member of the teetotal movement and at the moment helps as a factory worker' might have to do with this. The suspect seemed to have gotten back on the right track, without the need for any special help, which the court specifically named as a reason for their choice. This might explain why the court never looked into the statements of Johannes' mother.<sup>74</sup>

So, in all these cases, the perpetrator got off fairly easily, since none of these cases contained a dossier. Thus, we can conclude none of the suspects got more than a year's worth of prison time. However, this did not mean that their parole period did not exceed this time. Some got three years of probation. In this period, they had to follow the instructions of the various organizations that ruled over the *reclassering*. The *Genootschap* is the only organization I encountered more than once. This might indicate that, although the *Genootschap* was not the only (subsidized) organization during the (late) 1920s and early 1930s, it still had quite a large say in the parole system. So big a say in fact, that other organizations like the *Centrale Vereeniging*, who might have been a better fit for a particular felon, were overlooked in favor of the *Genootschap*.

Something else worth considering is the fact that the amount of felons referred to the probation system grew in the later 1920s. Whereas I only found two cases in the period 1920-1925, I encountered four in the period 1927-1930, one in every single year. This might indicate a heightened trust in the parole officers. However, since six parole cases is a fairly small number, I do not believe we can draw any firm conclusions on this basis. Other research might give us more to work with. For now, however, it seems that during the later 1920s, the trust in the *reclassering* grew, and, since they were heavily associated with various organizations within this system, the reliance on psychiatrists as well.

---

<sup>74</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 47, d. 210, 1930 and NDA, GA, inv. 68, d. 210, 1930.



***Evidence, Experts and Witnesses of Respectability***

'Ladies' pants and two underskirts'. Those were the pieces of evidence mentioned in Nicolaas van den H.'s case. These clothes belonged to Stijntje H. and seemed to have been investigated. Apparently, the clothes did their work, since Nicolaas was convicted to six months incarceration. We, however, are unfortunately unable to get more information on this case. Still, the fact that these particular pieces of evidence are mentioned enables us to understand more about the procedures surrounding the scientific evidence. For scientific evidence, one needs something to investigate, be it a piece of clothing or the psyche of the victim or perpetrator. Many of the cases used the clothes of the women victims involved as a piece of scientific evidence. Sometimes these clothes would carry wet patches on them which needed further research, as they might prove to be sperm cells. Other times, pieces of clothing could put the women at the place of the crime, for instance if a hairpin had fallen out of her hair or a button had fallen off of her coat in the scuffle with the rapist. In one particularly violent rape, the clothes of a victim had been thorn, something that supported her claim of resistance to her attacker.<sup>75</sup>

Besides examination of the clothes involved in the rape, we also find some examination of the victim herself. These examinations not only focused on the woman's genitals, as in the case of the aforementioned Maria H. and of Cathrien de G., who was abused in 1933, but also involved a consideration of her whole body. Gertrud W. for instance, was raped by three men in a car. Besides one confession, of the seventeen-year old boy who participated in the rape, there was also a witness other than the victim and perpetrators. Gertrud was hurt during the rape and got a doctor to describe her wounds. Cathrina de G., likewise, had wounds of which the doctor took note; her rapist had tried to strangle her, thus causing her, according to the doctor, to possibly go into so much shock she could not keep on fighting her attacker.<sup>76</sup>

The doctors in the above cases seemed to have followed the books rather well. Roll, for instance, alerted the doctors to physical damages such as bruises (as those found on

<sup>75</sup> Nicolaas' case: NDA, GA, inv. 29, d. 376, 1921 and NDA, GA, inv. 53, d. 376, 1921. Other cases involving research of clothes: NDA, GA, inv. 17, d. 546, 1933/NDA, GA, inv. 37, d. 546, 1933/NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933 (thorn clothes of the victim and her hairpins at the crime scene), NDA, GA, inv. 28, d. 111, 1922/NDA, GA, inv. 52, d. 111, 1922/ NDA, GA, inv. 82, d. 111, 1922 (clothes of the victim with wet patches), NDA, GA, inv. 68, d. 660, 1920/NDA, GA, inv. 115, d. 660, 1920/ NDA, GA, inv. 385, d. 660, 1920 (button from the coat of the victim), NDA, GA, inv. 29, d. 257, 1921/NDA, GA, inv. 53, d. 357, 1921/NDA, GA, inv. 85, d. 357, 1921 (a pair of woman's trousers worn during the rape).

<sup>76</sup> NHA, GA, inv. 28, d. 111, 1922/NHA, GA, inv. 52, d. 111, 1922/ NHA, GA, inv. 82, d. 111, 1922, NDA, GA, inv. 17, d. 546, 1933/NDA, GA, inv. 37, d. 546, 1933/NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933 and NDA, GA, inv. 68, d. 660, 1920/NDA, GA, inv. 115, d. 660, 1920/ NDA, GA, inv. 385, d. 660, 1920.

Cathrina in the shape of a thumb on both sides of her neck), scratches and the like. He likewise focused on the hymen of the women. However, he warned that this membrane does not prove for a fact whether a woman is a virgin or not: 'in lots of cases, one cannot tell whether or not a defloration has had place, nor that it has not'. Roll adds: 'Finding lesions, made by outside violence and proving the presence of sperm in, on or in the area of the genitals, has most importance in the case of already deflowered women and are many times the only material evidence for rape.'<sup>77</sup>

Bolten was even stricter in deciding what was rape and what was not. Since he believed it very important that there had been resistance to the victim's utmost ability, he stated that rape by one man was virtually impossible. The only way this might be achieved, would be, according to him, if the woman was not physically or psychologically normal. Women in his opinion *needed* to show some type of proof of their resistance. Men, likewise needed to have some physical damages, since women would – according to Bolten – be able to hurt a rapist enough to make him back off. Secondly, if the rape had been completed, one needed to prove the woman to be 'abnormal' and thus unable to stop her rapist.<sup>78</sup>

It is clear, however, that not everyone agreed with Bolten. Jan Hulst, expert in forensic medicine (something that was a very unusual specialization), argued that the victims in the trial in which they both functioned as experts, were so completely shocked by the abuse they had suffered on the hands of their local doctor, that they did not know how to react. Likewise, Hulst mentioned the fact that the doctor would be considered with much reverence in this small town, and the women might not even have dared to go against him. Hulst thus left open the possibility of a rape without any visible marks (besides defloration) and Bolten disagreed strongly with this point – partly, it seems, out of personal dislike of Hulst. Bolten believed Hulst to be over-appreciated, something that might be connected to the fact that Hulst functioned as 'supra-arbiter and was allowed to hear all expert statements; the other experts, as lesser gods, were not given this right'. This, in combination with Bolten's very obvious opinion on the know-how of Hulst – he refers to Hulst's testimony as 'bakerspraatjes' (old-wives' tales) – shows us very clearly that the medical profession should not be taken as a monolith in this period.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Roll, *Leerboek der gerechtelijke*, 419, quotes respectively from 364 and 374.

<sup>78</sup> Bolten, *Een rechterlijke dwaling?*, 151-156.

<sup>79</sup> Bolten, *Een rechterlijke dwaling?*, 151-156, 210. Quotes respectively 237, and 210.

