The Netherlands embassy and the interest representation for Israel in the Soviet Union, 1967-1990:

Willing administrator or full agent?

Daniël Cornelis Cremer – 3567850

Thesis – MA Internationale Betrekkingen in Historisch Perspectief

August 2015

Supervised by prof. dr. D.A. Hellema

Words: 44.000

Universiteit Utrecht

Table of Content

Introduction

On a quiet Sunday during the summer of 1967, the Dutch ambassador in Moscow received a cable from The Hague: his embassy would from then on diplomatically represent Israeli interests in Moscow, because the Soviet Union had broken off its diplomatic ties with Israel as a result of, or punishment for, the Arab-Israeli war of 1967. The Dutch ambassador in Jerusalem received this request from the Israeli Foreign Ministry earlier that day, and The Hague swiftly agreed the same day. Little did the Dutch diplomats know that this commitment would entail a 24-year period during which the Dutch embassy would be responsible for the facilitation of the emigration of over half a million Jewish Soviet citizens through the issuance of visas. The demand for visas was so high at times, that the entire staff had to drop what they were working on in order to jump in and assist at the visa section.

The diplomatic service that was provided to Israel by the Netherlands gives rise to a number of key questions. Why had the Soviet Union broken off relations with Israel, given the fact that the Soviet Union was among the first to provide *de jure* and *de facto* recognition following the establishment of the state of Israel? Moreover, the Soviet Union had allowed for crucial arms shipments from Czechoslovakia to reach Israel, which has played a decisive role in the first Arab-Israeli war of 1948. Why did the Israeli policymakers decide to ask the tiny embassy of the Netherlands to represent their interests, and not, for example, the United States or France? Why did the Dutch say yes, and more importantly, why did they do so without taking any time for serious deliberations?

Moreover, why did that many Jews want to leave the Soviet Union, and why were they allowed to do so by the authorities, given the fact that the Soviets had a planned economy and a national ideology claiming to be a perfect state? Had there been Jewish emigration prior to the onset of Dutch interest representation for Israel and what bureaucracy did the Soviet Jewry have to undergo before being allowed to leave the country? Finally, what did the Dutch and Israeli diplomats agree on upon the onset of Dutch interest representation for Israel? Did the Dutch display any agency in relation to their responsibilities for Israel, or did they only undertake actions on specific Israeli instructions?

This Master's thesis will seek answers to these questions, and more, by researching both secondary literature and the archives of the Dutch embassy in Moscow. It will tie in with several historical topics. Firstly, the cooperation between the Dutch embassy and the Israeli authorities is important because it

will lead towards a better understanding of Dutch Cold War policies and the role that the Netherlands, as a small country, chose to play in the Cold War superpower conflict. Moreover, this research thesis will display the lengths that the Netherlands were prepared to go to in order to facilitate their ally, Israel, even if it meant paying a price for it. Thirdly, this study will provide insights into the inner mechanisms of Dutch diplomacy and foreign policy considerations. Furthermore, an analysis of the history of Soviet Jewry, Soviet policies on Jewish life and anti-Semitism will be provided, as well as theories as to why the Soviet authorities decided to allow Jewish emigration *en masse* during the 1970s and 1980s. The tasks and responsibilities of the Dutch embassy in the context of the provided interest representation will be thoroughly examined, as well as the matter of Dutch agency in relation to the interest representation.

Topic

The main tasks for the Dutch delegates consisted of standard consular work, primarily the issuance of visas for Israel to all those presenting a valid exit permit. This task alone meant the issuance of somewhere between 500 and 600.000 exit visas for Soviet Jews wishing to emigrate. This exodus, peaking in the mid-70s, during a period of détente, and the late 80s, during the period known as *perestroika*, was a substantial part of Cold War politics. The Soviets used the Jewish emigration as a political bargaining tool to influence Western public opinion. The 1974 Soviet-American trade association linked enlarged US export to the USSR with a loosened Soviet emigration policy. Other tasks for the Dutch embassy staff included care for the building that housed the Israeli delegation, the deliverance of legalized invitation to Israel, the issuance of loans to Jewish émigrés, the transmission of documents and other paperwork and the issuance of national certificates, which would create considerable strife between the Dutch and Israeli authorities.

A final task for the Dutch ambassador to Moscow was the execution of demarches.[1] These were delivered almost exclusively on Israeli instructions. It has often been the case that an official or a civilian would address the ambassador with a request for assistance to a Soviet Jew or dissident. The majority of times the reply would be along the lines of: "*If Israel wanted us to assist this person emigrating from the USSR, they would have informed us,*" or the often heard response "*the department is well aware of this issue, but due to the delicate task of interest representation for Israel we have to act in utmost*

[1] According to the U.S. protocol for the modern diplomat, a demarche is "*a request or intercession with a foreign official, e.g., a request for support of a policy, or a protest about the host government's policy or actions*".

discretion. If we were to request information about this person or exert pressure in order to assist, the Soviet authorities would view this as interference in their domestic affairs, which would endanger the interest representation."

The scholarly debate surrounding the Dutch interest representation for Israel focuses specifically on whether or not the Dutch executed demarches and had other diplomatic engagements with the Soviet authorities in the 1970s solely on the instructions of the Israeli authorities or whether there was some space for Dutch initiatives This Master thesis will seek to shed more light on the question of Dutch initiatives and agency in relation to the interest representation for Israel, contributing to this discussion.

Hence, the topic of this Masters' thesis is the Dutch interest representation for Israel in the Soviet Union, which took place from 1967 up to the dissolution of the Soviet Union. More specifically, this study will answer the question whether the Dutch retained any agency in relation to this, and if so, to what degree.

To do so, I will work along the following research questions:

Main research question:

- Did the Dutch embassy in Moscow maintain agency with respect to the interest representation for Israel, and if so, to what degree?

To answer this question, a number of sub questions are identified that will help introduce the subject and formulate an informed argument. Each sub question represents a chapter and has a different scope: starting out broad, each subsequent chapter will narrow down the content, until the final chapter will eventually answer the main research question.

Sub questions:

- Chapter one: How did the Dutch align themselves politically to Israel, the United States and the Soviet Union, in the context of the Cold War?
- Chapter two: What was the domestic situation of the Soviet Jewry at the onset of Dutch interest representation for Israel?
- Chapter three: What basic responsibilities and tasks did the Dutch interest representation for Israel consist of?
- Chapter four: Concerning the steps that have been undertaken as a part of the Dutch representation of Israeli interests, can one speak of Dutch policy?

The first chapter will provide for necessary context, focusing on the political relationships which the Dutch maintained with their Atlantic allies, Israel and the United States, and their main antagonist, the Soviet Union. The focus of this chapter is on the period that started after the Second World War and up to the 1970s. The second chapter focuses on the domestic situation of Soviet Jewry. A history of Soviet anti-Semitism will be provided, as well as the motivations behind the Jewish incentive to emigrate and the reasons behind the displeasure of the Soviet authorities with losing these citizens. Furthermore, some emigrational numbers concerning Soviet Jewry will be put forward, from both before and after the onset of Dutch interest representation for Israel. Finally, some theories which deal with the question why the Soviet authorities decided to let go of its Jewish subjects will be presented. Both these chapters will lean heavily on secondary literature.

The third and fourth chapters will present research which starts touching upon the main question: the Dutch interest representation for Israel at the Moscow embassy. The third chapter is based on a combination of archival research and secondary literature and will delve into the establishment of the Dutch embassy as the diplomatic liaison for Israel in Moscow. Other topics within this chapter are the agreement that was made between Israeli and Dutch diplomats, the standard tasks in the context of the interest representation, as well as the Dutch policy regarding publicity and the cooperation with Soviet officials. The fourth chapter, based mostly on archival research, will start by introducing the established historical debate on the abovementioned issue of Dutch agency. Following this, evidence will be put forward that will allow the formation of an informed argument on the issue of Dutch agency in relation to the interest representation for Israel in the Soviet Union.

This research paper will focus on the Moscow embassy, starting from the onset of the interest representation in 1967 up to the end of détente, in the late 1970s. This approach has been chosen for dual reasons: firstly because the most interesting discoveries in relation to the main research question are to be found in this period, and secondly, a practical reason, because of the limited availability of the archives of the Dutch embassy in Moscow at the National Archive in the Hague: later years (from 1975 onwards) were kept at a different location.

In sum, this research paper will seek an answer to the following research question: Did the Dutch embassy in Moscow maintain agency with respect to the interest representation for Israel, and if so, to what degree? First, chapter one will provide the necessary context by focusing on the political relationships which the Netherlands maintained with the parties that this thesis is concerned with, Israel, the United States and the Soviet Union.

Chapter one: How did the Dutch align themselves politically to Israel, the United States and the USSR, in the context of the Cold War?

This first chapter will provide insights in the political relationships that the Dutch maintained with Israel, the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War and up to the period of Dutch interest representation for Israel in the Soviet Union. By presenting the most important aspects of the relationship that the Dutch maintained with the abovementioned countries, this chapter will outline the status of the international arena in which the events, which this Master thesis focuses on, take place.

The Dutch alignment toward the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War

The early post-war years '45-'48

The Netherlands was one of the last countries worldwide to formally recognize the Soviet Union. In 1942, the exiled government was forced by the circumstances of World War 2 to do so. The late timing of the recognition and exchange of ambassadors had its roots in a strong pre-war anti-communist tradition, across all pillars of Dutch society. This attitude had a diverse set of roots: churchgoers were put off by the 'godless' ideology, and the royal family felt deep grudges about the murder of the Romanovs, to whom they were related. Furthermore, Communism was seen as a threat to economic individualism and it would lead to the end of individual liberty itself. [2] Another reason for the Dutch government not to want to establish diplomatic relations was that the Soviets decided to unilaterally terminate their public debt upon the declaration of the Soviet Union. Some Western European countries decided to recognize the Soviet Union in 1924, realizing that the Soviet rule was taking on a permanent character. The Netherlands started lagging behind commercially, and in some circles a trade agreement with the Soviets was called for. The government tried to realize such an agreement but the Soviet Union would only accept a full *de jure* recognition. This was unacceptable for Foreign Minister Van Karnebeek, and also for Queen Wilhelmina who had indicated that she would not, under any circumstance, receive a diplomat from the Soviet Union. [3] The monarch was so radically opposed, that she even threatened to

[2] Koedijk, P. 'The Netherlands, the United States, and Anti-communism During the Early Cold War', p. 597.
[3] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld. De Buitenlandse Politiek van Nederland,* p. 84.

step down as queen if the Netherlands were not to vote 'nay' in the League of Nations deliberations on a Soviet entry. The Netherlands were one of few countries voting against Soviet Russian accession.[4]

In the early years after the Second World War, up to 1947, the world was not as bipolar as it would soon become as a result of the Cold War. The United States and the Soviet Union had liberated Europe, the Soviets in Eastern Europe and the Americans the Southern and Western parts, and seemed to control the European fate. These two new superpowers were dominating the international political scene, yet their supremacy had not yet been anchored in opposing hostile alliances. This allowed the Western European nations a few years in which they could 'live in the past' and ignore the logic of the new bipolar world order.[5]

In the years right after the war, Dutch policymakers held the position that the Netherlands should avoid having to make a choice between the United States and the Soviet Union. The pre-war anti-communism seemed to have (temporarily) lost some of its sharp edges, due to the sympathy for the Soviet contribution to the war effort and the communist contribution to the Dutch resistance movement. The fact that the United States also did not (yet) perceive itself in their new role as a major power contributed to this Dutch uncertainty. Some Europeans spoke of a 'Third Way', as a kind of bridge between the extremes of American capitalism and Soviet Communism. This denial of choice was a continuation of Dutch pre-war neutralism, but the option of a choice started disappearing with the emergence of the Truman doctrine, presented for congress in March 1947, which would evolve into the Marshall plan and demanded of each nation that they make a choice between totalitarianism and democracy. The Dutch policymakers and public opinion, however, only felt obliged to choose sides following the founding of the Kominform in September 1947, the event considered to finalize the division between East and West. The communist takeover in Prague the following year, and the descent of the Iron Curtain were seen as a confirmation of this division. [6]

Of course, the American decision to offer assistance through Marshall Aid was not purely an exercise in philanthropy. It can be said that, following World War 2, the United States were in the process of building a sphere of influence in Western Europe. In his book *The United States and Western Europe Since 1945*, Geir Lundestad argues that *"the position of the United States was unique in 1945, no other great power had ever had such a vast lead over its potential competitors. The American role was so*

[4] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld. De Buitenlandse Politiek van Nederland*, p. 90.
[5] Idem, p. 108-109.
[6] Koedijk, P. 'The Netherlands, the United States, and Anti-communism During the Early Cold War', p. 598-599.

important in Western Europe, that it could be argued that Western Europe became part of an American sphere of influence, politically and economically."[7] Firstly, the U.S. government was determined not to repeat the mistakes made during the aftermath of World War I, when economic instability had culminated in a worldwide financial and political crisis, and eventually World War II. Furthermore, the Marshall help could be used as a way to pressure Western governments into certain behaviours. But the foremost motive for the United States to initiate the Marshall plan had been the political and military tension between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, which was developing into the Cold War. Economic warfare, in the form of Marshall Aid, was chosen to combat the spread of Communism in Europe. The reasoning behind this motive was that a healthy economy was an important precondition for political stability. This would undermine the popularity of the reasonably large communist parties in France and Italy.[8]

Decolonization

Colonialism and decolonization were the single most divisive issues in bilateral Dutch-American relations following World War II. The American stance on colonialism had become clear during the war. President Roosevelt believed that the phenomenon had contributed to the pre-war international tensions, and that the war effort of democracies against Fascism and totalitarianism entailed a larger commitment to freedom and self-determination, not only in Europe but worldwide. The European colonial powers were aware of the American critique of colonialism, yet neither the Dutch nor any of the other colonial powers were planning to reform their empires in the post-war world. [9]

When the Dutch tried to restore rule and order in Indonesia after World War 2, this proved difficult, for the Japanese occupants had instilled notions of anti-colonialism and nationalism. British-mediated negotiations led to the signing of the Linggadjati agreement, which stipulated *de facto* sovereignty of the Indonesian Republic over Java, Madura and Sumatra, continued Dutch control over the other islands, a federated Indonesian state and a Dutch-Indonesian union with common foreign and trade policy. Yet, it was an uneasy agreement: the Indonesians viewed it as a first step toward the complete transfer of power, the Dutch as the basis for continued influence in Indonesia. [10]

[7] Lundestad, G. *The United States and Western Europe Since 1945*, p. 1.
[8] Idem, p. 792.
[9] Frey, M. 'Decolonization and Dutch-American Relations', p. 609-610.
[10] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld*, p. 135-136.

When the Linggadjati agreement failed, the Dutch launched their first military offensive, dubbed 'police action', in order to reclaim their colonies. This led to much international criticism, mostly from the U.N. and postcolonial nations such as India and Australia. Yet, the only thing that could bring the Dutch back to the negotiation table was the American threat that an agreement would have a 'decisive influence' on the distribution of Marshall Plain aid. The negotiations led to the Renville Agreement of January 1948, which reflected American conceptions of decolonization: the prospect of eventual independence coupled with a period of 'apprenticeship'.[11]

The agreement was never carried out because of irreconcilable interests: the Netherlands demanded to remain the ultimate arbiter of Indonesian affairs, while the Republic wanted complete independence. This led Dutch policymakers, under domestic pressure to show a tough attitude, to launch the second police action, a highly controversial decision which left the Dutch in an internationally isolated position. The United Nations passed several resolutions that were ignored by the Dutch, leaving the U.S. Senate and State Department enraged and calling for a freeze on all Marshall Plan aid to the Netherlands.[12] The Dutch-American relations reached a nadir in the spring of 1949, when Foreign Minister Stikker visited Secretary of State Acheson. He was told that the U.S. might suspend economic aid and cancel the Military Assistance Program for Western Europe.[13]

While there is some debate on whether the American pressure was instrumental in bringing about a fundamental change in Dutch policies, it was nonetheless important. Equally important were military and political developments in Indonesia: the Dutch military was confronted with increasing guerrilla activities and by the spring of 1949 the conflict started to resemble the large-scale 'dirty war' which was going on in Indochina. The amount of Dutch casualties also started rising steeply, a death rate which the Netherlands could not sustain for long. These factors went hand in hand in forcing the Dutch government to change its policies.[14]

Dutch-American relations improved considerably during the negotiations regarding the transfer of power to Indonesia. The tensions over colonialism in Dutch-American relations proved to be of a temporary nature, had no lasting impact, and remained limited to colonial issues. Once the Indonesian issue was settled, the United States found an increasingly staunch supporter in the Netherlands. According to Marc Frey, the U.S. might even have done the Netherlands a favour. Thanks to the

[11] Frey, M. 'Decolonization and Dutch-American Relations', p. 611-612
[12] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld*, p. 138.
[13] Frey, M. 'Decolonization and Dutch-American Relations', p. 613-614
[14] Idem, p. 614.

American intervention, the Netherlands did not get embroiled in bloody and protracted wars, unlike France and, to a lesser extent, Britain. This, in turn, allowed the Dutch much greater involvement in Europe and the European integration process in the 1950s and 1960s.[15]

The partition of Europe

The conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union became military during the Berlin crisis in the summer of 1948. Displeased with the introduction of a new currency in the Western zones, and the subsequent economic partition of Germany, the Soviets decided to close down the entry roads to the Western part of the city. As the military tension increased, an airlift for goods and personnel was installed which would supply the city for months. It seemed like the standoff would end in an armed conflict, yet the situation was defused at the last minute.[16]

The militarized tension in Berlin was one of the reasons for the foundation of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization). As the later Secretary-General Lord Ismay would famously declare, the goal of the alliance was to: "*keep the Russians out, the Americans in, and the Germans down*".[17] The Dutch accession to the alliance can be seen as the final major turning point in the reorientation of Dutch foreign policy from neutrality to Atlanticism. The Dutch government at the time called it a 'logical supplement' of the Marshall-aid.[18]

Major issues of division in the first years of the Atlantic alliance were the admittance of Germany and the efforts to create a European Defence Community. Regarding these conflicts, the Netherlands have always followed the American lead. Dutch policymakers have consistently believed that the formation of a military and political alliance, linking the United States to Europe, was of vital importance. The Hague accepted and welcomed the United States leadership, because the U.S. had taken the lead in liberalizing and coordinating the West European economies. Furthermore, it was thought that American hegemony would stabilize political relations within Western Europe and could act as a counterbalance to Soviet expansionism.[19]

Yet, in the eyes of the Dutch policymakers, the major danger was not a military attack by the Soviet Union, but home-grown, Soviet-supported Communism capable of destabilizing society. On the political

[15] Frey, M. 'Decolonization and Dutch-American Relations', p. 614-619.
[16] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld*, p. 145-146.
[17] Lundestad, G. *The United States and Western Europe Since 1945*, p. 8.
[18] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld*, p. 154.
[19] Hellema, D. 'The Politics of Asymmetry: The Netherlands and the United States since 1945', p. 582-583

level this translated into a policy of using the Marshall help to improve the living standards of the population, as such a policy was regarded as an antidote against the growing support for the Communist Party of the Netherlands (CPN). Social democratic Prime Minister Willem Drees has privately expressed his scepticism about the likelihood of a Soviet attack on Western Europe to American diplomats, even after the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950.[20]

Regarding Dutch-Soviet relations, the 1950s are characterized by further estrangement and distrust. The Netherlands committed to several Western organizations, such as NATO and the Western European Union. The freedom of movement of Western diplomats in Moscow was severely limited from 1952 onwards, effectively isolating the diplomats from the Netherlands and other countries. The Netherlands responded by placing the Soviet diplomats under the same restrictions.[21] The Korean War, the Soviet tests with the atomic bomb and the establishment of a Communist regime in China created further distance.

The death of Stalin and the subsequent appointment of Nikita Khrushchev as his successor seemed a precursor to positive change. Khrushchev promised to take the Soviet Union in a different direction: he introduced the notions of peaceful coexistence and destalinization, illustrating his intentions to avoid war with the West. A truce was reached in Korea, which brought a careful *rapprochement* between the two superpowers. This led to the so-called 'spirit of Geneva', named after the location of a 1955 summit of the big four: the USA, the USSR, France and Britain. In the final communique, the participants announced to strive for relaxation, disarmament and a European safety system.[22]

Despite these promising developments the Dutch government remained suspicious.[23] In the eyes of the Dutch policymakers, the 'peaceful coexistence' was primarily advantageous for the Soviet Union, which was spreading its sphere of influence into African and Asian countries. The Americans did not prioritize the Western European interests enough, and should defend these interests against both communist as well as radical African and Asian states.[24] Unfortunately for the Hungarians, the relaxation that Khrushchev brought about was not to last. The biggest cause for the renewed hostility of 1956 was the Soviet reaction to the Hungarian secession of the Warsaw pact. The West reacted resentfully and the Dutch response was emotional. The Dutch government responded by minimizing diplomatic ties with

[20] Koedijk, P. 'The Netherlands, the United States, and Anti-communism During the Early Cold War', p. 599.
[21] Munter, E., Naarden, B., Witte, T. *Voorzichtig en Met Mate: De Betrekkingen van Nederland met de Sovjetunie (1942-1991)*, p. 30.
[22] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld*, p. 178.
[23] De Vries, W., Onderwater, J, Gerritsma, H. *Nederland-Rusland: Beelden en Betrekkingen 17e t/m 20e Eeuw,* p. 59.
[24] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld,* p. 191-192.

the Soviet Union and by being the first Western nation to opt for the stationing of American nuclear weapons on its soil. [25]

The 1960s: Dutch Atlanticism

The 1960s can be seen as the heyday of Dutch Atlanticism. In a well-cited article from 1969, Robert W Russell presents an argument concerning Dutch post-war foreign policy regarding Europe and the Atlantic alliance. The official Dutch standpoint was that Dutch foreign policy is conducted in accordance with three principles in the following order: (1) international legal order, (2) Atlantic solidarity and (3) European integration. Russell states that actually, according to his study into the Dutch diplomatic record within the Atlantic alliance, the principle of Atlantic solidarity predominated over the other two principles.[26] He clarifies that the Dutch did have an independent foreign policy, but that support for the Atlantic alliance was the primary expression of it, for the Dutch government believed that this was in the national interest. Other authors agree: Jan van der Harst argues that Dutch European policy in the 50s and 60s was remarkably consistent and he recognizes some overarching themes. The Dutch stood for discouragement of hegemonic power aspirations within Europe (France in particular), support for regional trade liberalization and a preference for Atlanticism over European unification.[27] Van Staden states that *"On the long and tiring road to the unity of Europe, Dutch willingness to collaborate with the other Western European countries was subordinated to the principle of Atlantic cooperation, being the cornerstone of Dutch foreign policy".*[28] Finally, Van Staden argues that during the 1960s, the dominant starting point of Dutch foreign policy was the maintenance of NATO unity under American leadership.[29]

A great example of Dutch foreign policy aiming to maintain NATO unity under American leadership can be found in Foreign Minister Luns, who would become one of the most effective opponents of French President Charles de Gaulle and his attempts to transform the EEC into a political and military alternative to NATO. When France presented the Fouchet-plan, an attempt of de Gaulle to restore French *grandeur* on the world stage, The Hague and Luns looked upon it with scorn. In the view of the Dutch policymakers, Parisian initiatives aimed at a collective Western European foreign and security policy would create legitimacy for French claims at codirecting NATO, which would result in some competition with the American leadership and a weakening of Western unity. In the end it were the

[25] De Vries, W., Onderwater, J, Gerritsma, H. *Nederland-Rusland: Beelden en Betrekkingen 17e t/m 20e Eeuw*, p. 60.
[26] Russell, R. 'The Atlantic Alliance in Dutch Foreign Policy', p. 1189.
[27] Van Der Harst, J. 'Dutch and U.S. Assessments of European Political Integration', p. 641.
[28] Van Staden, A. 'American-Dutch Political Relations Since 1945, What Has Changed and Why?', p. 475.
[29] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld*, p. 218.

Dutch who torpedoed the Fouchet plan, the primacy of Atlanticism was decisive.[30] Joseph Luns would become Secretary General of NATO in 1971.

The nuclear issues of the late 1950s provided another example of how loyal a partner the Dutch were to the United States as the leader of NATO. The Netherlands have consistently displayed a high degree of readiness to leave the major responsibility for Europe's nuclear defence to the United States, and housed American nuclear weapons from 1958 onwards.[31] Any European initiative, were it the French *force de frappe* or the British nuclear force, was consistently turned down, as Dutch policymakers denied the existence of any basic conflict of security interests between the U.S. and its overseas allies.[32] Furthermore, the Dutch frequently expressed the opinion that the ultimate American control over nuclear weapons should persist into the indefinite future. The Dutch preferred an American monopoly because they felt that rapid, efficient use of such weaponry is impossible unless the final decision is left to a single person, in this case the U.S. President.[33] The only change in NATO nuclear arrangements acceptable to the Dutch was joint planning of nuclear strategy and consultation on nuclear weapons questions. This was supported because it would dampen possible nuclear aspirations among other NATO allies, and because it would give the European allies a better insight into the meaning of the American nuclear guarantee.[34]

The reasons for this staunch Dutch Atlanticism are manifold, according to Van Staden. Firstly, Soviet expansionism: Dutch policymakers were convinced that the Soviet Union would try to dominate or subjugate Western Europe, if allowed the chance. Moreover, van Staden argues that Dutch politicians at the time believed that the safety of Western Europe and the United States were linked, and that the United States would always come to the rescue, because they needed a free and democratic Europe. Thirdly, The Hague did not believe in détente and thought the only way in which to have peaceful relations with the Soviet Union was based on military power and Atlantic unity. Furthermore, the Netherlands could only influence some power as a part of the alliance. Finally, the Dutch thought that public criticism on their NATO allies would prove counterproductive for NATO unity.[35]

At the same time, the increasing East-West tensions reached a new nadir through the construction of the Berlin wall in November 1961 and the Cuban missile crisis of the next year, during which a global

[30] Van Der Harst, J. 'Dutch and U.S. Assessments of European Political Integration', p. 645-646.
[31] Hellema, D. 'The Politics of Asymmetry: The Netherlands and the United States since 1945', p. 585-586.
[32] Van Staden, A. 'American-Dutch Political Relations Since 1945, What Has Changed and Why?', p. 476.
[33] Russell, R. 'The Atlantic Alliance in Dutch Foreign Policy', p. 1191.
[34] Idem, p. 1193-1194.
[35] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld*, p. 219.

nuclear disaster was barely avoided. Even though the nuclear arms race continued unabated, a sense of normalization occurred between the Soviet and the American sides, aimed at avoiding a direct (nuclear) confrontation. This aim is best visualized by the establishment of a direct phone connection between the Kremlin and the White House: the hotline.[36] From the mid-1960s onward, the rivalry of the two dominant powers shifted geographically and became more vividly expressed in the third world. The power of anti-Western liberation movements grew, often supported by the Soviet Union. Vietnam would become the symbol of the weakening of the West, and the strong position of the Soviet Union. This image of a strong position was diminished during the Prague Spring of 1968, when it turned out that the Moscow authority within the Soviet Bloc was not as dominant as assumed.[37]

The Dutch-Soviet relations also worsened during the 1960s. Some smaller incidents included an official Soviet demarche, written in a highly threatening language, regarding the consequences that allowing American missiles on Dutch soil will bring. The Soviet ambassador to the Netherlands getting into a fistfight with the Dutch military police at the Amsterdam airport proved detrimental for the already strained relationship.[38] Moreover, two Dutchmen were arrested in the Soviet Union, after supposed espionage activities.[39] The pre-war anti-communism was a durable presence in society: Ben Knapen argues that there is a strong continuity in Dutch standpoint vis-à-vis the Soviet countries with regards to anti-communism, barely interrupted by the war.[40] Other historians agree with him and put forward that the fear of the Soviet Union, following the partition of Europe in 1948, became an even bigger cornerstone of Dutch foreign policy.[41]

The American military guarantee made life easy for the Western European countries. The *Pax Americana* provided a comfortable position for the NATO allies, and although the Netherlands made their contributions to the Allied defense, it was relatively sheltered from the major conflicts and its military capacities were never really tested.[42] In return for the military protection and as a sign of solidarity, all but unconditional support was lent for political and military actions taken by the U.S. throughout the world. During the Vietnam War the Netherlands was one of the few countries that refused to condemn the United States. As late as 1970, the Dutch policymakers were in sympathy with

[36] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld*, p. 215.
[37] Idem.
[38] Munter, E., Naarden, B., Witte, T. *Voorzichtig en Met Mate,* p. 33-34.
[39] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld,* p. 242.
[40] Knapen, B. *De Lange Weg naar Moskou. Nederlandse Relaties tot de Sovjet-Unie, 1917-1942,* p. 249.
[41] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld,* p. 241.
[42] Hellema, D. 'The Politics of Asymmetry: The Netherlands and the United States since 1945', p. 588-589.

