

Fall 2018

# Frank Thoughts: Investigating the Construction of Anne Frank as a Site of Heritage and Identity Formation in a Globalized PostHolocaust Society

Sarah Silverstein  
*SIT Study Abroad*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp\\_collection](https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection)

 Part of the [Dutch Studies Commons](#), [Inequality and Stratification Commons](#), [Jewish Studies Commons](#), and the [Politics and Social Change Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Silverstein, Sarah, "Frank Thoughts: Investigating the Construction of Anne Frank as a Site of Heritage and Identity Formation in a Globalized PostHolocaust Society" (2018). *Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection*. 2959.  
[https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp\\_collection/2959](https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/2959)

This Unpublished Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the SIT Study Abroad at SIT Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection by an authorized administrator of SIT Digital Collections. For more information, please contact [digitalcollections@sit.edu](mailto:digitalcollections@sit.edu).

Frank Thoughts: Investigating the Construction of Anne Frank as a Site of Heritage and Identity  
Formation in a Globalized Post-Holocaust Society  
Silverstein, Sarah

Academic Director: Dr. Byars, Jana  
Advisors: Cohen, Margaret; Mepschen, Paul

Franklin and Marshall College  
Women's Gender and Sexuality Studies

Europe, Netherlands, Amsterdam  
Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for  
The Netherlands: International Perspectives on Sexuality and Gender,  
SIT Study Abroad, Fall 2018



### Access, Use, and Publication of ISP

Student Name: Sarah Silverstein

Email Address: ssilver1@fandm.edu

Title of ISP/Internship: Frank Thoughts: Investigating the Construction of Anne Frank as a Site of Heritage and Identity Formation in a Globalized Post-Holocaust Society

Program and Term/Year: SIT Netherlands: International Perspectives on Sexuality and Gender Fall 2018

Student research (Independent Study Project, Field Study Project) is a product of field work and as such students have an obligation to assess both the positive and negative consequences of their field study. Ethical field work, as stipulated in the SIT Policy on Ethics, results in products that are shared with local and academic communities; therefore copies of ISP/FSPs are returned to the sponsoring institutions and the host communities, at the discretion of the institution(s) and/or community involved.

By signing this form, I certify my understanding that:

1. I retain ALL ownership rights of my ISP/FSP project and that I retain the right to use all, or part, of my project in future works.
2. World Learning/SIT Study Abroad may publish the ISP/FSP in the SIT Digital Collections, housed on World Learning's public website.
3. World Learning/SIT Study Abroad may archive, copy, or convert the ISP/FSP for non-commercial use, for preservation purposes, and to ensure future accessibility.
  - World Learning/SIT Study Abroad archives my ISP/FSP in the permanent collection at the SIT Study Abroad local country program office and/or at any World Learning office.
  - In some cases, partner institutions, organizations, or libraries in the host country house a copy of the ISP/FSP in their own national, regional, or local collections for enrichment and use of host country nationals.
4. World Learning/SIT Study Abroad has a non-exclusive, perpetual right to store and make available, including electronic online open access, to the ISP/FSP.
5. World Learning/SIT Study Abroad websites and SIT Digital Collections are publicly available via the Internet.
6. World Learning/SIT Study Abroad is not responsible for any unauthorized use of the

ISP/FSP by any third party who might access it on the Internet or otherwise.

7. I have sought copyright permission for previously copyrighted content that is included in this ISP/FSP allowing distribution as specified above.

Student Signature: Sarah Silverstein

Date:

---

---

*Table of Contents*

---

<b>Access, Use, and Publication of ISP</b> .....	1
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	4
<b>Abstract</b> .....	5
<b>Introduction</b> .....	6
<b>Assumptions</b> .....	7
<b>Methodology</b> .....	10
<b>Literature Review</b> .....	12
<b>Ethnographic Description and Discussion</b> .....	26
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	36
<b>Appendix</b> .....	41
<b>Reference List</b> .....	44

## *Acknowledgements*

---

This research was supported by the School of International Training (SIT) in the Netherlands. A big thank you to Dr. Jana Bayers for her unwavering support and commitment to my intellectual growth over the course of this semester and in this research project.

Thank you to my advisor Paul Mepschen for providing time and expertise that greatly assisted me in pursuing this research.

Thank you to my advisor Margaret Cohen for working through my ideas with me and for your insight, sources, and comments that greatly improved my work.

I also would like to thank Brooks Hosfeld, I am immensely grateful for your comments and feedback on earlier versions of the paper.

I would like to show my gratitude and sincerely thank the two individuals who agreed to participate in this research.

## *Abstract*

---

This research begins to investigate the ways constructions of Dutch-Jewish history and the Holocaust in the Netherlands post World War II have become active symbols of heritage or physical sites of heritage for tourists and host communities alike. In this paper I consider the ways in which the memorialization of Anne Frank in Amsterdam and the human rights violations documented more broadly in the host community, the Netherlands, during the Holocaust has and continues to influence identity politics of the Dutch nation-state, its culture, and citizens on both a local and global stage in contemporary times. The “Jewish History – Anne Frank Tour,” an experience offered through Airbnb, is presented as a case study and ultimately represents the evolution of a long running social phenomena in which the reimagining and retelling of Dutch Jewish history from a neoliberal nationalist lens transforms Dutch Jewish history into a subject of tourism in relation to the nation-state. In this process Jewish peoples and identity are cultivated into productive citizens of the state through market virility via the mass tourism industry. In reconstructing the past and historical memory of a Dutch-Jewish community within a tolerant Dutch nation-state, an ahistorical retelling of Dutch history comes into play the assimilation of Jews and Judaism into the Netherlands represents virtues of Dutch tolerance and culture. So the Netherlands’ response of regret, remorse, and reception to the Holocaust as an unacceptable chapter of heritage allows the Dutch government and nation-state to present as progressive and tolerant in a globalized context, when in reality the Netherlands may be relapsing into the practices of exclusion and injustice they participated in during World War II.

## *Introduction*

---

In the wake of the World War II, the Netherlands and neighboring European nations were faced with the pressing question: who are we? To many, World War II and the Holocaust, marked an era of European history that represented the antithesis of Western ideals of liberation and justice. To commemorate the injustices that took place during World War II there was a push from European nations to maintain or create symbols and sites of heritage other than those based on recreation and leisure to pay homage to and commemorate groups that faced mass extermination during the Holocaust. In commemorating tragic socio-political events, European nations have erected memorials in public spaces. National Holocaust monuments and memorials in Europe are invested in preserving narratives of defeat and triumph in national memory and national identity; memorials, thus, represent complex nationalist spaces that engage with remembering the past while simultaneously envisioning a more tolerant and different future. Monuments exist as national institutions seeking to deliver representations of host nations as tolerant and progressive to visitors by immersing them in narratives of collective violence, death, and ultimately national rebirth” (Crysler, 2006) and the stories of individual peoples and nations are synthesized.

Amsterdam’s Anne Frank is one of the world’s most well-known Holocaust victims and Jewish figures around the world. Frank’s death has come to represent a site of connection for Dutch people and culture: “not only all who died in the Holocaust but also all children, all civilians, everyone whose lives are destroyed by war and racism” (Walter, 2009). In this analysis I focus on investigating the following question: In what ways does tourism, specifically heritage, literary and dark tourism around Anne Frank and the Anne Frank House in Amsterdam today

lend themselves to the nation-state as important and didactic objects representing the moral fiber of the nation-state in themselves that work to impress and reproduce, national memory and a sense of a shared historical world memory? Through the heritagization of the events of the Holocaust in the Netherlands the Dutch nation-state has embraced pre-war Jewish histories and cultures to integrate them into the Netherlands's national history and culture. The convergence of Dutch history and Jewish history after World War II in a public way catalyzed a need for both Anne Frank as a historical figure and her family's Secret Annex as commemorative heritage sites in Amsterdam. Both sites, and the history of the Holocaust are used by the Dutch nation-state as spectacles of despair and triumph in which Dutch culture disguised as Dutch-Jewish culture offers a sense of community, resistance and hope for a future rooted in a more modern and progressive culture.

### *Assumptions*

---

I hypothesize that Amsterdam's most well-known victim of the Holocaust, Anne Frank, has become a symbol of Dutch, Dutch-Jewish, and world culture via the heritagization of the Holocaust in the Netherlands. This can be attributed to the mass distribution of Frank's diary in print originally in Dutch as *Het Achterhuis: Dagboekbrieven 14 Juni 1942 – 1 Augustus 1944* (The Annex: Diary Notes 14 June 1942 – 1 August 1944) (1947) and in English as *Anne Frank – The Diary of a Young Girl* (1957), on film screens in Hollywood, and on Broadway stages around the world. It can also be attributed to the preservation of the Frank family's Secret Annex in Amsterdam's City Center a public museum by the Anne Frank Stichting a non-governmental not-for-profit organization. This combination of variables has enabled Anne Frank to become a spectacle of Jewish, national, and historical memory. The heritagization of the Holocaust in the

Netherlands via the memorialization of Anne Frank is worth investigating because it unfolds within a modern political context that is inseparable from the nation-state's neoliberal and nationalist agendas. Overarching representations of European modernity and nationalism are transmitted via tropes of national renewal or rebirth in monuments commemorating the Holocaust and World War II in the Netherlands. Immediately following World War II, the need to acknowledge and simultaneously eliminate Hitler's ideologies of white-supremacy and violence became incredibly important to European nations on both the local and global levels. In the Netherlands specifically, emerging social movements of sexual emancipation and liberation, committed to an ethos of multiculturalism, individual freedoms, and access to choice represented stark alternatives to the authoritarian past of Nazi occupation during World War II. Anne Frank has become one of Amsterdam's most well-known victims of the Holocaust because to the nation and world the candid thoughts and stories she authored while in hiding represented a longing for freedom and autonomy that have become grounds for psychological identification and symbolic extension on a mass and global scale (Ibrahim 2009).