These discussions likewise show that even though doctors had become more integrated in court, they still argued about the different interpretations of rape. Respectability was still on the line, since doctors needed to prove that a woman did resist the rape. If a woman was not known as particularly proper, proving that she did resist to her uttermost ability was very hard. The title of this thesis, arguing that a victim was not trustworthy because of her family connections, shows how strong Bolten still felt about the intimate connectedness of both respectability and his scientific proof. Scientific proof needed to be interpreted and in this, we see respectability is used by both Bolten and Hulst as an explanation. Important in how much value was given to this explanation, was the specialization and position of the doctor doing the conjecture, as can be seen with Hulst.

### ***Of Cars and Kidnapping: Gertrud, Frederik, Michael and Marinus***

So, after these general remarks, let us now turn towards the individual cases. As said before, most cases studied ended in the verdict 'guilty'. However, the influence of the experts on this verdict differed in these cases. Let us start with Gertrud W.'s case. Gertrud's case was dealt with by the appellation court in 1920. She was, according to the dossier, raped on the evening of May 30<sup>th</sup> of that same year. The woman, who worked in a hotel and was walking in the neighborhood with some co-workers, was abducted by three men. These three men, Frederik L., Michael S. and Marinus B. were waiting behind the car Frederik drove for a living. They jumped in the car, which already contained Josephus W. Frederik then drove to car to a more secluded spot and all three men raped Gertrud, while Josephus watched. The youngest of the men who abused Gertrud, Marinus, was seventeen years old and would testify before the court that all three men indeed had raped Gertrud. Josephus would do the same, as would Michael (although he claimed that the sex he had had with Gertrud was voluntary). Three people likewise testified that they had seen the kidnapping happen.<sup>80</sup>

All these testimonies made, of course, for quite a strong case for Gertrud. We thus find that all men were jailed. However, it seems that, because this would have made her case even stronger, Gertrud needed to show she had resisted the three men. Bolten's opinion on the impossibility of raping an ordinary woman might thus have been more common. Gertrud, or possibly her lawyer, maybe wanted to prevent discussion about her resistance by proving with scientific evidence that she was indeed hurt during the rape.

---

<sup>80</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 68, d. 660, 1920, NDA, GA, inv. 115, d. 660, 1920 and NDA, GA, inv. 385, d. 660, 1920.

Doctor P. Varekamp therefore described her wounds: abrasions on her leg and right shoulder and a thickness in her neck, that might have been caused by violence. It is interesting, however, that, although this information can be found in the dossier connected to the case, dr. Varekamp never testified in the courtroom. Likewise, Gertrud's genitals were never examined. This most likely can be explained by the fact that Gertrud was already married when she was raped, and her hymen would most likely have been ruptured for some time. Varekamp could have searched her nether regions for abrasions and bruises though, and had not done so.<sup>81</sup>

The paperwork on the case is very light on the respectability politics as well. We find a mention of the guardian of Marinus who told the court that the boy was 'in possession of a soft character, childish, and positively known by him'. Later on, we find a mention of the felon's mother who was a prostitute. Even so, the boy was considered a good child in general. Frederik and Michael both tried to claim that they had a sexually transmitted disease – making it all the more surprising that none of the perpetrators' nor the victim's genitals were seen by a physician – and tried to argue that every doctor would tell the court that an ill man would not be a rapist. (A fairly strange assumption since physicians would use these types of diseases as proof of a rape having occurred. If both victim and perpetrator had the same illness, this could support a rape claim.) Frederik's wife tried to support him by claiming her husband was indeed ill and that she and her children needed him at home. This is however, all that is said on the respectability front. It would seem that the court considered the case almost closed with the testimonies and confessions. The extra uses of scientific and respectable evidence thus was not truly needed.<sup>82</sup>

In this way, Gertrud's case shows how both respectability and scientific evidence were mostly used instead of witnesses. Since rape was, and is, most of the time a crime in which only two people – victim and perpetrator – are involved, there was no possibility of a neutral witness to help the judge decide what had happened. Gertrud's case did not only have a neutral witness, but also two perpetrators confessing that they had sex with her. Therefore, respectability and scientific evidence was less needed than it was in the other cases.

---

<sup>81</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 68, d. 660, 1920, NDA, GA, inv. 115, d. 660, 1920 and NDA, GA, inv. 385, d. 660, 1920.

<sup>82</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 385, d. 660, 1920 and Roll, *Leerboek der gerechtelijke*, 383. More on the connection between venereal diseases and rape: W. Ruberg, 'Mother Knows Best.' The Transmission of Knowledge of the Female Body and Venereal Diseases in Nineteenth-Century Dutch Rape Cases, in: M. Dinges & R. Juetten (Eds.), *The transmission of health practices (c. 1500 to 2000)* 35-47.

***Of 'Retards' and Pregnancies: Maria and Jan***

The next case is very interesting for our knowledge on psychiatry. The victim in this case, Maria de G., worked for her rapist, Jan B., who was a tailor, as a cleaning lady. The case, which happened late in 1921, concerned a series of rapes that occurred between 1920 and 1921. The only reason her parents –with whom she still lived, even though she was already 25 years old – found out about the rapes was that Maria had become pregnant. Maria had wanted to keep it a secret and had not really known what had happened, something we can understand from her testimony about the rape. Instead of knowing what to call a penis, Maria, during her trial, spoke of the rapist's 'snake part'. In the investigation, she had told the police that she had no knowledge of 'how the fertilization of a woman would come to be'. She explained that 'she – because she got pregnant from the proceedings – now understood that the later actions [the rapes] were even worse than the first [an assault]'. Reading Maria's case, I got a feeling that she lacked certain thought processes, almost as if she were mentally disabled. This feeling seemed to be right, since her father explained to the court that 'his daughter Marie sometimes was like a child, and does what one tells her' and 'is mentally retarded'. The midwife who had delivered Maria's baby, claimed likewise that Maria was mentally handicapped, as did her mother. The director of the local health services believed Maria to be mentally challenged as well, and believed that she had resisted the rape as much as could be expected of her.<sup>83</sup>

The above-mentioned midwife was used as an expert. A doctor, G. Kasteleyn, was used as an expert as well. Madam van Kooy, the midwife, believed that Maria's story fitted with the development of the child she had carried to term. Kasteleyn said that the midwife could be correct in her estimation. Van Kooy used for instance the fingernails of the infant as a point of reference. The doctor, however, pointed towards the fact that he could support the midwife's conclusion on this basis, but that the signs on the infant's body did not give a solid conclusion, as opposed to how she presented her thesis.<sup>84</sup>

Whereas the defense of Maria mostly focused on her retardation and her ignorance of all things connected to sex, the defense of Jan focused on his respectability. A widowed woman who had worked for Jan before, Gijsbertha, claimed that she had been immorally touched by him. After that, she stopped working for him. Interestingly, she did – at first –

---

<sup>83</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 29, d. 257, 1921, NDA, GA, inv. 53, d. 357, 1921 and NDA, GA, inv. 85, d. 357, 1921.