President Nixon's decision to expand military operations to Cambodia. Only the New-Guinea episode put a damper on Dutch-American relations in the sixties.[43]

Détente

Only in the late 1960s, early 1970s, is the anti-communist tradition suddenly tossed aside as an anachronism, a relic from times past.[44] From then onwards, the Dutch government would carefully start to seek some form of *rapprochement*. In 1964 Joseph Luns was the first Dutch Foreign Minister to set foot on Soviet soil, urged on by the House of Representatives.[45] This is identified as a turning point in Dutch-Soviet relations by Hellema.[46] From then on, even though reluctantly and not to the same degree as some other Western countries,[47] some improvement in the Dutch-Soviet relations occurs, expressed through an increase of diplomatic traffic.[48] There is some disagreement among historians regarding the pace and the motivations behind this *rapprochement*. Schulte claims that the Cuban Crisis and the subsequent Soviet-American steps regarding crisis management inspired a sense of collective responsibility for East-West reconciliation in the Dutch. Other authors, among whom Van Staden and Voorhoeve, disagree, and underline the staunch Dutch scepticism toward the communist countries. They argue that the Dutch were being loyal Atlanticists by following the NATO Harmel doctrine, which called upon the European nations to engage into friendly and relaxed bilateral relations with the Soviet countries in order to create a 'European detente'.[49] Luns visited a number of Eastern European states in 1967. The 1968 Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia, which led the Netherlands' government to raise its military expenditures, did not halt the Dutch attempts at reconciliation, even though the scope was shifted to Romania, which had refused to take part in the military Warsaw Pact operations.[50] Van Staden argues that Dutch public opinion and the House of Representatives influenced Luns' eastward wanderlust. [51]

The late 1960s and early 1970s see many anti-Western and anti-capitalist movements in the third world. The Soviet Union seemed to have influence over allies on every continent while the United States looked

[43] Van Staden, A. 'American-Dutch Political Relations Since 1945, What Has Changed and Why?', p. 476.
[44] Idem.
[45] Munter, E., Naarden, B., Witte, T. *Voorzichtig en Met Mate*, p. 46.
[46] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld,* p. 242.
[47] De Vries, W., Onderwater, J., Gerritsma, H. *Nederland-Rusland,* p. 61.
[48] Idem.
[49] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld,* p. 242-243.
[50] Idem.
[51] Van Staden, A. 'De Toenadering tot Oost-Europa in Nederlandse Ogen', p. 739.

weak, for they kept floundering in Vietnam. The European NATO allies were governed by predominantly social-democratic and communist parties, which led to differences between both sides of the Atlantic camp and severed the U.S. position of power. The Western European nations and the United States had many quarrels over trade, monetary issues and political differences. European integration, on the other hand, seemed to flourish with the addition of Great-Britain, Ireland and Denmark in 1973 and plans were made to reform the European Community into a monetary and economic union within ten years. Détente had brought the two dominant superpowers closer in an attempt to limit the arms race, which was changing the East-West conflict. From the late 1960s onward, the Soviets and Americans were negotiating the SALT-I-treaty (Strategic Arms Limitation Talks), which was signed in 1972. The Soviet-American *rapprochement* made the necessity of Atlantic unity less urgent, and the European countries seemed to marginally alter their courses.[52]

This applies to the Dutch as well. The American war in Vietnam especially seemed to influence the usual pro-American standpoints. These years saw increasing Dutch domestic criticisms regarding American foreign policy, the relatively large defense spending and the undemocratic domestic situation within some NATO allies, namely Greece and Portugal. The Atlanticist Joseph Luns came to be seen as too rigid by many and the Atlantic-focused foreign policy was no longer seen as adequate. The newly appointed Foreign Minister Schmelzer stated that he would seek a better connection between the domestic public opinion and Dutch foreign policy at his first press conference in 1971.[53] The agreements upon the formation of the 1971 cabinet included that the Dutch would strive to contribute to improved East-West relations and to achieve a European safety conference, following the example of the SALT-I-treaty.[54]

Under the next Foreign Minister, Van Der Stoel, the relations with Eastern European nations became more substantial. Van Der Stoel, sometimes accompanied by the Minister of Economic Affairs, visited a series of Warsaw pact countries between 1973 and 1977, a practice that had started under Luns. He underscored the importance of human rights more than any of his predecessors, which led to some unpleasant situations: when he visited the Soviet Union in 1974, he supposedly emphasized the fate of the dissidents and *Refuseniks* to his Soviet colleague Korygin, which created a poor atmosphere.

The conference that would lead up to the establishment of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) was the platform for Van Der Stoel's first major speech. In Helsinki in 1973,

[52] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld,* p. 262-263.
[53] Idem.
[54] Idem, p. 265.

he pointed out that the success or failure of the conference depended on the degree to which measures were taken regarding the cultural and human exchange between East and West. He would prioritize the 'third basket', repeating on several occasions that this was the most meaningful and important aspect of the conference. It would be undesirable in his view, if the sole outcome of the conference was the recognition of the present borders in Europe. At the final conference in Helsinki in 1975, during the ceremonial signing of the agreements, Prime Minister Den Uyl repeated that the issues of human rights and political freedom in the signatory states were of the utmost importance for the Netherlands. According to journalists reporting on the event, the Dutch were still among the NATO 'hawks'.[55]

It has been argued that the Dutch Atlantic orientation has contributed to their stance on the Arab-Israeli conflict. As has been established in the past section, the Dutch tended to strongly support the United States and American policies, whilst at the same time they were generally dismissive of France and the French attempts to elevate their status within the European 'cluster' of the Atlantic alliance. This constant pro-American and anti-French standpoint has, according to Grünfeld,[56] been a strengthening factor for Dutch-Israeli relations. The French tended to be more pro-Arab in their Middle Eastern policies, whilst the United States firmly backed Israel, most of the times. Therefore, the Netherlands and Israel, another country firmly rooted in the Atlantic alliance, shared their pro-American anti-French sentiments, which has mutually strengthened their bond. The next section will properly examine the Dutch-Israeli political relationship.

[55] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld*, p. 284.
[56] Grünfeld, F. 'Zestig jaar Nederland-Israel', p. 680-683.

The Dutch-Israeli political relationship

A slow start

Contrary to popular belief, the Dutch-Israeli political relationship did not start out as a 'special'. Following the declaration of independence and foundation of the state of Israel by the Jewish community in Palestine, it took the Netherlands a full year to recognize the new state *de facto*.[57] As stated by Minister of Overseas Territories Maan Sassen at the UN General Assembly, this was because "*the Dutch government found and find it our duty to give special and careful consideration to the interests and safeguards of the Arab population in Palestine, without losing sight of the other side of the question*".[58] The reason for this late recognition was to be found exactly in those overseas territories: the colonies of Surinam and Indonesia. Great-Britain, a colonial power like the Netherlands, pressured the Dutch government to refuse recognition in May 1948.[59] Both countries feared the negative reception that recognition might have among the Muslim populations in their territories overseas. A note was drafted by the Foreign Ministry stating that: *"… recognition of the Jewish state will undoubtedly make a highly unfavorable impression in Indonesia… "*.[60] Moreover, the Dutch feared the measures which the Arab countries in the Middle East would take, most notably the interruption of the Dutch air connection to Indonesia, which had a layover in the Middle East.[61]

Only on January 16th, 1950, following Indonesian independence and several Israeli requests, did the Netherlands recognize Israel *de jure*,[62] as one of the last Western European countries to do so.[63] Hatta, the first Prime Minister of Indonesia, indicated that he understood the Dutch intentions. The Arab parties, such as Egypt, were relatively indifferent, which assuaged any lingering fears that repercussions might follow.[64] The lack of significance attached to this act by the Indonesian and Arab parties is also reflected by the words of Israeli President Chaim Weizmann when he was informed about the Dutch recognition: "*It is with affection and pleasure that I welcome you today as the first Minister of the*

[57] Soetendorp, R. *Pragmatisch of Principieel. Het Nederlandse Beleid ten Aanzien van het Arabisch-Israëlisch conflict*, p. 53.
[58] Translated from: Schaper, H., 'Nederland en het Midden-Oostenconflict', p. 229.
[59] Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 38.
[60] Translated from: Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 39.
[61] Soetendorp, R. *Pragmatisch of Principieel*, p. 47.
[62] Snel, D. 'Nederland en de Band met Israël', p. 48.
[63] Soetendorp, R. 'The Netherlands and Israel: From a Special to a Normal Relationship', p. 698.
[64] Soetendorp, R. *Pragmatisch of Principieel,* p. 55.

'United Kingdom of the Netherlands' in Israel".[65] The last time that the Netherlands formally held this name was in the nineteenth century, before the secession of Belgium in 1839.

The basis for the 'special relationship'

The awkward start of the Dutch-Israeli political relationship was in no way reflected in the Dutch national sentiment. On the contrary, sympathy for Israel had solid roots in the Dutch national consciousness, especially in the first few decades following the Second World War.[66] The Dutch were highly impressed with the pioneering spirit that the Israelis showed during the construction of their country. The political system was, like in the Netherlands, a parliamentary system with proportional representation. All these similarities evoked sentiments of affinity among the Dutch for the young Israeli state, especially during the first Arab-Israeli war of 1948, in which Israel eventually secured a decisive victory.[67]

This pro-Israeli sentiment was present in most of the pillars of post-war Dutch society. According to Catholics, and even more so among Protestant circles, Israel should exist and be supported, for the history of the state of Israel was inextricably linked with biblical history.[68] For Dutch Protestants, Israel quickly became a destination for pilgrimage and in the Dutch-Reformed church the people spoke of 'the conversation with Israel' in 1948, even prior to the Dutch governmental recognition of the new state.[69]

The Dutch socialists saw their sympathy for Israel reinforced by the socialist attitude in Israel, expressed through, for example, collective agricultural villages (*Kibbutzim*) and the strong labor movement (*Histadrut*). Apart from that, Jews had played a role in the development of the Dutch labor movement, especially in Amsterdam, where Henri Polak was the leader of the first Confederation of Trade Unions (NVV).[70] Frans Peeters claims that there were close ties between the Israeli labor party (in government almost uninterruptedly from '48-'77) and the Dutch labor party (PvdA)[71], which was a ruling party in the Netherlands from 1948 to 1958. The PvdA was led by Willem Drees at the time. Willem Drees was, according to journalist Peeters, a passionate supporter of the Jewish cause. Motivated by what he had seen in his youth and during the War, he became loyal to the Zionist cause and expressed this on several

[65] Translated from: Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 39.
[66] Grünfeld, F. *Nederland en het Nabije Oosten*, p. 31.
[67] Grünfeld, F. *Nederland en het Midden-Oosten*, p. 14.
[68] Soetendorp, R. 'The Netherlands and Israel: From a Special to a Normal Relationship', p. 697.
[69] Idem.
[70] Snel, D. 'Nederland en de Band met Israël', p. 48.
[71] Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 67.

occasions to Israeli politicians and diplomats.[72] Peeters further claims that Willem Drees had made an oral commitment to David Ben-Gurion, the first Israeli PM ('48-'53 & '55-'63) in which he reassured Ben-Gurion that "*Whenever you need us, just give me a sign*".[73] It is hard to ascertain whether this really took place or not, but Peeters presents an impressive number of Dutch and Israeli policymakers and diplomats who confirm this unwritten understanding between Drees and Ben-Gurion.[74]

Another important contributing factor regarding the 'special relationship' between the Netherlands and Israel is, of course, to be found in the Holocaust. Israel was a safe haven for the few survivors of the Holocaust in Europe. In this role, Israel won much support and sympathy from a large segment of the Dutch public.[75] This sympathy was undoubtedly related, to some extent, to the collective guilt that the Dutch felt for their collaboration with the Germans in bringing about the death of 70% of the Dutch Jewish population during WWII, one of the highest mortality rates in Western Europe.[76] Whether this feeling of guilt contributed to the governmental pro-Israeli position, is debated. According to Soetendorp, who has studied the Dutch policy regarding the Arab-Israeli conflict over the period 1947-1977, the moral debt for the Dutch participation in the Holocaust was in no way a guiding principle for Dutch governmental policy making.[77] This statement led him to receive much criticism from reviewers regarding his research methods.[78] Grünfeld refutes Soetendorp's thesis in his PhD dissertation, stating that the Dutch pro-Israeli attitude definitely has had, at least partially, to do with the persecution of Jews in the Netherlands during WWII.[79] To support this statement he mentions that this point has been put forward by several politicians, and specifically refers to a dinner speech made by Ruud Lubbers in Jerusalem in 1988.[80] Peeters fully agrees with Grünfeld, arguing that many politicians were highly influenced by the war in their sentiments regarding Israel. He mentions, among others: Prime Minister Willem Drees,[81] Secretary of War F. Kranenburg ('52-'58),[82] Foreign Minister Joseph Luns ('52-'71)[83] and

[72] Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 66-67.
[73] Idem, p. 67.
[74] Amongst others, Abba Eban, Israeli diplomat, Stemerdink, secretary and Minister of Defense, Kranenburg, secretary of War, Van der Beugel, secretary of Foreign Affairs, Micky Bavly & Hanan Bar-On, ex-ambassadors of Israel to the Netherlands.
[75] Soetendorp, R. 'The Netherlands and Israel: From a Special to a Normal Relationship', p. 697.
[76] Idem.
[77] Soetendorp, R. *Pragmatisch of Principieel*, p. 205-206.
[78] Bank, J. 'Review: Dissertation Soetendorp 1982', p. 281-284. & Schöffer, J. 'Review: Dissertation Soetendorp 1982', p. 658-659.
[79] Grünfeld, F. *Nederland en het Nabije Oosten*, p. 31.
[80] In Which Lubbers spoke about his experiences in the Holocaust. His mother would keep him inside, as recommended to her by friends, because the young, darker skinned Lubbers would look kind of Jewish to the Germans. He also tells of 'one of the most memorable moments in his life', a visit to Dachau as a 19-year old; *NRC Handelsblad*, 19-7-1988.
[81] Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 66.
[82] Idem, p.64.
[83] Idem, p.66.

Minister of Defense Henk Vredeling ('73-'77).[84] Thus, it seems that the memories of the Holocaust, whether or not fueled by guilt, played a significant role in the Dutch sympathy for the Jewish state of Israel.

The Dutch government has often taken the sentiments of the Jewish community in the Netherlands into account when it came to the making of Middle Eastern policy and repeatedly and explicitly made these a factor in the considerations. This happened in 1977 for example, when Minister de Koning rejected subsidies to the Palestine committee (Nederlands Palestina Komitee), in 1980, in relation to the relocation of the Dutch embassy in Israel,[85] and in 2012, when the Dutch Centre for Information and Documentation Israel (CIDI), a lobby group, successfully pressed the Dutch government into adjusting the annual Dutch commemoratory event. In some municipalities the mayor planned on visiting German graves as well as Dutch ones, and a young boy was supposed to recite a poem about his uncle who collaborated with the Nazis in the war. Despite the fact that, according to official Dutch policy, the commemoration ceremony on the 4th of May concerns all war victims since WWII, CIDI successfully made the Dutch government cancel both events.[86] This susceptibility to the national Jewish sentiment was not based on electoral expectations, as the Jewish vote only made up 0.2% of the electorate, but based on feelings of sympathy.[87] Since World War II, it has been a common practice in the Dutch political culture to have pity on the sentiments of the Jewish inhabitants of the Netherlands. It may be clear that the Dutch politicians and society felt a special bond with Israel, based on feelings of guilt, recognition and shared history.[88]

The Special Alliance in Action

In the years following the official recognition of Israel by the Netherlands, the alliance between these two nations could be seen in action. As Israel had started crafting its foreign policy in the late 1940s, it initially adopted a neutrality policy in the context of the global rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union. However, as the Cold War soon extended to the Middle East, with the Soviet Union aiming to cement ties to some major Arab states by providing them with arms, the Israeli government started to pursue a pro-Western policy with special emphasis on the United States.[89] The United States came to

[84] Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 204-205.
[85] Grünfeld, F. *Nederland en het Midden-Oosten*, p. 16.
[86] NOS, *4 Mei geen Duitsers herdenken*, May 2nd, 2013, retreived on March 26th, 2014. <http://nos.nl/l/502381>
[87] Grünfeld, F. *Nederland en het Midden-Oosten*, p. 16.
[88] Idem.
[89] Cleveland, W. & Bunton, M. *A History of the Modern Middle East*, p. 354

view Israel as a potential strategic asset to US Middle Eastern policy as a result of Israel's outstanding military performance in the Arab-Israeli conflict.[90] Israel had been dependent on weapons from the Communist bloc – the Soviet Union hoped to lure Israel toward their side of the Cold War conflict - to ensure their survival in the 1948 war,[91] but as a result of their Western alignment this stream of weapons would soon dry up. When some of Israel's main Western allies, the US, England and France, decided to call a weapon embargo on the entire Middle East in 1951, which lasted up to 1956 and was known as the Tripartite-agreement,[92] the purchase of foreign weapons became the main goal of Israeli foreign politics. Over the next decade, the Netherlands would stand up as Israel's main arms dealer, steadily supplying arms and ammunition despite the embargo that their Atlantic allies had installed.[93] Moreover, the Dutch government acted as a middle man for Israeli arms purchases.[94] Numerous military transactions were settled. Some of these transactions went through the legal democratic channels, but others were hidden from the Dutch Prime Minister (as was the case with Secretary of Defense Kranenburg in 1956[95] and, according to some scholars, Minister of Defense Vredeling in 1973)[96] or the United Nations (as was the case in the 1956 Suez crisis).[97]

During the 1960s, the Netherlands and Israel intensified their military cooperation. The Dutch purchased a large amount of Uzi hand weapons, 100.000, for a total value of 4 million guilders. To that date 15 different countries had bought a total of 200.000 Uzi's, including an earlier Dutch purchase of 27.000. An Israeli newspaper wrote: "*The fact that a NATO-country such as the Netherlands purchases the Israeli Uzi as a standard weapon makes the best commercial advertisement imaginable*".[98] The military departments cooperated on a modernization process of the Centurion tanks, employed by both the Dutch and the Israeli's. Israeli military personnel were educated at the army tank workshops in Amersfoort and ammunition and spare parts were flown to Israel from the military airfield in Soesterberg in 1973.[99] This last fact is remarkable, since the newly inaugurated minister of Foreign Affairs, Max van der Stoel, had just decided that no weapons were to be delivered to states immediately involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict.[100] It seems that this policy did not apply to Israel.

[90] Cleveland, W. & Bunton, M. *A History of the Modern Middle East*, p. 354.
[91] Van Creveld, M. 'Sword and the Olive: A Critical History of the Israeli Defense Force', p.78.
[92] Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 74.
[93] Snel, D. 'Nederland en de Band met Israël', p. 50.
[94] Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 82-84.
[95] Idem, p. 87-88.
[96] Idem, p. 204.
[97] Idem, p. 100.
[98] Translated from: Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 110.
[99] Hellema, D., Wiebes, C., & Witte, T. *Doelwit Rotterdam*, p. 18.
[100] Hellema, D., Wiebes, C., & Witte, T. *Doelwit Rotterdam*, p. 18-19.

The Dutch defended the Israelis diplomatically in various forums, such as the European Community, the NATO and the United Nations. The obvious example of this behavior is the Dutch interpretation of the famous resolution 242 of the UN Security Council following the Arab-Israeli war of 1967. In this resolution, Israel was called upon to hand back (the) occupied territories. The English version spoke of '*occupied territories*' where the French translation spoke of '*des territoires occupés'* or 'the occupied territories'. This freedom of interpretation is the reason that this resolution got passed in the first place. Israel would only accept resolution 242 on the terms that 'all the' would not be placed in front of the words 'occupied territories'.[101] The Dutch supported resolution 242 in the original British proposal, leaving the option for 'strategic border corrections' open, an interpretation highly favored by the Israelis.[102]

Moreover, the Dutch have also made efforts to include Israel in trade unions such as the European Economic Community.[103] A foreign observer remarked that the EEC agreement with Israel was a result of: *"…rather astute blackmail and tough bargaining by the Netherlands*".[104]

The Netherlands have repeatedly shown to be willing to accept diplomatic isolation in order to support the Israeli cause. An example can be found in the U.N. General Assembly of 1970, in which the Dutch voted against two resolutions regarding the Palestinians; resolution 2628 which stated that '*respect for the rights of the Palestinians is an indispensable element in the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East*' and resolution 2672, which repeated resolution 2628 and added that: '*the people of Palestine are entitled to equal rights and self-determination in accordance with the Charter of the UN*'.[105] As motivation for the Dutch nay-votes, Foreign Minister Joseph Luns explained that these resolutions would undermine resolution 242 of 1967, that the text was written too 'vaguely' and that he found the term 'People of Palestine' too vague. Furthermore, the Dutch delegation was of the opinion that this was an issue for the Security Council, not the General Assembly. The resolutions were upheld with 57 countries voting yay, 16 countries voting nay and 39 abstentions.[106] The Netherlands never voted in

[101] Soetendorp, R., *Pragmatisch of Principieel,* p. 113-118.
[102] Grünfeld, F. *Nederland en het Nabije Oosten*, p. 60.
[103] Soetendorp, R. *Pragmatisch of Principieel*, p. 100-102.
[104] Translated from: Schaper, H. 'Nederland en het Midden-Oostenconflict', p. 230.
[105] Graafland, E. 'Van Humanitair tot Politiek Probleem, Het Nederlands Beleid ten aanzien van de Palestijnen van 1965 tot 1975', Master Thesis, University Library Utrecht, p. 30.
[106] Schaper, H. 'Nederland en het Midden-Oostenconflict', p. 235. Yay voting members included the Soviet Union, France, and Japan. Nay voting members included the United States, Israel, the Netherland, and Australia. Abstentions included Belgium, Luxemburg, England, Italy, Denmark, Ireland and Canada.

favor of Palestinian rights over the period 1967-1971. Luns kept referring to the 'refugee problem' until the end of his term.[107]

The first indication that the Dutch pro-Israeli policy was changing is to be found in 1966, when the Netherlands voted in favor of a UN Security Council resolution which condemned an Israeli retaliatory action in Jordan. In 1967, after the Six-Day War in which Israel had just doubled its territory, the Netherlands voted in favor of two concept resolutions presented by Pakistan. These stated that Israel ought to cancel the annexation of East-Jerusalem. Even though the subsequent voting behavior and interpretation of resolution 242 was in favor of the Israelis, the first breaches in the 'special relationship' had been made. It can also be argued that the Dutch were growing more sympathetic towards the Palestinian side. The following years showed an increase in attention for the Palestinian cause and the Arab side of the conflict, as well as an increasing distance between the Israeli and the Dutch standpoints. This change in attitude can be partially ascribed to the changing viewpoints of Foreign Minister Luns, who grew more critical of Israel and would eventually adopt a more balanced standpoint on the conflict, blaming both parties for the deadlock.

The two wars that Israel fought against their Arab enemies in this period, in 1967 and in 1973, were exceptions to this movement away from the 'special relationship'. On both occasions the Dutch supported the Israelis diplomatically, politically, militarily (by sending ammunition and spare parts) and economically. Especially during the war of 1967, the leading Dutch sentiment envisioned a poor little David that would be pushed into the sea by the Arab Goliath. Unfortunately for the Dutch, the support for Israel during the 1973 war did not go unnoticed by the Arab governments and resulted in an oil embargo against the Netherlands by the Arab oil producing countries. During the subsequent oil crisis, the Dutch temporarily found themselves in the diplomatically most isolated position conceivable in the European Community.[108] This, because the Dutch took on a more pro-Israeli standpoint than most of the other member states, and vetoed a proposal in the context of the European Political Cooperation which would mandate France and the UK to act as spokespersons for 'the nine' member states, out of fear for an EPC standpoint that would be too critical of Israel.[109]

[107] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld,* p. 251.
[108] Grünfeld, F. *Nederland en het Midden-Oosten*, p. 66.
[109] Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld,* p. 273.

The oil boycott against the Netherlands proved ineffective, as was acknowledged by Saudi oil Minister Yamani in January 1974. Yet, he added that it was meant as a political protest and that it, in that way, was successful.[110] In that respect he was right; while there had been little economic consequences, the embargo had also been about imaging and fear. Despite the ineffectiveness of the oil boycott against the Netherlands, it had led to some changes in the longer term. The oil crisis led to a better understanding of Arab sentiments within the Dutch government. Economically, it would become too dangerous to adhere to the national pro-Israeli sentiments too much. Diplomatically, it was no longer advisable - in the context of European and Atlantic cooperation - to form an individual Middle Eastern policy. In the next years, the Dutch policy would align with its European counterparts.[111] Member of Parliament Patijn described the year 1973 as "*a turning point, since the Netherlands would from that point onwards no longer practice an independent foreign policy regarding the Middle East*".[112] From then on, the Dutch government would try to lose its pro-Israeli image and present an impartial position regarding the Arab-Israeli conflict. The government would henceforth present its policy as 'balanced'.[113]

The years following the oil crisis would be marked by strong efforts from the Dutch government to appease the Arab governments. For example it chose Egypt as a 'special focus' country for development aid in 1974.[114]

The first opportunity for the Dutch government to put their new balanced policy into practice was the UN General Assembly of late 1973. In the debate concerning the UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East), the Dutch Permanent Representative clarified the new policy regarding the Middle Eastern conflict and the Palestinian refugees. He stated that the Dutch government "*holds the opinion that the political aspirations of the Palestinians should be given form and substance in the framework and as an essential element of a comprehensive peace settlement"*.[115]In this speech, he announced that the Netherlands would double its contribution to the UNRWA, so that "*the Netherlands will not be found wanting in their support*" for the improvement of the Palestinian fate.[116] With the UNRWA contribution doubled and the speech delivered by the Dutch

[110] Soetendorp, R. *Pragmatisch of Principieel*, p. 149.
[111] Grünfeld, F. *Nederland en het Midden-Oosten*, p. 111.
[112] Translated from: Grünfeld, F. *Nederland en het Midden-Oosten*, p. 111.
[113] Idem, p. 150.
[114] Hellema, D., Wiebes, C., & Witte, T. *Doelwit Rotterdam*, p. 271.
[115] Translated from: Graafland, E. 'Van Humanitair tot Politiek Probleem, Het Nederlands Beleid ten aanzien van de Palestijnen van 1965 tot 1975', Master Thesis, University Library Utrecht, p. 49.
[116] Idem

representative in the debate concerning UNRWA, the Dutch had shown the Arab countries in word and deed that the change of policy was being taken seriously.

The United States were also opening up to the idea of the inclusion of a Palestinian party in the peace process and in 1977 Jimmy Carter stated that: "*There has to be a homeland provided for the Palestinian refugees who have suffered for many, many years*".[117] A completely open dialogue between the PLO and the U.S. government was only possible in 1988, though, following the Palestinian Declaration of Independence in November of that year and the official recognition of Israel by the PLO.

In 1977, the nine countries of the European Community, including the Netherlands, issued a statement regarding the collective policy on the Middle East. In this declaration, unanimously signed, the EC countries confirmed their conviction that a solution for the dispute in the Middle East was only feasible if the legitimate rights of the Palestinians to express their national identity were concretized. In this process the need for a homeland for the Palestinian people was to be taken into account.[118] In 1979 the Dutch government opened up the opportunity for dialogue with the Palestine Liberation Organization, recognized as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people by the United Nations. Only four MP's voted against this initiative.[119]

In sum, the political relationship between the Netherlands and Israel has undergone a gradual process of change in which no single occasion or event can be recognized as a key turning point. For the first two decades of the existence of the Israeli state, there was indeed a 'special relationship' between the two small countries. Starting in 1966, the Dutch governments increasingly distanced itself from the Israeli position, with the crucial exceptions of the wars of 1967 and 1973. On these occasions Dutch support for Israel peaked. This movement away from the tight alliance was mostly fueled by pragmatic political decision-making, for the majority of inhabitants of the Netherlands still had warm feelings for Israel. These feelings for Israel would slowly erode over the decades. This can in part be explained by the changed power position of Israel in the Middle East, the passing away of the generation that witnessed WWII, the decreasing religiosity in the Netherlands and Israeli occupation policies.