In many ways Anne Frank expressed feeling disenfranchised from society because of her religious identity, gender identity, and age. For these reasons, Anne Frank's Diary also becomes a site of heritage, connection, or meaning for Jewish peoples and female identifying peoples in addition to Dutch citizens. In using the "Jewish History – Anne Frank Tour," a tour currently offered as an "experience" in Amsterdam on Airbnb as a case study, I anticipated the Jewish history narrative to be overtly intertwined with an agenda of neo-liberal Dutch nationalism. The tour, organized and run by Dutch Amsterdammers, should provide as a rich case study considering the ways Anne Frank has been incorporated into industries that inform historical

memory which incidentally influence identity politics in contemporary globalized societies. With a rise in mass tourism in an increasingly globalized society, several types of unique tourisms emerged including, national tourism, heritage tourism, dark tourism, and literary tourism focusing on Anne Frank and the Frank's Secret Annex in Amsterdam. Tourism has become a major avenue in which the heritagization of the Holocaust has taken place in the Netherlands. I suspect that museums and spaces memorializing Anne Frank instrumentally separate the narratives of violence waged by the nation-state in the global past and present. This is done through the process of heritagization, which places fraught political histories in a distant, ahistorical, museological past.

I anticipate that the transformation of Frank from a teenaged Jewish German-Dutch victim of the Holocaust in Amsterdam into a globalized spectacle of humanity and resilience is linked to temporal politics in the Netherlands that reinforce a revamped Dutch ethos of individual freedom and autonomy as alternatives to a German authoritarian past. The preservation of Anne's private diary and of the Frank's Secret Annex as relics of the Holocaust and World War II have been imbedded within larger representations of the Holocaust and Dutch history, to be constructed as Dutch-Jewish history. In emphasizing a pre-war historical presence of Dutch-Jews and Dutch-Jewish culture in the Netherlands with testimonies such as Anne Frank's, a nation that prizes multiculturalism and individual freedoms can be located in a Dutch history. In the Netherlands today, where discourses of multiculturalism and cultural citizenship are particularly salient in local and global debates, the acts of the Nazi regime in occupied Holland during World War II are understood as not just anti-European but inherently anti-Dutch. Throughout her diary, Anne expressed a fondness for Dutch culture and an immense amount of gratitude for the good

Dutch peoples who worked to keep her and the others in the Annex alive, well, and hidden during the war. Through the heritagization of the Holocaust in Dutch national and international memory, the horror of the barbaric past serves as a warning to the progressive future to produce political history, agenda, and message that is inseparable from neoliberalism. The act of constructing a sense of shared world history over the triumph of anti-modernity Nazi Germany enforces ideals of Dutch and European citizenship where cultures of social progress and liberalism are championed. Anne Frank emerging as a source and sight of mass tourism, heritage tourism, and dark tourism in a post-World War II and post- Holocaust Dutch society is linked to the intensified emergence of both Dutch nationalist and culturalist discourses in a globalized marketplace that chart Dutch society and possibly the world at large as socially progressive and moving in a positive linear direction.

### ***Methodology***

---

This research will rely on situating qualitative and quantitative research within multiple theoretical perspectives to investigate the influence and implications of the memorialization of Anne Frank literary and physically as relics of the Holocaust in Amsterdam and the Dutch context more broadly. Research from academic fields such as Holocaust studies, mass tourism studies, dark tourism studies, literary tourism studies, and gender studies will be used to frame my question, contextualize, and support my findings. The qualitative research that will be used come from the following studies: “Heritage Site Management: Motivations and Expectations” by Yaniv Portia, Arie Reichel, and Avital Biran, “The Holocaust in the Netherlands and the Rate of Jewish Survival” by Marnix Croes, and from the “Foreword” and “Afterword” of Anne Frank – *The Diary of a Young Girl* (2012). I hope to further insight on Anne Frank as a sight of rich

identity discourse specifically for Jewish and Dutch peoples. This study of heritage, thanatourism, and literary tourism will not directly interview participants on their emotional experiences with Anne Frank, the annex or the Holocaust to avoid ethical concerns that arise with studies of this nature. Instead, this study takes a closer look at constructed touristic experiences revolving around Anne Frank and the Anne Frank House.

A field study on one touristic experience in Amsterdam revolving around Anne Frank and the Anne Frank House entitled, “Jewish History – Anne Frank Tour” was conducted for this research. This tour which is offered as an “experience” in Amsterdam through Airbnb for \$70.00 U.S. dollars is one of several tours in Amsterdam revolving around Anne Frank and Jewish history more broadly. Companies like TripAdvisor, Viator, GetYourGuide offer tours on Jewish history that focus on Anne Frank as well; prices range from \$20 U.S. dollars to \$70 dollars and run times, tour routes, and attractions visited may vary. Tours are offered on Tuesdays and Sundays; I attended the Sunday tours with Vaughn Lisser twice to observe and take notes on the content, route, and informational composition and delivery of the tour. I furthered research on the tour and its components by conducting two interviews with Vaughn, the Sunday guide, outside of the tour space. I also interviewed Stan van Pieter, the original creator of the tour who currently manages the tour’s online Airbnb listing and bookings in addition to guiding the Tuesday tour as well. By attending tours and speaking directly with the guides and manager of the tour I sought to investigate the macro-social phenomena tourisms related to Anne Frank on a micro-social level. This approach is intended to draw lines of connection between the processes of heritagizing Anne Frank and the legacy of World War II within a larger temporal political landscape.

Considering the academic and ethical arguments that surround the topic of dark tourism, it was deemed important that questionnaires used to guide interviews did not offend any of the participants. A spatial reading of the Frank's Annex as a spectacle of memorial will be offered in conjunction with close readings of selected excerpts from Anne's diary, *Anne Frank – The Diary of a Young Girl*. As someone with direct ties to Judaism religiously and culturally I hope to counteract implicit biases I may have towards this study's content by incorporating other researchers work alongside my own in the analysis of Jewish heritage in this context. All data on the emotional experiences of individuals from different groups will be cited from other accredited sources of human research.

### ***Literature Review***

---

In this literature review I will begin by addressing works that contextualize World War II and the situation of Jews during the Holocaust within a specifically Dutch context. Following this introduction, a history of the Frank family's experiences as Jews in hiding during World War II in Amsterdam will be outlined. The ways in which Anne's diary was made available to the public will be addressed as well. Reviewing this history will allow for an in depth discussion on Anne Frank's legacy and the Frank's secret annex as a symbolic space linked to Jewish, Dutch, and women's heritage to unfold in analysis. This approach is intended to give way to understandings of how the publishing of Anne Frank's private diary along with the physical preservation and conversion of the Annex into a museum and space of commemoration have transformed Anne Frank from an icon of remembrance on the page and on screen into an idol of remembrance from a cultural, ethnic and national and gendered perspective. The mass memorialization of Anne

Frank on a local and international level has helped validate her diary and the Secret Annex or Achterhuis as national Dutch heritage and world heritage. In line with this analysis, a review of key studies on tourism, heritage tourism, literary tourism, and dark tourism will be offered to further engage with constructions and representations of heritage sites for visiting tourists and the Netherlands as a host community.

In working to better understand the positioning of the Frank family and their experiences in their secret annex during World War II (1939-1949) it is relevant to discuss Nazi Germany's occupation in the Dutch context. Between 1933 and 1945 the Nazis murdered an estimated six million Jews and hundreds of thousands of individuals from other marginalized groups (for example, homosexuals and Romanies) (United States Holocaust Museum 2018). It is important to consider the difficulties in calculating the numbers of people who were killed as the result of Nazi occupation and policies. For example the Netherlands' citizen registry system documented a total of 160,820 Jewish people in country, but the Nazis perceived 140,000 to be Jewish, namely those individuals with at least three grandparents of Jewish descent (Croes 2006). Of the 140,000 Jews who lived in Holland in 1940, 102,000 Jews did not survive the war (Nederlands Auschwitz Committee 2018). The central question of why such a high percentage of Jews from the Netherlands died in the Holocaust has been researched by both Holocaust studies scholars and Dutch historiographers.

The most important work on this topic has been conducted by historians Johan Cornelis Hendrik Blom and Bob Moore. In pursuit of investigating the low survival rate of Jews in the Netherlands, Blom differentiates the persecutors, the "setting" (bureaucracy, population, and geography), and the victims (Blom 1989). In this analysis the role of the German civilian

administration that Hitler allowed the Dutch in 1940 as a “Germanic” people (Blom 1989). Regarding the “setting” of the Netherlands, Dutch bureaucracy played a unique role in influencing the low survival rate of Jews. As briefly hinted to before, the Dutch’s pre-existing bureaucratic system of citizen registration where almost all Dutch citizens were catalogued made it exceptionally easy for Nazi forces to identify and locate Jews in the Netherlands. Overall, the Dutch response to German occupation and the systematic murder of peoples was met with a high degree of cooperation which Blom attributes to the Dutch tradition of deference of authority (Croes 2006). Geographically, Jews in Holland had a particularly difficult time fleeing to less populated and forested areas as the Netherlands was heavily populated and lacked forests regions. The Netherlands also bordered by Germany, occupied Belgium and the Wadden sea made exiting the country particularly challenging. In the final area of analysis, and the least relevant to Blom’s work, is the disposition or behavior of the victims. Blom considers the role the Jewish Council of the Netherlands in the execution and deportation of Jews from Westerbork, and suggests that their “docility” may have played a facilitating role in the process (Blom 1989).