<sup>84</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 85, d. 357, 1921.

not tell this to the police, since she believed that the case was ‘a frightening tactic which would end in the suspect having to pay for the child’. It seems that there might have been some cases of the kind described by American historian Stephen Robertson. Robertson argued that some families during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century would pressure a rapist into marrying the rape victim by threatening to sue him. We seem to have a similar assumption here on the part of Gijsbertha, who believed that some families would threaten to sue to get some type of alimony from the rapist.<sup>85</sup>

To get back to the main point of mentioning Gijsbertha: she tried to destroy Jan’s respectability by claiming that he had tried to do some strange things with her as well. However, Jan had several witnesses of respectability on his side. One of those, Dirk, not only re-established Jan’s good behavior (by claiming him to be a good member of their church with outstanding behavior), but tried to discredit Gijsbertha’s as well. Gijsbertha had children who were born out of wedlock – something she readily admitted. Dirk, then, tried to claim that she was, at night, ‘in the cinema where she got to know strange men who she takes home’. This she denied, and Gijsbertha explained that she worked in the cinema sometimes, but never took men home. A civil servant of the local *Burgerlijk Armbestuur* (a support organization for poor people), however, told the court that Gijsbertha was not very moral, thus discrediting her as a witness. It is very intriguing that, even though Gijsbertha was not the raped party, her sexuality became part of the trial, because it was believed to give more information on her trustworthiness as a witness.<sup>86</sup>

Besides Gijsberta and Dirk, two other witnesses of respectability were heard, both claiming that Jan was very trustworthy and they could not find any strange acts in his behavior. This defense seems to have worked, since Jan was not convicted in the appellation court. The first court in Hilversum had given him a punishment of a year and three months. The second, however, argued that there had been some fault in the legal process. Therefore, Jan was released of all charges. Since the court did not specify which fault had been made, we cannot explain this change. The absence of a psychiatrist to examine Maria’s mental state can’t be considered the cause, since judges were free to make up their own minds about the psyche of the victim and perpetrator. Maybe the fault could be found in the first enquiry done by the police, or, maybe the judge did not like the conjecture on the part of

---

<sup>85</sup> Stephen Robertson, ‘Making Right a Girl’s Ruin. Working-Class Legal Cultures and Forced Marriage in New York City, 1890-1950’, *Journal of American Studies* 36 (2) (2002) 205-206, 226-230 and NDA, GA, inv. 85, d. 357, 1921.

<sup>86</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 85, d. 357, 1921.

the midwife and thus judged this evidence to be too circumstantial. This type of speculation, however, can give us no certainties.<sup>87</sup>

Maria's case is especially interesting since it shows that even if it was suspected that the someone involved in the case wasn't quite 'right' in the head, psychiatrists were not always called in. We cannot explain this by saying that Maria's mental state would not have mattered for this particular case, since people with different psyches were better protected by Dutch law than was the case with those who were considered normal. Doctor and midwife, however, were given consideration, which shows that these types of experts were considered important and knowledgeable. The same can be said about witnesses of respectability who were consulted a lot in this case.

### ***Of Chairs and Hotels: Maria and Nathan***

Let us now turn to our third larger case. This case, involving the aforementioned Nathan van Z. and Maria H., reached the Amsterdam appellation courtroom in 1922, after an Alkmaar court had judged the defendant to be guilty of attempted rape. The Amsterdam court did not agree with this and lowered the sentence by almost three years, to a year and three months. The judgment itself was likewise turned into an assault charge. Since the introduction has explained several of the main points of this case, a quick recap will suffice here.<sup>88</sup>

Maria H., the victim in this case, worked in a hotel called 'De Brug'. She was raped there, by a guest named Nathan van Z., who was a livestock salesman and did quite well for himself. On these bare bones of the accusation one finds several layers piled up. On the one hand, we find the scientific evidence, which, in the Alkmaar court, had been ignored in obtaining the assault charge, since doctor Hulst (and yes, this is the Hulst mentioned in Bolten's book) believed a rape in that particular chair that would have been used impossible. Therefore, the logical conclusion would have been an assault. The Alkmaar court still held onto the attempted rape charge, however, a charge that would be changed by the Amsterdam court. This new charge would follow dr. Hulst's conclusions more closely.<sup>89</sup>

The next layer piled onto this very intricate case can be found in respectability. Many witnesses engaged in the politics of respectability. On one hand we have Maria's bosses,

---

<sup>87</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 29, d. 257, 1921 and NDA, GA, inv. 53, d. 357, 1921.

<sup>88</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 28, d. 111, 1922.

<sup>89</sup> NHA, GA, inv. 82, d. 111, 1922.

who claimed that they did not ring the bells in the rooms that were used to contact the staff of the hotel. However, a bell did ring in a very unusual pattern, making it thus seem Maria tried to defend her virtue as much as possible, even using the bell to alert the staff. However, the hotel at this point was very busy so they ignored the bell. The wife of the owner of the hotel explained that Maria was not particularly forward with men, as opposed to some women whom she had hired before.<sup>90</sup>

On the other hand, we have witnesses for the defense who testified that the women working in the hotel were 'easy' and not particularly virtuous, thus damaging Maria's reputation as well. Letters about the behavior of the suspect can likewise be found in the dossier, some speaking about his virtue, others about his faults. In this case, it seems that, at least in the Amsterdam court, the scientific evidence was the decisive factor in making a judgment, since the witnesses of respectability seem to be about evenly weighted.<sup>91</sup>

Maria's case shows us how respectability politics and scientific evidence can entangle. In the first case, which came before the Alkmaar court, the respectability evidence seemed to win out, since the court largely ignored the conclusions of dr. Hulst. The second court, however, showed that disregard of the expert was not something that should be encouraged and lowered both the sentence and the verdict in accordance to what the doctor had said in the case.

### ***Of Essentially Good Girls and Men Who Disappear: Catharina and Jan***

Cathrina de G. is our next victim. She was a young girl just over the age of consent when this particular incident happened. Cathrina, according to her mother, was a very outdoorsy type of girl who 'likes to be on the street, and dresses well, but isn't the type of girl to walk with every single boy' and, she was 'dead honest, and, at the end of the day, extraordinarily sensitive and sweet. In her work as a daytime servant, she is also very much appreciated'. The night of the rape, Cathrina was allowed by her parents to be out until 10.30 p.m. Cathrina met a man this evening 'and he was also very handsome! He was slightly bigger than I, had broad shoulders, not truly black, but very dark blonde hair, with a nice weave in it, a freshly shaven face, and beautiful white teeth. A dark coat, that ended a bit over his knees, a dark suit, and a grey hat, with a round dent in the top'. This man, Jan, asked her to

---

<sup>90</sup> NHA, GA, inv. 28, d. 111, 1922, NHA, GA, inv. 52, d. 111, 1922 and NHA, GA, inv. 82, d. 111, 1922.

<sup>91</sup> NHA, GA, inv. 28, d. 111, 1922, NHA, GA, inv. 52, d. 111, 1922 and NHA, GA, inv. 82, d. 111, 1922.



share some drinks with him, which Cathrina did. Then he told her he would bring her home in a taxi. After stepping into the cab, they proceeded to have a light make-out session, but this did not escalate further. Jan told the cab to stop at his house and he took her into the vestibule where he raped her. Cathrina later tells us that ‘father and mother had warned me so many times, that I should not believe everyone, and that I should watch out. But they had never told me exactly what to watch out for. I didn’t even know exactly, how children came to be’. Even so, she tried to fight Jan off.<sup>92</sup>

She did not succeed in fighting Jan off, but he stopped with his actions when three elderly neighbors got home. They heard Jan greet them and one of them picked Cathrina’s coat up for her and gave it back, noticing that her hair was quite wild. However, they did not see more, like Cathrina’s torn clothing, since Jan had disabled the lights in the little entranceway they had occupied. After the elderly left, Jan proceeded to rape Cathrina a second time. Somewhere in all these horrible events, Jan also abused Cathrina anally, having told her that this would prevent pregnancy, something both Cathrina and her parents very much feared (in the end, Cathrina did not conceive a child). Jan, when he has had his way with her, disappeared, saying that she wouldn’t find him since he was ‘Jan the Untraceable’. This strange way of departing might be explained by the fact that the suspect was called Jan by most of his family, but his true name was Gerrit L., thus making him harder to find for the police.<sup>93</sup>

Jan, however, was swiftly found and put in a line-up with two police officers. Cathrina was quite traumatized by the happenings and had stayed in bed for some time since she had, according to the agent who came to interview her while she lay in bed, ‘had, mentally too, a magnificent shock; she is completely lethargic, and down, and finds it horrible to speak about the happenings’. When she was called to look at the line-up, however, she came and, after pointing out Jan as the rapist, had a breakdown. Jan denied anything having to do with the rape and said that he thought the girl he had been with would probably be twenty or twenty-one years old and larger than Cathrina. However, the police noted that ‘while the girl walked past, the suspect was visibly nervous; his mouth and hands shook’.<sup>94</sup>

Cathrina was very quickly made to see a doctor by her father who picked her up from the police office where she had been brought after a police officer found her on the street

---

<sup>92</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 17, d. 546, 1933, NDA, GA, inv. 37, d. 546, 1933 and NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933.