[117] Clinton, Massachusetts Remarks and a Question-and. Answer Session at the Clinton Town Meeting.
March 16, 1977, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=7180.
[118] Graafland, E. 'Van Humanitair tot Politiek Probleem, Het Nederlands Beleid ten aanzien van de Palestijnen van 1965 tot 1975', Master Thesis, University Library Utrecht, p. 59.
[119] Snel, D. 'Nederland en de Band met Israël', p. 51.

Conclusion

Through this first chapter, it has been attempted to outline the political relationship that the Dutch maintained with Israel, the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War and up to the period of Dutch interest representation for Israel in the Soviet Union.

The First section of this chapter has focused on Dutch relations vis-à-vis the United States and the Soviet Union, in the context of the Cold War. The Dutch were one of the last countries to formally recognize the Soviet Union, for a host of reasons ranging from ideological (Communism was seen as a godless ideology by Christians, liberals feared Communism as a threat to individuality and liberalism), historical (the monarchists felt deep grudges about the murder of the Romanovs) and economical (debts had been unilaterally terminated by the Soviet Union, Communism was seen as the end of economic individualism). This anti-communist attitude translated in a recognition as late as 1942, and only because the circumstances of war forced the Dutch to do so. In the first post-war years this attitude thawed a little and some spoke of a 'third way', between the extremes of U.S. capitalism and Soviet Communism.

This option of not choosing sides disappeared with the emergence of the Truman doctrine, the formation of the Kominform, the communist takeover in Prague, the establishment of the Marshall plan and the Berlin crisis, all taking place in 1947-1948.These events forced the Dutch to choose the Western bloc under American leadership, leadership which was eventually welcomed by the Dutch. Postwar Dutch-American relations were initially highly strained, for the Dutch and Americans had serious contentions over colonialism and the fate of Indonesia. The Dutch eventually caved after their Marshall funding was put at stake, after which Dutch-American relations improved considerably. Once the Indonesian issue was settled, the United States found an increasingly staunch supporter in the Netherlands over the next decades.

The 1950s and 1960s were characterized by further estrangement and distrust regarding Dutch-Soviet relations. Khrushchev's 'peaceful coexistence' and the 'spirit of Geneva' were seen as sanctimonious and primarily advantageous for the Soviet Union, and soon the Soviet response to the Hungarian secession of the Warsaw pact proved this suspicion. Yet, the major danger, according to Dutch policymakers, was home-grown, Soviet supported Communism which could destabilize society. This translated into a policy of using the Marshall help to improve the living standards of the population. This was possible because the *Pax Americana* ensured that the Dutch, as most other Western European nations, were relatively

sheltered from the major conflicts, as the United States bore the brunt of the military efforts undertaken by the Western alliance.

The 1960s can be seen as the heyday of Dutch Atlanticism, and it is argued that Dutch foreign policy was dominated by the principle of Atlantic solidarity. This translated in policies such as the discouragement of hegemonic power aspirations within Europe in order to avert regional Atlantic leadership (e.g. the Dutch eventually torpedoed the Fouchet plan), support for regional trade liberalization, a preference for Atlanticism over European unification, and the maintenance of NATO unity under American leadership. Van Staden provides various reasons for this staunch Dutch Atlanticism: to curb Soviet expansionism into Europe, the believe that the United States would always come to the rescue of Western Europe for their security was linked, a distrust in détente and the belief that only military power and Atlantic unity could assure peaceful relations with the Soviet Union and finally, because the Dutch thought that public criticism on their NATO allies would prove counterproductive for acquiring and maintaining NATO unity.

Only in the late 1960s and early 1970s is the anti-communist tradition suddenly tossed aside. A turning point is the visit of Joseph Luns to the Soviet Union in 1964: the Dutch government had carefully started to seek some form of rapprochement, focusing on the Soviet Union as a whole as well as some satellite states such as Romania and Czechoslovakia. At the same time, and perhaps as a result from this rapprochement, some minor Dutch-American estrangement occurred, especially over the Vietnam War, trade and monetary issues. The Atlantic focused foreign policy of Luns came to be seen as too rigid by many and when Luns became Secretary-General of the NATO in 1971, his successor Schmelzer stated that he would seek a better connection between Dutch public opinion and foreign policy and that his goal was, amongst others, to improve East-West relations. This policy continued and substantiated under his successor Van Der Stoel (1973-1977), who visited a series of Warsaw pact countries and underscored the importance of human rights more than any of his predecessors.

One conclusion that can certainly be drawn from the second section of this chapter, is that both the Dutch population and Dutch politicians maintained a ‘special relationship’ with Israel, amongst other reasons based on religious (both Catholic and Protestant), ideological (the Israeli socialist attitude enticed many Dutch labor politicians) and historical (the treatment of Jewish Dutch citizens during and after the war) reasons.

This ‘special relationship’ was expressed in many forms. Diplomatically and politically, the Dutch have defended the Israelis in various forums such as the EC, NATO and the U.N., made efforts to include

Israeli in trade unions such as the EEC, and of course by representing Israeli interests in the Soviet Union twice – in 1953 and from 1967 onwards. Sometimes the Dutch even took a diplomatically isolated position for granted in order to support Israel, as was the case in the United Nations General Assembly in 1970 and during the oil crisis of 1973. Militarily, the Netherlands have steadily provided their 'special friend' with arms and ammunition, thereby sometimes ignoring embargoes and legal democratic channels. In the 1950s and 1960s the Netherlands would stand up as Israel's main arms dealers for some years. Joint projects were initiated and Israeli military personnel were educated in the Netherlands.

Starting in 1966, the Dutch governments increasingly distanced itself from the Israeli position, with the crucial exceptions of the wars of 1967 and 1973.[120] On these occasions Dutch support for Israel peaked. This movement away from the tight alliance was mostly fueled by pragmatic political decision-making, for the majority of inhabitants of the Netherlands still felt warm sentiments for Israel. These feelings for Israel would slowly erode over the decades. This can in part be explained by the changed power position of Israel in the Middle East, the passing away of the generation that witnessed WWII, the decreasing religiosity in the Netherlands and Israeli occupation policies.

[120] For a more thorough examination of Dutch-Israeli relationship, specifically the change from a strong pro-Israeli to a more balanced policy, I would like to refer you to my Bachelor's thesis named: 'The change in the Dutch-Israeli political relationship during the late 1960s and the 1970s.'

Chapter two: What was the domestic situation of the Soviet Jewry at the onset of Dutch interest representation for Israel?

This chapter is based primarily on literature research, to which some archival findings are added. The chapter presents a study on the reasons for, and the forces behind, Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union and aspects related to this. Starting with a history of anti-Semitism in the USSR, this chapter will focus on the reasoning behind the Soviet Jewish desire to emigrate to Israel, the United States and the Western world. Following this, the Soviet policy on Jewish emigration, and specifically the reasons behind the Soviet state not wanting its Jewish inhabitants to emigrate, will be addressed, as well as the bureaucratic procedure Jewish emigrants had to undergo in order to receive an exit permit. The following two subchapters will establish how, and in what quantities, Jewish emigration took place both before and after the diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel were broken off. Finally, three theories that deal with the question why the Soviets decided to let go of its Jewish inhabitants will be addressed.

The history of anti-Semitism in the USSR

Prerevolutionary Russia

Jews have a longstanding presence in the area formerly known as the Soviet Union. The vast territories of the Russian Empire used to host the largest population of Jews in the world. Within these lands, the Jewish community flourished and developed many of modern Judaism's most distinctive theological and cultural traditions, while also facing periods of anti-Semitic discriminatory policies and persecutions. The earliest settlement is said to date back to pre-Christian times, when Jews migrated from ancient Babylon and Persia through the Caucasus to the North.[121] Later groups arrived from Palestina and the Byzantine Empire and settled around the Black sea and the Southern Russia.

Throughout history, the Jews of Russia and the Soviet Union were often subjected to changing policies which frustrated their freedom and livelihood. For example, at one point they were heavily involved in the production of spirits, upon which the Czar decided to revoke their right to do so, in order to maintain the state alcohol monopoly. Yet a positive policy change of pivotal importance was the decree

[121] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union 1967-1990*, p. 5.

of Alexander I in 1804, which allowed Jews entry into schools and universities. The Jewish youth, more literate than others, subscribed *en masse*, which urged the state to install a *numerous clausus* for Jews attending any institution.

Bitter shock with the French revolution led Catherine II to install a harsh regime, which lasted up to 1917, and her 1791 edict to the Senate is commonly seen as the initiation of the establishment of the Pale of Settlement, in fact a massive ghetto. The Pale consisted of a large area enclosing the Russian parts of Poland and the Western provinces of Russia where all Jews had to live and which they were not allowed to leave without special permission.[122] Constituting about 10% of the population of the Pale, the Jews were not allowed to live in the larger cities and were frequently driven out of villages, which left them heavily concentrated in the often overcrowded smaller *shtetlekh* or townships.[123]

Following the murder of Alexander II in 1881 the situation worsened considerably for the Jews of the Russian Empire. The years from 1881 up to the Russian revolution of 1917 were marked by intense anti-Semitism, anti-Jewish policy measures and *pogroms*.[124] It is suggested that these *pogroms*, committed by peasants, were in fact organized by racist-Christian societies and tolerated, if not initiated, by the central authorities who saw the *pogroms* as a canalization of peasant unrest. By the late 1800s Jews were effectively excluded from Russia except for a few rich Jews, barred inside the Pale on the countryside, disqualified from agriculture, civil service and military office and restricted in education and industrial employment. The issuance in 1903 of the *protocols of the elders of Zion*, a forged document claiming to uncover a Jewish plot to take over the world, intensified Russian anti-Semitism.

Suffering under the intensified anti-Semitism sparked by the murder of Alexander II, more and more Jews started considering emigration. High bureaucrats agreed to this practice, as can be concluded from this excerpt from an interview with a high official by Michael Davitt in 1903:

> *"They are the racial antithesis of our nation. A fusion with us is impossible, owing to religious and other disturbing causes. They will always be a potential source of sectarian and economic disorder in the country. We cannot admit them to equal rights of citizenship for these reasons and, let me add, because their intellectual superiority would enable them in a few years' time to gain possession*

[122] Healy, A. 'Tsarist Anti-Semitism and Russian-American Relations', p. 409-410.
[123] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 7.
[124] Healy, A. 'Tsarist Anti-Semitism and Russian-American Relations', p. 411.

of most of the posts of our civil administration. They are a growing danger of a most serious nature to our Empire in two of its most vulnerable points-their discontent is a menace to us along the Austrian and German frontiers, while they are active propagandists of the Socialism of Western Europe within our borders. The only solution of the problem of the Russian Jew is his departure from Russia."[125]

Others within the regime had a different view on Jewish emigration, a view of which reflections would resurface repeatedly throughout the period 1967-1991. According to the American novelist and Orthodox Rabbi Chaim Potok, whose parents moved from Poland to New York:

"*The Russians never quite knew what to do with their Jews. Autocratic Czars saw the Jews as a problem which could only be solved by assimilation or banishment. But Jews who assimilated were accused of trying to take over the power in their fatherland and Jews who emigrated were regretted as a serious economic loss or labeled as treacherous revolutionaries.*"[126]

Following the first *pogroms*, émigrés started crossing the border with Galicia, then part of the Austrian empire, hoping to find their way to America, which already housed a Jewish community of considerable size, and to Palestine, where some of the orthodox Jewish émigrés started agricultural communities. The representatives of the Jewish community of Vienna organized help in the Galician city of Brody where many Russian Jewish émigrés gathered. Generally, Russian policies on Jewish emigration were erratic, inconsistent and ever-changing. Throughout the period from 1881 up to the First World War a total of 2 million Russian Jews emigrated, of which most of them to the United States through the ports of Hamburg, Rotterdam and Antwerp.[127]

Jews and the Bolshevik revolution

The terrible living standards under which most Russian Jews lived, and the harsh restrictions on their civil rights motivated many younger Jews to take control of their own future and join the rising, often secret, political movements. Some flocked towards the Zionist movements, who believed that Russia would never allow the Jews the political rights that would ensure their security. Therefore, they strove

[125] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 8-9.
[126] Potok, C. *Wanderings.*
[127] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 10.

for a free Jewish life in their biblical homeland. Russian Zionist organizations, ranging from orthodox to liberal to socialist, numbered over 300.000 members by October 1917.

Others joined non-Jewish socialist parties. These Jews were less numerous, but some individual Jews have played important roles in the Bolshevik, Menshevik and Social Revolutionary Parties. Finally, the Bund, founded in 1897 on a Marxist basis, was an important Jewish socialist party. The Bund was originally part of the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party, but it clashed with Lenin over its ideas concerning the national question. The national question, the issue of cultural or national autonomy for the many different peoples in the gigantic Russian empire, would preoccupy the communist leaders of the Soviet Union from its inception to the end. Stalin was sent to Vienna by Lenin to work on an essay on this question. His research resulted in an article in a party journal in 1913. In it, Stalin defined a nation as a "*historically evolved stable community of language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up, manifested in a community of culture*".[128] He accused the Bund of retarding the natural process of assimilation, which, in his eyes, was desirable and inevitable. Despite being opposed to all manifestations of anti-Semitism, Lenin agreed with him, denying the existence of a Jewish nationality and calling this a reactionary, counterrevolutionary Zionist idea.

Following the resignation of the Czar in March 1917, the Kerensky government granted cultural-national autonomy to all national minorities and withdrew the restrictive laws of the Pale. This allowed for a brief blossoming period of Jewish political and cultural life. Zionism was strengthened by the Balfour declaration of November 1917, which stated that "*His Majesty's government views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people*."[129]

As the October revolution brought Lenin and his Bolshevik party to power, they continued to denounce Zionism and advocate the assimilation of the Jews. The civil war, lasting up to 1920, saw much Jewish suffering, including further *pogroms*, especially in the Ukraine. Even though the Jewish masses did not support the new regime,[130] many others turned to the communists for protection.

A Jewish section had been created in the Communist Party, named the *Evsektsya*, which tried to win over the Jews to Communism while denouncing the 'counterrevolutionary essence' of Zionism. Even

[128] Stalin, J. 'Marxism and the National Colonial Question'.
[129] Balfour declaration
[130] Pinkus, B. *Jews of the Soviet Union*, p. 58.

though Jews constituted 5.1% of the total membership of the Bolshevik Party, it soon became clear that in a communist state there was no place for Jewish life. As explained by Levin: "*the large masses of the Jews were shocked and bewildered by the swift and brutal Bolshevik measures which destroyed their property, their religious and national culture and often their livelihood. The freedom and political efflorescence of the brief March Revolution was extinguished – an immense loss especially for Jews*." [131] While all religions were under fire, the Jews were hit especially hard by the assimilatory urges of the regime. The *Evsektsya* closed all central synagogues, Jewish religious schools, political parties and youth movements, Zionists were arrested. Ironically, this campaign against traditional Jewish life was waged to a large extent by the communist Jews who chose to assimilate into the new party and system, which allowed them to become part of the society around them.[132]

Throughout the Soviet period, policies both condemned and encouraged the concept of Jewish nationality, depending on which domestic and foreign policy considerations were important. If the rulers of Tsarist Russia were confused about the role of the Jews, so were the Soviet leaders. Soviet president M.I. Kalinin declared in 1926 that:

> *"The Jewish people face a great task – to preserve its nationality, and for this end a large part of the Jewish population, hundreds of thousands at least, must be turned into agricultural peasants, settled in a continuous area. Only in those conditions can the Jewish masses hope to preserve the continued existence of the Jewish nationality".*[133]

Thus, the *Evsektsya* was to establish a Jewish republic somewhere in the territory of the Soviet Union. It was considered that if Jewish soviet citizens could be turned into farmers, it would promote their integration and diminish the popular anti-Semitism. After Crimea was considered but vetoed by Stalin with regards to strategic considerations, the area known as Birobidzhan was designated as the official territory for the Jewish land colonization, despite protests by the *Evsektsya*. This territory was chosen to redirect the movement of Jews to the land away from Ukraine, Belarus and Crimea where the native populations resisted Jewish settlement, to buffer the Soviet Union from Chinese and Japanese expansionism and to tap natural resources such as fish timber iron, tin, graphite and gold. Moreover, the

[131] Pinkus, B. *Jews of the Soviet Union,* p. 43.
[132] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 13.
[133] Idem, p. 14.

Kremlin hoped to score 'propaganda points' internationally by establishing the first Jewish homeland in the modern era.[134]

Between 1928 and 1934 some 20.000 Jews moved to Birobidzhan, of which 60% soon left again. Birobidzhan received the status of autonomous region in 1934, but few years later only 18.000 Jews lived there, constituting a mere 23% of the population. When the Jewish leadership in Birobidzhan was exterminated by the Stalinist purges, it became clear that there would be no Jewish republic in the far-off, hostile area with which the Jews felt no emotional, historical, religious or national connection.

Jews under Stalin's 'Iron Age'

In 1926 a power struggle started within the Politburo, which resulted in the deaths of Trotsky in 1929 and Zinoviev and Kamenev in 1934, all of Jewish descent, by the design of the virulent anti-Semite Stalin. This marked the dawn of Stalin's 'Iron Age', a period between 1929 and 1939 in which the survival of Jewish religion and culture in the USSR was under threat. In 1930 the Central Committee ordered the reorganization of the Communist Party, thereby abolishing all national sections, including the *Evsektsya*. From 1932 onwards, all urban residents had to carry an internal passport. Jews were now marked as *Yevrei*, and the document had to be shown everywhere, even to obtain permission for ordinary travel within the country, thereby impeding not only emigration but also settlement in a different city.

When Stalin introduced his purgatory actions in the years 1936-1938, thousands of party members, intellectuals, leaders of the state apparatus and the army and even Stalin's personal secretariat were arrested and either exiled or executed, usually on the most ridiculous of charges. Among the victims of these purges the Jews were overly represented compared to the other internal nationalities, dealing an irreparable blow to any identifiable Jewish life. Some historians argue that this is due to a "*conspicuous anti-Jewish thrust*" and a "*disproportionate suffering of the Jews*", where others explain the Jewish overrepresentation by stating that Jews were also overrepresented in the central administration and the military commands, and were not necessarily expelled because they were Jewish.[135]

[134] Swarthmore College (2001) *Stalin's Forgotten Zion: Birobidzhan and the Making of a Soviet Jewish Homeland.* < http://www.swarthmore.edu/Home/News/biro/>
[135] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 15-16.

The Second World War

As a result of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of 1939, the Soviet Union annexed parts of Romania and Poland, as well as the Baltic states. This added another 1.88 million Jews to the Soviet Jewish population. Many of those who refused to accept Soviet passports were deported to Siberia, where most perished under the harsh circumstances.

When the Soviet Union was attacked by Nazi Germany in June 1941, it took the German armies four months to reach Moscow and Leningrad, occupying the entire area which had once been the pale, where 37% of the Soviet Jews still lived. An estimated 1.5 million Jewish factory workers had been evicted previously, when their factories relocated to the East. As a result of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, the Soviet media had not been reporting on the war crimes and atrocities towards Jews that had been committed by the Germans, so most of the Jews that remained behind were not aware of what the Germans had done to their kin and was to be their fate as well.[136]

The Holocaust raged for more than three years through the Soviet Union. The SS-Einsatzgruppen deported and murdered hundreds of thousands. Outside the Nazi-occupied zones there were also many victims among the Jews. Some of the nationalities in the Soviet Union collaborated with the Nazi invaders in seeking out Jews and taking part in their murder.[137] Althuser puts forward the claim that the percentage of Jewish soldiers killed during the war was higher than that of any other nationality within the Soviet army. An estimated 2.5-3.3 million Soviet Jews perished during the war, half of the total amount of Jews living in the Soviet Union in 1941.[138]

Realizing that he needed as much support from all the groups within the Soviet Union, Stalin opportunistically established the 'Jewish Antifascist Committee' in April 1942. The real motivation behind this move was that the leadership thought that badly needed foreign aid, especially from the US, would be easier to obtain with the help of connections that the Soviet Jews could make with Jews in the West. The famous actor Schlomo Mikhoels was named chairman and was allowed to broadcast to the Jews of the world that he represented the Soviet Jews. This giant departure from previous policies

[136] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 16.
[137] Zvi, A. 'Immigration to Israel from the USSR', p. 270.
[138] Altshuler, M. *Soviet Jewry in the Second World War,* p. 4.

raised Jewish hopes in both the West and the Soviet Union, but as is typical for Soviet policies on Jews, this measure did not last long after the war's end.[139]

Following the war, Anti-Semitism returned to the Soviet Union, more overt and venomous than ever. Jewish survivors of the Holocaust were faced with both the local population and the representatives of the state. The regime took no measures to restitute Jewish property and often the apartments that had been taken over by Nazi collaborators or their neighbors during the war were not returned to their proper Jewish owners. In trials of collaborators, the extermination of the Jews was played down. On their own initiatives, Jews started to erect monuments on the sites of mass extermination, often defying local authorities.[140]

The Soviet Union and the State of Israel

The Soviet Union was the first state to extend full *de jure* recognition to Israel, following the proclamation of the state of Israel by David Ben-Gurion in May 1948.[141] Moreover, Soviet support in the United Nations had proved a decisive factor for the adoption of the Two States Resolution of 1947, which provided the possibility of a Jewish and an Arab state within the territory of the former British mandate of Palestine.[142] Furthermore, arms shipments from the Communist bloc had been instrumental in the survival of the Israeli state during the 1948 war.[143] This behavior is remarkable, given the domestic treatment of Jewish Soviet citizens and given the fact that up till this time, almost automatic support for Arab causes had been standard Soviet policy. The reasons for this altered policy were presented by deputy Foreign Minister and representative of the Soviet Union at the U.N. Andrei Gromyko in a session of the United Nations assembly in November 1947. He stated that "*The Jewish people has been closely linked with Palestine for a considerable period in history*" and "*we must not overlook the position in which the Jewish people found themselves as a result of the recent World War*".[144]

That the motivation offered by Gromyko was not the real reasoning behind the vote, can be deduced from earlier Soviet behavior. The USSR had never before recognized the Jewish links with Palestine, and

[139] Zvi, A. 'Immigration to Israel from the USSR', p. 272-273.
[140] Idem, p. 270.
[141] Cleveland, W. & Bunton, M. *A History of the Modern Middle East*, p. 267.
[142] Idem, p. 264.
[143] Van Creveld, M. 'Sword and the Olive: A Critical History of the Israeli Defense Force', p.78.
[144] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 18-19.

had indeed offered Birobidzhan as a Jewish settlement location. Recognition of the Jewish suffering during the Holocaust had never been Soviet policy and a few months earlier, the Soviet propaganda machine had still referred to Zionists as 'bourgeois lackeys of British imperialism'. In hindsight, it seems highly likely the Soviets hoped to establish an anti-British and anti-Western foothold in the Middle East. The results of its repeated support for the Arab causes had been disappointing and the Soviets received assurances from "*relatively important, though left-wing, individuals who might rise to prominent positions in future Israeli governments*" that Israel could become a socialist state and Soviet client in the Middle East.[145]

Indeed, during the first few years of its existence, Israel pursued a policy of neutrality and nonidentification with either East or West and tried to maintain stable relations with the Soviet Union, keeping in mind the possibility of Soviet Jewish emigration to Israel. However, David Ben-Gurion was far more of a social democrat than he was a communist, and with the extension of the Cold War to the entire Middle East and the Soviet Union cementing its ties to Arab states hostile to Israel, Israel began to pursue a pro-Western foreign policy.[146] When Israel supported the resolution on the UN intervention against the North Korean invasion of South Korea in 1951, its Cold War alignment became obvious. Jewish emigration from the Soviet satellite countries virtually stopped, and only a few older Soviet citizens received permission, by exception, to join their families in Israel.[147]

Golda Meyerson, who would later be called Golda Meir, arrived in September 1948 as the first Israeli minister in Moscow. Following her arrival, the Jewish author Ilya Ehrenburg was made to write in *Pravda*: "*Let there be no mistake about it. The state of Israel has nothing to do with the Jews of the Soviet Union, where there is no Jewish problem and therefore no need for Israel*". Gromyko stated that *"the Soviet Union is not directly interested in the Palestine problem from the point of view of the emigration of Jews to Palestine, since the Jewish population of the Soviet Union does not show any interest*."[148] A few weeks into Meyerson's visit, Jewish new-year was celebrated and her and her staff went to the Moscow synagogue, where "*almost fifty thousand Jews came… to be with us, to demonstrate their sense of kinship, and to celebrate the establishment of the state of Israel*".[149] The Soviet reaction was one of disbelief and surprise, and soon it would become clear that the Jews of the

[145] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 18-19.
[146] Cleveland, W. & Bunton, M. *A History of the Modern Middle East,* p. 354.
[147] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 20.
[148] Idem.
[149] Meir, G. *Mijn Leven*, p. 217-218.

Soviet Union would have to pay a heavy price for the warm welcome they had given Golda Meir. Soviet authorities took measures to ensure the lack of interest which Gromyko spoke of.[150]

Stalin, Khrushchev and the Doctors' plot

Thus began another period of extreme institutional Soviet anti-Semitism, often disguised as anti-Zionism, adding to the already overtly present civil anti-Semitism that followed World War 2. Yiddish was banned from writing and theatre and almost all the members of the Jewish Antifascist Committee, installed during the war by the Soviets, were arrested, as well as at least 430 Jewish writers, painters, actors, engineers, musicians and public figures. Most Committee members were among the 25 Jewish writers and public figures who were executed in August 1952, most of the others perished in labor camps. Still, it seemed like there was worse to come when Stalin accused medical practitioners, most of them Jewish, who had treated Stalin and many other members of the Communist Party leadership of plotting to murder Soviet leaders in collaboration with Western Jewish organizations. These accusations were the cue for one of the worst periods of Soviet anti-Semitism thus far. There were even indications that Stalin planned to deport the whole Jewish population of the European part of the Soviet Union to Siberia.[151] Fortunately for the Jewish population, Stalin died in March 1953, and the new rulers acknowledged that the accusations of a plot had been without any legal ground and the arrests had been made without justification.[152]

The doctor's plot led to a worsening of Israeli-Soviet relations: the Israeli public reacted shocked at the outrageous accusations against respectable Jewish doctors. When a bomb exploded in the courtyard of the Soviet legation in Tel Aviv, the attack was immediately denounced by the *Knesset* and Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, but the Soviet authorities decided to break off its diplomatic relations with Israel anyway. The Netherlands consented to represent Israeli interests in the Soviet Union.[153] Following Stalin's death, Soviet policy in both internal and external affairs could return to a sense of 'normalcy' and relations between Moscow and Jerusalem were restored and improved.[154]

Stalin was succeeded by Khrushchev in 1955, following a power struggle. During his speech to the Twentieth Party Congress the following year, he denounced Stalin's methods and introduced

[150] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 20.
[151] Idem, p. 21.
[152] Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 74.
[153] Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 57.
[154] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 21-22.

destalinization. Yet, Khrushchev was a traditional anti-Semite and failed to mention or denounce Stalin's crimes against the Jews. Moreover, he adopted a stricter antireligious policy. Even though it was mainly aimed at the Orthodox Church, the Jewish community also suffered, for more than 50 synagogues were closed. He rejected Jewish emigration to Israel, and during the final years of his leadership, in the early 1960s, a new round of prosecutions for economic criminal activities found Jews bearing a disproportionate share of the punishment.[155]

The 1956 Middle East war did not lead to a break in diplomatic relations, but certainly did not improve them either. Emigration remained practically impossible until 1962, when the number of exit permits granted increased to several hundred on a yearly basis. When Khrushchev was deposed and replaced by a quartet consisting of Brezhnev, Suslov, Podgorny and Kosygin, the latter declared in 1966 that he saw no objection to family reunion of Jews that had been separated from relatives, which gave hope to many Jews. Brezhnev was eventually to take sole power, but was not completely in charge of Soviet foreign policy yet, when a new war broke out in the Middle East in 1967.[156]

The reasons behind the Soviet Jewish desire to emigrate

Zvi recognizes four key elements linked to the desire for emigration of Soviet Jews who left the Soviet Union during the 'second exodus', which started in the second half of 1968. The first element is their desire to settle in Israel or elsewhere, and their struggle to that end. Secondly, Soviet policy and anti-Semitism have played a major part in the desire for emigration. The global campaign which was initiated on their behalf and the public pressure exerted on the Soviet authorities also supported their desire. Finally, the economic and security prospects and the effectiveness of absorptive measures in the economic, social and cultural spheres in Israel were a pull-factor.[157]

More importantly, he sees the second exodus accompanied by a resurgence of the national consciousness of Soviet Jews, especially among those of younger generations. The previous section, on Soviet anti-Semitism, has illustrated the Soviet attempts to assimilate Jews and other groups from the 1920s onwards. Jewish parties and institutions were disbanded, Hebrew and Yiddish were banned and the usage of these languages was penalized. Jews were not recognized as a nationality anymore since

[155] Cullen, R. 'Soviet Jewry', p. 255.
[156] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 22.
[157] Regarding the final key element linked to the Soviet Jewish desire for emigration, Zvi explicitly means Israel, but those who had the United States as their destiny would certainly also improve their economic and security situation.