Moore’s research expands on Blom’s to consider potential explanations of why foreign Jews, German Jews in particular, had higher rates of survival than Dutch Jews. He hypothesizes that Jews coming from Germany had a clearer understanding of German occupation making it more likely for them to self-organize a plan to escape or go into hiding sooner than Dutch Jews. A lack of overt anti-Semitism in pre-war Holland may have given Dutch Jews a sense of false consciousness and security that Jews in and from different countries lacked (Blom 1989). 25,000 Jews went underground in the Netherlands and while 10,000 of these individuals were caught by the Nazis, individuals who hid during the Holocaust still remain the single largest group of

survivors (Moore 1997). Moore's research continues to reiterate many of Bolm's explanations on the low Jewish survival rates during World War II in the Netherlands. Together these theories offer insight into the historical socio-political context framing the experiences of Jews in Holland during World War II. Marnix Croes's research in "The Holocaust in the Netherlands and the Rate of Jewish Survival" (2006) casts doubt on the "deference-to-authority" hypothesis in Blom and Moore's work, and proposes that the relentless quest for Jews in hiding deserves more attention. The work of Blom and Moore will provide a helpful frame of analysis in working to understand the ways the legacy of Anne Frank and the Frank family's secret annex in contemporary Amsterdam have become active symbols of heritage or physical sites of heritage for tourist and host communities alike.

Anne Frank was a female German Jewish teenager who went into hiding with her family in July of 1942 to try and escape the perils of the Holocaust in German occupied Holland. Anne, her father Otto, mother Edith, sister Margot, along with four others in an annex of rooms located above Opteka—Otto Frank's office in Amsterdam's city center at Prinsengracht 263 (Biran et al., 2005). Like many other Jews, the Franks relocated to Amsterdam, the Netherlands from Frankfurt, Germany in 1933 in face of an economic crisis and in seeing growing anti-Semitism and Hitler's rise to power. The family's attempts to emigrate to the U.K. and the U.S. fail and on May 10<sup>th</sup>, 1940 Holland is invaded by the Nazi regime and anti-Jewish sentiments and legislation increased. Otto set up the annex with his Jewish business partner Hermann van Pels, whose family also hid in the annex, and his non-Jewish Dutch associates Johannes Kleiman and Victor Kugler (Anne Frank House, 2018). Miep Gies and Bep Voskuijl, the two secretaries working in the building along with office supervisors Kleiman and Kugler,

greatly helped to protect the secret annex in addition to managing its logistics and the survival needs of the eight individuals in hiding (Frank and Pressler 2012).

Anne kept a private diary from June 12<sup>th</sup> 1942 to August 1<sup>st</sup> 1944. Her diary, which she nicknamed Kitty, is described by the Anne Frank House to have been her best friend and greatest source of comfort and support while in hiding. The Dutch minister of education in exile makes a call for people to keep war diaries or eye witness accounts of the hardships and suffering of the Dutch people under German occupation in 1944; upon hearing this Anne decides to edit her diary and write a novel called *The Secret Annex* with the intention of publishing it as a book after the war (Anne Frank House, 2018). In her edits she worked to improve the text, omitted passages she found less interesting, and added more detail from memory to previously written excerpts (Frank and Pressler 2012). After 25 months, a little more than two years in hiding, the annex was discovered and its residents were arrested and deported to concentration camps.

Gies and Voskuijl found Anne's diary in the ransacked annex and Gies held onto it until after the war (Frank and Pressler 2012). The only member of the Frank family and annex of eight to survive the Holocaust was Otto Frank (1888-1980) (Anne Frank House, 2018). Anne died in Bergen-Belsen of typhus in March 1945, three months before her sixteenth birthday (Frank and Pressler 2012). When Gies learned of Anne's death she gave the diaries, to Anne's father, Otto Frank (Frank and Pressler 2012). After much thought and consideration, Otto Frank decided to publish Anne's diary, fulfilling his daughters original hope. In publishing her work, Otto selected materials from both versions of the diary and created a shorter version which was published under the title of *Het Achterhuis: Dagboekbrieven 14 Juni 1942 – 1 Augustus 1944* (*The Annex: Diary Notes 14 June 1942 – 1 August 1944*) by Contact Publishing in 1947. At first the diary was

somewhat successful in the Netherlands, but overall it had a slow beginning. On the other hand the book was a major hit in the United States; “on 16 June 1952... all 5,000 copies were sold that afternoon” (Frank and Pressler 2012). There was a lot of buzz from screenwriters, producers, and theatrics who were interested in taking *The Diary of a Young Girl* off the page.

In October 1995 at New York’s Cort Theatre a Broadway show based on the diary premiered (Frank and Pressler 2012). When the book garnered popularity in the United States on print and on stage the book became a bestseller in the Netherlands. Between 1995 and 1997 fifteen new editions of the diary became available in the Netherlands in addition to being published internationally in places like Germany, Sweden, Japan, Hungary, Spain for starters (Frank and Pressler 2012). In 1957 Otto signed an agreement with 20<sup>th</sup> Century Fox for a Hollywood film version of the diary. In 1955 when Opteka moved to a Amsterdam-West the building and Secret Annex were at risk of being demolished; Otto and Mr. Kleiman naturally both set out to save the building to preserve it. The reaction to news of the destruction of the Frank’s annex outraged many Dutch citizens. In response, many Dutch newspapers campaigned against the destruction of the space; the democratic-socialist newspaper *Het Vrije Volk* went as far in stating that “the Netherlands will be subject to a national scandal if this house is pulled down” (Frank and Pressler 2012). On the day demolition was scheduled protesters surrounded the house and warded off the looming construction.

In 1957 Amsterdammers worked with Otto Frank and Mr. Kleiman to create the Anne Frank Stichting, a foundation whose espoused mission was dedicated to the “restoring and, if necessary, renovation of the attached annex, as well, as the propagation of the ideals, left as a legacy to the world, in the diary of Anne Frank” (Frank and Pressler 2012). Shortly after the

founding of this foundation, Berghaus the legal owners of the property donated the house to the Stichting Foundation. A mere three years later in 1960 the Anne Frank House opened for public viewing. Otto made a point of sharing his intentions of the preservation of the house telling journalists that the house was intended “neither as a museum nor a place of pilgrimage. It is an earnest warning from the past and a mission of hope for the future” (Frank and Pressler 2012). In the first twelve months 9,000 people visited the house and ten years later that number rose to 180,000 people annually. The mass amount of visitors led to the museum needing essential renovations and the building was under construction for several months in 1970 and reopened in 1971 (Frank and Pressler 2012). When the museum reopened it could no longer maintain the building’s upkeep and operate on donations, so, an entry fee was introduced.

Even with an entry fee the number of visitors to the site drastically increased rising to 710,000 people in 1997 (Frank and Pressler 2012). The house was in need of more repairs, and renovations were launched to incorporate more exhibition space, and build a bookshop and café. The Opteka offices in the front of the building were reconstructed to their state in 1940 while the Secret Annex was left untouched. In 1999 Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands reopened the museum making it a national spectacle. Since its reopening more than a million people visit the site annually (Frank and Pressler 2012). Information on visitors show that most visitors are English speakers, with 25 percent from the United Kingdom and 25 percent from the United States (Frank and Pressler 2012). 15 percent of visitors are from Holland and the outstanding 35 percent are from other places in the world (Frank and Pressler 2012). When Otto Frank passed in 1980, he willed Anne’s manuscripts to the Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation in Amsterdam. This national institute confirmed the diary to be an authentic manuscript and all

three versions of the diary were released to the public in addition to other articles that contextualized the circumstances that led to their arrest, deportation, and death of those hiding in the annex and of Jews at large in Holland. This transaction can be considered a clear marker of the forging of a unique relationship between the Dutch-nation state and the Jewish experience as a part of Holland's national heritage and history.

A small amount of research has been done on the Anne Frank House as a site of what Irene Stengs identifies as “sacred waste.” The concept of sacred waste offers insight into the significance of materiality in the production, preservation, and management of meaning (Stengs 2014). Sacred waste is identified as a material residue or object that cannot be discarded as trash but can neither be left alone: it is “ambiguous in nature, charged with a religious, moral, or emotional value on one hand, but at the same time kind of leftover for which no proper destination exists” (Stengs 2014). Sacred waste may emanate from religious ritual or via events of extraordinary scale or impact, or rest upon trauma. These types of “waste” must be sanctioned off and maintained as an artifact or as cultural heritage. This argument of preservation is a historical argument that operates from a moral framework: the act of destroying these materials would be an act against ourselves (ie: society) or an act that would deny the sacrifices made by those who died. Inappropriate treatment of sacred waste may damage the moral reputation of persons and institutions involving public condemnation and provoking consequences (Stengs 2014). This becomes increasingly relevant when Stengs’ considers the moral dilemma that emerged around the question of what to do with the remnants of the “Anne Frank Tree” a chestnut tree that stood behind the Frank’s Secret Annex on Prinsengracht.

