

- 6 who could have liked to combine with it a revision of the traditional Dutch state and social system. This attitude, which was strongly marked in the emergence of the Netherlands Union, could be characterized by a term which was created after the French capitulation in June 1940, that of "Attentism". Several French contemporaries have maintained that the openly confessed willingness to submit to German rule already constituted collaboration and have thus considered "Attentism" and "collaboration" as one and the same thing. Thus Albert Fabre-Luce writes in his *Journal de la France 1939-1944*: "*L'attentisme déclaré, c'était, virtuellement, l'acceptation de l'occupation intégrale. La collaboration, c'était le véritable attentisme.*"

In contrast to this, I see "Attentism", as far as the Netherlands are concerned, as a condition thoroughly characteristic of the first phase of occupation, in which not only the essential elements of the subsequent collaboration were formulated, but also the determining factor for a later resistance were established. As regards administrative and economic collaboration, collaboration by social groups and organizations, including various parties, there is an abundance of evidence for this. However, attentist behavioural patterns in these fields are superseded at a very early stage by original motivations, inherent to the individual institutions and organizations. An example of this is the "New Order" discussion amongst Dutch economists and civil servants (i.e., collective "Reorientation" to the realities in Europe created by the Reich, dismantling of a hyper-national economic system, new spheres and methods of production, reorganization of the social system, restructuring of the administrative spheres after the removal of the political controlling authorities). This discussion ultimately dominated by fear of economic and social chaos, and concern for the maintenance of industrial production and jobs, even though the original causes of political attentism continued to play their part.

In the summer of 1940, a mere two and a half months after the German occupation of the Netherlands, there emerged a collective movement of a magnitude and kind never before experienced in Dutch history. Now this raises the question: why did it emerge at that particular time and what were the decisive conditions for its formation? It seems that there were four reasons for the emergence of this popular mass movement, the Netherlands Union, each of which individually only partially explains the formation of this collective movement, but which, taken together, provide the essential conditions for its appearance:

1. The external conditions, as incorporated in the concrete plans of the occupying power, for establishing a popular "collaboration movement".
2. The lasting political and social tensions in the Netherlands. Criticism of the parliamentary democracy and the fact that it no longer had any function.
3. The sudden presence of an alternative ideology. Longing for identity when faced by a widely-felt threat and at the same time overcoming the pre-war social segmentation.