Stalin redefined the concept of nation and the Jews were even tasked with Russifying other national minorities.[158]

Zvi organizes the causes of the national Jewish resurgence in positive and negative categories. Among the latter, negative causes, he lists (1) the shock of the Holocaust and (2) the systematic and deliberate official playing down of the Holocaust by the Soviet regime, (3) the anti-Semitic attitude adopted by the Soviet authorities after the war, (4) the time of terror 1948-1953 and (5) the fact that Stalin's crimes against the Jews were not denounced by Khrushchev, (6) the loss of educational and economic opportunities, (7) the anti-Semitic state campaigns directed at 'economic criminals' and religiosity and finally, (8) the pro-Arab foreign policy and the full support that Moscow gave to Arab ambitions to destroy Israel.[159]

Among the positive causes of the national Jewish cultural rebirth Zvi lists (1) meetings with the Jews of the lands annexed by the USSR during World War II, [160] who had deep roots in Jewish traditions and profound Zionist convictions, (2) the activities of the Jewish anti-fascist committee, which went beyond the limits of the task given by the authorities and was regarded by world and Soviet Jewry alike as the recognized spokesman of the Jewish community in the USSR, (3) Jewish solidarity in the face of the Nazi's, (4) Israel's war of Independence, Gromyko's historic speech at the UN and the Soviet recognition of Israel, (5) the Israeli legation (later embassy) in Moscow, Golda Meir's visit to it and the tours throughout the country that its officials undertook, meeting thousands of Soviet Jews, (6) contacts with the outer world through radio broadcasts, visiting artists and Jewish tourism in the USSR, often sanctioned by Israel as a part of the campaign to draw the Soviet Jewry towards Israel and finally (7) the positive outcome of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, which was described by Zvi as one of the most profound emotional experiences for Soviet Jewry.[161]

Buwalda cites a remark from Elie Wiesel's famous book *The Jews of Silence* to illustrate that the major reason for the various groups of Soviet Jews to leave was structural state-sponsored and civil anti-Semitism, the inability to live their own lives and develop their own culture, and the general lack of hope:

[158] Zvi, A. 'Immigration to Israel from the USSR', p. 269-270.
[159] Idem, p. 270-272.
[160] Including Eastern Poland, the Baltic countries, the Carpatho-Russian strip, Bessarabia and parts of Moldavia.
[161] Zvi, A. 'Immigration to Israel from the USSR', p. 272-274.

"By preventing the Jews from developing their own culture… the Kremlin seems to force them in the direction of complete assimilation; this process is held back by the difficulties which every Jew encounters when he tries to integrate in the Russian society… The Jew cannot be a Jew but neither can he be a non-Jew."[162]

Chaim Potok captures the same sentiment in his book 'The Gates of November', which chronicles the life of a Soviet-Jewish dissident family:

"'Even if we pretend to them that we are Russian, they say that we are Jews'. (…) 'During and directly after the war, maybe. We had the feeling that we all formed one country, one people. That was the only time in which I felt fully human and not half-Russian half-Jewish. But after the arrests of the Jewish Antifascist Committee, the execution of the Yiddish writers, the doctors' plot and the endless stream of articles in which the Jews are condemned… The deeply rooted antisemitism in this country really made us a separate peoples.' One of his friends wondered aloud: 'How would it have been if there hadn't been any antisemitism?' 'Then we would have seen the country as a new nationality and we would have completely assimilated' (…)"[163]

Among the émigrés, Buwalda recognizes three distinct groups: the relatively prosperous urban intellectuals, lesser placed Jews such as the old Jewish colonies in Central Asia and the Caucasus, often rural, or those who had been evacuated to Siberia and finally, the Zionists, dedicated to the ideal of building a Jewish state and the obligation of all Jews to participate in that effort. The former, the urban intellectuals, often held good positions and because both partners worked, earned an income that enabled them to live well, have big apartments, holidays on the Black or Baltic Sea and sometimes even own a car. Yet many urban intellectuals were willing to give this up because they could no longer live under the Soviet regime and no longer tolerate the anti-Semitist system where there was, for example, a secret *numerus clausus* for Jews in institutions:

"It [anti-Semitism] was there in your workplace where you would never quite reach the position you thought you were entitled to. It was there when you did not get the permission to travel abroad that

[162] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 35.
[163] Potok, C. *De Familie Slepak: Kroniek van een Russisch Dissidentengezin*, p. 196-197.

your colleagues did receive. But you tried to adapt, to find another university or a correspondence course for the children, an institute for yourself that did accept Jews. One had learned to live with that – but not with a regime that allowed no civil rights or personal freedom, was patently dishonest, and forced you to participate in that dishonesty, even frequently trying to recruit you to spy on your friends and co-workers."[164]

The Zionists were the only category of emigrants where the inability to exercise their religion seemed to have been a motive in their desire for *Aliya* (emigration to Israel). Dedicated to the ideal of building a Jewish state, these religiously motivated Jews were among the vanguard of emigration in the early 1970s. Yet, they were a minor group and by 1973 most of them had left the Soviet Union.[165] The lesser-off Jews, who mainly lived in their own communities outside the major cities, had a slightly different range of motives to emigrate than the urbanite intellectuals. For them, anti-Semitism was more direct and sometimes they feared *pogroms*. Poverty would also play a role, as well as discrimination and the fear that their children would never be able to get an education or a good job.[166]

In the 1960s, groups of predominantly younger Jews began to organize to fight for their right to go to Israel in major Soviet European cities such as Leningrad, Moscow, Kishinev, Kharkov, Riga and Vilnius. They did so by openly demanding their right to live a Jewish national life and to *Aliya*. Some groups studied Hebrew and others published semi-legal publications. Letters and petitions were sent to Israeli and American statesmen, organs of the United Nations and other relevant persons and institutions.[167]

The first *Refusenik* and a hero of the Jewish movement in the Soviet Union would become Boris Kochubyevski, a young Kiev Jew. He wrote in 1967, upon his application for an exit permit to emigrate for Israel:

"*Why is it that the most active sector of Jewish youth, raised and educated in the USSR still retains a feeling of Jewish national unity and national identity? Thanks for that, in a large measure, can be given to anti-Semitism, the new brand which was implanted from above… and the old one which is still alive among the more backward sectors of Soviet society… [Furthermore there is] the absence*

[164] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 33-34.
[165] Tabory, E. 'Jewish Identity, Israeli Nationalism, and Soviet Jewish Migration', p. 290.
[166] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 34-35.
[167] Zvi, A. 'Immigration to Israel from the USSR', p. 269-270.

of Jewish schools, religious persecution, [discrimination] when we are looking for jobs or applying to institutes of higher learning. I am a Jew and I want to live in the Jewish state."

Kochubyevski was initially informed that his request had been granted, yet subsequently he was told that he was denied after all. He was dismissed from his job, his wife was disallowed to continue her studies and finally, in December 1968 he was arrested and sentenced to three years imprisonment for 'slander of the Soviet Union'.[168]

Soviet policy on Jewish emigration

Permission to emigrate was not normally granted to any Soviet citizen. The regime claimed to have established a workers' and peasants' paradise and it was considered treason to want to leave it. The reasoning behind this was that if one is in an ideal state, such as the Soviet Union, one did not want to leave for there was nowhere better to go. The USSR abstained in 1948, when the U.N. Declaration on Human Rights, proclaiming amongst others that each person had the right to leave his or her country, was adopted.[169] The objection was even towards emigration to other states of the Eastern bloc within the Soviet sphere of influence. The Polish government and Communist Party, for example, fought a difficult fight in order to secure the repatriation of (former) Poles who had found themselves in the USSR during World War 2 and the territorial alterations that followed it. It was the same for citizens of other Soviet-friendly states, such as Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary and East-Germany. The repatriation of Poles in 1957-59 and Germans to West-Germany since 1955 was only allowed by the state organs following long public and political pressure from outside.[170]

Ideological reasons aside, the Soviet Union was not keen on Jewish emigration for it would translate into a brain drain: the emigration of intelligent, well-educated individuals to somewhere for better pay or living conditions, causing the donor state to lose these skilled people or 'brains'. The Soviet Union was trying to run a closed and planned, yet sophisticated economy, which means that it trained specialists who were equal to their colleagues worldwide in their respective fields. Yet, it expected them to live and work under much lesser conditions than their Western counterparts. If the doors for emigration were opened, some of the most valuable specialists would have strong economic motives to emigrate. The

[168] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 30.
[169] Idem, p. xv-xvi.
[170] Zvi, A. 'Immigration to Israel from the USSR', p. 279-280.

drain might have been bearable if it remained confined to the Jewish population. But if Jews were indeed allowed, the numbers might swell as children from mixed families were allowed to choose and reclassify their own nationality. Moreover, if other Soviet nationalities such as Ukrainians, Latvians or Muslims began to demand the same right, the Soviets would have to face a choice between internal political unrest among minorities, or a hollowed-out economy.[171]

Related to this is the issue of domestic and international prestige. If that many citizens were to emigrate in order to improve their living standard, all Soviet efforts to portray the quality of life under a socialist system as superior to the capitalist system would be seriously undercut. Another reason for the Soviet Union not to want to let go of its Jewish inhabitants was the fact that the Arab states, allied to the Soviet Union, also tried to pressure the Soviet Union into not releasing large numbers of Jews for emigration to Israel. King Imam Ahmed of Yemen wrote to Khrushchev in 1959 that doing so would create "*an immense danger*" to his nation, demographically speaking.[172]

'The Labyrinth': Soviet emigrational bureaucracy

Emigration was practically impossible for Soviet citizens. The Communist regime's ideology believed that anyone wanting to leave their 'workers' and peasants' paradise' was committing treason. Emigration could only be allowed for a single reason: family reunion, and still then it would be seen as a gift that was given to the émigré, not as a right. Soviet citizens viewed those Jews that were allowed to emigrate with both contempt, for they were betraying the state, and envy, for most Soviet citizens were never allowed to cross the border, let alone emigrate. The bureaucratic process seems to reflect both these feelings, for the process appeared to be designed to make the departure of the Jews as difficult as possible.

Before going to the Visa Office of the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs (*Otdel Viz I Registracii Inostrannykh Grazdan,* OVIR), in order to formally apply for an exit permit, one had to be in the possession of a complete dossier with the following documents:
- A *vysov* (a personal and notarized invitation from a relative in Israel, on which the Israeli authorities stamped their approval),
- Several completed questionnaires with data about the prospective emigrants' family names, addresses

[171] Cullen, R. *Soviet Jewry*, p. 258.
[172] Idem, p. 259.

and occupations,

- Character reference from colleagues at the workplace, which could be especially difficult to obtain because he was a 'traitor' and a traitor he had to be called. Once a Jew's desire to emigrate became known at his place of work, he was routinely demoted, fired or forced to resign,
- Reference from the institution of learning for children,
- Character reference from the Communist Party (if a member) and for children from the Communist Youth Organization,
- Statement from the housing authority,
- Internal passport containing notices of the cancellation of registration and of dismissal,
- Birth certificates for all travelers,
- Certificate stating that the labor book was returned to the last employer,
- Certificate stating that no court order against the applicant had been issued,
- Statement from a military committee that the military I.D. card had been returned,
- Statements from the hire-purchase office and the phone company that there were no outstanding debts,
- Receipt of payment of 40 rubles per applicant
- Consent from relatives, which could also be especially difficult to obtain. Sometimes old family feuds were rekindled over these questions, estranged relatives would try to get even and long divorced ex-partners would block the emigration of their former spouses or their children.

From 1972 onwards, a 'diploma fee' was added, also named the 'education ransom'.[173] This constituted another crippling fee in return for the higher education that was enjoyed in the Soviet Union prior to leaving. The rates ranged between 4,500 rubles for a graduate of an Institute of the Humanities, to up to 19,400 rubles for a Doctor of Science. The 'ransom' had to be paid only by those who were forced to renounce their citizenship, thus exclusively penalizing only those that were hoping to go to Israel. Payment did not guarantee permission to leave and the measure applied retroactively: it also affected persons whose emigration had already been approved but who had not yet got their permits.

The education ransom decree stirred up much anger in Israel, the United States and the West. Following international protests, the U.S. intervened by linking concessions done by the Soviet Union regarding freedom of movement to economic trade concessions done by the United States, an act which in the

[173] Zvi, A. 'Immigration to Israel from the USSR', p. 292.

process focused world attention on the plight of the Soviet Jews.[174] Zvi notes that "*the evolution of the education ransom and the open Soviet response to American intervention is of particular moment: the Government of the USSR recognized de facto that the problem of Aliya was a permissible theme for bilateral discussion between the super-powers and that its Jewish issue was no longer an internal one*",[175] thus lending support to the external theory as discussed in chapter 2.

Once all the required documentation had been gathered, one could do nothing but wait, sometimes for months or even years, to find out whether the application had been granted or denied. No permission was granted to anyone who had been in contact with military or state secrets. But in a country without private enterprise practically everyone worked for the state, and the authorities could declare work secret although it had nothing to do with defense or matters of state. The decisions were never explained and an appeal was not possible. Thousands of Jewish applicants were refused an exit visa on these arbitrary grounds: three quarters of all refusals were based on 'security'.[176]

Those whose applications were accepted received a simple three-page document with their picture: the exit permit. The price for this document was the same as for a passport, 360 rubles, a large sum of money for most Soviet citizens as the average monthly wage in the Soviet Union, even in the 1980s, was a mere 185 rubles. Most Jewish emigrants could only finance their emigration by selling their possessions or by obtaining a loan from the Netherlands embassy. The next step for the future emigrants would be to abolish their Soviet citizenship, an administrative act which only applied to emigrants with exit permits for Israel and cost another 500 rubles, totaling the costs for emigration to 900 rubles, excluding the education fee. Initially, the authorities told Western journalists that this measure was intended to guarantee that no Soviet citizens would be fighting Arabs in the Israeli army. Only in 1989 was it acknowledged that the real reason had been the wish to "*punish*" Jewish emigrants.[177]

After this, the Soviet Jewish emigrant could finally go to the Netherlands embassy and receive his Israeli visa and the Austrian embassy to receive transit visas, since there was no direct connection to Israel and all Jewish emigrants had to travel via Vienna. The Soviet Jewish emigrants did have to hurry though, for the exit permit was usually only valid for a thirty day period and sometimes for one week or less. Most Jewish emigrants left the Soviet Union with just the two suitcases allowed by customs regulations, which

[174] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 108.
[175] Zvi, A. 'Immigration to Israel from the USSR', p. 296.
[176] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 51.
[177] Idem, p. 54.

were usually thoroughly searched. It was common for emigrants to spend their final night before departure at customs.

Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union *before* the diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel were broken off

Despite the Soviet objections, there was *some* Jewish emigration in the period (1948-1967) preceding the severance of the diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Israel, yet with little discernable continuity. Three major periods can be discerned within this period: the end of the Stalinist era (1948-1953), Khrushchev's rule (1954-1964) and finally, Brezhnev's rule up to the outbreak of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war (1965-1967).

During the first of these periods, the end of the Stalinist era, the USSR recognized the right of Jews to have their own state, and the right of Jews throughout the world to go to Israel, but denied that right of return to its own Jews. Emigration from the Eastern European satellite states was not prevented, but from 1948 until the closure of the Israeli Mission in 1953 only eighteen Jews were granted exit visas.[178]

Following the restoration of diplomatic relations between Israel and the Soviet Union, hopes among Jews were high that the promised relaxation and destalinization would apply to them equally. Unfortunately, it turned out Khrushchev was an anti-Semite himself and the Jews of the Soviet Union did not see their domestic situation improve. Yet, upon the restoration of relations Foreign Minister Gromyko indicated to Israeli Ambassador Shmuel Eliashiv that he was prepared to authorize the consular section of the ministry to deal with individual cases of reunification of families. In 1954 and 1955 a total of 158 Jews came to Israel from the USSR and in 1956 this number rose to 753. After the 1956 war in the Middle East, numbers dropped drastically. The amount of émigrés from the USSR to Israel between 1954 and 1964 totaled 2418. When asked after the Soviet Union's hesitance, Khrushchev explained that: "*American Security Services often use Jews who fled for purposes of their own and this is not good for us. We do not want a decent person who goes to visit his kinsfolk in Israel to be turned into a traitor to his country. Our stand toward Israel is determined by the Cold War and we hope that this is a passing phenomenon*."[179]

[178] Zvi, A. 'Immigration to Israel from the USSR', p. 281.
[179] Idem, p. 281-283.

When Khrushchev was relieved of his responsibilities and succeeded by the Brezhnev quartet, a change in the number of Jews leaving the country was perceptible almost immediately. A formal expression of this policy came at a press conference in Paris in December 1966. In response to a question, Premier Kosygin answered that:

> *"Individual persons raise the question from time to time. There are even some who say in the USSR there allegedly is anti-Semitism. There is no such thing in our country and there cannot be… As for reunification of families – if there are any families that want to meet or to leave the USSR, the way is open for them and there is no problem here."*

The premier had a quick response, which was also printed in a major Soviet newspaper the next day, suggesting that there had been discussion on the subject before he left for Paris, and that decisions had been made on the highest level. From 1965 up to mid-1967, when another Arab-Israeli war took place, permits were granted to almost 4500 Jews, almost twice as many as the sum total of all permits since the establishment of the state of Israel.[180]

Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union *after* the diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel were broken off

Following the cessation of the 1967 war in the Middle East and the establishment of the Dutch embassy in Moscow as the diplomatic liaison for Israeli affairs, the Netherlands embassy was able to issue visas for Israel to a few emigrants. This, because after a few days of hesitation, and despite the decision not to issue any new exit permits after the break in relations, the Soviet authorities decided to honor exit permits that had already been granted. Approximately 116 Jewish Soviet citizens left for Israel in that year.[181] In September 1968 the Netherlands embassy in Moscow reported that the Visa Office of the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs, had made it possible again for Jews to obtain exit permits, but only for the purpose of reuniting families and generally only applicable to seniors and those who had received exit permits before the diplomatic relations with Israel were broken off.[182] In 1969, 2808 visas were issued, but the number fell to about 1000 again in the next year. The rate changed suddenly by March 1971 and in April of that year the embassy was handling several hundred applications per week, the

[180] Zvi, A. 'Immigration to Israel from the USSR', p. 284-285.
[181] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 24.
[182] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Weidema to Luns 100, 5/9/1968.

ambassador spoke of a "*flood*."[183] The total number of Jewish emigrants that year was to exceed 13.000: the second exodus had truly begun.[184]

These numbers rose to over a yearly 30.000 in 1973. The next few years saw a dip in visa issuances until the number would rise again to over 30.000 in 1978 and over 50.000 in 1979. The end of détente in the 1970s also marks the end of Soviet Jewish emigration in great numbers: 1980 still saw over 20.000 Jews leaving the Soviet Union through the Dutch embassy, but in the following years the number would sometimes drop to less than a thousand. In 1987, shortly after the introduction of *perestroika* and *glasnost* by Gorbachev, the numbers start increasing steeply again, peaking at an estimated 212.700 Jewish émigrés destined for Israel and the Western world in 1990.[185] Appendix B shows a full breakdown of the number of persons for whom visas for Israel were issued by the Netherlands embassy in Moscow per year.

Why the Soviets let them go: internal vs. external vs. interaction theory

It has already been established that the Soviet Union preferred not to let go of any of its inhabitants, or serfs, for reasons based on foreign policy and ideological, domestic-national and intellectual considerations. Yet, over the period 1967-1990 an estimated 500-600.000 Soviet Jewish citizens leave the Soviet Union for Israel and the Western world. Buwalda recognizes three theories which explain why the Soviet Union granted permission to leave the Soviet Union to so many.

Internal theory

The theory dubbed 'internal theory' by Buwalda states that the decisions to allow emigration were made independent of external forces and were due to considerations internal to the Soviet Union and due to the pressure of the Soviet Jews themselves. In this form, the internal theory doesn't have much support. A more sophisticated version of the internal theory claims that "*constant pressure by Soviet Jewish leaders and their supporters succeeded in forcing the Kremlin to look more closely at the Jewish question… Soviet Jews posed a successful challenge to the Kremlin*".[186] In other words, it was the Soviet Jews who succeeded in obtaining emigration concessions, but it is recognized that foreign help was required. Adherers to this theory believe that Soviet Jewish emigration policy was conditioned primarily

[183] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14216, Bakker to Luns, reference number 916/281, 21/4/1971.
[184] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 24.
[185] Idem, p. 221-224.
[186] Idem, p. 42.

by Soviet nationality policy, the uneasy position of Jews in Soviet society and a confrontation with the demands of a significant segment of the population that could no longer be quieted by imprisoning outspoken critics. Laurie Saltan, defender of the internal theory, claims that Soviet authorities thought that letting that segment emigrate would remove individuals who would not accept their lot in Soviet society and at the same time satisfy those who felt that the Soviet Union was better off without the troublemakers.[187]

The visit of Golda Meir in the Soviet Union and the establishment of the state of Israel, both in 1948, had stimulated the feeling of Jewish awareness in Moscow and in the rest of the Soviet Union. At that time, mass emigration to the Jewish homeland was still a faraway dream, yet the birth of their 'own state' and the relative relaxation of political pressures in the Khrushchev era emboldened some of the Soviet Jews to begin to think seriously about that dream, even after Khrushchev was replaced and the oppression of Jews worsened again. The Jewish activism resulting from this attitude, as discussed earlier in this chapter, stands at the basis of the internal theory on Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union.

A great example to support the internal theory is to be found in 1970. In June of that year the Netherlands embassy reported to The Hague that there had been an attempt to hijack a plane at Leningrad airport: three men had been arrested for the crime and eight others, all Jewish, had been detained in connection with it.[188] Although many people in the West initially doubted that a hijacking had really been attempted in Leningrad, later statements by the participants made clear that a group of Jews from Riga had indeed planned a hijacking as a demonstration of their desperation to be allowed to emigrate to Israel. In what became known as the Leningrad trial, thirty-four people, two of them non-Jewish, stood trial for the charge of high treason. On Christmas Eve of 1970 two of the accused were sentenced to death, two to fifteen years in prison and the others from five to fourteen years in prison.[189]

A Muscovite non-Jewish dissident, Vladimir Bukovsky, swung into action, translating texts, telephoning foreign journalists and urging maximum publicity for the information he provided. Much attention was paid to the issue in the Western media and many governments, together with the Socialist International, carried out demarches.[190] The Netherlands ambassador had already done so just before the sentences were passed. For the Soviet authorities, the most painful response to the Leningrad trial was not the diplomatic reactions, but the fact that several Communist Parties joined the protests. This included

[187] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 131.
[188] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14215, Beelaerts to Luns 102, 25/6/1970.
[189] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 32.
[190] Idem.

those of Italy and France, the two largest ones in the Western world. The Kremlin must have been taken aback by the worldwide response to the court case: the Soviet Supreme Court met six days after the end of the first trial and shortened all the sentences, the death penalties were reduced to fifteen years prison. Yet, the Jewish protesters and the movement for emigration was not broken. There were Jewish demonstrations and even a sit-in strike at the Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in 1971. It is suggested by Buwalda and others that this was the moment that the authorities decided to allow a greater number of Jewish Soviet citizens to emigrate, especially many leaders and the most committed Zionists, in the hope that their departure would reduce and exhaust future demand.[191] The Dutch embassy reported that between March 3 and 10 of that year an unusually high number of visas had been issued: 135. It was thought that among those were the sit-in protesters.[192] It would not be the last time that the Soviet authorities tried to weed out the 'unruly elements' in the hope of settling the others. It was even believed that the KGB (*Komitet Gosudarstvenoy Bezopasnosti*, committee for state security) was aware of the plan for the Leningrad hijacking and allowed it to be developed and executed with the purpose of eliminating much of the leadership of the Jewish activist movement.[193]

External theory

Conversely, the 'external theory' posits that *"permission for the Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union was granted largely as a result of foreign policy considerations; it was a function of the Soviet relations with the West in general and the United States in specific*".[194] This theory is also named the 'barometer' thesis, for it tries to correlate the yearly variations in the number of exit permits to specific factors in East-West political relations, measuring how 'cold' the Cold War is at any given moment in time. Peter Baehr seems to subscribe to this theory, for he states that "*the number of granted exit visas grew whenever Moscow wanted to influence Western public opinion and dwindled again when these chances were virtually absent*".[195]

An example in support of the external theory is to be found in the early 1970s. In 1974, the American congress passed the Jackson-Vanik and Stevenson Amendments to two bills, with the goal of pressing the Soviet Union to allow more emigration by making it a condition for trade in, amongst other products, the grain and computer technology so badly required in the Soviet Union. The Jackson-Vanik

[191] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 32.
[192] Idem, p. 33.
[193] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14215, Beelaerts to Luns 102, 25/6/1970.
[194] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 42.
[195] Baehr, P., Castermans-Holleman, M., Grünfeld, F. *Human Rights in the Foreign Policy of the Netherlands*, p. 132.

Amendment to the Trade Act of 1974 stated that countries with nonmarket economies could not receive most-favored-nation status, nor government-backed credits, unless they allowed free emigration.[196] Senator Jackson stated that: "*While we are bargaining with the Russians over Dollars and Rubles, let us do some bargaining on behalf of helpless human beings. When we talk about free trade, let us talk about free people*".[197]

Despite the fact that the Soviets torpedoed the agreement on January 10th, 1975, claiming not to have agreed to any increase in Soviet Jewish emigration and thereby stupefying all those involved, the ordeal made sure that the American and Western governments now regarded the affairs and fate of Soviet Jews not as a domestic problem but as an item on the agenda of bi- and multilateral discussions. Unfortunately for the Jewish Soviet inhabitants, the number of exit visas granted dropped under 20.000 during the years 1974-1977.

A more convincing example of the external theory is to be found in the SALT I and SALT II negotiations, aimed at limiting the ongoing arms race. The SALT-I treaty was discussed between 1969 and 1972 in Vienna and Helsinki and signed in Moscow in 1972 by Nixon and Brezhnev. The SALT II treaty was signed in Vienna in June 1979, but never rectified by the United States because the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan six months later. Its terms were, nonetheless, honored by both sides. Robert Freedman, supporting the external theory, explains the peaks in exit visas of 1973 (34.778 visas) and 1979 (50.461) through the linkage of Soviet foreign policy considerations and emigration. The Soviets urgently needed trade and technology from the United States, who's GNP doubled that of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, Freedman notes that the Soviets badly wanted a strategic arms agreement, for the arms race was crippling the Soviet economy.[198]

Interaction theory

It can reasonably be said that external pressure did play a large role in urging or even forcing Soviet leaders to allow Jews to emigrate. This foreign pressure did not spring up by itself though; it had to be generated first by pressure inside the Soviet Union. The continuous denial of large-scale emigration, the harassment of applicants and the maltreatment and persecution of *Refuseniks* in turn produced Western pressure, stirring into action Jewish activists, Western Jewish organizations, public opinion and

[196] Cullen, R. 'Soviet Jewry', p. 253.
[197] Zvi, A. 'Immigration to Israel from the USSR', p. 297.
[198] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 131.