<sup>93</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 17, d. 546, 1933, NDA, GA, inv. 37, d. 546, 1933 and NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933.

<sup>94</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933. The English word ‘down’ is used in the original sentence.

near the place where the rape had happened. The doctor who saw her that particular night of the rape concluded that she had been in cohabitation and she was bruised. A second doctor, Carl Izaäk de Vries Robles, likewise added his own investigation. He explained that he did not believe that Cathrina would have been anally abused, even though his investigation did not focus on this. He thought he would have seen it if this was the case, even if he did not pay close attention to it. It would thus seem that some doctors mostly focused on the female genitals while investigating rape victims and did not look further, unless told to do so.<sup>95</sup>

Both doctors, De Vries Robles and the younger doctor who saw Cathrina first, Willem Stomps, thought it very likely that Cathrina had had intercourse. Stomps then was asked to answer whether or not ‘the girl bore traces of violence which could support the notion of rape’ and ‘whether so much violence could be used, that the girl would have been brought in a state of shock’. Although the question was specifically posed to Stomps (there might be a case of anti-Semitism in that, since De Vries Robles’ name would suggest Jewish origins), both doctors answered it together. They found ‘small bruises to the left and right of the neck, a bruise on the right shoulder and left breast, a wound on her left upper leg and small tears in the hymen’. They thus concluded that especially the small strangulation marks on the neck of the victim could have made her unable to react and that violence did indeed happen.<sup>96</sup>

Christiaan Jacobus van Ledden Hulsebosch, a police chemist, was also involved with the case. An interesting expert, since we haven’t seen this type of professional in this thesis yet. As cultural historian Willemijn Ruberg has shown for the Netherlands, apothecaries were, however, called in in court cases as early as the nineteenth century. Van Ledden Hulsebosch and his father Marinus van Ledden Hulschebosch were well-known Amsterdam pharmacists. Besides running their own pharmacy, they did some forensic science for the Amsterdam police. Van Ledden Hulsebosch the Younger was charged with studying Cathrina’s (torn) clothes. He found no traces of blood or sperm and thought it ‘undesirable, even illicit, to remove material’ to test a stain he found, since he did not know ‘whether the medical investigation would focus on the material causing the stain’. It is thus interesting

---

<sup>95</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 37, d. 546, 1933 and NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933.

<sup>96</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933. The word used in the Dutch original is ‘willoosheid’ instead of ‘shock’. Compare the case with the Jewish doctor to: Ruberg, ‘Onzekere kennis. De rol van forensische geneeskunde en psychiatrie in Nederlandse verkrachtingszaken (1811-1920)’, 97.

that there seems to be a hierarchical notion in the research on this case. The pharmacist did not believe his research should be considered more important than the doctors' and therefore did not remove material for testing. These tests were completed by doctor De Vries Robles, who concluded that the stains were made by blood and 'the slimy fluid that excretes from the uterus during cohabitation with a young female'.<sup>97</sup>

We thus get two doctors supporting Cathrina's story. But that is not all, we find both the perpetrator and the victim heavily involved in the politics of respectability. This is something we already saw with for instance Cathrina's mother, who felt the need to explain her daughter might be out and about a lot, but was, in essence, a good girl who was quite hardworking. This, in general, was confirmed by old bosses of Cathrina, who were asked about her character. A boy who had been out in the city with her likewise confirmed this; she was a 'decent girl' who tended to forget the time if she was in a 'pleasant café or in a dancing'. The fact that Cathrina claims to know nothing about sex seemed to confirm her status as a good girl; after all, most girls were not truly taught about intercourse, as seen in the chapter on women, and the less a girl thus knew about the subject, the more innocent she would appear. Likewise, her behavior while confronted with Jan and after the rape supported her innocence too. I do not believe that Cathrina was acting while confronted with Jan and during the time she stayed in bed after the rape. However, even so, it would be read as a sign of trustworthiness on her side; after all, if a woman had voluntary sex, she would not be so affected by it and the sight of her partner, right?<sup>98</sup>

This respectability play is something we also encounter in Jacobus S. and Van D.'s case. Van D., whose first name is not mentioned in the case files, was abused by Jacobus in 1929 and their case got into the appellation court in 1930. Van D.'s boss, Johanna, explained to this court that 'the witness was, at the time, very much ignorant when it came to the realm of sexuality and that she, maybe because of that, did not resist the suspect's acts'. An interesting claim, since Van D. had lived in *De Goede Herder*, a Catholic home for both 'fallen' girls and abandoned or neglected children. The court did not mention this dichotomy

---

<sup>97</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933. On the Van Ledden Hulsebosches: De Rooy (ed.), *Waakzaam in Amsterdam*, 399-400, Ruberg, 'Trauma, Body, and Mind: Forensic Medicine in Nineteenth-Century Dutch Rape Cases', 98.

<sup>98</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933. 'Dancing' is in the original. This is interesting, since it suggests some connection to American cultural influences in entertainment.

however. Maybe being released by *De Goede Herder* was enough of a vouchsafe for good behavior.<sup>99</sup>

Jan's behavior was far more problematic than Cathrina's, however. He claimed that he was drunk the night of the rape, a Sunday. He ended his defense with: 'If the girl tells the truth, there is only one possibility, namely, that I was so drunk, that I did those actions without realizing it'. Not only did Jan incriminate himself by his behavior (the shaking after seeing Cathrina) and what he said about his drinking, but others incriminated him as well. Most condemning would be the statement made by his mother, with whom he lived. She told the police: I 'got suspicious when I later heard from the detective that "something had happened with a girl" in the staircase, because I know that Jan likes girls and women, and is "a spineless fellow" when it comes to that'.<sup>100</sup>

His behavior with women seems to have been quite notorious, since his wife, whom he was divorcing, had borne the brunt of his violent behavior as well. She told the police he had demanded intercourse with her, even if she did not want it. She also witnessed several girls with him. One of them, Anna, explained that he had tried to abuse her before. Jan, however, chose to slander her saying: 'I consider her to be a public woman'. He later said the same about his (soon to be ex-)wife; 'she [Anna], like my own wife, submits to prostitution'.<sup>101</sup>

Jan's defense thus seemed deficient. This is something the court picked up on, and Jan, in the end, would be put away for two years in a penitentiary because he was judged to have raped Cathrina. A protestant reintegration society tried to take him under their wing. This did not happen though, perhaps because Jan was considered too violent to get out on probation. Interesting is that Jan assumed to be able to buy off all charges by offering a marriage to Catharina. Her parents seem to have been horrified by this offer, especially her mother. Her father considered it, but in the end rejected it. The fact that her father did consider this offer seems to point towards the phenomenon Robertson witnessed in New York during the same period.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 47, d. 9, 1930/NDA, GA, inv. 47, d. 9, 1930. About *De Goede Herder*: Huygens ING, 'Verenigingen voor armenzorg en armoedepreventie in de negentiende eeuw', <http://resources.huygens.knaw.nl/armenzorg/gids/vereniging/2579685398> (version: unknown, last seen: 10-06-2015).