The “Anne Frank Tree” had garnered attention as a site of sacred waste because Frank described the tree in her diary while narrating a moment between her and Peter in the attic: “The two of us looked out at the blue sky, the bare chestnut tree glistening with dew, the seagulls and other birds glinting with silver as they swooped through the air, and we were so moved and entranced that we couldn’t speak” (Frank, 2012). When the tree fell in 2010, the 25 tons of leftover wood was preserved as a relic of sacred waste from Anne Frank’s story and from the time of German occupation in Holland more broadly. In this analysis Stengs (2014) reiterates that “Disintegration, disposal, or destruction [of the tree] would be tantamount to playing down the importance of ‘Jewish cultural heritage.’ Moreover, the “Anne Frank Tree” offers an example of the moral load that may concern those in charge of sacred waste. The Anne Frank House as a managed form of “sacred waste” that produces or substantiates ritual performances has not been fully explored while Anne Frank and the Anne Frank House have been researched as sites of mass tourism, heritage tourism, dark tourism and literary tourism.

As tourism has become a central part of contemporary society and the globalized economy tourism studies has become a major field of scholarly study and intrigue in social sciences. Early literature in tourism studies began by defining tourism as an activity engaged in by human that features three specific characteristics (Tribbe, 1997). The first being the act of travel from one place to another, the second being a particular set of motives for engaging in that travel (outside of commuting for work) and lastly the engagement in activity at the destination itself (Tribbe, 1997). In vein with this definition, tourism has been linked with various sub-activities: travel, hospitality, and recreation. These sub-activities emphasize the economic and business aspects of tourism. In a globalized context tourism is a bigger enterprise that may interact and

impact host regions, business suppliers, governments, communities, and environments (Tribe, 1997).

Beyond acts of recreation, tourism may offer more than just that which is monetarily measurable. Przeclawski (1993) noted the relevancy of the psychological, the social, and the cultural experiences anticipated or evoked through tourism. Heritagization, a concept defined by Harrison (2013) as the process through which objects, places and practices are turned into cultural heritage becomes increasingly relevant in expanding on the anticipated cultural Przeclawski (1993) considered. The shift in research from the descriptive to the experiential conceptualization of tourism has been in line with contemporary developments of the tourism body of knowledge (Biran et al. 2011). This approach considered the experience as an interactive process that involves both the visitor and the site, thus, emphasizing the symbolic meaning or nature of the site to the visitor (Biran et al. 2011). For example, cultural tourism presents a tourism product that aims to raise awareness or emphasize the importance of preserving the values of the past, and highlight how cultural heritage interacts with identity (Bujdosó et al. 2015). As the scope of tourism has widened, heritage tourism has become a major area of study. Timothy and Boyd (2003) take two approaches in working to define heritage tourism. The first approach focuses on the presence of the visitor in spaces that display historic artifacts or at locations that have been classified as sites of heritage (Garrod and Fyall 2000). The second approach emphasizes the connection between the individual and the heritage presented which is related to the perception of the site in relation to the visitor's own heritage (Biran et al., 2001).

Understanding the motivations behind heritage tourism has become increasingly relevant in understanding tourism outside of leisure. Biran, Poria, and Reichel (2005) argue that attention

should be given not only to the tourist (the subject), or the place visited (the object), but also to the relationship between them, which is at the core of social behavior in a destination. Their study on the Anne Frank House as a heritage site for certain visitors supported their claim that tourists' perceptions are critical in understanding visitors' behavior at historic settings, rather than only their presence at the site (Biran et al., 2005). In their research specific motivations for visiting Anne Frank House were polled via interviewing 208 individuals and conducting statistical analyses. They were able to identify and interpret their findings on individual motivations into categories: willingness to feel connected to the history presented, willingness to learn, and motivations not linked with the historic attributes of the destination. Moreover, they concluded that the more participants perceive the site to be part of their own heritage, the more they want to feel connected to the site (Biran et al. 2005).

Human fascination with death and the macabre is not a new phenomenon, however, in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries more scholars and theorists have begun investigating this happening. Lennon and Foley (2000) label some of these phenomena as 'dark tourism,' and their research considers the fundamental shift in the ways death, disaster, and atrocity, are being dealt with by parties who offer affiliated tourism products or experiences. Giving attention to 'dark tourism' as a circumstantial product fueled by modernity in an increasingly globalized world, they emphasize "the politics, economies, sociologies, and technologies of the contemporary world" as influential factors that become relevant in the selection and interpretation of spaces and events that become dark tourism (Lennon and Foley 2000). Their work posits the act of visiting dark tourism sites as an opportunity for local-global connections to be made. In contexts where tourism sites celebrate history or commemorate

memory, national, regional, and commercial bodies see opportunities to pursue their agendas. These opportunities reach their peak when later infrastructure has been repaired or maintained and investment in site as a site of visitation is secure (Lennon and Foley 2000). The most recent announcement by Holland's Cabinet of Prime Minister Mark Rutte in February 2017 on the state's allocation of \$8.5 million towards the construction and maintenance of the National Holocaust Museum in Amsterdam could be seen as the Dutch government engaging in the practices Lennon and Foley (2000) speak of. As the Dutch government invests in maintaining sites of the Holocaust to secure them as sites of dark, Dutch, and Jewish history they are simultaneously offering an experience sponsored by the state (Times of Israel 2017).

Considering these circumstances, it is easy to anticipate the ways a former battlefield or concentration camp becomes an exploitable tourist resource (Lennon and Foley 2000). Their main argument aims to categorize dark tourism as a notion of post-modernity in which irrelevant aspects of 'post-modernity' are principally taken to represent its main characteristics. They continue to identify two critical features inherent in dark tourism: the first being the role global communication technologies have played in catalyzing interest in the site and the second being that the object of spectacle appears to induce a sense of or feelings of anxiety about enterprise of modernity (Lennon and Foley 2000). The example of the use of 'rational planning' and technical innovation used to launch a Jewish Holocaust is offered. Thus, this theoretical framework addressing questions of what sites have become dark sites and why becomes particularly relevant in expanding discussion on the nature and construction of dark tourism sites.

In "Violence and Empathy: National Museums and the Spectacle of Society," (2016) C. Greig Crysler, considers the ways institutions actively try to exemplify models of tolerant

national citizenship in their visitors in museums and monuments by engaging them in narratives of collective violence, death and finally national rebirth. The theory of museology is defined as an effort to refashion professional museum practices and technologies to better fit local cultural contexts and socioeconomic conditions (Kreps 2008). Museum spaces in contemporary society introduce new pedagogies of citizenship and consumption that can be linked historically to spaces of public exhibition and spectacle used in the nineteenth century (Crysler 2016). Specifically, the simulation of national violence in museums becomes relevant in Crysler's analysis. Simulations of violence, depending upon processes of empathetic identification, attempt to position politically fraught histories of the nation in a museological past. By placing socio-historical and political violence into distant histories allows for pain and suffering to be memorialized and operated upon as something separate from the present (Crysler 2016). In doing this, troubled histories of "the past" are separated from the violence of the nation-state in the global present. Museum goers begin to see the legacy of Holocaust concurrently as: an act of the past antithetical to justice and modernity, which now informs the production of progressive, liberal society that prizes social justice. Holocaust narratives in particular become a malleable metaphor for the human condition which enables it to be used to represent historical trauma in other national contexts. By re-constructing traumatic events, materials, and symbolic spaces for collective identification, consumers engage with representations of trauma in the Holocaust as a crisis for the Western civilization and the whole of humanity which informs the imperative not to forget a universal agenda (Ibrahim 2009).

While many have studied the motivations behind visiting dark tourism sites there has been little research done to understand what influences these motivations. Busby and Devereux

(2015) research reviews the effect of literature on tourism. Specifically the literature they studied was Anne Frank –The Diary of Anne Frank, to understand the influence for visiting this dark tourism attraction. Busby and Devereux’s (2015) research indicated that individuals who had read the Anne Frank – Diary of a Young Girl were more likely to be encouraged to visit the site of the Secret Annex than those who had not. Overall, people visiting attractions hold motivations that may be related to expectations, education, or entertainment among other things. Literary attractions have been defined as a “site that may be constructed around the life of an author or the characters and/or setting described in the literature” (Fawcett and Cormack 2001). Attractions differ from homes where authors and or characters owned, lived, or died to places that have been used in film or television adaptations (Philips 2007). Literary and dark tourism are not always concerned with real-life events or tragedy. In the novel, Dracula by Bram Stoker Count, Dracula landed in Whitby where a festival celebrated by Goths celebrating this event takes place annually (Spracklen & Spracklen, 2014). This point becomes increasingly relevant in considering Anne Frank – The Diary of Anne Frank as a site of literary and dark tourism.

Herbert (2001) argues that visitors are more likely to tour literary sites if they can personally relate to the literature or visual adaptations and identifies four key reasons tourist visit literary attractions that my research builds upon. The first is when the visitor’s interest is peaked because they have a connection with the author’s life. This is followed by people’s interest in places that act as settings in literature. The third reason may be that individuals visit the site for a deeper emotion than the particular author or story in itself. The last reason, “may be less concerned with the literature than with some dramatic event in the writer’s life” (Herbert, 2001). Busby and Devereux (2015) draw the connection between the writings of Anne Frank and the

Holocaust that tremendously affected her life and the lives of so many others. Moreover, from this perspective, “Anne Frank can represent not only all who died in the Holocaust but also all children, all civilians, everyone whose lives are destroyed by war and racism” (Walter, 2009).