Western governments interacting with the Soviet state. Yet, this pressure would not have translated into anything if it was not for the Soviet leaders that gave in to it. Brezhnev felt, as Gorbachev would later, he needed détente with the West for it could help him reverse a deteriorating economic situation in his country. He received a clear signal that a prerequisite for such a détente would be an increase in Soviet Jewish emigration, which became an element in Soviet power considerations.

The theory which explained best why the Soviet Union decided to allow for Jewish emigration can therefore be named 'interaction theory'. The domestic context did play a role, but not solely, as suggested by the internal theory. The Jewish suffering and the stand of the Jewish leaders inside the Soviet Union drew Western attention on the problem and accumulated Western pressure. The external pressure, and sometimes the lack thereof, was in turn the immediate cause of the ups and downs in the flow of that emigration. But then again, it was the domestic situation, now mostly economically seen, which at certain times made good relation with the West so necessary that emigration concessions became unavoidable.[199]

[199] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 43-44.

Conclusion

This chapter has presented a study on the reasons for and the forces behind Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union and several aspects related to this. It has been established that Jews have a longstanding, even pre-Christian, presence in the area which was formerly known as the Soviet Union, and that the Jewish presence in the area has been met with constantly changing policies, segregation and anti-Semitism, both civil and institutional: it is no wonder that the word *pogrom* derives from the Russian language.

Said anti-Semitism, and the lack of hope of a 'normal' existence with decent economic and security prospects were major contributors to the Soviet Jewish desire to emigrate, reinforced by a Jewish national consciousness. This Jewish national consciousness was rekindled by the establishment of the State of Israel, Golda Meyerson's visit to the Moscow synagogue, the global campaign on behalf of the Soviet Jews and the Israeli successes in the 1948, 1956 and 1967 Middle Eastern wars.

The Soviet authorities preferred not to let go of its Jewish inhabitants, for several reasons. Beside ideological reasons, 'there is no better place than the workers' paradise', an important consideration for the Soviet leaders was the danger of a brain drain: the Jewish inhabitants of the cities were relatively educated and their emigration would mean a severe blow to the planned economy. Moreover, the Soviets were afraid of losing domestic and international prestige: if many were to leave the country in order to improve their quality of life, the world would find out about life in the Soviet Union and this would seriously undercut all Soviet efforts to portray the quality of life under a socialist system as superior to the capitalist system. Another reason for the Soviet Union not to want to let go of its Jews was the fact that the Arab states, allied to the Soviet Union, also tried to pressure the Soviets into not releasing large numbers of Jews for emigration to Israel.

Soviet citizens and officials viewed those Jews that were allowed to emigrate with both contempt, for they were betraying the state, and envy, for most Soviet citizens were never allowed to cross the border, let alone emigrate. The bureaucratic process surrounding emigration seems to reflect both these feelings, for the process appeared to have been designed to make the departure of the Jews as difficult as possible.

Before the onset of the Dutch interest representation for Israel, there are three discernable periods of Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union. In the final years of Stalin's rule, 18 permits were given out to

Jewish émigrés. Khrushchev's rule, from 1954 to 1964 saw no different attitude towards Jewish emigration but an increase in Israeli visas for Soviet Jews, namely a total of 2418 people. The next period, under Brezhnev, saw a loosening of the rules. From 1965 up to the outbreak of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, a total of 4500 Jews received exit permits, almost twice as many as the sum total of all permits since the establishment of the state of Israel. After the Dutch had started representing Israeli interests, a visa stop was installed, but soon some emigration was allowed again. The year 1971 saw a sudden peak of 14.000 visas for Israel, a number which kept rising for two more years up to almost 35.000 in 1973. After this year, the number drops to about 15.000 on a yearly basis. The years 1978-1980 saw a steep rise in exit visas again, after which the number dwindles to about a thousand during the years 1982-1986. From 1987 onwards this number would rise again to a total of 141.572 over the first eight months of 1990.

Three theories have been put forward on why the Soviets decided to let so many Jews emigrate, despite having many reasons not to wish this. Internal theory states that it was the Soviet Jews who succeeded in obtaining emigration concessions, by pressuring the authorities through civil disobedience and protests. Conversely, the 'external theory' posits that "*permission for the Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union was granted largely as a result of foreign policy considerations; it was a function of the Soviet relations with the West in general and the United States in specific*". Yet, both these theories fail to offer a complete and satisfactory explanation. Interaction theory combines both and proposes that the Jewish suffering and the stand of the Jewish leaders inside the Soviet Union drew Western attention on the problem and accumulated Western pressure. The external pressure, and sometimes the lack thereof, was in turn the immediate cause of the ups and downs in the flow of that emigration But then again, it was the domestic economic situation which at certain times made good relations with the West so necessary that emigration concessions became unavoidable for the Soviet authorities.

Chapter three: What basic responsibilities and tasks did the Dutch interest representation for Israel consist of?

Based on data derived from both the archive and secondary literature, this chapter will focus on the details of the actual task of interest representation, after which the next chapter will attempt to answer the main research question. Firstly, the events surrounding the establishment of the Dutch embassy as the diplomatic liaison for Israel in Moscow will be presented, followed by the agreements that were made between the Dutch and Israeli governments regarding the procedures and finances. Furthermore, the administrative tasks that the Dutch embassy provided will be introduced: the issuance of visas and loans, the deliverance of Israeli demarches at the Soviet Foreign Ministry, the circulation of *vysovs* (legalized invitations), the deliverance of certificates of Israeli citizenship, the transmission of official and nonofficial documents and the keeping of a visiting hour every afternoon. Besides this, the Dutch policy regarding confidentiality will be discussed, as well as the cooperation with Soviet officials and institutes.

The establishment of the Dutch embassy as the diplomatic liaison for Israel in Moscow.

War broke out in the Middle East on June 5, 1967, between Israel and an Arab alliance consisting of Iraq, Jordan, Syria and Egypt. The Soviet Union, closely allied to both Egypt's leader Gamal Abdul Nasser and Syrian leader Hafiz al-Assad, strongly condemned Israel. Where it had only recalled its ambassador in the aftermath of the 1956 war in the Middle East,[200] the Soviet Union and its satellite-states, except for Ceausescu's Romania, now decided to break off all relations with Israel completely.[201] The emergence of the Cold War embroiled many states in a regional Cold War as clients of either the Soviet Union or the United States. Economic assistance and military weapons shipments became the *modus operandi* of alliance building. Countries which preferred to keep a certain distance between themselves and their former imperial rulers, such as Syria, Algeria and Egypt generally turned to the Soviet Union for such assistance, under the influence of nationalism and pan-Arabism. After the outbreak of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, in which the Soviets played a role which is still debated, the Soviet Union strongly condemned the Israeli aggression and called upon Israel and the United Nations to put a halt to the hostilities. The Soviet Union broke off diplomatic relations with Israel on June 10th through a message to

[200] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 23.
[201] Idem.

the Israeli ambassador in Moscow which read that "*The Soviet government states that in view of the continued Israeli aggression against Arab states and its gross violation of the Security Council resolutions, the Soviet government has decided to sever diplomatic relations with Israel*." [202]

Following the cessation of hostilities on June 10th, the Netherlands ambassador in Jerusalem, Bentinck, informed his ministry in The Hague by cable that he had just received a phone call from the Director-General of the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He had requested of him that if the Netherlands would, just as in 1953, represent the Israeli interests in the Soviet Union.[203] Whereas the deliberations on whether or not to grant the Israeli request were tedious before,[204] the records do not indicate much hesitation or even discussion in The Hague this time around. A positive reply was dispatched the same day in which the Netherlands embassy in Moscow was instructed to inform the Soviet authorities and ask for their consent, which was given by phone the next day.[205]

Dr. Ir. P.J. Polak, head of the Eastern European section of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs at the time, later admitted that had they known that the interest representation would constitute the emigration of over half a million Soviet Jews over a 24 year period, there would have been more thorough deliberations. The Dutch embassy in Moscow expected that the interest representation would not amount to too much work, as the main task would be to issue visas to emigrants going to Israel. The Israeli embassy had given out no more than a few hundred per year between 1954 and 1964. As established in chapter 2 of this thesis, there had been an increase to over 2000 in 1966, but at the onset of interest representation the Soviet authorities had announced not to issue any more exit permits following the break in relations. The tasks which remained were mainly administrative, namely the storage of the furniture from the Israeli embassy in Moscow and the settlement of exit visas of Jewish Soviet inhabitants that had already been granted by the Soviet authorities.[206]

The Dutch Prime Minister at the time, P. de Jong, said the following regarding the decision-making process:

> *"Luns was highly in favor of cooperation with the Israeli's at the time. When the topic of diplomatic representation for Israel in Moscow came up, we said: 'we'll do that.' We could do*

[202] Cleveland, W. & Bunton, M. *A History of the Modern Middle East,* p. 273.
[203] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Embassy Jerusalem to Luns 30, reference number 806344, 10/6/1967
[204] Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 159-164.
[205] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, charge d'affaires Weidema to Luns 51, reference number 6367, 11/6/1967
[206] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, charge d'affaires Weidema to Luns 50, reference number 6368, 11/6/1967

Warsaw in the same stretch. Helping Jewish people in Russia happened on a very grand scale, yet we tried to practice secrecy. Israel did not favor making public how many immigrants came from the Soviet Union either. The House of Representatives would not ask about it, and one would not speak about it. That was not only out of fear for an Arab boycott; it was also about helping a friend in need, without patting yourself on the back."[207]

The friendly sentiments that the Dutch felt towards the state of Israel, as described earlier in this paper, were not the sole reason for the Netherlands' speedy acceptance. The Dutch embassy had, of course, already performed the same duties for Israel in 1953 and was vaguely familiar with the task. According to Baudet, the Dutch policymakers were under the impression that if the Netherlands would not represent the Israeli interests, no other country would either.[208] Moreover, international courtesy alone would have demanded that the request be honored.[209]

As to why Israel asked the Netherlands to represent the young state as opposed to some other country, the answer can be found in the fact that in 1967 the Netherlands was Israel's best friend, next to the United States. The Dutch amicable feelings towards Israel must have been obvious to the Israeli policymakers in the build-up to and during the war of 1967.

During the third Arab-Israeli war of 1967, Israel was perceived by the inhabitants of the Netherlands as a little Jewish David facing an evil Arab Goliath. This led to massive outbursts of support for Israel during the crisis preceding the war and during the war itself. Youths volunteered to go to Israel to replace mobilized Israelis in civil service, many cars carried stickers that read: 'We support Israel' and sport clubs organized charity matches.

The Dutch support was also expressed by the ruling politicians at the time. Prime Minister De Jong declared in parliament that the crisis was caused by the Arab countries and that Israel's right to exist is beyond any doubt. The parliament unanimously agreed and labor- and oppositional leader Den Uyl went one step further by stating that: *"The Netherlands cannot and should not be politically neutral in the war. The Netherlands partake, ought to partake and ought to express that."* The Israeli ambassador to the Netherlands said in an interview that: *"Of course I expected the Dutch to support us, but this I did not expect. This exceeds the classification 'sympathy'; the Dutch have identified themselves with Israel"*.

[207] Translated from: Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 164.
[208] Baudet, F. '"*Het Heeft Onze Aandacht*", *Nederland en de rechten van de mens in Oost-Europa en Joegoslavie, 1972-1980',* p. 109.
[209] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 23.

At a demonstration in Amsterdam, organized by Jewish organizations, representatives from every party spoke. The labor representative, Joop den Uyl, said that: *"When I saw that thousands of you have come today, it hit me: This is Amsterdam, standing up for Jerusalem".* [210] The Catholic representative, W. Schuyt stated that: *"Whoever jeopardizes the Israeli right to life and existence, will find the Dutch opposing him"*. [211] At this demonstration it was decided to organize an economic relief effort: the Collective Israel Action. The support for this initiative was massive; a labor association agreed with employers to donate the monetary equivalent of three hours labor to Israel, the government agreed not to levy tax on this donation and requested its civil servants to agree to a donation of 0.5% of their salary over three months. Commercial companies chipped in as well.

It was not just money that was being sent to Israel, the Netherlands also supplied weapons and ammunition. Efforts were made to conceal this, out of fear for Arab boycotts. De Koster, Secretary of Foreign Affairs in 1967, stated: *"In 1967 I have agreed to export more or less all the weapons that we could to Israel. We have helped them greatly with everything they needed; at that time it was still possible"*. [212]

Peeters cites a personal conversation regarding the 1967 war with PM Piet de Jong, which he identifies as the most important man for the Dutch-Israeli alliance, next to Willem Drees:

> *"I have made quite a Pro-Israeli statement in the Second Chamber. It was the only time that I experienced full support from all the fractions; it was a matter of sympathy. Israel was founded by the United Nations, and we have quite the faith in this institution. Israel was a small country, surrounded by enemies. We were also a small country, and we felt threatened by the Russians. Moreover, the memory of our collaboration during the war was fresh and bitter. Also, I think that within important segments of our population, especially the orthodox-religious, the fact that the crisis concerned the Holy Land was also a factor. "* [213]

De Jong, a Catholic himself, did not exclusively refer to the Dutch Protestants: "*After all, Christ was also Jewish".* [214] De Jong spoke of his meeting with Golda Meir, an important Israeli diplomat and later Prime Minster (1969-1974), at a UN party in New York: *"We spoke for an hour and a half and it turned out that we are on the same line, politically. It was clear that we would support her, even though we did not discuss*

[210] Translated from: Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 144.
[211] Idem.
[212] Translated from: Grünfeld, F. *Nederland en het Midden-Oosten*, p. 11.
[213] Translated from: Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 149-150.
[214] Idem.

that in so many words. In parliament we told ourselves: if they run into trouble, we will support them as much as they need, as long as we don't need the materials ourselves." [215]

Taking into mind all these positive public expressions of sympathy, the decision to ask the Dutch embassy to represent the Israeli interests seemed a logical choice. Moreover, the Israeli policymakers preferred a small and efficient embassy that could handle affairs discretely. It would preferably have to be an embassy from a small country which was not likely to antagonize the Soviet Union too severely.

The Soviet authorities also had to agree to the Dutch interest representation for Israel in the Soviet Union, which they did.[216] The responsible Soviet organs had an interest in an efficient and discrete embassy to issue the Israeli visas to Soviet Jews once they had received their exit permits.[217] The Dutch embassy in Moscow was able to deliver just that. Moreover, if the Soviets would have not consented with the Dutch embassy taking up the task, another embassy would have had to take it on, most likely the United States embassy. This arrangement might have strained the constantly tense relations between that embassy and the Soviet authorities even further. Furthermore, the small Dutch embassy could be bullied a bit easier than the American one.[218]

The agreements that were made between the Dutch and Israeli governments at the onset of the interest representation

In a letter to the Foreign Minister, temporary envoy Weidema indicated that he had come to an agreement with the departing Israeli officials regarding the future issuance of Israeli visas and the financing of the Dutch operation on behalf of the Israeli state. [219]

As is customary in these kind of circumstances, the work of the Netherlands' officials was provided free of charge, but Israel had to refund the salaries of the Russian personnel working exclusively for the interest section, the rent of their former building, the loans that were to be extended to the future emigrants and some other miscellaneous expenses. The Soviet authorities swiftly authorized the Dutch embassy to withdraw funds from the Israeli bank account in Moscow, which was replenished whenever necessary thereafter. Financial statements were sent regularly to Jerusalem by the ministry in The

[215] Translated from: Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden*, p. 149-150.
[216] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, charge d'affaires Weidema to Luns 51, reference number 6367, 11/6/1967
[217] Confirmed in interview with Count L. J. R. de Marchant et dÁnsembourg, former Netherlands ambassador and head of the consular section, Moscow, in the Hague, January 1996. In: Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 74.
[218] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 74.
[219] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Weidema to Luns, reference number 1289/673, 13/6/1967.

Hague. During the twenty-four years of interest representation, there were no financial problems between the two nations.[220]

The Dutch and Israeli officials proposed the following procedures to Jerusalem regarding the issuance of Israeli visas for Soviet Jewish citizens:

- Application forms would not be required.
- The antecedents of applicants would not be checked. (Which meant that anyone showing a valid Soviet exit permit for emigration to Israel would be given a visa. Almost no exceptions were made to this principle during the 24 years of interest representation.)
- The number of Soviet exit permits would be noted in a newly established visa register.
- The visas were authorized with a Dutch stamp and validated for a 12 month period.
- No tickets or loans would be granted to future emigrants. (The Israeli ambassador authorized the Netherlands embassy to extend such loans just before he left.)[221]
- Emigrants would be recommended to travel to Vienna by plane, where an 'Israeli-committee' – the Jewish Agency of Israel - would receive them.
- The issuance of visas was to happen free of charge.[222]

The Israeli policymakers responded by stating that application forms would be required, and blanks of Israeli forms were sent to Moscow shortly afterwards, which remained in use throughout the representation period. All the other provisions were accepted and thus the Netherlands were ready to issue some visas.[223]

Nonetheless, the first duty of the Dutch ambassador and his staff was to facilitate their Israeli colleagues in returning home with their belongings. It is customary, in the case when diplomatic relations are broken off, that the receiving government (the Soviet authorities) allows a few nationals of the sending state (Israel) to remain in the embassy of the protective power (the Netherlands embassy) to assist with the new duties. This would have been very helpful in this case, especially when Soviet Jewish emigration rose steeply in the early 1970s. Unfortunately, the Soviets did not allow any Israeli nationals to stay on,

[220] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 25.
[221] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Weidema to Luns, reference number 1304/683-T, 14/6/1967.
[222] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Weidema to Luns, reference number 1289/673, 13/6/1967.
[223] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 25.

so they all left for Amsterdam on June 17th.[224] The customs officers proved their bureaucratic zeal by claiming that the Israeli's had lost their diplomatic immunity and refused to pass their luggage without inspection,[225] but fortunately enough the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs *(Ministerstvo Innostrannikh Del*, MID) showed better understanding for the Vienna Treaty on Diplomatic Relations and allowed the Israelis to proceed unchecked.[226]

The Dutch embassy issued a few visas to émigrés almost immediately after the break in relations, as the Soviet authorities had decided to honor the few exit permits that had already been granted. Sixty-two visas were issued during the first ten days, a total of one hundred and thirteen by July 11th, a month after the Netherlands had taken up the task, and only three more by August 8th. The ban on the issuance of new exit permits worried Israeli policymakers, who asked the Dutch Foreign Ministry to emphasize to the Netherlands embassy in Moscow that "*the Israeli government considers continuation of emigration of Soviet citizens to Israel of the utmost importance and regards this question as one of the most essential elements in the representation of Israeli interests by the Netherlands*."[227] The ambassador was instructed to visit MID and ask for a clarification of the Soviet emigration policy. The atmosphere at MID was "*stern*" and the Soviets kept speaking of "*the aggressors*" and their response was clear:

> *"There is no chance to restart emigration. One should realize that for the Russians permission to emigrate is a great concession, because a Soviet citizen is in principle a serf who is not allowed to leave his country. At the moment the circumstances are not such that this serfdom can be removed in favor of those who want to go to Israel, because the State of Israel is acting in contradiction to the role which Soviet policy assigns to it."*[228]

The administrative tasks for the embassy staff

For clarity's sake, this thesis shall subdivide the embassy's tasks into administrative or ordinary and non-administrative or extraordinary tasks. The former category, administrative tasks, consists of the issuance of loans to future émigré's, the transmission of official and nonofficial documents (which would have

[224] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, celer to Moscow embassy 60071, 17/6/1967.
[225] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Blokland to Luns, reference number 1360/703, 21/6/1967
[226] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 24 &
NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Blokland to Luns, reference number 1360/703, 21/6/1967
[227] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Luns to Moscow, reference number 143243/237, 15/8/1967
[228] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Blokland to Luns, reference number 1987/1010, 4/9/1967

been confiscated by the Soviet authorities), the deliverance of demarche's on behalf of Israel, the circulation of *vysovs* – the required, legalized invitation from Israel – between Israel and the potential Soviet Jewish émigrés, the deliverance of certificates of Israeli citizenship to *Refuseniks* and others, the keeping of *priyom* - receiving hour - every afternoon and of course, the most monumental of tasks, the issuance of visas for Israel to anyone presenting a valid exit permit. The latter category, extraordinary tasks, will be dealt with in the next chapter.

Priyom

Soviet Jewish residents that wanted anything done from the embassy were received by a Dutch official in the consulate during *Priyom,* or visiting hours. The embassy never had a separate section for the Israeli interests. In the beginning this was not an issue, since the embassy did not have much work to do in general. There were few Dutch citizens living in the Soviet Union that might require assistance and only a few Soviet officials needed visas to travel to the Netherlands. In fact, the consular work was done by a diplomat who was also tasked with handling trade relations. When the flood of emigration started in 1970, though, he soon had to neglect his other work. Russian assistants were hired and in some periods the entire embassy staff had to help out issuing visas for Israel, which could sometimes lead to issues. "*Once inside the embassy, the 'gate to freedom', emigrants are disappointed when they are still faced by Russians*", reported the embassy in 1973.[229] Despite the fact that these assistants were, like all Soviet personnel, hired through the Soviet Government Administration for Service to the Diplomatic Corps (*Upravlenye Po Obsluzhivaniyu Diplomaticheskgo Korpusa,* UPDK) and obliged to report regularly to the authorities about their work and experiences in the embassy, many Dutch consular officials expressed satisfaction with their efficiency afterwards. Moreover, the ambassador ensured the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that anyone who insisted on seeing a Dutch official was given this opportunity. [230]

Visas

The issuance of visas to prospective émigrés was the main task in relation to the interest representation, and in a sense also the easiest. The Israeli's had authorized the Dutch to grant a visa for Israel to anyone presenting a valid exit permit, without Israeli authorization. The official simply had to check the validity of the exit permit – often the only identity document left in the possession of the applicant – stamp and

[229] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14219, Bakker to Schmelzer, reference number 1014/290, 25/4/1973.
[230] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 83 &
NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14219, Bakker to Schmelzer, reference number 1014/290, 25/4/1973.

sign the Israeli visa and register it. The issuance of visas was described as an "*automatic and technical act*",[231] which only became burdensome when the number of applications took a big rise.

The embassy also issued visitors visas, of which there were few requested in the 1970s. The occasional Soviet citizen, usually elders, would receive permission to visit relatives in Israel, in which case the embassy stamped a tourist visa for Israel in the Soviet passport of the applicant. At some points in time, this action was allowed without preliminary authorization, at other times Jerusalem wanted to give its approval beforehand. At all times the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs would receive a cable from The Hague that a visa had been issued and to whom.[232]

Loans

Just before his departure from Moscow in June 1967, the Israeli ambassador had granted his Dutch colleagues permission to advance money to emigrants, which could be used to cover travel expenses up to the cost of a one-way plane ticket to Vienna.[233] At the time, there was no great demand for loans, because there were few exit permits granted to potential émigrés. Once emigration was permitted on a larger scale in 1971, the Soviet authorities decided to, 'at least', make the Soviet Jewish citizens pay large sums of money for their 'privilege'. According to an *ukase* – or decree – of September 1970, a 400 ruble fee was charged for an exit permit, and another 500 ruble fee for the rejection of the Soviet citizenship, adding up to costs of at least 900 rubles for every adult wanting to depart the Soviet Union for Israel and the Western world. Some were able to manage this by selling valuables and borrowing money from friends, but most would ask for help at the embassy,[234] which was then provided following authorization by the Israeli authorities.[235] Authorization was necessary, for the costs were unrelated to travelling and the Dutch were only authorized to give out the loan unchecked if it concerned travel expenses. When the 'wave' of emigrants started pouring out of the country in the spring of 1971, the Israeli policymakers sanctioned financial support for payment of exit documents without preliminary authorization.[236]

[231] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14223, Huydecoper to Van Der Stoel 184, 24/10/1974.
[232] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 73.
[233] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Weidema to Luns, reference number 1304/683-T, 14/6/1967.
[234] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14215, Bakker to Luns 173, 30/10/1970.
[235] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14215, Luns to embassy 82, 9/11/1970.
[236] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14216, Celer to Moscow embassy 58, 22/4/1971.

This new mechanism significantly burdened the consular staff for they now had to decide to whom loans were to be extended and how large these loans would be: "*You could not and should not honor every request in full,*" recalls Godert van Vliet, former head of the consular section. "*But which one deserved money and how much*?"[237] In Israel there was no procedure for the recovery of the loans – according to Buwalda the Israeli government did not ask for full reimbursement of the loan if it had been spent on emigration[238] - and when this became apparent among the potential émigrés, the number of requests quickly multiplied. In 1972 the Netherlands ambassador, Tammenoms Bakker, decided to restrict these kind of loans to exceptional cases, for it had become increasingly difficult to properly administer the loans.[239] After the Israeli's requested he reconsidered, the ambassador discussed the question in The Hague with Dutch and Israeli officials and stuck to his standpoint: the volume of the loans could be slightly increased but they would remain limited. Fortunately, the announced restrictions had shown to be effective and the demand soon dwindled down to manageable levels.[240]

Transmission of documents

Soviet customs officials could be extremely restrictive regarding the personal documents which emigrants wanted to take with them. These bureaucrats routinely confiscated all documents from émigrés, not just personal letters but even school and university diplomas and birth and death certificates. The Netherlands embassy was asked to transmit documents by diplomatic pouch to Israel, which it agreed to and continued to do so up to the end of the interest representation period. The Dutch policymakers in The Hague did specify this service be restricted to official documentation and not to private documents. The paperwork would be sent to The Hague in sealed diplomatic pouches, where they were handed, unopened, to the Israeli embassy for transmission to Israel. Delays were unavoidable, and the Dutch consular staff received several inquiries and complaints, which were referred to the Israeli's.

All soviet citizens allowed to enter the Netherlands embassy were checked by the militia guarding it. The bags were opened and anything the militia did not approve of was confiscated. Fortunately, there was no body search, so most future emigrants carried their important documents on their bodies. Soviet

[237] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 239.
[238] Idem.
[239] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14217, Bakker to Schmelzer 80, 12/6/1972 &
NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14217, Bakker to Schmelzer 91, 26/6/1972.
[240] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14218, Bakker to Schmelzer 105, 13/7/1972.

authorities must have been well aware of this practice, for the local staff made regular reports to them, but never put a halt to this practice. Dutch officials tried to carry out their instructions accurately, but did not always have the time to check the great amounts of documents presented to them for transport. Practically, their tendency was towards clemency, for they recognized the importance for the emigrants of the doctoral theses, scientific works and other documents that they had written in the Soviet Union, and sometimes these were allowed to 'slip through'.[241]

Nonetheless, the official attitude in The Hague remained highly restrictive, which led to a painful incident when it was discovered in 1986 that a letter from the famous *Refusenik* and political activist Josef Begun, addressed to the Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, had been resting in a file in The Hague for at least two years. The Hague had been overly cautious here, for it seems to reasonably fall within the framework of the interest representation to transmit letters from private citizens to the government which that embassy is representing. The strict attitude of the Foreign Ministry did not seem to influence the merciful attitude of many of the Dutch ambassadorial staff. Buwalda claims, based on interviews, that several employees took personal letters and manuscripts of Jewish authors with them when they went on leave.[242]

Vysovs

The first document that a prospective emigrant required was a *Vysov*, a notarized invitation from a close relative in Israel, translated into Russian and stamped by the Israeli government to confirm that it was willing to receive the invited person, persons or family. In the Soviet ideology, since no one could have any reasons to leave their 'workers' paradise', exceptions could only be made for a compassionate reason: family reunion. When Moscow thought it advantageous to allow Jewish emigration, the justification had to be that it was to bring about family reunion. Conversely, when Moscow decided to restrict emigration again, the reason was that the reunion of families "*had been basically completed*."[243]

[241] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 82.
[242] Idem, p. 239.
[243] Idem, p. 48.