<sup>100</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933. Underlined in the original as well.

<sup>101</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933.

<sup>102</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 37, d. 546, 1933 and NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933.

In Cathrina and Jan's case, we thus encounter an intricate tapestry of both respectability and scientific evidence. In the end, the case of Cathrina and Jan seems to have been decided by both the evidence on respectability and the scientific evidence. Since both mostly supported the other, we find no interference here. Neither does one type of evidence seem to be favored over the other.

### ***Of a Lack of Experts and Bicycles: Martha and Gerardus***

Sometimes, all traces of scientific evidence are absent, thus leading to the conclusion that experts were most likely not involved in the case. One of these types of cases is that of Johann de R., who was convicted to an incarceration period of eight months, an addition of four months to the original sentence which had been made early in 1931. The reason for this higher sentence was most likely that the suspect had been involved in another sexual offence. In this case, he was judged to be guilty of assault of a minor. Since this had happened about two months before this new judgment, the court probably did not believe it necessary to call in more witnesses of respectability and experts on scientific evidence.<sup>103</sup>

The case of Gerardus van N. and Martha V. is quite unique when compared to other cases. This is caused by the fact that it relied solely on witnesses of respectability, something I have not seen in any of the other cases which resulted in over a year of punishment studied here. Not a single doctor, psychiatrist or parole officer was involved in this case. I believe this can be explained by the fact that the science was not as far developed as is now the case. If there had been the possibility of DNA comparisons, it would most likely have been used in this case. As it was now, however, scientific evidence could hardly prove anything. Even so, the witnesses of respectability were so much against Gerardus, that he would be jailed for a year and a half.<sup>104</sup>

The problem here was that it was Gerardus' word against Martha's, not an unusual circumstance in a rape case. Martha had gone to her brother one evening in 1925 and had cycled back home. During this short drive, she encountered a man who made her stop and tried to rape her. She resisted but he silenced her cries by putting his hand on her mouth. Another cyclist then passed them, causing him to flee. She ran away as well and found the nearest house, where she was helped by the man living there and his neighbor. Gerardus

---

<sup>103</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 13, d. 315, 1931 and NDA, GA, inv. 32, d. 315, 1931.

<sup>104</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 37, d. 29, 1926, NDA, GA, inv. 37, d. 29, 1926 and NDA, GA, inv. 117, d. 29, 1926.

would be seen by a man standing in his yard while he fled the crime scene. This man, who recognized him as Gerardus, told the police and added that Gerardus seemed to have quite the haste to leave from whence he came.<sup>105</sup>

Martha, who said that she had a bad feeling when the man approached her, could describe her attacker very well, since she had taken extra notice of his face. She therefore recognized Gerardus when the police showed him to her. Another witness, Jan, likewise believed that the suspect was the right person. Jan's daughter (who was eleven years old), had been harassed at the same spot, most likely by Gerardus as well. That's not the end of it though, because Gerritdina, the mother-in-law-to-be of the suspect told the police that she was sexually abused by Gerardus, as would her mother (who was aged 77) have been.<sup>106</sup>

It seems that this type of black mark could not be erased, not even by the mayor of Gerardus' hometown who believed that Gerritdina lied since she was against her daughter's marriage with Gerardus. Neither could several other witnesses of respectability save Gerardus from time spent in penitentiary. Old bosses, who claimed that the defendant was 'a decent human being', neighbors who believed him to be of 'blameless behavior', his mother, who called him a decent bloke, nothing seemed to be enough to counter the acquisitions against him. However, neither could scientific evidence collected by experts. The court seemed to have a strong belief that the attempted rape did happen, since Martha seemed very trustworthy in her acquisitions. By whom it would've happened in that case could not be found out by any expert. Whether or not Gerardus was in the wrong place at the wrong time did not matter. It couldn't have been proven and the respectability evidence that *was* available seemed to point towards him.<sup>107</sup>

### **Summary**

Now that we have taken a look at all the different cases involving adult rape victims one finds in the period 1920-1933 in the appellation court of Amsterdam, we can draw a few conclusions. The first conclusion we find is that the sexual respectability of the victim was seen as quite important during this period. Some experts did not believe the rape of an ordinary woman was possible and believed women nearly always lied about being raped. Thus, it was very important one was as sexually impeccable as possible, since some of these

---

<sup>105</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 117, d. 29, 1926.

<sup>106</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 117, d. 29, 1926.

<sup>107</sup> NDA, GA, inv. 37, d. 29, 1926 and NDA, GA, inv. 117, d. 29, 1926.

ideas might have found their way to the courtroom. The dominant IDF, however, seemed quite willing to believe the women, even if they did not seem as 'blameless' as the court would have wanted. An example of this was Catharina's case. Catharina did not exhibit behavior that would be considered decent all the time. However, at her core, she was a good girl, according to her mother and several others asked for comments on her character. The fact that she was unmarried and thus did not have to be a 'decent matron' yet, might have helped in this.

The victim wasn't the only one who needed to be sexually impeccable. This can for instance be seen in the case of Johann de R., who had been convicted of child abuse a few months before the case studied here came before the court. Because of this conviction, he was not considered a trustworthy person and convicted for the new sexual offence as well. Sometimes men tried to claim they were drunk at the time of the offence. This did not have the results it seems to have had in England. Historian Louise Jackson argued that men assumed a different type of respectability than women. Whereas her cases – which happened during the Victorian era – tended to focus on class, work status, marital status and character of the defendant, the focus was (besides their class, work, marital status and character) mostly on sexual knowledge and experience in the case of the victims. If a man was generally considered respectable because of his high class, work and marital status and his character, being drunk during a sexual offence might save him from a negative judgment. This was entirely different in the Netherlands. The drunk mentioned in the first part of this chapter was released on probation, but he did have to report to a consultation bureau that would prevent him from drinking. Johannes T., who was seen as retarded by his mother, made some positive changes in his life, according to the court. One of those was becoming a member of a teetotal organization. Likewise, Jan's defense of being drunk while raping Catharina was never truly considered in court. Thus, it seems that the Dutch and English looked at the 'drunken defense' differently. This might partly be explained by the focus on high morality of the (mainly protestant) Dutch which resulted in the 1911 *Zedelijkheidswetten* (morality laws). Further research could give us more insight into this.<sup>108</sup>

The way the perpetrator and victim were judged extended to their witnesses as well. If a witness was not considered respectable, their credibility as a witness was damaged. This can be most clearly seen with Gijsbertha, Jan's old maid who claimed to be unmorally

---

<sup>108</sup> Jackson, *Child Sexual Abuse in Victorian England*, 7-8, 125-127, 130-131.

treated by him, like the victim had. However, other witnesses tried to destroy her credibility and we can conclude that this kind of respectability play might have been quite common. We thus find that almost all people involved in the case are somehow judged on their respectability. Doctors were no exception in this, something that can most clearly be gleaned by looking at the problems between Hulst and Bolten. It would seem that a lot of the dislike Bolten carried for Hulst came from the fact that he was considered, because of his specialization, to be such a trustworthy expert-witness that he could judge on all the expert statements, something that Bolten was not allowed to do. It seems that in this case, Hulst was considered a more respectable doctor than Bolten, something Bolten resented. We see this type of hierarchy in Van Ledden Hulsebosch's behavior as well. The pharmacist seemed very conscious of the fact that he was not on the same foot as the more respectable doctors were, and therefore referred some of the research to them. Doctor Kasteleyn seemed cognizant of the hierarchy as well, when he attempted to correct the midwife witness on his case, even though he essentially agreed with her.