### ***Ethnographic Description and Discussion***

---

The following breakdown of the “Jewish History – Anne Frank Tour” is intended to identify the ways this curated touristic experience presents didactic objects and spaces that qualify as “sacred waste” to reproduce memory in three different ways: personal memory, national memory, and a sense of world memory. The first tour I attended was on a Sunday morning in October 2018; after buying a ticket for \$70 U.S. dollars online through Airbnb I had been told the group would be meet at 10:00 AM in the Jewish Cultural Quarter of Amsterdam at the Joods Historisch Museum. At five past ten, Vaughn Lissen, introduced himself as the tour guide to the people in the area and everyone was called to convene as a group in a small semi-circle. Vaughn, a Dutch native in his 30s enthusiastically told us a bit about himself and the tour that we would be starting shortly. He explained that the group would be walking to different monuments and memorials related to Jewish history in Amsterdam, starting with the Portuguese Synagogue and ending at the Anne Frank House on Prinsengracht around 12:30 PM. After going through the logistics of the next three and a half hours we began the tour by walking across the street to the Portuguese Synagogue.

Here Vaughn began telling the group about the arrival of the Sephardic Jews from Spain and Portugal in the fifteenth century. He explained that Jewish history and the presence of the Jews in Amsterdam had existed some time before the events of the Holocaust; the question “why would Jews want to live or move to Amsterdam as early as the late fifteenth century?” was posed

to the group. When the group fell silent Vaughn explained that Amsterdam under Philip II in 1579 established a republic in which freedom from religious persecution was guaranteed. Naturally, Jewish people who had been experiencing persecution and or discrimination elsewhere flocked there. Immediately, narratives of an Amsterdam as a tolerant and liberal European commercial center during the European Golden Age was introduced to the group. A focus on culture over religion in Vaughn's commentary was intended to reflect the integrated nature of Dutch-Judaism both before and after German occupation of the Netherlands during World War II. When Vaughn made this socio-cultural historical connection many people nodded in agreement to show they understood. The location of the synagogue and its positioning in a modern bustling intersection of the city was then addressed.

The Portuguese Synagogue located on Mr. Visserplein in the historic Jodenbuurt, or Jewish district, the eastern section of the old city center in Amsterdam marked a geographic border between different pre-World War II Jewish neighborhoods. The neighborhood that at one point extended westward towards Waterlooplein was known as the poor Jewish neighborhood while the area and houses moving toward east Amsterdam were known to be more affluent. Of the 77,252 Jews living in Amsterdam in October 1941, 25.3% of Jews survived German occupation of the Netherlands from 1940-1945 (Croes 2006). Rates of Jews returning to Amsterdam after World War II were minimal and so, the uninhabited neighborhood stretching westward towards city center was demolished to build new, modern parts of the city up. In sharing these narratives alongside one another, the Portuguese Synagogue is framed as a site of Jewish history that has overcome national violence and preserved Jewish history. This telling of Jewish history entwined with narratives of a historically liberal yet evolving Amsterdam facilitate

the process of framing the atrocities of Nazi Germany during World War II in the Netherlands as something separate from Dutch culture historically. The delivery of narratives on Dutch culture as devoted to individual sovereignty and tolerance continued as group arrived at the next site:

The Dockworker statue located on Jonas Daniel Meijerplein.

The group walked through the empty square and gathered around the statue of ‘The Dockworker’ located next to the Portuguese Synagogue. Vaughn, in attempt to reign the group in at this site, began noting of the squares positioning in between the Ashkenazi synagogue (now the Joods Historisch Museum) and the Portuguese Synagogue before going deeper into the following Jewish and Dutch histories embedded in this location. The square was named after Jonas Daniel Meijer the first Jewish layer known to have lived in the Netherlands in 1873 who was well known and respected for being decisive in pursuing “Dutch justice” (Jewish Amsterdam 2018). On February 22 and 23 1941 the Nazi’s held one of the first major raids and deportations of Jews in the Netherlands. A total of 427 Jewish men were rounded up between Waterlooplein and the Jonas Daniel Meijerplein and were deported to concentration camps Buchenwald and Mauthausen via prison camp Schoorl. After the war it was learned that only one of them survived the war (Anne Frank House 2018). At this point in telling the story, Vaughn passed around an iPad with several different photos of the square; some of the pictures were photoshopped and images of the deportation event itself and the surrounding buildings in 1941 were transposed over modern images of the square. In sharing these images, the events that took place in the square were simulated in a way and tour attendees were immediately able to locate the square and buildings they faced head on in the historical photos presented. After briefing attendees on the

Jewish history of the space, Vaughn began to elaborate on the ways this particular event reverberated through the city shocking many Amsterdammers.

Immediately after this raid, on Tuesday February 25 1942, the illegal Communist Party of the Netherlands (CPN) called for a city-wide strike (Verzets Resistance Museum 2018). The work strike which began in Amsterdam and spread to outlying towns was an explicit protest against the persecution of the Jews and against German occupation of the Netherlands (Verzets Resistance Museum 2018). As explained by Vaughn, The Dockworker, erected as a monument and unveiled by Queen Juliana in 1952 is intended to be a representation of “the average laborer who when on strike after the first deportation of Jews in Amsterdam.” In this vein, the memorialization of the first deportation of Jews in Amsterdam at Jonas Daniel Meijerplein happens simultaneously with the commemoration of the Dutch response to Nazi persecution through The Dockworker. In Vaughn’s explanation of the site’s monuments and history, a socio-historical legacy of the Dutch pursuing “Dutch justice” continues to be charted. In this rendition of history the heritagization of Jewish history is informed by and within narratives of secular Dutch history. So, while the Nazi violence that took place in city center Amsterdam are framed as Jewish history, the Dutch response of having gone on strike is dually framed as Dutch history and Jewish history.

The group then took a five minute walk to the Auschwitz Monument (1977) in Wertheim Park, Amsterdam Centrum. The Auschwitz Monument, or Auschwitzmonument in Dutch, was created by Dutch writer and artist Jan Wolkers in memory of the numerous victims of Auschwitz (Netherlands Tourism 2018). The monument entitled “Broken Mirrors” is made of six panels of broken mirrors which face upward towards the sky. Vaughn explained that the mirrors are

intended to reflect air and symbolize that the sky, or would around us, will never be the same again because of the atrocities of the Holocaust. The words “Nooit Meer Auschwitz,” “Never Again Auschwitz” are inscribed in glass on a large glass plaque framing the memorial. This memorial is visited by thousands of visitors annually. Despite this memorial being tucked away from the public eye it is was unfortunately vandalized in 1977, 1997, and 1999 (Netherlands Tourism 2018). When a member of the group posed a question about one of the panels being noticeably damaged Vaughn explained that the source of vandalism is unknown but that such open acts of destruction on the site eerily personify the memorial’s message: injustices that have already occurred, can occur again. In this dialogue the Auschwitz Monument, is unique in that it cannot be placed neatly in an explicitly museological historical past. The two sites visited prior to the Auschwitz Monument clearly depended upon simulations of national violence or stories of persecution to evoke a process of memorialization in which troubling socio-political histories are understood and catalogued as something historical and separate from the present. The Auschwitz Monument on the other hand presents a unique case as where the process of memorialization is disrupted by present-day vandalism. This exposure or proof of anti-Semitism in contemporary Amsterdam makes it increasingly difficult to categorize the legacies of Nazi Germany as being in the shadows of a national, or worldly distant past.

The next stop, Burlange De Burcht located on Henri Polaklaan, was another site of both Jewish and Dutch culture and history that introduced narratives of a historically progressive Amsterdam while furthering the heritagization of the Dutch Judaism in the Netherlands. Built in 1899, the Burlange De Burcht, is a relevant building in Dutch history as the oldest trade union building in the Netherlands to date. Vaughn elaborated explaining that the building was designed

by Dutch architect Hendrik Petrus Berlage. In Dutch culture Berlage is considered the “father of modern architecture” in the Netherlands whose work would later inspired Dutch architectural groups of the 1920s including the Amsterdam School and De Stijl. Dutch Jews played an notable role in the economic development of Amsterdam as bankers, merchants and parliamentarians. Many working-class Dutch Jews advocated for socialism and were at the forefront of supporting the trade union movement most notably in the diamond industry (Bender 1988). Henri Polak a Jewish Amsterdammer and prominent member of the Social Democratic Association fought for the socialist ideal from 1890-1940. Polak was important political and social figure; Polak in collaboration with De Levita and Jos Loopuit, co-founded the first modern trade union in the Netherlands for Dutch diamond workers in 1894 (Joods Amsterdam 2018). Polak served as the long-standing chairman of the Algemene Nederlandse Diamantbewerders Bond (ANDB) from 1894 until his arrest in 1940 by Nazi soldiers. As early as 1929, Polak openly spoke against the National Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP), foreseeing the Nazis as a threat to democracy and his own Jewish people’s welfare 1894 (Joods Amsterdam 2018). Once again, the intertwining of Dutch and Jewish history through Vaughn’s storytelling at different monuments and sites of Jewish history in the city leaves tour attendees thinking about interactions between Dutch culture and Dutch Jews as building a more inclusive and progressive nation-state which in turn sidelines a central theme of the tour: the legacy of Dutch participation in the Holocaust and Nazi rule.