Of course, not every Soviet Jew had relatives in Israel. But as an Israeli official explained:

> *"The Jews are one big family, and often a distant cousin could be found. The only criterion really was, what kind of relationship was acceptable to the Soviets? In general the people of Israel were asked to sign for relatives or nonrelatives; the degree of relationship was uncertain and the office in charge did not check that out. Both we and the Soviets understood that."*[244]

And indeed, as one would expect, it usually did not matter. When the Soviets wanted Jewish emigration, they accepted any *vysov* as long as the fiction of family reunion could be maintained. As soon as Jewish emigration was to be restricted, tight rules were applied, relationships checked and changes in the *vysovs* rejected. Illustrative, in this light, is the case of Mr. B. Olsjanskij of Kiev, who had recently received his *vysov*. It was based on the invitation of a certain Eva Krasowskaja, supposed to be Mr. Olsjanskij's sister. During his visit to the Dutch embassy in 1968, he indicated not to have any family in Israel, let alone a sister, and that he was worried that such a falsification would easily be picked up on by the Soviet authorities, who could then use it against Israel and against his own prospective emigration. Moreover, he did not believe that a *vysov* was required in the first place, for Mr. Olsjanskij had obtained an exit permit already, without having to show his *vysov*.[245]

Despite this, it could be dangerous to ask for the legalized invitation from Israel by ordinary mail. Letters to foreign countries were spotted at the post office, which regularly passed it on to the KGB, which would thus learn of the sender's intention to emigrate. This could lead to any kind of intimidation, from harassment at home or workplace to dismissal from one's job. For this reason, requests for a *vysov* were usually transmitted by others. For the delivery of *vysovs,* emigrants were faced with the same problem: the KGB routinely intercepted all incoming foreign mail. Depending on which policy was current, the KGB officials would then either send the *vysov* on to its destination, confiscate it, or call in the recipient and ask him about his intentions and his relationship with his Israeli 'relative'.

Diplomatic pouch would have been the best way to ensure that all *vysov* requests and deliverances arrived, but Israeli and Dutch authorities decided that there were objections to this procedure. The demand for *vysovs* took on flood-like proportions during the 1970s: tens of thousands were dispatched

[244] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* Interview with Yaakov Kedmi, p. 48.
[245] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Weidema to Luns, 3074/1479, 19/11/1968

by the Israeli authorities. The staff of the Netherlands embassy in Moscow was too small to adequately handle such amounts. More importantly, this procedure would enable the Soviet authorities to accuse the embassy staff of actively promoting emigration to Israel.

Vysovs constituted an integral part of the embassy work: requests for invitations were received from visitors and passed along by diplomatic pouch. Some, and sometimes many, legitimized invitations were also returned along that route. The embassy did not use the domestic mail services, instead handling the requests the same way as they had come in: they were given to visitors of the embassy that had already received their exit permits and who would then pass them on to relatives or neighbors.[246]

National certificates

The issue of national certificates has created some disagreement between Israeli and Dutch policymakers. In 1970 the Dutch embassy had received several letters from *Refuseniks* who wanted to become Israeli citizens in the hopes that this step might improve their position.[247] Almost a year later, Jerusalem announced in a press release that the government hoped to create legislation which would allow Jews to become Israeli citizens before actually emigrating to Israel.[248] On July 1st of that year, the embassy was informed that the Israeli *Knesset* had approved the amendment to the 'Law of Return' and that Israeli instructions could be expected.[249]

In a letter to The Hague, the ambassador indicated that he was adamantly opposed, calling the entire exercise "*futile*" since the Soviet authorities were not going to change their attitude, and if they were, it would be in a fashion disadvantageous for the whole emigration movement. Any initiative to approach Jews and hand them certificates would be regarded, as per usual, as an interference in Soviet internal affairs and as a provocation. Such a policy was certainly outside the boundaries of the Dutch interest representation for Israel. The Jews receiving the certificates would be disallowed to enter the embassy and might be in danger of arrest or serious intimidation. Equally importantly, any officer that was handing out certificates could be declared *persona non grata* and be expelled from the Soviet Union.[250]

[246] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 80.
[247] For example: NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14215, Van Blokland to Luns, reference number 606/239, 5/3/1970, & NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14215, Beelaerts van Blokland to Luns, reference number 1113/447, 5/5/1970.
[248] *Associated Press*, press release from Jerusalem, 17/3/1971
[249] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14216, Luns to Moscow ambassador, reference number DEU/OE-129090, 1/7/1971.
[250] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14216, Bakker to Luns, reference number 1818/525, 16/7/1971.

Moscow, The Hague and Jerusalem discussed the issue for months. On November 30th, 1971, the Dutch ambassador summed up his objections once again and put forward that an Israeli ambassador, had there been one present in Moscow, would also have warned of the possible negative outcomes of handing out Israeli citizenship certificates to Soviet Jewish citizens. Since there was no Israeli ambassador, it was now his duty to do so. The handing out of such certificates would endanger both the Dutch embassy staff and the recipients and was therefore, "*in view of the Soviet mentality, unwise*". Should the ministry nonetheless decide to grant the Israeli wish, then the document should at least indicate that it would not automatically absolve recipients from their duties as a Soviet citizen.[251] The Dutch Foreign Ministry informed the Israeli ambassador that the Dutch would not be granting Israeli citizenships, for it would not be in conformity with generally recognized international practice. Israeli authorities responded by stating to understand the reason for the Dutch decision and that they would now send the citizenship papers directly to the recipients. On the certificate, it would be clearly stated that the granting of Israeli citizenship did not automatically abolish the recipients' Soviet citizenship or entitle bearers to expect assistance from the Netherlands embassy.[252]

In October 1972 the legal advisor to the Israeli Foreign Ministry went to The Hague to once more plead for the Moscow embassy to deliver the certificates.[253] The embassy received instructions from the (new) Foreign Minister to indeed deliver the certificates to the recipients. The ambassador addressed a personal letter to the Secretary General of the Ministry to inquire whether it was indeed the Minister's intention to reverse the policy formerly agreed on. He had been warned twice that month that the embassy should not exceed what was appropriate and to execute these new instructions would be to play into the hands of the KGB. The ambassador received his answer a week later: the minister had carefully considered the matter but was "*willing to take an accommodating attitude*".[254] At the instigation of the ambassador, the Dutch demanded that at least a sentence be added stating that: "*persons granted Israeli nationality are not released automatically from the citizenship of their country of residence*".[255]

[251] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14216, Bakker to Luns, reference number 3125/917, 30/11/1971.
[252] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14217, Internal memorandum DEU 2/72, 4/1/1972.
[253] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14218, Internal memorandum DEU 137, 6/10/1972.
[254] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14218, Schmelzer to Bakker, 21/12/1972.
[255] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 78.

Despite this, the files in the National Archive do not show that any of such certificates were ever transmitted to the embassy during the 1970s. A later report mentions "*a few dozen certificates sent*". Most likely, most certificates were sent by mail directly from Israel.

Israeli demarches

Demarches constituted a major aspect of the interest representation that the Netherlands provided for Israel. In general, diplomatic actions could only be taken at MID, the Soviet Foreign Ministry. The Dutch were well aware of the Soviet perception of demarches in favor of human rights situations. Steps by the ambassador, or his deputy, on behalf of Jewish prisoners or *Refuseniks* were customarily met with indignation. The MID officer would state that this subject concerned Soviet citizens and that the deliverer of the demarche was trying to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. The Dutch diplomat would then usually answer that he was speaking out of "*humanitarian concern*" only.[256]

The expectations for a positive outcome of a demarche were always low. The archive on the Dutch diplomatic mission in Moscow is filled with civilian requests for the assistance of a certain individual, family or group, originating from Israel, the Netherlands, the United States and many other, mostly Western European, nations. Heartbreaking as these requests might be, due to the minimal results yielded through demarches in favor of certain individuals, the Dutch representatives would see no grounds to undertake any action in response to the requests. Moreover, it was thought best not to irritate the Soviet authorities and to avoid endangering the embassy's work on behalf of Jewish emigrants. [257] Furthermore, the Dutch were, as interest representatives for Israel, concerned with the whole Jewish community, so they deemed it better not to mention individual cases. A typical response to one of such requests would look similar to the following one from 1968, during the visa-stop:

> "*Dear Mrs. Suganas,*
>
> *In answer to your letter of March 3, I regret to inform you that at the present moment an intervention by this embassy on behalf of your brother and his family, who wish to emigrate to Israel, would be useless.*

[256] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 84.
[257] Idem.

As you may know, the Soviet authorities have stopped issuing visa for emigration to Israel since the breaking-off of diplomatic relations. Many people who already had been granted permission to leave the Soviet Union were refused a visa. Quite a number of these persons had already made all necessary preparations for the journey. In some cases of special hardship, this embassy has been trying to persuade the authorities to make an exception, so far without success.

As long as no result has been obtained in these cases, no further step can be undertaken by this embassy."[258]

Buwalda claims that "*during the 1970s (…) diplomatic demarches were undertaken exclusively at the request of the Israeli authorities within the framework of the interest representation*",[259] with exception to the Dutch demarche carried out during the Leningrad Trial. This statement will be scrutinized in the following chapter. In the name of the Israeli's, demarches were made regularly, for example on behalf of the famous dissident Anatoli Sharansky.

On the 7th of August 1967, the Dutch ambassador received a cable in which the Israeli's requested "*that everything possible be done to help the two girls to rejoin their parents*." The two girls referred to were members of the Zhulkover household which had successfully applied for exit permits, Israeli visa and Austrian transit visas. On receiving their passports, it was noticed that the photos of the daughters were 'mistakenly' exchanged and put on the wrong passports. At the suggestion of the Soviet visa office they left the two passports to be corrected. According to the cable,

"The matter dragged on for weeks and in the meantime war broke out in the Middle East. Major Orzov of the Kishinev OVIR told them they will not get back their passports. The parents, faced with the eventuality that their exit permits would expire, decided after long hesitation to separate from their daughters and in the meantime arrived in Israel. The daughters are now staying with acquaintances at the abovementioned address, having liquidated their belongings and with no means of subsistence. On July 5th they again went to the OVIR in Kishinev and were told by Major Orzov that he does not know when they will get their passports."[260]

[258] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, van Blokland to Mrs. Liuba Suganas in Haifa, 693, 18/3/1968
[259] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 84.
[260] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Israeli embassy the Hague to van Blokland, 7-08-1967.

On September 4th of that year the ambassador notified the Dutch Foreign Minister that he had executed this demarche at MID but that he had encountered a:

> *"pretty grim mood. Repeatedly there was talk of 'the aggressors'. I maintain my judgment that the sisters Zhulkover will eventually be allowed to emigrate and with them more who are in the possession of an exit visa yet not able to leave because the authorities refused to provide them with travel tickets."*[261]

In May 1968, almost a year since ambassador van Blokland delivered his Israeli demarche, a member of the Dutch consular staff heard that the Soviets had come to a positive decision regarding the Zhulkover sisters: they would be allowed to exit and join their family. Van Blokland notified Luns that he would inform the Zhulkover sisters and that he would let them know that when necessary, the embassy would be willing to cover the transit to Vienna.[262]

The Zhulkower sisters were eventually, it still took two months, escorted to a KLM plane which took them to Amsterdam, where they were to be picked up by an official of the Israeli embassy in The Hague. This route was chosen because the customary route, through Vienna, was fully booked and because it seemed that: "*for both the Zhulkover sisters as for the Soviet authorities, it would seem psychologically unjust to stretch their stay in this country*."[263]

Demarches in the name of the Israeli's were commonplace, even though they were usually to no avail. Demarches were not solely executed in favor of the *Refuseniks,* the liberalization of Soviet emigrational policies and other major human rights issues, but also for seemingly trivial causes such as the recovery of documents and personal items. In a letter from the Ambassador to the Foreign Minister, for example, the Ambassador reports on an Israeli demarche he executed, unsuccessfully, in order to retrieve a watch that was confiscated from a certain Mrs. Jakobson at the airport as she was about to emigrate to Israel.[264]

[261] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, van Blokland to Luns, 1987/1010, 4-09-1967.
[262] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, van Blokland to Luns, 1293/663, 15/5/1968
[263] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, van Blokland to Luns, 1503/771, 7/7/1968
[264] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14215, van Blokland to Luns, 60/17, 8/1/1970

The policy regarding publicity

The Dutch Foreign Ministry maintained and demanded maximum confidentiality regarding the work done on behalf of Israel. According to the Ministry, it was up to the Israeli authorities to decide what should and what should not be published. No information about any activities should therefore be provided from the Dutch side. Regarding this policy, one of the Dutch bureaucrats commented that: "*After all, our task is to maintain the relations between the Soviet Union and the Netherlands, but we also have to cherish our friendly relationship with Israel. In fact, we are constantly maneuvering*".[265] Laurentius van Gorp, head of the consular section from 1974 up to 1977, was aware of the delicacies that his job entailed: "*You cannot properly do your job if you say certain things, that don't land well with the other. That's why we prefer to say nothing and just do our job*."[266] Dutch officials went to great lengths, for example, to keep the number of visas issued a secret, information that was often sought after by foreign journalists and other embassies. When a journalist found out that they could keep track of the serial numbers to find out how many Israeli visas had been issued, the embassy immediately started a new series.[267] In the eighties, it was discovered that the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs had knowledge of the number of visas issued and the Netherlands embassy in Moscow had to apologize: numbers had indeed been given "*on a confidential basis*" to the German and American embassies. "*This practice would be stopped immediately"*.[268] Van Gorp was one of the few who had knowledge regarding the numbers, during his time as head of the consular section. *"I would never want to be in his shoes, for he must be under enormous pressure*", was commented by an anonymous diplomat from a fellow Western European embassy.[269]

Buwalda has posed the question whether this secretive policy was really necessary.[270] There seem to be no requests for secrecy from the Israeli policymakers in any of the files, and the number of emigrants leaving the Soviet Union for Austria was registered by the Jewish Agency in Vienna and monitored by the International Committee on Migration, where any party could obtain numbers on the migration of Soviet Jews. Moreover, the secrecy made it harder for Dutch officials in Moscow to explain what they were doing and to maintain good relations with the press and their Eastern and Western colleagues. On the other hand, the secrecy can be viewed as a courtesy towards the Israeli's: the work was done for

[265] Nederland laveert Joden Rusland uit, *Het Vaderland.*
[266] Idem
[267] NA, 28/1/1975
[268] NA, 20&21/10/1982
[269] Nederland laveert Joden Rusland uit, *Het Vaderland.*
[270] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 87-88.

Israel and questions of internal policy might be involved. Buwalda argues that sometimes this secrecy was used too quickly and too easily to head off questions from parliamentarians, press representatives and citizens.

The cooperation with the Soviet officials and the KGB

The Dutch consular staff in Moscow mainly interacted, directly and indirectly, with two Soviet institutions: MID (the Soviet Foreign Ministry) and the KGB. As stated in the previous section, MID was the place to go to for official diplomatic actions. No other Soviet authority would accept contact with foreign diplomats, and once there, one could only discuss matters that were indicated and approved of in advance. Buwalda explains the difference between the bureaucratic processes as we know them in the Western world to the Soviet bureaucracy:

> *"In an office in a Western nation a task might be accomplished in a few minutes, but in the Soviet Union one had to wait for the better part of a day. The Soviet bureaucracy traced its roots directly to the czarist bureaucracy, which in turn had incorporated the worst characteristics of the officialdom of Byzantium. The bureaucracy was not there to serve the people; to the contrary, citizens had to come and beg for its services. To show a kindness, or even civility, to its customers would lower the exalted position of the bureaucracy in the eyes of its officials."*[271]

This sense of 'the bureaucracy was not there to serve the people' applied equally to foreign diplomats, especially when their business concerned Soviet Jewish emigration. Most of the archival reports on official visits and demarches at MID state that "*the concerned persons are Soviet citizens, you are mingling into our affairs, we have good reasons not to provide them with exit visas, and questions like these fall under the exclusive competence of MID*."[272] Often, the Dutch ambassador or envoy would question whether it would be useful to execute certain demarches in the first place, or that they might actually damage the potential émigré's prospects of leaving the country:

> *"…unfortunately, I see severe objections to intervention on behalf of all these cases. The agitated responses which previous interventions yielded, make me fear that they had an inverted effect. (…) On top of this, the amount of civilian letters requesting intervention on behalf of someone make it*

[271] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 49.
[272] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14214, van Blokland to Luns, 2253/983, 6/8/1969

impossible for me to ascertain which cases are worth the minimal amount of support that we can offer and which are not. On the Soviet side, it is seen as a grand concession that the emigration has already reached its current volume…."

The other major institution that the Dutch consular staff interacted with, be it in a much less direct fashion, was the KGB. In an effort to underline the workings of this security apparatus, Dutch ambassador Bakker wrote the following to his Foreign Minister in 1972:

"After all, the German occupation of the Netherlands has shown us that in a totalitarian state, there can be much rivalry between the separate branches of government and that some of those practically make their own decisions, unregulated. This applies particularly well to the political secret service. These, for clarity's sake I shall group them under the known abbreviation KGB, are anything but happy with the Jewish emigration. In their eyes they are concerned with dissidents that should be locked up, if only to prevent other minorities of growing incentive to resist the state and desire emigration."[273]

Possessing a high degree of autonomy and acting on the basis of ingrained anti-Semitism,[274] the KGB actively sought to discourage Soviet Jewish emigration. The KGB even had a special department working on Jewish problems: Department 8, 'on the struggle against Zionism'. According to an interviewee of Buwalda, "*it controlled all the struggle against Zionism at the international level and promoted and spread anti-Semitic sentiments all over the world, especially in the Arab countries*."[275]

In the same letter from 1972, Dutch ambassador Bakker recognized three ways in which the KGB tried to hinder Soviet Jewish emigration, besides 'general preventive repression':

"Firstly, intimidation and arbitrariness have been practiced against families that had already acquired their exit visa. Secondly, traps have been set in order to create situations in which the Dutch consular staff can be declared personae non gratae, or situations that force their own government to call them back. Both situations would mean a setback on the pace of Jewish emigration. Thirdly, over the last few months, warnings to stay within the boundaries of the

[273] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14218, Bakker to Luns, 3331/785-GS-419, 27/12/1972.
[274] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 153.
[275] Idem, p. 152-153.

interest representation have reached the embassy, and me personally, in a fashion typical for the Soviet apparatus."[276]

An example of such warnings can be found in 1971, when the Dutch diplomat charged with consular affairs was told by his maid that "*he should not mix too much with the Jews*".[277] This maid had obviously been engaged through her employer, the UPDK, which was under the control of the KGB, for a simple Russian woman had no way of finding out whether her boss was 'mixing' with Jews or not.

Next to obstruction and intimidation, the KGB also engaged in manipulation in relation to the Dutch embassy. It is well known that the KGB had tried to send out spies with falsified *vysovs* along this emigration route, and there was a strong suspicion in the Netherlands embassy that the KGB had also tried to get rid of common criminals this way. Moreover, non-Jewish 'unruly elements' were at times also disposed of via this way. Nehamiah Levanon, the head of *Lishka*, the Bureau of Scientific Relations of the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, went to The Hague in 1972 to report that the Israeli authorities were well aware that the Soviets sometimes used emigration to Israel to get rid of non-Jewish dissidents, such as members of Helsinki Watch Groups, who were allowed, or forced, to go into exile. Specifically, he mentioned the brother-in-law of the famous dissident Vladimir Bukovsky.[278] In 1976, another dissident, Andrei Amalrik, had been sent to the embassy by the KGB to request an invitation from Israel, despite being of non-Jewish descent. Some others had been forced to leave in this way as well, according to the embassy.[279]

Curiously, the KGB has been of actual assistance to the Dutch embassy at least once. In 1971, right before the start of the 'second exodus', the embassy reported that a Scandinavian diplomat had been told by a *Pravda* journalist that the Soviet authorities had decided to let 30,000 Jews emigrate within the next two years. The ambassador noted that there had indeed been an increase in visa applications in the past month and that the information seemed correct.[280] Somehow the ambassador failed to report that the secretary in charge of the consulate had received similar information. *Pravda* journalist Victor Louis, who later became famous and notorious for passing on KGB messages and who was generally believed

[276] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14218, Bakker to Luns, 3331/785-GS-419, 27/12/1972.
[277] Heinemann, interview. See also embassy, internal memorandum, March 3, 1971. In: Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 74.
[278] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14217, Internal memorandum DEU 2/72, 4/1/1972.
[279] NA, 29/3/1976.
[280] NA, 2/4/1972

to be working for that organization, had visited the embassy to warn that visa applications would triple in the coming year.[281]

Conclusion

This chapter has presented some facts regarding the task of Dutch interest representation for Israel in Moscow. When the Soviet Union broke off their diplomatic relations with Israel in the summer of 1967, following a war in the Middle East, the Dutch policymakers responded positively to the Israeli request whether the Dutch embassy would represent Israeli interests in the Soviet Union. The Dutch needed little time to deliberate, for it was a common courtesy to take up such a task, especially for a closely allied country such as Israel.

The main tasks for the Dutch delegates consisted of standard consular work, primarily the issuance of visas for Israel to all those presenting a valid exit permit. This task alone meant the issuance of somewhere between 550.000 and 570.000 exit visas for Soviet Jews wishing to emigrate, over the whole period of interest representation for Israel. Other standard tasks included the care for the building that housed the Israeli delegation, the transmission of documents and other paperwork, the circulation of *Vysovs* (legalized invitation to Israel), the deliverance of Israeli demarches, the issuance of loans to Jewish émigrés and the issuance of national certificates, of which the latter two categories created considerable strife between the Dutch and Israeli authorities.

The Dutch maintained a strict policy regarding confidentiality: the Foreign Ministry maintained and demanded maximum confidentiality regarding the work done on behalf of Israel, for it was up to the Israeli authorities to decide what should and should not be published. The interactions with the Soviet authorities occurred mainly through MID and the KGB and was difficult, to say the least. In Soviet society, the bureaucracy was not there to serve the people (or diplomats), on the contrary, one was considered lucky to be heard. Most interactions with MID were relatively fruitless and Dutch officials, when they were received, were usually unkindly told that they were mingling into internal Soviet affairs. The KGB actively sought to obstruct, intimidate and manipulate the Dutch embassy and the Soviet Jewish emigres in an effort to hinder migration.

[281] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 33.

Chapter four: Concerning the steps that have been undertaken as a part of the Dutch representation of Israeli interests, can one speak of Dutch policy?

The previous chapter has given an overview of the established facts concerning the Dutch interest representation for Israel in the USSR. This chapter will address one of the components of the Dutch interest representation which is still debated. There has been scholarly debate on the Dutch Soviet policy, specifically on whether or not the Dutch executed demarches and other diplomatic engagements with the Soviet authorities in the late 1960s and early 1970s solely on the instructions of the Israeli authorities or whether there was some space for Dutch initiatives. This chapter will discuss the matter of Dutch agency during the period of interest representation. Can one speak of *Dutch* policy or was it merely an administrative service that was provided following instructions from Israel?

Introduction into historiographical debate

The question whether the steps that have been undertaken as a part of the Dutch interest representation for Israel can be qualified as Dutch policy has been put forward repeatedly by Floribert Baudet.[282] In order to answer this question, it is important to review where the policies, demarches and other pursuits that the Dutch delegates undertook in Moscow originated. Did the Dutch solely undertake actions when it was on Israeli instructions, or can one recognize certain initiatives employed as a part of Dutch policy? Buwalda, Baudet and Peeters have made some statements regarding this subject, which contradict each other. This chapter starts by presenting the current debate on the subject, and will then proceed to present evidence from archival research, in order to shed more light on, and hopefully settle, this debate.

Among the deniers of Dutch agency during the interest representation for Israel in the USSR is former Dutch ambassador to the USSR (1986-1990) Petrus Buwalda, who finished his dissertation on the subject of the Dutch interest representation for Israel in 1996 and published a book in it in 1997.[283] In it, he claims that:

[282] Baudet, F. *'Het Heeft Onze Aandacht'*, p. 108. &
Baudet, F. 'Book review: *Refuseniks*: het drama van de Joodse emigratie uit de Sovjet-Unie en de Nederlandse rol daarbij 1967-1991'. p. 375.
[283] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone.*

"*During the 1970s such diplomatic demarches were undertaken exclusively at the request of the Israeli authorities within the framework of the interest representation. The Dutch demarche carried out during the Leningrad Trial was the single exception.*

(…)
Demarches in favor of Refuseniks, except at the request of the Israeli government, also remained excluded. An internal ministry memorandum of August 15th, 1977 made this very clear:

For over ten years it has been standing practice that no initiatives are taken by the Netherlands in order to obtain exit permits for Soviet citizens. There is neither reason nor latitude to deviate from this line of conduct.

In the name of the Israeli's, however, demarches were made regularly, for example for Sharansky. Purely Dutch demarches on humanitarian grounds did not start until the early 1980s.

(...)

While the fear of harming the interest representation generally precluded any action in favor of Refuseniks or prisoners on behalf of the Netherlands itself, demarches in the name of Israel regarding Refuseniks and prisoners were frequently carried out."[284]

Baudet adds to this statement that the Dutch embassy always did tread lightly in respect to maintaining contacts with Soviet citizens. This was based on the fear not to endanger the interest representation for Israel, and the underlying intention was not to endanger the dissidents. If they wanted to get in touch with the Dutch embassy, they would have to choose to take the initiative by themselves, considering the risks for the concerned dissident.[285]

In an article which was published in 2001, Baudet puts forward this statement again, saying that:

[284] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 85-88.
[285] Baudet, F. *'Het Heeft Onze Aandacht',* p. 132-133.

"*Dutch interference deemed ostentatious could easily irritate the regime in Moscow, which could then install countermeasures. This given has led to the standing practice that the Dutch government would not conduct diplomatic steps, except at the specific request of the Israeli authorities.*"[286]

Moreover, in his dissertation Baudet states that:

"*Next to the issuance of entrance visa for Israel, a standard task, the Dutch interest representation also consisted of the execution of demarches in favor of Refuseniks. In these cases, to avert the standard Soviet argument of mingling into internal affairs, the executioners of the demarche always pointed out the humanitarian aspect of these demarches and emphasized the fact that it was executed following an explicit Israeli instruction*."[287]

On the other side of the debate, arguing in favor of Dutch agency, is Frans Peeters, a former *Parool* Journalist and editor at *Vrij Nederland* and author of a book which argues for a 'special relationship' between Israel and the Netherlands.[288] He does not agree with the claims made by Buwalda and Baudet. He states, citing Dutch rabbi Soetendorp:

"*Refuseniks were helped through the Dutch embassy. The ministry of Foreign Affairs in The Hague also cooperated. Demarches in favor of captive or ill Refuseniks were sent regularly through diplomatic channels… Avital Sharansky, who did get an exit visa and was visiting The Hague, was terrified over the fate of her husband. We held a press conference and drove to the Catshuis afterwards. Prime Minister Lubbers had requested to meet her. Following the advice of the ministry of Foreign Affairs, there were no journalists allowed at this meeting. When we had said goodbye and were already seated in the car that was waiting for us, Lubbers walked out, approached the car and said: 'I've given it another thought. You know what, I'll call Thatcher to have her exert pressure on the Russians in order to free Sharansky*."[289]

Baudet adds to this side of the argument in his review of Buwalda's *They Did Not Dwell Alone:*

[286] Baudet, F. '"Zie, ik Breng hen uit het Land van het Noorden" Nederlandse Belangenbehartiging voor Israel Tijdens de Koude Oorlog 1967-1991', p. 9.
[287] Baudet, F. *'Het Heeft Onze Aandacht',* p. 108.
[288] Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden.*
[289] Idem, p. 166-167.

"*The fact that he repeats a number of incorrect statements from his dissertation seems to indicate that he has mostly used that text as a basis. According to him, the Netherlands would only undertake initiative in Moscow in the eighties for the Jews that wanted to emigrate (69), where this actually already happened in 1978 following the arrest and conviction of Anatoly Sharansky. Foreign Minister Max van der Stoel supposedly did not mention human rights when he visited Moscow in 1974, where he actually – as we know through other sources – was told by Brezjnev that he could not really appreciate this 'Dutch cabaret*'."[290]

In sum, there is disagreement among the established authorities on the subject as to whether and to what degree the Dutch diplomatic mission in Moscow maintained agency with respect to the interest representation for Israel in the former Soviet Union during the late 1960s and the 1970s. Buwalda and Baudet argue in favor of little to no agency; stating that diplomatic demarches were undertaken exclusively at the request of the Israeli authorities within the framework of the interest representation and that no initiatives are taken by the Netherlands in order to assist and obtain exit permits for Soviet citizens. Peeters does not agree with this thesis and is supported in this by Baudet, who seems to refute his own statements from 2001[291] in his 2006 review of Buwalda's *They Did Not Dwell Alone.* Both have put forward instances that are indicative of an autonomous Dutch policy with respect to the interest representation.