Not only did doctors and especially psychiatrists engage with respectability in this way, they also supported it through the *reclasseringssysteem*. One would not be allegeable for parole if one was not considered trustworthy enough. This could be judged through the witnesses of respectability's statements. If the subject was not considered reliable enough to be released on parole, he would remain imprisoned, even if he asked to be released, something that happened quite a lot. If, on the other hand, the subject did not receive that much jail time, but did something in court that made him less trustworthy (as for instance Casparus did by carrying arms into the courtroom), his sentence could be added to with a parole scheme.<sup>109</sup>

On the subject of psychiatrists we can be quite short; they were not involved in the cases investigated here. And interesting conclusion, since two of the cases involved people who were considered 'retarded'. Especially in Maria de G.'s case, proving that she was 'not right in the head' might have enabled a harsher sentence. However, no psychiatrist or doctor was asked to do a mental exam of her. This happened in the case Bolten described as well. Bolten thought it important that one of the victims, whom he considered mentally abnormal, should be seen by prof. Bouman, a very well-known psychiatrist of the time. The

---

<sup>109</sup> Examples of felons asking to be released on parole can be found in: NDA, GA, inv. 385, d. 660, 1920 and NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933.



court did not even take this in consideration. The same can be said about Johannes, who was seen as retarded by his mother. No psychiatrists were involved and not one of these cases resulted in the new *tbr*.

Doctors were highly involved, though. In most cases, their judgments were considered important, most likely because they gave the scientific evidence courts seemed to crave so much. In most cases, the scientific evidence focused on proving that intercourse had truly happened and that it had been violent. In some cases, such as that of Gertrud, the focus was solely on violence. This can be explained by the fact that virginity was a very hard thing to prove (especially if the woman was married as Gertrud was), if we are to believe Roll's instruction manual. Doctors most likely were aware of this – something that can be glanced from the way they informed the court. Most of the time, they spoke of intercourse that had happened, but left it to the judge to decide whether this was the voluntary type or not, even if they found traces of violence.

## Conclusion

### **During the period 1920-1933, did the way scientific expert knowledge was treated compared to lay knowledge in rape cases in the Netherlands change significantly?**

The above question was the main question of this research. The short answer to this question would be: there is not much evidence of change during this period. If we go into this answer a little more, we get a more nuanced picture. Some things did change. The parole system most likely picked up more towards the later years of the interwar period. This meant that more doctors and especially more psychiatrists became involved with the criminal system. However, if we look directly at the courtroom, an unexpected discovery is made. Doctors were called in in cases throughout the period. We do not see a sudden surge of this type of expert and their conclusions don't seem to have become more valued either. The IDFs surrounding doctors most likely were in place before this period, and had become stronger before the 1920s. Therefore, the doctor had, in the period studied here, become an accepted and valued expert in court.

The same cannot be said about psychiatrists. They did not appear in one single case studied here. The claim that court psychiatry grew is therefore unsupported by the direct evidence researched in this particular study. Psychiatrists were not an accepted part of courtroom practice, because if they had been, some of these cases would have involved psychiatrists very early on. The IDFs considering psychiatrists thus did not seem as stable in court as they might have been outside of it. This might have been caused by some of the judges simply being old-fashioned. Whereas juries might have had more variance in ages, the judges of the appellation court most likely were older than the general lawyer; they had to have won their spurs in their field before being appointed as judges. Therefore, they might have been a little more stuck in their ways as opposed to the juries that were generally younger and might appreciate the new ideas on psychiatry more. Another possible reason might be the fact that the Dutch were not involved in the First World War, thus giving the country an entirely different background in psychiatry. While other countries were trying to find out how to deal with severely traumatized soldiers, the Dutch had only sent 100 000 soldiers into the War and did not have the problem of a 'lost' generation.

IDFs on women did not change as much in the Netherlands as in other European countries – again, because the Netherlands had been largely neutral during the War. This is something we see in the treatment of women victims as well. Although women were treated

far more humanely in these trials than one might expect, women could be attacked on their sexual behaviors. The harshest of these attacks seemed to have been aimed at discrediting witness statements and making the perpetrator's own position stronger. Examples of this include claiming one's (soon to be ex-)wife was a prostitute and telling the judge a woman witness had children out of wedlock.

Men, however, were also held to a standard and this norm involved good sexual behavior as well. This is interesting, since Louise Jackson believed that male perpetrators tended to be able to avoid some of the charges by claiming to have been drunk. Provided that they were, otherwise, respectable, they could thus win the sympathy of the judge. This is behavior that is absent in the Netherlands. Some men tried to claim they were ill-behaved because of being drunk, but judges did not believe this a legitimate reason nor did they leave the perpetrator unpunished. In the case of Jan and Cathrina, Jan, who claimed to have been drunk if the rape had even occurred, was still incarcerated. The other drunk from the beginning of chapter three was likewise referred to a teetotal organization.

Respectability and scientific evidence, however, did not exclude one another. In many cases, both were used. Experts themselves were involved in the politics of respectability as well, since there was a hierarchy showing that some experts were considered more respectable and thus more trustworthy. Some experts resented this hierarchy, which was partly built on the difference between a specialized professional and a general practitioner, such as was the case with Bolten, but others approached it very respectfully and considered it carefully in their research, as was the case with Van Ledden Hulsebosch.

It thus seems that the scheme I have proposed here, that of a scientific evidence and witnesses of respectability, works very well for the 1920s and early 1930s. Both were used during this period and not only ordinary people engaged in the politics of respectability; so did the experts. The same framework could thus wield different results in the period after 1933 and I would assume that after the Second World War, in which the Netherlands were heavily involved even though they had remained neutral, psychiatrists would have become more accepted expert witnesses, as they still are today. More research would have to be done on this subject to draw definite conclusions, though.

The framework proposed here, though not entirely new, since Louise Jackson and others have worked with the concept of respectability in connection to rape cases, does give

us new insights. Scientists do engage with respectability, even if they claim that is not the case. After all, they are children of their time, and, even if they are quite revolutionary, they will still carry some of the dominant IDFs with them. What the framework I used shows best, is that the switch from witnesses of respectability to experts is not as clear cut as some older research, such as that of Shorter, Koenraadt, Kelk and Vijselaar would have us believe. Psychiatrists were getting more involved in court cases through the *reclassering*. But they did not get called in in any of the cases I studied, not even when one would expect it. This shows that even though they were gaining ground, they were not doing so at a quick pace.