The group then headed northwest down the block from the Burlange De Burcht to Artis Amsterdam Zoo. Artis, short for Natura Artis Magistra (Royal Zoological Society), is a zoo located in city center Amsterdam. Founded in 1838, Artist is the oldest zoo in the Netherlands,

the oldest zoo in Europe, and the fourth oldest zoo in the world (Frankenhuis 2017). After the group assembled into a semi-circle facing Artis Vaughn told the group that this is one of his favorite sites to speak about as many people are not familiar with this site as a sight of Dutch-Jewish history. He continued to give some history on the Artis; unlike other Dutch zoos, Artis remained open during the German occupation. Covering a total thirty four acres of land, the park is thought to have housed as many as 250 people seeking refuge for short and extended periods of time during World War II. In 1941 Jewish employees and members of the zoo's Board of Directors were removed from their positions and the zoo was 'forbidden to Jews' (Frankenhuis 2017). However, the Artis zoo became a place of hiding for Jews and young men avoiding their summons to work in Germany. The idea of people hiding in the zoo amongst different animal exhibitions and spaces greatly peaked the groups interest. Vaughn began explaining that Artis was a site that attracted many Nazi soldiers and officials on break looking for a pleasant escape from wartime duties and stress in the city, but little did they know that there were Jews and other political dissenters amongst them. Vaughn continued to tell the group that people were thought to had in the lofts above the predator gallery, the aquarium, the primate house, the wolf house and the avian exhibition. This site marked a shift in the nature of the stops on the tour and the tour's historical narrative and tone to incorporate more stories on Dutch-Jewish resistance during the war in addition to pre-war Dutch-Jewish culture and later Jewish persecution.

Continuing on to the next location on the tour route and focusing on the theme of resistance we walked northwest towards a building on the corner of Plantage Kerklaan and Plantage Middenlaan. At this bustling intersection Vaughn spoke over moving trams and dingling bikes about another example of Dutch resistance to Nazi Germany's occupation of Holland: the

attack on the Public Records Offices on the Plantage Kerklaan Artis' former concert hall. As touched upon earlier in the literature review the Dutch's pre-existing bureaucratic system of citizen registration where almost all Dutch citizens were catalogued made it exceptionally easy for Nazi forces to identify and track down Jews in the Netherlands. In 1943, Gerrit van der Veen and Willy Arondeus, leaders of the PCB a Dutch resistance movement known for forging identity papers were especially interested in destroying these personal records as false identity papers pass as authentic more often than not when the original information is no longer accessible (Anne Frank House 2012). The group bombed the office with dynamite and when a strong fire fails to take hold the fire brigade gets involved and supports the efforts of resistance fighters by holding off putting out the fire for as long as possible. When the brigade does turn their water hoses on they use an excess amount of water in attempt to further destroy the remaining records. A total of about 15 percent of the personal records are destroyed (Anne Frank House 2012). This anecdotal story offered a smooth segue into the history of resistance surrounding the next site: the National Holocaust Museum opposite the Hollandsche Schouwburg in the Jewish Cultural Quarter of Amsterdam.

Built in 1892, the Hollandsche Schouwburg theatre, became a deportation center for Jews during World War II (Jewish Cultural Quarter 2018). Once considered a space of Dutch culture and entertainment, today the building is a monument that to the memory of those Jewish victims. When the group arrived at the Schouwburg Vaughn asked everyone to position themselves with their backs toward the theatre so they could look out onto the street, Nieuwe Amstelstraat. Before speaking, Vaughn allowed an oncoming tram to pass to make sure the group could hear him, but he asked the group to take note of where the tram stopped to unload and collect passengers. With

less noise, Vaughn went into detailing the history of the Hollandsche Schouwburg, explaining that for many Jews it was their last stop for before being sent to Nazi work or death camps. Beyond being a place tragedy and morbidity, this site according to Vaughn “tells a special story that Amsterdammers hold close to their hearts.” He elaborated explaining that when the war ended it was discovered that the Dutch resistance was running a secret operation of saving children who had reported to the Schouwburg for deportation with their parents. In working to utilize limited space and manage feelings of hysteria in the theatre Nazis began separating children ages thirteen and up from their parents when they arrived on site; these children were taken to a daycare center across the street, however, they would be reunited with the parents before being deported to Westerbork and Vught and from there to German concentration camps (Verzets Resistance Museum 2018). The then daycare center across the street from the Schouwburg is the National Holocaust Museum of the Netherlands today.

The Jewish Council introduced in the literature review became more relevant to this site than the previously visited stops. Vaughn explained that members of the Jewish Council who oversaw the Schouwburg and the daycare center saw their positioning as an opportunity to save adults and children and they did so as often as possible. As the ones responsible for registering all peoples who arrived and left these Council members collaborated with Dutch resistance to have a certain number of children smuggled out of the daycare center a day. In detailing how children were smuggled out by resistance fighters Vaughn asked the group to recall the way the tram stop in front of the Schouwburg blocked the front facade of the daycare center building. He explained that when the tram would roll in to stop in front of the theatre resistance members would sneak children out of the building by walking alongside the tram on the tramline to escape

into the city. Nazi soldiers didn't detect the movement of people out of the building and the leaders of the Jewish Council involved in the operation would have the names of those children disappear from the Schouwburg registry records. It is believed that just over six hundred children were saved by this operation run by the Dutch Resistance and the Jewish Council members which explains why Vaughn introduced the group to this site as one of resistance that Amsterdammers feel particularly proud of and connected to.

The group then headed into the National Holocaust Museum memorial in the 'Hollandsche Schouwburg.' The preserved parts of the building house informational spaces including a hall where the names of all those who passed through the theatre who were later killed are displayed. Through two glass doors on the main floor the memorial extends outside to an open roofed amphitheatre. Upon entering the outdoor space the group walked towards the monument on a path between six marble benches. These benches were placed in the area where the first, second, and third rows of seats would have been. Facing three charred brick walls, in the area what once was a stage, a concrete diamond shaped pillar juts out of a concrete base in the shape of a Star of David. On the sides of these benches were pink wooden tulips – Vaughn explains that each flower has a note attached to it that was written by a Dutch child in elementary school. The wooden tulips in the monument space offer visitors a tender visual example of the ways Dutch children engage and commemorate the Holocaust in contemporary society. After giving everyone a couple of moments to be in the space on their own, the group exited the memorial and took the tram noted earlier to Dam Square. From Dam Square the group would walk to Prinsengracht to make the groups 12:30-12:45 ticketed time slot for the Anne Frank House.

The portion of the tour in which the group was around the Anne Frank House felt distinctly different. The group came to a stop in front at the Westerkerk Church in between Prinsengracht and Keizersgracht before receiving their museum tickets. Here, Vaughn began sharing anecdotes from *Anne Frank – The Diary of a Young Girl*. He did not read the passage but paraphrased the following excerpt:

**Anne Frank:** We've all been a little confused this past week because our dearly beloved Westertoren bells have been carted off to be melted down for the war, so we have no idea of the exact time, either night or day. I still have hopes that they'll come up with a substitute, made of tin or copper or some such thing, to remind the neighborhood of the clock.

Just as Vaughn finished contextualizing the bells within Anne Frank's story, they sounded. In many ways the presentation of information at this site allowed participants to occupy a complex space. Anne's war-time anecdote highlights that the the sounding of the Westerkerk bells represented hope: with each peal war-time would pass and a times of peace, autonomy, and freedom would reign. In knowing and understanding the fate of Anne and the Frank family during the Holocaust, participants may perceive meaning or assign meaning to the act of hearing the bells chime in a free society something Anne would never experience again in her lifetime. In this moment the group was presented with ideas of emancipation and freedom of movement; I found it worth noting that Vaughn didn't mention the presence of The Homomonument, a Dutch memorial representing the persecution and violence against queer bodies in the Netherlands before distributing tickets to the Anne Frank museum and guiding the group to the museum's entry.

The Homomonument is a public monument intended to symbolize the long standing campaign for gay emancipation in the Netherlands (Homomonument Amsterdam 2018). The installation consists of three triangles of Rosa Porinogranite that together form one large triangle. The three triangles represent the past, the present and the future (Homomonument Amsterdam 2018). According to the The Homomonument Amsterdam website (2018), the memorial exists to “commemorate everyone who was murdered or persecuted (and still is) because of his or her sexual preference and / or identity. Here we celebrate the freedom to be who we are. Here we call for vigilance in the present and in the future.” During World War II, between 1933 and 1945, an estimated 100,000 men were arrested for violating Nazi Germany’s law against homosexuality. Of these individuals, approximately 50,000 were sentenced to prison and an estimated 5,000 to 15,000 men were sent to concentration camps (United States Holocaust Museum 2018). The values and representations espoused in and by the Homomonument are explicitly linked to the events of the Holocaust and share the same ideals of emancipation and freedom of discrimination Frank clearly yearned for and tried to will in her writing.

In a way Vaughn’s oversight of The Homomonument on both tours, whether intentional or accidental, brings the most central and important point of this research to head: the heritagization of Anne Frank and Dutch-Jewish history in Amsterdam is about memory, however, it is also a process about forgetting. As Jewish history is remembered and retold it is also reconstructed, so, while certain people, stories, and sites are made increasingly visible as relevant heritage through the act of preservation and memorialization the darker or apathetic actions of Dutch society are swiftly glided over and placed within a historical past. The “Jewish History – Anne Frank Tour,” brings participants to several Holocaust memorials and Dutch-Jewish spaces

while offering narratives of history in which the Dutch nation and peoples had historically considered Jews as productive and full cultural citizens of the state before and after World War II when this was in fact untrue. Specifically, Vaughn's presentations of Dutch resistance forces as successful at hiding individuals in the Artis Zoo, in bombing the Public Records Offices, and in running the escape operation at the Hollandsche Schouwburg gives tour participants the impression that Dutch citizens were quite active in fighting against Nazi persecution and occupation of Holland.