Work and services provided in the context of Dutch interest representation which exceeded the agreed interest representation

Through archival research, some reports of actions, initiatives and policies have been found which suggest a certain willingness among the staff of the Dutch embassy in Moscow to do work and provide extra services to some of the potential Soviet Jewish emigrants, work and services that certainly stretch, and sometimes cross, the margins of the agreed interest representation. To support this claim, the following chapter will provide archival evidence, after which a conclusion will be formulated.

[290] Baudet, F. 'Book review: *Refuseniks*: het drama van de Joodse emigratie uit de Sovjet-Unie en de Nederlandse rol daarbij 1967-1991', p. 376.
[291] Baudet, F. *'Het Heeft Onze Aandacht'*, p. 132-133.

Dutch emigrational route

It appears that the Dutch embassy has, in exceptionally poignant cases, provided temporary visas for the Netherlands to Soviet Jews that were unable to obtain permission to emigrate to Israel. The recipients of these exit visas were always expected to journey onwards to Israel from the Netherlands, which has caused the occasional friction with the Dutch justice department when the émigrés refuse to move to Israel and stick around in the Netherlands.[292]

The first time that a suggestion of this kind came up can be found in August 1967, mere months following the start of the interest representation for Israel by the Dutch delegation in Moscow. In a message from ambassador Blokland to the Dutch minister of Foreign Affairs, the ambassador refers to a recent embassy visitor, soviet citizen and war veteran Mark Nemirowsky, who handed over a written request for a temporary visa for the Netherlands for him and his partner Sheyla Leibowitch, at the suggestion of the soviet visa bureau in his hometown Kiev. The Israeli authorities had agreed to his emigration plans, but the soviet authorities postponed his request due to the severance of the diplomatic ties between the two countries.[293]

In his letter, the ambassador addresses a number of questions that are raised by this request; whether the request is agreeable for the Soviet authorities and whether it is a precedent which the Dutch authorities wish to establish. Moreover, if the Dutch authorities agree to this route, should the Nemirowsky's be offered a settlement permit, which would allow them to liquidate their soviet belongings, or a tourist visa, which would not allow them to do so?[294]

In his reply,[295] the Foreign Minister stated that in his view, the emigration of Mark Nemirowskij and his wife can only be seen in light of their planned establishment in Israel. Luns indicated that he could not agree to any other representation of facts from the official Dutch side towards the Soviet authorities, because the concerned émigrés had already indicated their intentions at the Soviet visa office. The Nemirowskij's would not be the last to take the indirect emigration route through the Netherlands.

[292] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, internal memo DAZ/VZ to DEU/OE, 99/67, 19/12/1967.
[293] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, van Blokland to Luns, 1835/931, 15/08/1967.
[294] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, van Blokland to Luns, 1835/931, 15/08/1967.
[295] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Luns to van Blokland, DEU/OE-151526/247, 28/08/1967.

The case of Mr. Uri Foerstadt was an example of an exceptionally poignant situation. On August 22nd of that year, Uri Foerstadt checked in at the embassy with the request that the Dutch embassy support his request for an Israeli exit visa. He arrived in the USSR to visit his sister on the 10th of June, the day on which hostilities broke out in the Middle-East. He had left the USSR three years prior with some other family members. After arriving at his sisters' residence, he was pressured by her and her surroundings not to return to Israel, for Israel was in Soviet society seen as the aggressor in this conflict. Foerstadt gave in to the pressure and successfully applied for a passport at the local OWIR, at which occasion the OWIR officials withheld his Soviet entrance and exit visa.

Foerstadt wanted to return to Israel because of concerns about his parents' health. His request for an exit visa was denied, on which occasion the OWIR officials pointed out the policy - installed since the severance of diplomatic ties between Israel and the Soviet Union - not to provide exit visas for that country. His argument that he is an Israeli citizen was not accepted, for he was seen as a Soviet citizen ever since his earlier request to stay in the Soviet Union was granted. Since then, his situation has been especially dire, for he has fallen out with his family, cannot expect support from the Soviet authorities and is not likely to be employed.

After expressing his doubts about the emotional stability of Mr. Foerstadt, the Ambassador questioned whether he is still an Israeli citizen according to Israeli nationality law. In this case, he would support Mr. Foerstadt's request, despite the fact that he doubts it will have any success.[296]

On September 21st of that year, ambassador van Blokland received a letter from the consular division of the Israeli ministry for Foreign Affairs. In it, it was indicated that they were aware of the Foerstadt case in general terms. They informed the Ambassador of "*a slanderous article against Israel based on a conversation with him, published in a newspaper in the town of Ivanovo*". However, "*this fact of course does not alter the status of Mr. Uri Foerstadt as an Israeli national according to our laws and therefore we do have to assist him in every possible way with the Soviet authorities, in order to enable him to return to Israel*".[297]

[296] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, van Blokland to Luns, 1908/964, 23/08/1967.
[297] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Israeli Consular Division of Foreign Affairs to van Blokland, 2968/95, 21/9/1967.

In the latter half of November of that year the embassy and the Foreign Minister exchanged coded messages concerning the Foerstadt situation: he had visited the embassy, requesting financial aid.[298] Luns agreed to the suggested financial support of a monthly 100 Rubles.[299] Foerstadt had also informed whether it would be possible that he could seek refuge at the embassy grounds. He was told that first of all, this would be impossible and second of all, that this would only intensify his difficulties with the Soviet authorities.[300]

In a follow-up letter, temporary charge d'affaires Weidema reports on Foerstadt's visit to the Soviet emigration office. Foerstadt was told there that the Soviet officials had strict instructions not to issue any exit visa for Israel, but that they might view a request for an exit visa for the Netherlands in a different light.[301] After some internal debate at the concerned departments, the Moscow mission was instructed that the Dutch authorities agreed and that the Israeli embassy in The Hague would cover the travel expenses to the Netherlands.[302] The Dutch justice department would only allow it, though, after receiving certain guarantees from the Israeli government, namely that Mr. Foerstadt would indeed be allowed into Israel and that the Israeli's were willing to cover any expenses related to the possibility of Mr. Foerstadt's extended stay in the Netherlands. This fear was based on previous unpleasant experiences with Israeli's and aspiring Israeli's that indicated a desire to travel to Israel from an Eastern European state through the Netherlands. More specifically, some of those emigres did not proceed to travel to Israel and stayed in the Netherlands.[303]

Foerstadt finally flew to Amsterdam in October 1968. The embassy employee specifically pointed out the mental instability of Mr. Foerstadt and, in that light, insisted on someone to pick him up from the airport to ensure his continued journey to Israel.[304]

In May 1968 the Ambassador received a letter in which he was instructed to cooperate with the emigration to Israel, through the Netherlands, of the Kvint family of six. This decision, made by the Foreign Minister, the Managing Board General Affairs and the immigration department, was based on a guarantee of the Israeli consul that they would be granted Israeli visas in the Netherlands, as was done

[298] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Weidema to Foreign Ministry, 122, reference number 11567, 21/11/1967.
[299] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Luns to Moscow embassy, 58, reference number 7953, 24/11/1967.
[300] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Weidema to Luns, 2337/1434, 21/11/1967.
[301] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Weidema to Luns, 2880/1490, 30/11/1967.
[302] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Luns to Moscow Embassy, DEU/OE-217068/399, 29/12/1967.
[303] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, internal memo DAZ/VZ to DEU/OE, 99/67, 19/12/1967.
[304] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Beelaerts to celer The Hague 60461, 30/9/1968.

for earlier Russian Jews using this route, and based on a guarantee of financial support from a Dutch relative. The Kvint family were to tell the authorities they were applying to visit their relatives in the Netherlands, after which they would return to the USSR.[305]

In his response, the ambassador explained his doubts about the Soviet response to the deceit. The authorities might suspect that the visit of the Kvint family to the Netherlands is a precursor to their emigration to Israel. Moreover, ambassador van Blokland indicates that in cases such as these the authorities usually withhold visa for one or more of the family members, in order to have a guarantee that the whole family returns. In this light, he doubts that both parents will receive the exit visa.[306] In his response, Luns indicated that it seemed preferable to pretend emigration to the Netherlands, in order to ensure exit visa for the entire Kvint family.[307]

Logically, the ambassador felt the need to express his doubts regarding this plan. In his view, the "*issuance of such an untrue statement will lead to a future lack of credibility with the Soviet authorities*". Next to this, he asks for a clarification on the Dutch directive on indirect emigration to Israel.[308]

In his response, Foreign Minister Luns states that the false declaration, regarding the emigration of the Kvint family to the Netherlands, can in fact be seen as consistent with the truth, for if the family would decide to stay in the Netherlands upon arrival, this would be allowed by the Dutch government.[309]

Regarding the ambassador's question on whether there is a Dutch policy on the indirect emigrational route, the Foreign Minister indicated that there is no fixed policy and that the usage of the indirect emigrational route through the Netherlands was only to happen in exceptional cases, following consultations with the Dutch Foreign Ministry, Justice Department and the Israeli authorities. [310]

More proof of policies involving a 'Dutch emigration route' can be found in 1969. In a message to the Dutch ambassador in Moscow, Minister of Foreign Affairs Joseph Luns authorizes ambassador van Blokland to issue entrance visas to the Netherlands for the four members of the Klebanova family from

[305] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Luns to van Blokland, DAV/VZ-84800/164, 10/05/1968
[306] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, van Blokland to Luns, 1504/773, 7/7/1968.
[307] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Luns to van Blokland, DAZ/VZ-103993/200, 19/6/1968.
[308] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, van Blokland to Luns, 1712/908, 2/7/1968.
[309] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Luns to van Blokland, DAZ/VZ-118558/233, 16/7/1968.
[310] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14213, Luns to van Blokland, DAV/VZ-118558/233, 16/7/1968.

Riga.[311] The Foreign Minister deemed it wise to maintain extreme secrecy in relation to the real danger of repercussions directed against subsequent attempts to use the 'Dutch emigration route'. Therefore, he ordered the cable to be destroyed after reading.[312]

There are no indications that this route of emigration has been practiced after the emigration of the Klebanova household in December 1969. It seems reasonable to assume that the practice has been discontinued following the Klebanova voyage. From the correspondence between the ambassador and the Foreign Minister one can deduce the most likely reasons for this: The Dutch ambassador was worried that the continued practice, especially the deceit, would upset the Soviets, which in turn could damage the Dutch interest representation for Israel. Likely, the alternate emigration service that applied to a few was weighed against the interest representation for Israel and the Soviet Jewry as a whole, where the latter took precedent over the former. One can question the validity of this fear, for the Soviets seemed to be aware of the practice, at least in the cases of Foerstadt and Nemirowsky. Another likely reason for the discontinuation of this specific service is that the Dutch Justice and Immigration department did not seem overly excited with the risks that came with the employ of this emigrational route, especially when the Soviet Jews refrained from moving on to Israel, settling in the Netherlands instead. Finally, the practice was initiated during the time in which the Soviet Union did not allow any migration to Israel at all, but after the emigration slowly built up again, this was no longer the sole instrument to get Jews with the desire to leave the Soviet Union out.

The anxiety concerning prospective Israeli's settling in the Netherlands, expressed by the Dutch Justice and Immigration department early on in December 1967, was based on earlier experiences and does suggest that there have been other instances where the indirect emigration route was used to move Jews out of the Soviet Union. Either the reports of these cases did not make it into the archives of the Moscow embassy, a likely scenario for one of the reports found in the archive was ordered to be destroyed after reading[313] - which clearly did not happen - or these immigrants were based in other countries, satellite-states of the Soviet Union such as Poland for example, where the Dutch had a separate embassy where the reports were filed.

[311] NA, Secret Archive BuZa 1967-1974, 25803, Luns to van Blokland 94, ref nr 409061, 2/12/1969.
[312] NA, Secret Archive BuZa 1967-1974, 25803, Luns to van Blokland 94, ref nr 409061, 2/12/1969.
[313] NA, Secret Archive BuZa 1967-1974, 25803, Luns to van Blokland 94, ref nr 409061, 2/12/1969.

Demarches

In the previous chapter it has been established that the Dutch ambassador regularly visited MID, the Soviet Ministry of Foreign affairs, to deliver Israeli demarches. These demarches were delivered regularly and the subjects ranged from extremely sensitive, such as pleads for *Refusenik* leaders such as Sharansky and Lerner and the two Zhulkover sisters that were separated from their parents, to more trivial cases such as the retrieval of a watch for a certain Mrs. Jakobson or the request for the (re)issuance of certain personal documents of emigres', such as birth certificates or diploma's. These Israeli demarches, executed by the Dutch, were predominantly ineffective: the usual response to any demarche was that the persons concerned were Soviet citizens and that the demarche meant interference in an internal Soviet affair, which was unwelcome.

Buwalda recognizes a single instance where the Dutch ambassador executed a demarche which was not on Israeli instructions and can thus be seen as a purely Dutch demarche. The subject of the demarche was the Leningrad airplane hijacking and the subsequent trial, which have already been described in chapter 2 while discussing the internal theory.

Days before the trial sentences were to be pronounced on Christmas eve of 1970, the Dutch ambassador van Blokland visited MID where he stated that he did not want to interfere in internal Soviet affairs but that he did want to point out that there was much anxiety over the case in the Netherlands, and to express his hope for clemency if death sentences were to be pronounced. The Soviet reaction had been, "*as expected*", negative. According to the Soviets, the Dutch demarche was "*interference*" in internal Soviet affairs, "*not suitable*" and "*contrary to the wish to promote good relations*" and therefore "*had to be rejected*".[314]

Through archival research, a single other occasion was identified where the option of a Dutch demarche was discussed by the embassy and the Foreign Ministry. In the final weeks of 1969, ambassador van Blokland received a cable from the Foreign Minister. In it, Luns reported on a parliamentary debate of the senate, in which the chairmen of all of the parliamentary groups but the Communist Party submitted a motion regarding the situation of Soviet citizens of Jewish origins. This Dutch motion followed an initiative in the Israeli Knesset: in a special session on November 10th of that year, the Israeli assembly

[314] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 32

passed a resolution in which all the parliaments of the world are called upon to exert their influence in order to make the Soviet Union allow its Jewish citizens to emigrate to Israel. The Dutch motion called for Foreign Minister Luns to act on this.[315] In a follow-up cable, Luns asked van Blokland how he thought this would influence the emigration possibilities for Jewish Soviet citizens.[316] In his reply, van Blokland stated that in his view, the worries of the senate could be transmitted to the Soviet authorities without great risks, for the Soviets are constantly speaking of solidarity. "*Moreover, it could be a positive thing to act on the senate motion, for if we don't, we might come across as fearful. Furthermore, it could be useful to demonstrate the influence of the senate, despite the fact that the outcome is negative for the Soviets. The effect on both the bilateral level as on the emigration possibilities will be minimal.*"[317]

Despite the enthusiastic reaction of the ambassador, unfortunately no further evidence of such a Dutch demarche was found in the archive of the Dutch Muscovite embassy. This could suggests that the demarche was delivered without any further documentation, but the likelier option is that the Dutch decided not to deliver this demarche after all, despite the brawny attitude of van Blokland. One would assume that in the latter case the reason not to deliver the demarche was similar to other moments in which the Dutch decided *not* to undertake a certain action or policy: fear of upsetting the Soviet authorities so much that they would force the Dutch to discontinue the interest representation for Israel.

False vysovs

A third activity that can be viewed of as extracurricular interest representation is the issuance of false *vysovs*, a policy which was practiced from 1970 up to 1974. As has been established in the previous chapters, a *vysov* was the first document that a prospective emigrant required. The *vysov* is a notarized invitation from a close relative in Israel, translated into Russian and stamped by the Israeli government, confirming its willingness to receive the invited person, persons or family. Acquiring a *vysov* could be troublesome, because Soviet citizens were formally not allowed to maintain contact with foreigners. Moreover, it could be dangerous to ask for the legalized invitation from Israel by ordinary mail. Letters to foreign countries were spotted at the post office, which regularly passed it on to the KGB, which

[315] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14214, Luns to van Blokland 98, reference number 9367, 11/12/1969
[316] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14214, Luns to van Blokland 100, reference number 9488, 18/12/1969
[317] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14214, van Blokland to Luns 262, reference number 14950, 19/12/1969

would thus learn of the sender's intention to emigrate. This could lead to any kind of intimidation, from harassment at home or workplace to dismissal from one's job.

In 1970, in order to alleviate some of the troubles that the Soviet Jewish community was having with acquiring *vysovs,* the Dutch embassy started issuing 'official' *vysovs* to Jewish citizens without Israeli relatives. These were direct invitations without mention of any relatives. These invitations went straight against the Soviet fiction of family reunion, and therefore should have been objectionable to the authorities. Curiously, they were accepted up to 1974, the year that the 'flood' of migrants constituting the first wave started receding, when the Dutch official who had been head of the Consular Section was accused, by name, in a televised report of "*issuing vysovs without checking whether the inviters had any relation with the invited*". It was, as the head of OVIR explained: "*all part of a dishonest campaign mounted by the rulers in Tel Aviv*".[318]

'Undercover Jew'

In November 1967 a memorandum from Dutch diplomat J.A. de Ranitz reached the embassy. In it, de Ranitz explains that he has been informally approached, twice, by an Israeli diplomat over the last four months with the question if there would be any possibility that the Dutch embassy in Moscow would pass along messages concerning Jews in the Soviet Union, which entailed that the embassy would also maintain contacts with the Jewish community. The spokesperson for de Ranitz replied that such an affair should not be discussed along informal channels and that the request should come from the Israeli embassy in the Netherlands.

The second conversation brought up the question again and the Israeli told the spokesperson that he had passed along the message regarding the usage of the formal channels, but that Jerusalem preferred to keep the inquiry informal, in order to avoid the risk of receiving a formal 'no'. The spokesperson replied that he was prepared to pass along the message and note down the following ideas which the Israeli's had regarding this undercover Jew:

[318] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone*, p. 80.

"1. The official will be selected or recruited by the Dutch ministry of foreign affairs. He will be subordinated to his superiors in the embassy only and report to them in pursuance of his duties.

2. He will be briefed and debriefed by the Israeli side only in the presence of Dutch officials, who will have the right of veto in respect to any assignment which he will be asked to undertake.

3. His duties for the Israeli side could be defined as follows:

a. Make himself known as a Jew who is interested in Jewish life in the Soviet Union

b Visit synagogues regularly on Sabbats and holidays and try to speak to local Jews on their problems

c. Keep in touch with Soviet Jews and their institutions

d. Report on Jewish problems as well as on the attitude of the Soviet authorities towards them and towards Israel, as reflected in the press.

4. Knowledge of the Russian language would of course be a great asset, but Yiddish or even German would suffice in a pinch."

De Ranitz told his spokesperson that he should pass along the following message to the Israeli's: assuming that the Dutch government was principally willing to honor such a request, it would firstly be practically impossible because enlargement of the consular staff with a person who maintains contacts as requested and who possesses such qualities as the aforementioned would be impossible to hide from the Soviet authorities. This would undoubtedly strain Dutch-Soviet relations and probably also worsen the already spoiled relations between Israel and the Soviet Union. Secondly, the objective of 'interest representation' is not to resume political activities in the host country with which the diplomatic ties are severed.[319]

There are no other archival indicators of the existence of such a Dutch undercover agent or a discussion regarding it, so it can be safely assumed that Jerusalem left it at that and did not officially make this request, in order to avoid a formal 'no'. This does not mean, however, that the Dutch did not go out of their way to maintain some form of contact with the Soviet Jewish community outside the diplomatic immunity which the ambassadorial building provided.

[319] NA, Secret Archive BuZa 1967-1974, 25803, de Ranitz to 'S', Chef DEU, Chef DAM, Chef DBD, reference number 717, 2/11/1967.

As the Dutch embassy was guarded by Soviet militia who would only allow entrance to those that already obtained an exit permit for Israel, the Dutch officials would regularly get requests for meetings with Soviet Jews in the streets or in private homes. Moreover, as head of the consular section, van Gorp later admitted in an interview with Buwalda that the expat community of foreign diplomats, businessmen and journalists was a small one during the 1970s and contacts among them frequent. Dutch officers were sometimes invited to parties in the apartments of colleagues, or other Westerners, and meet with Jews who took the risk of being present. Furthermore, van Gorp acknowledged that some members of the Dutch staff indeed had street meetings with Soviet Jews and answered unscheduled phone calls from unknowns.[320]

Thus, it appears that at the onset and during the first years of Dutch interest representation for Israel in the Soviet Union the Dutch certainly did overstep the boundaries for 'regular' interest representation. The staff of the embassy did more work for the prospective Jewish Soviet emigrants than was initially agreed upon by the Dutch and Israeli consular staffs in the summer of 1967. It also seems that the statements of those historians claiming that the Dutch embassy was merely providing an administrative service, only acted on Israeli instructions and thereby did not show any agency or initiatives are not entirely correct and can therefore be refuted or adjusted accordingly. The Dutch embassy *did* undertake initiatives that were well outside the boundaries of regular interest representation, such as semi-covertly moving *Refuseniks* out of the Soviet Union through an indirect emigrational route via the Netherlands, delivering a demarche, answering phone calls from unknowns that were not allowed to have contact with foreign embassies, issuing false *vysovs* to Soviet Jews unable to obtain one from Israel and by organizing meetings with people that were refused entry to the embassy. Moreover, the Dutch sometimes used the diplomatic mail pouch to smuggle out important scientific works of future emigrants, which would otherwise have been confiscated by the Soviet authorities.

The fact that the Dutch were acting outside the parameters of regular interest representation is acknowledged by ambassador Bakker in a letter which the Secretary-General of the Dutch Foreign Ministry, Emile Schiff, sent to several departmental heads at the Dutch Foreign Ministry, based on a conversation between Bakker and Schiff:

[320] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 75.

"It seemed to him [ambassador Bakker], that over the years a practice had developed at his post which did not yield great results yet endangered his employees. For example, frank conversations on the phone, organized meetings with people that were refused entry to the embassy, etc.

This left the embassy wide open for provocations and the ambassador thought to have identified some provocations, especially since he was the first to deliver a demarche in favor of the death row inmates related to the Leningrad trial, December 24th last year. Mr. Tammenoms Bakker even foresaw the possibility of an incident, orchestrated by the KGB, which could lead to the banishment of one of his employees.

(…)

Taking this in mind, the ambassador planned to instruct his employees to strictly follow the procedures and agreements, starting with a trial period of six months. This would imply that no phone calls from unknowns would be answered, that no appointments would be made with people that were denied entrance to the embassy, that more caution was to be practiced while receiving documents, and the like.

When asked, the ambassador later added that it would be obvious that all the necessary official steps would still be undertaken, as was the case before, and that anyone that requested information regarding emigration to Israel, would be informed.

(…)

The main point was, according to the ambassador, that the embassy restricted itself to representing Israeli interests and would not burden itself with the representation of the interests of Jewish Soviet citizens (to whom it is forbidden by law to have contact with foreigners)."[321]

Following this letter, the Dutch indeed showed more restraint regarding their 'extracurricular' activities. No proof from after this date has been found in the archives of the embassy that would indicate Dutch demarches, the use of the alternate migration route or any other significant policies that were not in line with the agreed interest representation, except for an incident in the following year, 1972, which made the Dutch even more careful.

[321] NA, Secret Archive BuZa 1967-1974, 25803, Schiff to DGEX, Chef DEU, reference number 808, 29/3/1971.

On Israeli instructions, the Dutch embassy started spreading a brochure with color pictures, printed in Israel, which informed the reader about Israel and about the desirability of migrating there. When the first copies were handed out, it turned out that this was not to the liking of the Soviet authorities. The Dutch chargé d'affaires was called in by MID and was told that one of his employees was "*actively distributing a propagandistic brochure, a manual for emigrants*." He was further accused of having "*encouraged further distribution to other Soviet citizens*." The Soviet MID official ended his tirade with a stern diplomatic warning, by stating that these actions "*went outside the framework of normal diplomatic practice, and it could hardly be the intention to disturb the relations between the Netherlands and the Soviet Union by distributing a publication that did not serve a Dutch interest.*"[322] The distribution of the flyer was stopped, and according to Buwalda, this incident had a restraining influence on the activities of the embassy for many years.

It has been established that the Dutch indeed have shown a certain willingness to go 'the extra mile': performing duties for Israel and the Soviet Jewry that exceed the boundaries of regular interest representation. While this is in itself is a strong indicator of agency, the matter of agency will be discussed more thoroughly in order to answer the research question on Dutch agency: whether it was present and up to what degree. To determine this, the actions undertaken by the Dutch that were not on Israeli instructions will be scrutinized, as well as the loyalty to the instructions from the Israeli side: did the Dutch blindly follow the Israeli instructions as they were received, or did both parties deliberate together regarding the Israeli wishes.

Actions without instructions

Firstly, some examples will be put forward which support the hypothesis that the Dutch certainly did sometimes demonstrate agency by acting on their own instincts instead of waiting for Israeli instructions to undertake certain actions and policies. This mostly happened on occasions where time was a factor and consulting with the Israeli authorities would just have taken too long, practically and humanly speaking. This was the case in 1973 when the Dreizners, husband and wife, were released from their sentences related to the Leningrad airplane hijacking and the subsequent trial. When they entered the Dutch embassy, requesting a substantial sum of money to pay off their outstanding debts, the ambassador agreed to the request without Israeli authorization.[323] Foreign Minister Van Der Stoel told

[322] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 75.
[323] NA, Secret Archive BuZa 1967-1974, 14220, Bakker to Van Der Stoel, 1/10/1973.

the ambassador in his reply that he had taken the right course, and that the Israeli authorities trusted him to make the right call and provide the funds in future cases of such dire humanitarian circumstances.[324]

As previously explained, Soviet Jewish émigré's were supposed to hand in all of their personal documents such as school diploma's, birth and marriage certificates and the like during the procedure to obtain an exit permit. Doctoral theses, scientific works, literature and other professional documents were also not allowed to leave the country and the customs officers routinely subjected Jewish emigrants to thorough searches. Officially, the attitude in The Hague was highly restrictive towards the usage of the diplomatic pouch, which was not subject to searches, to 'smuggle' such scientific works, often the fruit of much dedication or even one's life's work, out of the country. Unofficially, the tendency at the Dutch embassy in Moscow was towards clemency and such works were allowed to 'slip through', sometimes unchecked because of busy visiting hours. Moreover, Buwalda claims based on interviews, that several ambassadorial employees took personal letters and manuscripts of Jewish authors with them when they went on leave.[325]

In the first years of interest representation for Israel in Moscow, the Dutch have displayed agency by performing extra tasks that went outside the margins of the agreed liaisonship such as facilitating an indirect emigrational route via the Netherlands, executing a Dutch demarche and by having contact and meetings with Jews on the streets and in their homes. Besides this, on some occasions the Dutch ambassador took actions and decisions independent of Israeli instructions, especially when the human circumstances were so dire or urgent that waiting was not an option. Furthermore, the Dutch have also displayed agency by questioning the instructions that came from Jerusalem and proposing solutions that fitted the situation better, according to the ambassador and his staff. Some examples of instances where this occurred will be presented in the next section.

Loyalty to Israeli instructions

On July 1st, 1970, the embassy was informed that the Israeli *Knesset* had approved an amendment to the 'Law of Return' which would allow Jews to become Israeli citizens before actually emigrating to Israel.

[324] NA, Secret Archive BuZa 1967-1974, 14220, Van Der Stoel to Bakker, 26/10/1973.
[325] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 239.