The way the history on homosexuality connects to the history of rape is also worth considering. Anna Tijsseling has shown, for instance, how the probation system was concerned with rehabilitating homosexuals. The same can be said for rapists. The New Direction was concerned with making everyone 'abnormal' part of the ordinary society, something that they did by making some of the rapists come to a consultation bureau or putting them into the *reclassering*. Interesting is the fact that the medicalization of the rapist, unlike that of the homosexual, cannot be seen in the cases collected here. The rapists themselves are hardly ever seen by any doctor, even in cases where one would expect this. The only case in which the perpetrator underwent a medical examination was that of Maria H. and Nathan van Z. Nor were there any doctors involved in a mental examination of the perpetrators. If we consider the courtroom situation, this becomes even stranger. It would be interesting for the judge to know whether a suspect could be considered mentally and physically degenerate. If this was the case, he could – and maybe should – be placed in *tbr*. The connection to psychiatrists might have been simply too complicated in Amsterdam and the judge might have thought it easier not to get into the swamp of expert terminology on degeneration.

Like with the psychiatrists, it would be extremely short-sighted to claim that somewhere during the twentieth century, the politics of respectability suddenly ended. The traditional and old-fashioned practice of marrying the victim to the rapist gives us an example of this. Rape victims were, in some of the cases studied here, still expected to marry their rapist or extract alimony from him. This is surprising, since this is a very old practice which one can find as early as the middle ages. It, however, still showed up in the 'modern' interwar period. In the same way, the older practice of respectability and the newer of scientific evidence was entangled in this period. Scientific and respectable evidence did not

adhere to a hierarchy, one, in most cases, made the other stronger and more believable. Some of the evidence thus relied on science and some of it on the behavior and respectability of the victims but they always formed a complicated tapestry of integrated threads. This connects to Willemijn Ruberg's research, in which she found that several discourses on trauma did exist in the nineteenth century, some lay and some more or less scientific.<sup>110</sup>

Even nowadays, one still encounters respectability IDFs alongside our scientific evidence which presume a woman to be some type of gatekeeper and question her behavior. These IDFs lead to questions like 'what was she wearing when she was abused' and the so-called 'slut-shaming', which blames women's abuse on their previous sexual behavior. These respectability politics can still be found in the society at large. Even with our modern scientific evidence, we still can't prove everything – after all, how easily is consent proven? And with judges still being human, we can expect respectability politics to enter the courtroom again. If it has ever left, that is.

---

<sup>110</sup> C. Lansing, 'Crime and Criminals', in: M. Schaus(ed.), *Women and Gender in Medieval Europe. An Encyclopedia* (New York 2006) 180.

**Literature****Primary literature**

Algemeen Dagblad, 'Elke week 24 aangiften wegens verkrachting',  
<http://www.ad.nl/ad/nl/1012/Nederland/article/detail/3446461/2013/05/24/Elke-week-24-aangiften-wegens-verkrachting.dhtml> (version: 24-5-2013, last seen: 22-1-2015).

Case 1: victim Maria H., perpetrator Nathan van Z.

- NHA, GA, inv. 28, d. 111, 1922.
- NHA, GA, inv. 52, d. 111, 1922.
- NHA, GA, inv. 82, d. 111, 1922.

Case 2: Victim unknown, perpetrator Karel W.

- NDA, GA, inv. 24, d. 169, 1921.
- NDA, GA, inv. 49, d. 169, 1921.

Case 3: Victim unknown, perpetrator Tijmen A.

- NDA, GA, inv. 34, d. 138, 1925.
- NDA, GA, inv. 34, d. 138, 1925.

Case 4: Victim unknown, perpetrator Hendrikus H.

- NDA, GA, inv. 45, d. 268, 1929.
- NDA, GA, inv. 66, d. 268, 1929.

Case 5: Victim Hendrikje van de G., perpetrator Albertus van de H.

- NDA, GA, inv. 42, d. 539, 1927.
- NDA, GA, inv. 53, d. 539, 1927.

Case 6: Victim Johanna H., perpetrator Casparus M.

- NDA, GA, inv. 43, d. 318, 1928.
- NDA, GA, inv. 64, d. 318, 1928.

Case 7: Victim unknown, perpetrator Johannes T.

- NDA, GA, inv. 47, d. 210, 1930.
- NDA, GA, inv. 68, d. 210, 1930.

Case 8: Victim Stijtje H., perpetrator Nicolaas van den H.

- NDA, GA, inv. 29, d. 376, 1921.
- NDA, GA, inv. 53, d. 376, 1921.

Case 9: Victim Catharina ('Cathrien') de G., perpetrator Gerrit ('Jan (de Onvindbare)') L.

- NDA, GA, inv. 17, d. 546, 1933.
- NDA, GA, inv. 37, d. 546, 1933.
- NDA, GA, inv. 94, d. 546, 1933.

Case 10: Victim Gertrud W., perpetrators Michael S., Frederik L. and Marinus B.

- NDA, GA, inv. 68, d. 660, 1920.
- NDA, GA, inv. 115, d. 660, 1920.
- NDA, GA, inv. 385, d. 660, 1920.

Case 11: Victim Maria de G., perpetrator Jan B.

- NDA, GA, inv. 29, d. 257, 1921.
- NDA, GA, inv. 53, d. 357, 1921.
- NDA, GA, inv. 85, d. 357, 1921.

Case 12: Victim [first name unknown] van D., perpetrator Jacobus S.

- NDA, GA, inv. 47, d. 9, 1930
- NDA, GA, inv. 47, d. 9, 1930.

Case 13: Victim Klazina van der M., perpetrator Johann de R.

- NDA, GA, inv. 13, d. 315, 1931.
- NDA, GA, inv. 32, d. 315, 1931.

Case 14: Victim Martha V., perpetrator Gerardus van N.

- NDA, GA, inv. 37, d. 29, 1926.
- NDA, GA, inv. 37, d. 29, 1926.
- NDA, GA, inv. 117, d. 29, 1926.

### **Secondary literature**

Armstrong, K., *The Battle for God* (New York 2001).

Backerra, F., *Vrouwen van het Land. Anderhalve Eeuw Plattelandsvrouwen in Nederland* (Zutphen 1989).

Beyens, N., *Immer Bereid en Nooit Verlegen. Hector Treub, Vrouwenarts in een Mannenmaatschappij* (Amsterdam 2013).

Bland, L., *Modern Women on Trial. Sexual Transgression in the Age of the Flapper* (New York 2013).

Bols, M. and M. Noordman, *Moederschap als Balsem. Ervaringen voor Katholieke Vrouwen met Huwelijk, Seksualiteit en Moederschap in de Eerste Helft van deze Eeuw* (Amsterdam 1981).

Boons, O. a.o. (ed.), *Twee eeuwen Nederland Geteld. Onderzoek met de digitale Volks-, Beroeps- en Woningtellingen 1795-2001* (Den Haag 2007).

Boterman, F. and M. Vogel, *Nederland en Duitsland in het interbellum* (Hilversum 2003).

Brownmiller, S., *Tegen Haar Wil. Vrouwen, Mannen en Verkrachting* (Baarn 1989).

Cohen, B., a.o. (ed.), *Forensische Geneeskunde, Raakvlakken tussen Geneeskunst, Gezondheidszorg en Recht* (Assen 1996).

Daalen, R. van and M. Gijswijt-Hofstra, *Gezond en Wel. Vrouwen en de Zorg voor Gezondheid in de Twintigste Eeuw* (Amsterdam 1998).

Duby, G. and M. Perrot, *Geschiedenis van de Vrouw (deel 5). De Twintigste Eeuw* (Amsterdam 1993).

Fairclough, N., *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language* (London 1995).