As museums in the context of the mass tourism industry become directly involved with the production and maintenance of knowledge and history, the heritagization of Anne Frank and the Holocaust may exist within two contexts that are in dialogue or sometimes at odds with one another. While Anne Frank is used as the tour's main selling point, her story is shared within a larger context of Dutch-Jewish history. Anne Frank and the Holocaust have been deployed in Dutch culture to expand the political potential of Jews and Jewishness as symbols of integration and multiculturalism in a local and globalized context. Moreover, the active participation of the Netherlands' government and Dutch citizens in facilitating German militarization and occupation is downplayed, and the the historically liberal epicenter of Europe escapes condemnation for their complicitness in the process of the mass murder of millions of people during World War II.

In debates of multiculturalism, the assimilation of Judaism into the Netherlands represents virtues of Dutch tolerance and culture. The Netherlands' response of regret, remorse, and reception to the Holocaust as an unacceptable chapter of heritage allows the Dutch government and nation-state to present as progressive and tolerant in a globalized context, when in reality the Netherlands may be relapsing into the practices of exclusion and injustice they

participated in during World War II. November 14th 1938 the New York Times published an article entitled “Jews on Knees Beg Netherlands Entry; Implore Admission at Border, but Guards are Doubled.” According to the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) there are 65.8 million forcibly displaced people world wide. In 2017 a total of 16,785 people applied for asylum in the Netherlands from Syria, Eritrea, Morocco, Algeria, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, Georgia, and Turkey. The Netherlands currently has a 51 percent rejection rate (AIDA, 2018) . Self-righteous retellings of Dutch history results from falsely constructed memories and histories, and when we consider the legacy of Anne Frank and the Holocaust in this light onlookers are only able to see the end of a process and become unable to identify the processes persecution and genocide. The consequences that arise from this sort of neoliberal reflexive discourse in periods of national renewal are crucial to identify and weigh in contemporary society to avoid repeating grave mistakes of the past.

### ***Conclusion***

---

The “Jewish History – Anne Frank Tour,” represents a social phenomena in which the reimagining and retelling of Dutch-Jewish history from a neoliberal nationalist lens allowed the Dutch Jew to emerge as a subject of tourism in relation to the nation-state that has been transformed into productive citizens of the state though market virility via the mass tourism industry. In reconstructing the past and historical memory of the Dutch-Jewish community within a tolerant Dutch nation-state, an ahistorical retelling of Dutch history comes into play where Jewish life in Amsterdam is linked with ideas of life and productivity in Dutch society. Constructions of the once nonnormative subject into productive subjects of mass tourism via the framing of Anne Frank and the Holocaust as national heritage in the capitalist free-market are

linked to assimilationist and neoliberal constructions of the Jewish subject in public policy and memory. In this way, the heritagization of the Holocaust in and by the Netherlands via the installation of monuments and museums becomes an optic of national identity that informs ideals of citizenship and society. Even though the tour is categorized as Dutch-Jewish history, the tourism experience fails to genuinely grapple with the processes and events of dehumanization, hate crimes, and militarized acts of violence against vulnerable groups that then lead to the Jewish genocide in the Netherlands and Europe altogether. I do not believe the tour presented in this research as a case study is unique in its success and failures, rather it is a microcosm of a larger unfolding social phenomena that requires attention to truly prevent the repetition of the events documented during World War II and the Holocaust more specifically.

## *Appendix*

---

### [Appendix A]



**Sarah Silverstein**  
**SIT Study Abroad Amsterdam**  
**Student mobile phone # 31685274995**  
**Student email: ssilver1@fandm.edu**

### **Interview Consent Form**

You are invited to take part in an interview about a research study on dark tourism with a focus on the Holocaust tourism and the memorialization of the Holocaust within the city of Amsterdam.

This interview will take no longer than one hour. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this survey. Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. If you choose to be in the study you can withdraw at any time.

Results from this study will be used solely for this academic project. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, and data will be stored in secure computer files and devices. All identifying material will be kept strictly private, and will be destroyed at the end of this study, 3 December 2018.

Any report of this research that is made available to the public will not include your name or any other individual information by which you could be identified. If you have questions or want a copy or summary of this study's results, you can contact the researcher at the email address above. If you have any questions, you may contact SIT Academic Director, Dr. Jana Byars (Jana.Byars@sit.edu).

***Please feel free to keep this copy of the consent form.***

**Do you have any questions about the above information?**

#### **Participant's Consent to Take Part in This Study:**

- **I have read the above and I understand its contents and I agree to participate in the study. [ ]**
- **I acknowledge that I am 18 years of age or older. [ ]**
- **(if applicable) I give my consent to be recorded. [ ]**

**If tapes will be played in public, the following statement is also required: I give my consent to be recorded and to allow that tape to be used in conference and/or classroom presentations.**

---

**Signature of Participant**

---

**Date**

**[Appendix B]**

**Interview Guidelines:**

- 1- Tell me about your background
  - a. Name / age
  - b. Where are you / your family from
  - c. Cultural / ethnic / religious background
- 2- What is your relationship to the Netherlands? Amsterdam specifically.
  - a. Are you a tourist / permanent resident
  - b. Have you been to Amsterdam before
  - c. For what reason did you choose to visit / were you inspired to visit Amsterdam
- 3- Understanding Connection to the Holocaust + Anne Frank
  - a. Do you have any connections to World War II?
  - b. Have you learned about the Holocaust?
  - c. Do you have any direct or indirect connections to the Holocaust?
  - d. Have you been to other Holocaust memorials in the Netherlands or the world at large?
    - i. If yes, why, if not why?
  - e. Have you been to other Jewish sites in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, or in Europe?
  - f. How did you learn about the Anne Frank Museum?
  - g. What drew you to working with the story of the Anne Frank / the Annex?
    - i. Would you mind telling me a bit about that?
- 4- How and what do you know about Anne Frank?
  - a. When did you first learn about Frank? (context and age)
  - b. What did you learn about Anne Frank and the Frank family.
  - c. Have you read The Diary of Anne Frank? (if yes, specifically ask about which version / publishing details)
- 5- What about the Anne Frank Museum?
  - a. How did you get involved with the Museum?
  - b. Why do you do what you do?
- 6- Questions about your work:
  - a. What have your experiences working in this specific space of tourism been like?
  - b. What is the tourism industry surrounding the Holocaust in Amsterdam like?
  - c. Could you speak to the government's involvement in the tourism industry in your experience?
    - i. Do memorials commemorating the Holocaust get funded by the government?
    - ii. Are they maintained by the government?
  - d. What is it like working with tourists?
    - i. What do you learn from your clients?

- ii. What kinds of people make up your clientele?
  - iii. Do your clients tell you why they visit / or their relationship to the site?
  - iv. Do your clients tell you why they decided to take your tour?
  - v. Have you experienced visitors emotional / physical / intellectual responses to the space?
- e. What do you learn from this experience as a guide?
  - f. What do you want your clients to take away from the tour / experience you offer?
    - i. Morals, ideas, historical facts.

## Reference List

- Anne Frank House. (2012, April 13). Attack on the Public Records Offices on the Plantage Kerklaan. Retrieved November 21, 2018, from <http://web.annefrank.org/en/Subsites/Annes-Amsterdam/Timeline/Occupation/1943/1943/Attack-on-the-Public-Records-Offices-on-the-Plantage-Kerklaan/#!/en/Subsites/Annes-Amsterdam/Timeline/Occupation/1943/1943/Attack-on-the-Public-Records-Offices-on-the-Plantage-Kerklaan/>
- Anne Frank House. (2012, April 26). The First Raids. Retrieved November 20, from <https://web.annefrank.org/en/Subsites/AnnesAmsterdam/Timeline/Occupation/1941/1941/The-first-raids/#!/en/Subsites/Annes-Amsterdam/Timeline/Occupation/1941/1941/The-first-raids/>
- Anne Frank House. (n.d). The Short Life of Anne Frank. Retrieved November 12, 2018, from <https://www.annefrank.org/en/anne-frank/story-brief/>
- Bender, M. (1988, August 14). In Amsterdam, 300 Years Of Jewish Life. Retrieved November 20, 2018, from <https://www.nytimes.com/1988/08/14/travel/in-amsterdam-300-years-of-jewish-life.html>
- Biran, A., Poria, Y., & Oren, G. (2011). Sought Experiences At (Dark) Heritage Sites. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(3), 820-841. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2010.12.001
- Biran, A., Poria, Y., & Reichel, A. (2006). Heritage Site Management: Motivations and Expectations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(1), 162-178. Retrieved October 27, 2018, from <https://eurekamag.com/pdf/004/004437345.pdf>
- Blom, J. C. (1989). The Persecution of the Jews in the Netherlands: A Comparative Western European Perspective. *European History Quarterly*, 19(3), 333-351. doi:10.1177/026569148901900302