The law seemed, at least partially, aimed at the Soviet Jewish community, as some Soviet Jewish residents had hoped to become an Israeli citizen in order to improve their position vis-à-vis the Soviet emigrational authorities, or just as some form of moral support. [326] Dutch ambassador Bakker was adamantly opposed to the idea, and in a letter to The Hague he indicated this, calling the entire exercise "*futile*" since the Soviet authorities were nog going to change their attitude, and if they were, it would be in a fashion disadvantageous for the whole emigration movement. Any initiative to approach Jews and hand them certificates would be regarded, as per usual, as an interference in Soviet internal affairs and a provocation and was certainly outside the boundaries of the Dutch interest representation for Israel. The Jews receiving the certificates would be disallowed to enter the embassy and might be in danger of arrest or serious intimidation. Equally importantly, any embassy officer that was handing out certificates could be declared *persona non grata* and be expelled from the Soviet Union.[327]

The Dutch and Israeli authorities discussed the issue for over a year and finally, late December 1972, the ambassador received a letter from his Foreign Minister, Schemlzer: the minister had carefully considered the matter but was "*willing to take an accommodating attitude*".[328] At the instigation of the ambassador, the Dutch demanded that at least a sentence be added stating that: "*persons granted Israeli nationality are not released automatically from the citizenship of their country of residence*".[329]

The issue of the Undercover agent that would make himself known as a Jew who is interested in Jewish life in the Soviet Union and would act as a kind of spokesperson for the Soviet Jewish community, can also be seen as an example of agency. The Dutch diplomat that was unofficially approached with this request made clear that the Dutch ambassador could and would not comply with it, out of practical and security considerations.

Another example of Dutch agency can be identified in 1972, in relation to the loans that were provided to prospective Soviet Jewish emigrants. When the amount of exit permits issued started taking on large proportions in the spring of 1971, the Israeli authorities decided to sanction financial support for the payment of exit documents without preliminary authorization, which practically meant that the Dutch consular staff now had to decide to whom loans were to be extended and how large these loans would

[326] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14216, Luns to Moscow ambassador, reference number DEU/OE-129090, 1/7/1971.
[327] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14216, Bakker to Luns, reference number 1818/525, 16/7/1971.
[328] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14218, Schmelzer to Bakker, 21/12/1972.
[329] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 78.

be.[330] This caused that much stress at the embassy, that it made ambassador Bakker decide to restrict these kind of loans to exceptional cases only, for it had become increasingly difficult to properly administer the loans.[331] After the Israeli's requested he reconsidered, the ambassador discussed the question in The Hague with Dutch and Israeli officials and stuck to his standpoint: the volume of the loans could be slightly increased but they would remain limited. Fortunately, the announced restrictions had shown effective and the demand for loans soon dwindled back down to manageable levels.[332]

[330] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14216, Celer to Moscow embassy 58, 22/4/1971.
[331] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14217, Bakker to Schmelzer 80, 12/6/1972 &
NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14217, Bakker to Schmelzer 91, 26/6/1972.
[332] NA, Code Archive BuZa 1965-1974, 14218, Bakker to Schmelzer 105, 13/7/1972.

Conclusion

The final chapter of this thesis has attempted to settle the matter of agency with regards to the Dutch embassy in Moscow and its task of representing Israeli interests in the Soviet Union, a job which lasted from 1967 up to the dissolution of the Soviet Union, in 1990. There are not many authors that have written on the subject, but among those who did, there is disagreement on the subject of Dutch agency in relation to the interest representation for Israel. Floribert Baudet, scholar, and Petrus Buwalda, former ambassador in Moscow (1986-1990), both put forward the claim that the Dutch displayed little to no agency during the aforementioned period. Buwalda states that:

> "*During the 1970s diplomatic demarches were undertaken exclusively at the request of the Israeli authorities within the framework of the interest representation. The Dutch demarche carried out during the Leningrad Trial was the single exception.*
>
> *(…)*
>
> *Demarches in favor of Refuseniks, except at the request of the Israeli government, also remained excluded. An internal ministry memorandum of August 15th, 1977 made this very clear:*
>
> For over ten years it has been standing practice that no initiatives are taken by the Netherlands in order to obtain exit permits for Soviet citizens. There is neither reason nor latitude to deviate from this line of conduct.
>
> *(...)*
>
> *While the fear of harming the interest representation generally precluded any action in favor of Refuseniks or prisoners on behalf of the Netherlands itself, demarches in the name of Israel regarding Refuseniks and prisoners were frequently carried out."*[333]

[333] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 85-88.

Regarding requests for meetings with Jews outside the embassy, Buwalda states that the attitude towards this matter was:

> "*Highly restrictive (…) time and again the Foreign Ministry would point out that the embassy was carrying out a humanitarian mission in behalf of Jewish emigrants that might be jeopardized if Soviet authorities would be irritated by actions of the Dutch officials. Soviet authorities might, it was felt, prevent the Netherlands embassy at any time from continuing that mission*".[334]

Baudet adds that the Dutch embassy always did tread lightly in respect to maintaining contacts with Soviet citizens. This was based on fear not to endanger the interest representation for Israel. Furthermore, he claims that the underlying intention was not to endanger the dissidents. If the dissidents and Soviet Jews wanted to get in touch with the Dutch embassy, they would have to choose to take the initiative by themselves, considering the risks for the concerned Soviet citizens.[335]

Baudet refers to the same internal memorandum from 1977 as Buwalda does, putting forward the claim that "*the Dutch restraint went so far that the ambassador could, at some point, write that he did not maintain contacts with dissidents whatsoever*." He recognizes a turning point from such policies as late as 1987, when the embassy opens its doors for dissidents and *Refuseniks* with specific permission from Dutch Foreign Minister Van den Broek. [336]

The image of the Dutch embassy in Moscow that follows from these observations and statements is one of a willing interest representative with little to no agency. The Israeli instructions were followed up, but besides this there was little room for initiatives. The purpose of this research thesis is to establish whether this was really the case, or if there was perhaps some matter of agency after all. Therefore the main question of this research thesis is: *Did the Dutch embassy in Moscow maintain agency with respect to the interest representation for Israel, and if so, to what degree?* To provide, archival and literature research have been presented in an effort to establish where the Dutch embassy stood on a continuum between willing administrator, with no agency, and full agent, with maximum agency.

[334] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 74.
[335] Baudet, F. *'Het Heeft Onze Aandacht'*, p. 132-133.
[336] Idem.

Archival research has yielded a number of instances and examples which are indicative of an autonomous Dutch policy with respect to the interest representation, mostly during the early years of interest representation for Israel. These examples refute the claim made by Baudet and Buwalda that there was little to no agency with little space for Dutch initiatives up to 1977 or even up to 1987.

Firstly, some cases display a certain willingness among the staff of the Dutch embassy in Moscow to do work and provide extra services to some of the potential Soviet Jewish emigrants. The work and services referred to certainly stretch, and sometimes cross, the margins of the agreed interest representation as introduced in the third chapter of this thesis. The indirect emigrational route, where Soviet Jewish citizens were assisted in pretending to want to go to the Netherlands for a temporary family visit, after which they proceeded to travel to Israel, the United States or elsewhere, is a clear example of crossing the margins of the agreed interest representation. Moreover, the Dutch ambassador has executed a demarche in favor of those condemned in the Leningrad trial following the airplane hijacking by desperate Soviet Jewish *Refuseniks*. Furthermore, the Dutch embassy has produced false *vysovs* for Soviet Jewish emigrants unable to obtain one on their own, for the 1970-1974 period. The policy was discontinued after one of the Dutch consular officers was accused of this exact activity, by name, in a televised report. Finally, the staff of the Dutch embassy has engaged in meetings with people that were refused entry to the embassy and by answering phone calls from unknowns that were not allowed to have contact with foreigners and foreign embassies; all strong indicators of a certain sense of agency.

Secondly, other actions and policies have been presented that perhaps did not stretch the boundaries of the agreed interest representations as those described in the previous section, but are still indicators of Dutch agency, as these actions and policies were deployed by the Dutch without Israeli instructions. For example, loans have been handed out in cases where the Dutch technically had to await Israeli authorization (since the money was not to be used in obtaining exit permits). This was the case with the Dreizner family, who were released from their sentences in the Leningrad trial in 1973 and were in dire need of some money in order to pay off outstanding debts. Moreover, the Dutch have sometimes used the diplomatic mail, not subject to scrutiny from Soviet customs, to smuggle out important scientific works of future emigrants, works which in many cases constituted somebody's *magnum opus* and which would certainly have been confiscated by the Soviet authorities.

Thridly, some instances have been put forward in which the Dutch ambassador displayed agency by questioning the Israeli instructions which he has been given and by suggesting solutions which fit the situation better. The Dutch ambassador saw the possibility for Soviet Jews to become Israeli nationals while still being in the Soviet Union, resulting from the Israeli amendment to the Law of Return as "*futile*", for it would not further the cause of the Soviet Jewish potential emigres' and would only aggravate the Soviet officials. Additionally, when the 'flood' of emigrants started taking large proportions and the Israelis authorized loans without authentication, the Dutch ambassador restricted the volume of loans, for determining who was and who wasn't eligible for a loan and the subsequent administrative acts were taking up too much time and caused the staff of the embassy too much stress. Moreover, the Dutch have plainly refused the Israeli request of sending out an 'undercover Jew' that would maintain contacts with the Soviet Jewish community.

In sum, the image of the Dutch embassy in Moscow that erupts from the observations and statements from Buwalda and Baudet, one of a willing interest representative with little to no agency, is to be refuted. While the Dutch naturally followed most Israeli instructions to the letter, they were representing Israeli interests as agreed upon in 1967 after all, it would be unjust to view the Dutch embassy in Moscow as a willing administrator without any sense of agency. Instead, based on the presented evidence, one can certainly speak of *Dutch* policy and agency, be it in close accordance with Israeli policymakers.

Yet, one cannot help but note that most of the examples put forward stem from the early period of interest representation, from the onset in 1967 until the early 1970s. After this, examples of Dutch policies which overstep the boundaries of interest representation become increasingly rare, especially following the alarming letter from ambassador Bakker in 1971 and the incident with the brochure concerning life in Israel in 1972. It appears that following these occasions, Dutch policy indeed became more restrained and careful, in line with the observations made by Buwalda and Baudet, for after this date no more proof of Dutch demarches, usage of the indirect emigrational route or other policies that are 'extracurricular' is to be found in the archives of the Dutch embassy. It seems there was some uncertainty during the first five years of interest representation, regarding what was and what was not to be counted among Dutch tasks. In cases of doubt, the ambassador often decided in favor of lenience towards the Soviet Jews, providing services that went outside the boundaries of regular interest representation. But after some years of initial unclarity and liberal interpretations of the tasks of the embassy with respect to the interest representation for Israel, the

ambassador decided to instruct his employees to strictly follow the procedures and agreements, for in his view the practices so far have been endangering his employees and the interest representation as a whole.

In hindsight one could argue, as both Baudet[337] and Buwalda[338] do, that the eventual carefulness practiced by the Dutch embassy in Moscow following some initial years of liberal interpretations of the tasks related to the interest representation, was somewhat exaggerated. Often the Dutch have refused to take a certain course of action out of fear that the Soviet authorities would disallow the Dutch to continue their task for Israel, and that no other country would be willing to represent Israeli interests. According to Baudet, the concern with damaging the interest representation was overpowering.[339] Yet, as Buwalda also argues, a Soviet measure to prevent the Dutch embassy from representing Israel was not very likely.[340] The Soviet authorities were content having a smaller party efficiently handling the issuance of Israeli visas to Jews that had received their exit permit. Based on the interaction theory as discussed in the second chapter, the permits were granted in part to remove 'unruly elements' and to impress Western public opinion in order to gain economic advantages. The Netherlands embassy was able to ensure quick and discreet delivery. Furthermore, if the task were to be taken away from the Netherlands, another embassy would have to take it on. A likely candidate would have been the United States embassy, a situation which would have only further aggravated the tense relations between the U.S. embassy in Moscow and the Soviet authorities. Finally, at least in some instances, the Soviet authorities must have been aware of certain practices of which the Dutch thought they would not approve of. For example: it was after all the Soviet visa office which recommended Uri Feuerstadt to consider indirect emigration via the Netherlands, suggesting that at least some Soviet authorities were aware of this practice. Another example is the issuance of false *vysovs*, a practice which took place for four years from 1970 onwards. The Soviets must have been aware of this practice, given the fact that all Russian personnel had to report on their professional activities to the authorities. These observations are proof that the embassy's carefulness might indeed have been somewhat exaggerated, as suggested by Buwalda and Baudet. If the Soviet authorities had wanted a stick to seriously beat the Dutch embassy with, it would not have been hard to find, as there were many instances where the Dutch 'broke the rules'. Instead, they chose to let the Dutch embassy carry on, for the service it was providing to Israel was also of importance to the Soviet Union, in the context of the Cold War and the external/interaction

[337] Baudet, F. *'Het Heeft Onze Aandacht'*, p. 109.
[338] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 74.
[339] Baudet, F. *'Het Heeft Onze Aandacht',* p. 109.
[340] Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone,* p. 74.

theory. Thus it seems that, in relation to the Jewish emigration, the Soviet authorities generally chose pragmatics over ideological concerns.

The carefulness vis-à-vis the Soviet authorities that was practiced in order to appease the Soviets did not restrict itself to activities related to the actual interest representation, such as the cause for regular Soviet dissidents. When the British lawyer of Yuri Orlov, the famous dissident, asked the Dutch in 1977 to exert pressure on the Soviet authorities on behalf of his client, this led to an extensive discussion. The eventual conclusion was that Orlov, as far as they knew, was not Jewish and did not fall under the terms of interest representation for Israel. Therefore, the request was declined. This was not an exception according to Baudet; the Netherlands tended to avoid making statements and undertaking diplomatic steps which would endanger the interest representation. For example: Foreign Minister Van der Stoel personally designed a code of which the Dutch delegation to the CSCE conference in Belgrade of 1977 was to follow to the letter:

> *"Given the special position of the Netherlands in relation to the Israeli interest representation in the Soviet Union, which you are familiar with (…) it should obviously be seen as undesirable that the Netherlands would, within the CSCE framework, exhibit itself, which would create the risk that the already limited options of the Moscow embassy would decrease to a zero. Therefore, I insist that the delegation withholds from any activities vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, directly and indirectly."*[341]

This instruction was followed to the letter, and would also be the policy for the subsequent conferences in Madrid, Bern and Ottowa. Other Western European countries brought up the issue of Soviet Jewish emigration plentifully, but the Dutch remained silent. According to Baudet, this led to an internationally and nationally skewed perception of the role of the Netherlands as a champion of human rights. The subsequent Foreign Ministers responsible for Soviet policies came across as if they were not interested in human rights cases such as these, or others.[342]

This research thesis has shown the lengths that the Netherlands were prepared to go to, in support of their ally, Israel. It seems that the Dutch were more than willing to pay a certain price: in this case a constrained Soviet human rights policy, an extensive diplomatic mission in Moscow occupied with a task which did not directly yield any tangible results for the Netherlands and which was not completely risk-free for the involved diplomats, Foreign Ministers who are publicly perceived as not caring enough

[341] Baudet, F. *'Het Heeft Onze Aandacht'*, p. 109.
[342] Idem.

about the human rights situation in the Soviet Union and the ever-present threat of Arab repercussions, most likely in an economic fashion. The interest representation in Moscow was not the only instance in which the Dutch were prepared to pay the price in order to facilitate Israel. One can think of the oil crisis of 1973/1974 as another example of such behavior: the Dutch maneuvered themselves in a diplomatically isolated situation in a European context and were targeted by an Arab oil boycott as a consequence of Dutch pro-Israeli policies in the preceding years.

There are many separate factors that can be identified as contributing to the Dutch strong pro-Israeli position, such as a the affinity that the Dutch protestants and Catholics had with the Jewish faith, and the affinity which the Dutch socialists felt towards the socialist system that was in place in Israel for the first few decades of existence. It is debated whether feelings of guilt from the Dutch collaboration with Jewish persecution during World War II has played a role in the formation of the Dutch. Soetendorp has stated that it did not,[343] which has led him to receive much criticism.[344] Fred Grünfeld shares the opinion of many that this guilt certainly has played its part in the formation of Israel policies.[345] Moreover, according to him, the fact that Israel and the Netherlands both have an Atlantic orientation and have been firmly rooted in the Western camp during and after the Cold War, has strengthened the Dutch-Israeli relationship. The constant anti-French and pro-American attitude of the Dutch has converged in a pro-Israeli standpoint, because the French can be seen as having taken stance on the Arab side of the Arab-Israeli conflict, where the Americans were strongly pro-Israeli.[346] Pinpointing the exact reasons behind this strong support for Israel, and how each reason weighs up to others, is a difficult exercise, which has yet to yield scholarly consensus. It would be highly interesting to investigate this specific aspect of Dutch foreign policy.

[343] Soetendorp, R. 'The Netherlands and Israel', p. 697.
[344] Bank, J. 'Review: Dissertation Soetendorp 1982', p. 281-284. & Schöffer, J. 'Review: Dissertation Soetendorp 1982', p. 658-659.
[345] Grünfeld, F. *Nederland en het Nabije Oosten,* p. 31.
[346] Grünfeld, F. 'Zestig jaar Nederland-Israël', p. 680-683.

Appendix A: List of foreign terms and abbreviations

Term	Language	Meaning
Aliya	Hebrew	Literally 'ascent', the immigration of diaspora Jews to Israel
CPN	Dutch	Communist Party of the Netherlands
CSCE	English abbreviation	Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
Evsektsya	Russian	Jewish section of the Communist party
Glasnost	Russian	Literally 'openness', the policy initiated by Mikhail Gorbachev when he was Secretary General of the Communist party
KGB	Russian	*Komitet Gosudarstvenoy Bezopasnosti*, Committee for State Security
Knesset	Hebrew	Name of the legislative branch of the Israeli government
Lishka	Hebrew	Hebrew abbreviation for *Lishkat Hakesher*, or 'bureau of liaison', the Israeli service responsible for the migration of Jews from Eastern Europe
MID	Russian abbreviation	*Ministerstvo Innostrannikh Del*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NATO	English abbreviation	North Atlantic Treaty Organization, defense alliance among Western countries
OVIR	Russian abbreviation	*Otdel Viz I Registracii Inostrannykh Grazdan*, Visa Office of the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs
Perestroika	Russian	Literally 'reconstruction', the reform policy of Mikhail Gorbachev when he was Secretary General of the Communist party.

Pogrom	Russian/English	A violent riot aimed at massacre or persecution of an ethnic or religious group, particularly one aimed at Jews.
Priyom	Russian	Receiving hour reception, held every afternoon by the Dutch consul in Moscow
Refusenik	English/Russian	Person whose application for an exit permit from the Soviet Union has been refused
SALT	English abbreviation	Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, treaty: SALT I concluded in 1972, SALT II in 1979.
Shtetlekh	Yiddish	Town in the Pale of Settlement
Ukase	Russian	Tzarist proclamation in Imperial Russia
UPDK	Russian	*Upravlenye Po Obsluzhivaniyu Diplomaticheskgo Korpusa*, Soviet Government Administration for Service to the Diplomatic Corps (
Vysov	Russian	Literally 'summons', in this case a personal and notarized invitation from a relative in Israel, on which the Israeli authorities stamped their approval.
Yevrei	Russian	Jew

Appendix B: Full yearly breakdown of the number of persons for whom visas for Israel were issued by the Netherlands embassy.

Table 1. Number of Persons for Whom Visas for Israel Were Issues by the Netherlands Embassy in Moscow, 1967-1990.

Year	*Number of persons*
1967[a]	ca. 116
1968[b]	230
1969	2,808
1970[b]	935
1971	ca. 14,000
1972	31,413
1973	34,778
1974	20,146
1975	13,209
1976	14,064
1977	17,146
1978	30,579
1979	50,461
1980	20,342
1981	9,127
1982	2,561
1983	1,344
1984	890
1985	1,153
1986	902
1987	8,563
1988	26,183
1989	83,666
1990[c]	141,572

Source: Buwalda, P. *They Did Not Dwell Alone*, p. 221.

[a] After June 10, 1967, date of the breaking off of relations between the Soviet Union and Israel.

[b] Uncertain.

[c] For eight months only; later figures have not been preserved in the Dutch files.

References

Archival

The archival sources for this study are mostly the messages sent back and forth from the Netherlands embassy in Moscow and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs in The Hague. These documents are filed at the National Archive in The Hague. They are housed in the Code Archive Foreign Affairs ('Code Archive BuZa'), as well as in the secret archive regarding the interest representation for Israel, where some of the more interesting discoveries were made. The regular files are numbered according to year. The earlier years fit together in a single file, where the busier years can occupy three, starting at the number 14213 for the years 1967-1968. The number of the secret archive is 25803.

Messages about the interest representation were normally sent in code by cable, first transmitted by telex, later by wireless, when the embassy was provided with its own transmitter. All codes from the Ministry were signed with the name of the current Minister of Foreign Affairs, when he was in The Hague, or with CELER if he was not. Cables from the embassy were signed with the name of the ambassador or the chargé d'affaires. Since computers were considered too unsafe, they were not provided to the Netherlands embassy in Moscow during the period covered by this book.

Articles

Bank, J., 'Review: Dissertation Soetendorp 1982', *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden,* 99, 1984, p. 281-284.

Baudet, F. '"Zie, ik Breng hen uit het Land van het Noorden" Nederlandse Belangenbehartiging voor Israël Tijdens de Koude Oorlog 1967-1991'. *Transparant*, 12(4), november 2001, p. 8-12.

Baudet, F. 'Book review: Refuseniks: het drama van de Joodse emigratie uit de Sovjet-Unie en de Nederlandse rol daarbij 1967-1991'. *Low Countries Historical Review*, 121(2), 2006, p. 375-376.

Cullen, R. 'Soviet Jewry', *Foreign Affairs,* 65(2), winter 1986, p. 252-266.

Frey, M., 'Decolonization and Dutch-American Relations'. In: Krabbendam, H., van Minnen, C., Scott-Smith, G.(ed.) *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations 1609-2009.* Amsterdam: Boom, 2009, p. 609-620

Grünfeld, F. 'Zestig jaar Nederland-Israël'. *De internationale spectator,* 62(12), 2008, p. 680-683.

Healy, A. 'Tsarist Anti-Semitism and Russian-American Relations', *Slavic Review,* 42(3), autumn 1983, p. 408-425.

Hellema, D., 'The Politics of Asymmetry: The Netherlands and the United States since 1945' In: Krabbendam, H., van Minnen, C., Scott-Smith, G.(ed.) *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations 1609-2009.* Amsterdam: Boom, 2009, p. 579-596.

Koedijk, P., 'The Netherlands, the United States, and Anticommunism During the Early Cold War'. In: Krabbendam, H., van Minnen, C., Scott-Smith, G.(ed.) *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations 1609-2009.* Amsterdam: Boom, 2009, p. 597-608

Russell, R. 'The Atlantic Alliance in Dutch Foreign Policy'. *Internationale Spectator Oosteuropese Serie*, 6(2), 1969, p. 1189-1208.

Schaper, H., 'Nederland en het Midden-Oostenconflict', *Internationale Spectator,* 29(4), April 1975, p. 229-242.

Schöffer, J., 'Review: Dissertation Soetendorp 1982', *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, 97, 1984, p. 658-659.

Snel, D., 'Nederland en de Band met Israel', *Historisch Nieuwsblad*, 5, June 2008.

Soetendorp, R.B., 'The Netherlands and Israel: From a Special to a Normal Relationship', *Internationale Spectator*, 43, November 1989, p. 697-700.

Tabory, E. 'Jewish Identity, Israeli Nationalism, and Soviet Jewish Migration', *Journal of Church and State,* 33(2), 1991, p. 287-299.

Van Der Harst, J. 'Dutch and U.S. Assessments of European Political Integration'. In: Krabbendam, H., van Minnen, C., Scott-Smith, G.(ed.) *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations 1609-2009.* Amsterdam: Boom, 2009, p. 641-651.

Van Staden, A. 'American-Dutch Political Relations Since 1945, What Has Changed and Why?' *BMGN – Low Countries Historical Review,* 97(3), 1982, p. 470-486.

Van Staden, A., 'De Toenadering tot Oost-Europa in Nederlandse Ogen'. *Internationale Spectator,* 21(27), 1973, p. 735-742.

Zvi, A. 'Special Supplement: Immigration to Israel from the USSR'. *Israel Yearbook of Human Rights.* Tel Aviv University: Tel Aviv, 1977, p. 268-335.

Books:

Altshuler, M. *Soviet Jewry since the Second World War.* New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.

Baehr, P., Castermans-Holleman, M., Grünfeld, F. *Human Rights in the Foreign Policy of the Netherlands.* Antwerpen, Oxford, New York: Intersentia, 2002.

Baudet, F.H. *'Het Heeft Onze Aandacht', Nederland en de rechten van de mens in Oost-Europa en Joegoslavië*. Alphen aan de Rijn: Drukkerij Haasbeek, 2001.

Buwalda, P. *They did not dwell alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union 1967-1990.* Baltimore, London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Cleveland, W & Bunton, M. *A History of the Modern Middle East*. Boulder: Westview Press, 2004.

De Vries, W., Onderwater, J, Gerritsma, H. *Nederland-Rusland: Beelden en Betrekkingen 17^{e} t/m 20^{e} Eeuw.* Groningen: Origin Press, 1994

Grünfeld, F. *Nederland en het Nabije Oosten*. Maastricht, 1991.

Grünfeld, F. *Nederland en het Midden-Oosten.* Leiden: Institute International Studies, 1984

Hellema, D. *Nederland in de Wereld, de Buitenlandse Politiek van Nederland*. Houten-Antwerpen: Het Spectrum, 2010.

Hellema, D., Wiebes, C., & Witte, T. *Doelwit Rotterdam*. The Hague: SDU Uitgevers, 1998.

Knapen, B. *De Lange Weg naar Moskou. Nederlandse Relaties tot de Sovjet-Unie, 1917-1942.* Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1985.

Krabbendam, H., van Minnen, C., Scott-Smith, G.(ed.) *Four Centuries of Dutch-American Relations 1609-2009.* Amsterdam: Boom, 2009Levin, N. *The Jews in the Soviet Union since 1917.* New York: New York University Press, 1988

Lundestad, G. *The United States and Western Europe since 1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Meir, G. *Mijn Leven*. Weesp: De Haan, 1975

Munter, E., Naarden, B., Witte, T. *Voorzichtig en met Mate: De Betrekkingen van Nederland met de Sovjetunie (1942-1991)*. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam, Oost Europa Instituut, 1992.

Peeters, F. *Gezworen Vrienden, Het geheime bondgenootschap tussen Nederland en Israel.* Amsterdam: Uitgeverij L.J. Veen, 1997.

Pinkus, B. *Jews of the Soviet Union, 1917-1923*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Potok, C. *De Familie Slepak: Kroniek van een Russisch Dissidentengezin*, BZZToH: The Hague, 1996.

Potok, C. *Wanderings.* New York: Knopf, 1978.

Soetendorp, R. *Pragmatisch of Principieel. Het Nederlandse Beleid ten Aanzien van het Arabisch-Israëlisch conflict.* Leiden: Uitgeverij Martinus Nijhoff, 1983.

Van Creveld, M. *The Sword and the Olive: A Critical History of the Israeli Defense Force*. New York: Public Affairs, 1998.

Other:

Balfour, A., 'Balfour declaration', november 1917, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/balfour.asp.

Clinton, B. 'Massachusetts Remarks and a Question-and. Answer Session at the Clinton Town Meeting'. March 16, 1977, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=7180.

Cremer, D. *The change in the Dutch-Israeli political relationship during the late 1960s and the 1970s*, Bachelor's Thesis, University College Utrecht, 2013, accessible through my LinkedIn page: https://nl.linkedin.com/pub/daan-cremer/5b/8a9/a8.

Foreign Service Institute*, 'U.S. protocol for the modern diplomat'*, http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/176174.pdf.

Graafland, E., '*Van Humanitair tot Politiek Probleem, Het Nederlands Beleid ten aanzien van de Palestijnen van 1965 tot 1975*', Master Thesis, University Library Utrecht, 2010, <http://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/179880>.

UPI, 'Nederland laveert Joden Rusland uit', *Het Vaderland,* december 18th, 1974.

NOS, *"4 Mei geen Duitsers herdenken"*, May 2nd, 2013, retreived on March 26th, 2014. http://nos.nl/l/502381>

Press release from Jerusalem, *Associated Press*, march 17th, 1971.

Swarthmore College (2001) *Stalin's Forgotten Zion: Birobidzhan and the Making of a Soviet Jewish Homeland.* < http://www.swarthmore.edu/Home/News/biro/>