Fijnaut, C., *Criminologie en Strafrechtsbedeling. Een Historische en Transatlantische Inleiding* (Antwerpen 2014).

Gallagher, C. and S. Greenblatt, *Practicing New Historicism* (Chicago 2000).

Heinrich, J., *Particuliere Reclassering en Overheid in Nederland sinds 1823* (Arnhem 1995).

Hekma, G., *Homoseksualiteit. Een Medische Reputatie: de Uitdoktering van de Homoseksueel in Negentiende-Eeuws Nederland* (Amsterdam 1987).

Higginbotham, E., *Righteous Discontent. The Women's Movement in the Black Baptist Church 1880-1920* (Cambridge 1993).

- Hine, D., 'Rape and the Inner Lives of Black Women in the Middle West: Thoughts on the Culture of Dissemblance', in: *Unequal Sisters*, ed. E. Du Bois and V. Ruiz (New York 1990) 292-297.
- Huygens ING, 'Verenigingen voor armenzorg en armoedepreventie in de negentiende eeuw', <http://resources.huygens.knaw.nl/armenzorg/gids/vereniging/2579685398> (version: unknown, last seen: 10-06-2015).
- Huisman, G., *Tussen Salon en Souterrain. Gouvernantes in Nederland* (Groningen 2000).
- Kaal, H., *Het Hoofd van de Stad. Amsterdam en zijn Burgemeester tijdens het Interbellum* (Amsterdam 2008).
- Kimyongür, A. and A. Kershaw, 'Women in Europe between the Wars. A Culture of Contradictions', in: A. Kimyongür and A. Kershaw (eds.), *Women in Europe between the Wars. Politics, Culture and Society* (Aldershot/Burlington 2007) 1-24.
- Kistemaker, R., (ed.), *Een Kind onder het Hart. Verloskunde, Volksgeloof, Gezin, Seksualiteit en Moraal van Vroeger en Nu* (Amsterdam 1987).
- Kloek, E., *Vrouw des Huizes, Een Cultuurgeschiedenis van de Hollandse Huisvrouw* (Amsterdam 2009).
- Koenraadt, F. (ed.), *Ziek of Schuldig? Twee Eeuwen Forensische Psychiatrie en Psychologie* (Arnhem 1991).
- Koenraadt, F., C. Kelk and J. Vijselaar (ed.), *Tussen behandeling en straf. Rechtsbescherming en veiligheid in de twintigste eeuw* (2007).
- Kok, J. and J. van Bavel (ed.), *De Levenskracht der Bevolking. Sociale en Demografische Kwesties in de Lage Landen tijdens het Interbellum* (Leuven 2010).
- Lansing, C., 'Crime and Criminals', in: M. Schaus(ed.), *Women and Gender in Medieval Europe. An Encyclopedia* (New York 2006).
- Linders, A., *'Frappez, frappez toujours!' Corry Tendeloo (1897-1956) en het feminisme van haar tijd* (Hilversum 2003).
- Lintsen, H., a.o. (ed.), *Techniek in Nederland in de Twintigste Eeuw (Deel 4: Huishouden en Medische Techniek)* (Zutphen 2001).
- Marland, H., 'Opleiding en Carrière van de Tweede Generatie Vrouwelijke Artsen in Nederland', *Gerwina* 16 (1993) 218-233.
- Matthée, Z., *Voor Volk en Vaderland. Vrouwen in de NSB, 1931-1948* (Amsterdam 2007).
- Melker, R., 'De Huisarts en "De Spaansche Griep" 1918-1920', in: *Huisarts en Wetenschap* 48 (13) (2005) 684-688.
- Moore, R., 'Capital', in: M. Grenfell, *Pierre Bourdieu. Key Concepts* (Durham 2008) 101-117.
- Oei, T. and M. Groenhuijsen (ed.), *Forensische psychiatrie en haar grensgebieden. Actualiteit, geschiedenis en toekomst* (Alphen aan de Rijn 2009).
- Oldenziel, R., and C. Bouw (ed.) *Schoon Genoeg. Huisvrouwen en Huishoudtechnologie in Nederland 1898-1998* (Nijmegen 1998).
- Oosterhuis, H., 'Treatment as Punishment. Forensic Psychiatry in the Netherlands (1870-2005)', *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry* 37 (2014).



Poppel, F. van, *Trouwen in Nederland. Een Historisch-Demografische Studie van de 19<sup>e</sup> en vroeg-20<sup>ste</sup> Eeuw* (Wageningen 1992).

Posthumus-Van der Groot, W. a.o. (ed.), *Van Moeder op Dochter. De Maatschappelijke Positie van de Vrouw in Nederland vanaf de Franse Tijd* (Nijmegen 1977).

Robertson, S., 'Signs, Marks, and Private Parts: Doctors, Legal Discourses, and Evidence of Rape in the United States, 1823-1930', *The Journal of the History of Sexuality* 8 (3) (1998).

Rooy, P. de, a.o. (ed.), *Waakzaam in Amsterdam. Hoofdstad en Politie vanaf 1275* (Amsterdam 2011).

Ruberg, W., 'Mother Knows Best.' The Transmission of Knowledge of the Female Body and Venereal Diseases in Nineteenth-Century Dutch Rape Cases, in: M. Dinges & R. Juette (Eds.), *The transmission of health practices (c. 1500 to 2000)* 35-47.

Ruberg, W., 'Onzekere kennis. De rol van forensische geneeskunde en psychiatrie in Nederlandse verkrachtingszaken (1811-1920)', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale en Economische Geschiedenis* 9 (1) (2012).

Ruberg, W., 'Trauma, Body, and Mind: Forensic Medicine in Nineteenth-Century Dutch Rape Cases', *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 1 (2013) 85-104.

Saarloos, L., 'Because They Say So. Expertise and Traveling Knowledge in the Case of the Dutch Psychiatrist Gerbrandus Jelgersma', Unpublished MA Thesis (University of Utrecht 2013).

Schuursma, R., *Vergeefs Onzijdig. Nederlands neutraliteit 1919-1940* (Utrecht 2005).

Shorter, E., *Een Geschiedenis van de Psychiatrie. Van Gesticht tot Prozac* (Amsterdam 1998).

Shorter, E., *Geschiedenis van het Vrouwelijke Lichaam* (Baarn 1984).

Stel, J. van der, *Drinken, Drank en Dronkenschap Vijf Eeuwen Drankbestrijding en Alcoholhulpverlening in Nederland* (Hilversum 1995).

Stokvis, P. (ed.), *Geschiedenis van het Privéleven. Bronnen en benaderingen* (Amsterdam 2007).

Stompler, M., "'Buddies" or "Slutties": The Collective Sexual Reputation of Fraternity Little Sisters', *Gender and Society* 3 (1994) 297-323.

Tijsseling, A., *Schuldige Seks. Homoseksuele Zedendelicten rond de Duitse Bezettingstijd* (Leiden 2009).

Vooren, Jurryt van de, 'Sportief Huwelijk Was Vaak het Einde van de Loopbaan. Trouwende Sporters Trekken Altijd Veel Volk', <http://www.npogeschiedenis.nl/nieuws/2010/juli/Sportief-huwelijk-was-vaak-het-einde-van-de-loopbaan.html> (version: 15-07-2010, last seen: 12-05-2015).

Waal, M. de, (ed.), *Vrouwenlevens. Honderd Jaar Vrouwen over hun Leven* (Amsterdam 1995).

Wilhams, J., *Weimar Culture Revisited* (New York 2011).