- Bowman, M. S. (2010). What's so 'Dark' about 'Dark Tourism?': Death, Tours, and Performance. *Tourist Studies*, 9(3), 187-202. Retrieved October 27, 2018, from <https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/31223740/BowmanPezzullo.DarkTourism.TS.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1540656537&Signature=SOBw55OW6J3gWL%2BAhGCCcPdrOZU%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DWhat+s+so+dark+about+dark+tourism+Death.pdf>
- Bujdosó, Z., Tozser, A., Kovacs, G., Major-Kathi, V., Uakhitova, G., Katona, P., & Vasvari, M. (2008). Basis of Heritagization and Cultural Tourism Development. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 23(1), 23-41.  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.399>
- Busby, G., & Devereux, H. (2015). Dark Tourism in Context: The Diary of Anne Frank. *European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation*, 6(1), 27-38. Retrieved October 27, 2018, from [http://www.ejthr.com/ficheiros/2015/Volume6/EJTHR\\_Vol6\\_1\\_Art2.pdf](http://www.ejthr.com/ficheiros/2015/Volume6/EJTHR_Vol6_1_Art2.pdf)
- Busby, G., & Meethan, K. (2008). Cultural Capital in Cornwall: Heritage and the Visitor. *Cornish Studies*, 16(1), 146-166. doi:10.1386/corn.16.1.146\_1
- Charlesworth, A. (1994). Contesting Places of Memory: The Case of Auschwitz. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 12(5), 579 – 593. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d120579>
- Croes, M. (2006). The Holocaust in the Netherlands and the Rate of Jewish Survival. *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 20(3), 474-499. doi:10.1093/hgs/dcl022
- Crysler, C. G. (2006). Violence and Empathy: National Museums and the Spectacle of Society. *Traditional Dwellings and Settlement Review*, XVII(II), 19-38. Retrieved October 27, 2018, from <http://www.iaste.berkeley.edu/pdfs/17.2c-Spr06crysler-sml.pdf>

- Dasgupta, S. (2017). 'The Brilliance of Invisibility': Tracking the Body in the Society of the Spectacle. In J. F. Hartle (Author) & S. Gandesha (Ed.), *The Spell of Capital: Reification and Spectacle*, 417-457. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Dutch Council for Refugees. (n.d.). Statistics. Retrieved November 28, 2018, from <http://www.asylumineurope.org/reports/country/netherlands/statistics>
- Dutch Holocaust Memorial of Names. (2015). Retrieved November 12, 2018, from <https://www.holocaustnamenmonument.nl/en/holocaust-memorial-of-names/dutch-holocaust-memorial-of-names/>
- Fawcett, C., & Cormack, P. (2001). Guarding Authenticity at Literary Tourism Sites. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(3), 686-704. doi:10.1016/s0160-7383(00)00062-1
- Foley, M., & Lennon, J. J. (2000). *Dark Tourism*. London: Thomson.
- Frank, A. (2012). *Anne Frank: The Diary of a Young Girl* (O. Frank & M. Pressler, Eds.; S. Massotty, Trans.). London: Penguin Books.
- Garrod, B., & Fyall, A. (2000). Managing heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 682-708. doi:10.1016/s0160-7383(99)00094-8
- Harrison, R. (2013). Forgetting to Remember, Remembering to Forget: Late Modern Heritage Practices, Sustainability and the 'Crisis' of Accumulation of the Past. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19(6), 579-595. doi:10.1080/13527258.2012.678371
- Henri Polak. (n.d.). Retrieved November 20, 2018, from <https://www.joodsamsterdam.nl/henri-polak/>
- Homomonument Amsterdam. (n.d.). Homomonument 1987. Retrieved November 21, 2018, from <http://www.homomonument.nl/sinds1987/>
- Ibrahim, Y. (2009, December). Holocaust as the Visual Subject: The Problematics of Memory

Making through Visual Culture. [Scholarly project]. Retrieved November 20, 2018, from

[https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/599600/Nebula\\_Yasmin\\_Ibrahim.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1542820544&Signature=vs1qb9Z1GIIN4FnDTRd5XVX97Nk=&response-content-disposition=inline;filename=Holocaust as the Visual Subject The Prob.pdf](https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/599600/Nebula_Yasmin_Ibrahim.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1542820544&Signature=vs1qb9Z1GIIN4FnDTRd5XVX97Nk=&response-content-disposition=inline;filename=Holocaust+as+the+Visual+Subject+The+Prob.pdf)

Jewish Cultural Quarter. (n.d.). National Holocaust Memorial Hollandsche Schouwburg.

Retrieved November 21, 2018, from

<https://jck.nl/en/location/national-holocaust-memorial>

Joods Amsterdam. (n.d.). Jonas Daniël Meijer. Retrieved November 20, 2018, from

<https://www.joodsamsterdam.nl/jonas-daniel-meijer/>

Kim, H., Cheng, C., & O’Leary, J. T. (2007). Understanding Participation Patterns and Trends in Tourism Cultural Attractions. *Tourism Management*, 28(5), 1366-1371.

doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2006.09.023

Kreps, C. F. (2008). Appropriate Museology in Theory and Practice. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 23(1), 23-41. doi:10.1080/09647770701865345

Lennon, J. J., & Foley, M. (2006). *Dark Tourism: The Attractions of Death and Disaster*.

London: Thomson Educational Publishing.

Moore, B. (1998). *Victims and Survivors: The Nazi Persecution of the Jews in the Netherlands, 1940-1945*. London: Arnold.

1940-1945. London: Arnold.

Netherlands Tourism. (n.d.). Auschwitz Monument – The Broken Mirror Exhibit. Retrieved

November 20, 2018, from

<http://www.netherlands-tourism.com/auschwitz-monument-broken-mirror-exhibit/>

New York Times. (1938, November 14). Jews on Their Knees Beg Netherlands for Entry;

Implore Admission at Border, but Guards Are Doubled. Retrieved from

<https://www.nytimes.com/1938/11/14/archives/jews-on-knees-beg-netherlands-entry-implore-admission-at-border-but.html>

Poria, Y., Butler, R., & Airey, D. (2001). Clarifying Heritage Tourism: A Distinction between Heritage Tourism and Tourism in Historic Places. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(4), 1047-1049. doi:10.1016/s0160-7383(00)00069-4

Przeclawski, K. (1993). Tourism as the Subject of Interdisciplinary Research. *Tourism Research: Critiques and Challenges*, D. Pearce and R. Butler, eds., 9-19. London: Routledge.

Spracklen, K., & Spracklen, B. (2013). The strange and spooky battle over bats and black dresses: The commodification of Whitby Goth Weekend and the loss of a subculture. *Tourist Studies*, 14(1), 86-102. doi:10.1177/1468797613511688

Stengs, I. (2014). Sacred waste. *Material Religion*, 10(2), 235-238. doi:10.2752/175183414x13990269049482.

Stone, P. R. (2006). A Dark Tourism Spectrum: Towards a Typology of Death and Macabre Related Tourist Sites, Attractions, and Exhibitions. *Tourism: An Interdisciplinary International Journal*, 54(2), 145-160. Retrieved October 27, 2018, from [http://works.bepress.com/philip\\_stone/4/](http://works.bepress.com/philip_stone/4/)

Times of Israel (Ed.). (2017, February 1). Dutch Government Allocates \$8.5 Million for Holocaust Museum. Retrieved November 28, 2018, from <https://www.timesofisrael.com/dutch-government-allocates-8-5-million-for-holocaust-museum/>

Timothy, D. J., & Boyd, S. W. (2003). *Heritage Tourism*. Harlow: Prentice Hall / Pearson Education.

Tribe, J. (1997). The Indiscipline of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(3), 638-657. doi:10.1016/s0160-7383(97)00020-0

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Documenting Numbers of Victims of the Holocaust and Nazi Persecution. Retrieved November 12, 2018, from

<https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/documenting-numbers-of-victims-of-the-holocaust-and-nazi-persecution>

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (n.d.). Persecution of Homosexuals in the Third Reich. Retrieved November 21, 2018, from

<https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/persecution-of-homosexuals-in-the-third-reich>

Verzets Resistance Museum. (n.d.). De Hollandsche Schouwburg. Retrieved November 21, 2018, from

[https://www.verzetsmuseum.org/museum/en/tweede-wereldoorlog/digiexpo/byedad/byedad.hollandsche\\_schouwburg](https://www.verzetsmuseum.org/museum/en/tweede-wereldoorlog/digiexpo/byedad/byedad.hollandsche_schouwburg)

Verzets Resistance Museum. (n.d.). The February Strike. Retrieved November 20, 2018, from

[https://www.verzetsmuseum.org/museum/en/tweede-wereldoorlog/kingdomofthenetherlands/thenetherlands/thenetherlands-may\\_1940\\_-\\_february\\_1941/the\\_february\\_strike](https://www.verzetsmuseum.org/museum/en/tweede-wereldoorlog/kingdomofthenetherlands/thenetherlands/thenetherlands-may_1940_-_february_1941/the_february_strike)

Walter, T. (2009). Dark Tourism: Mediating Between the Dead and the Living. The

Darker Side of Travel: The Theory and Practice of Dark Tourism (pp. 39-55). (Aspects of Tourism). Retrieved October 27, 2018, from

<https://researchportal.bath.ac.uk/en/publications/dark-tourism-mediating-between-the-dead-and-the-living>

Wight, A. C. (2006). Philosophical and Methodological Praxes in Dark Tourism: Controversy, Contention, and the Evolving Paradigm. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 12(2), 119-129.

Retrieved November 28, 2018, from

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1026.8969&rep=rep1&type=pdf>