LUXEMBOURG RESISTANCE TO THE GERMAN OCCUPATION OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR, 1940-1945

by

Maureen Hubbart

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Major Subject: History

West Texas A&M University

Canyon, TX

December 2015

ABSTRACT

The history of Luxembourg's resistance against the German occupation of World War II has rarely been addressed in English-language scholarship. Perhaps because of the country's small size, it is often overlooked in accounts of Western European History. However, Luxembourgers experienced the German occupation in a unique manner, in large part because the Germans considered Luxembourgers to be ethnically and culturally German. The Germans sought to completely Germanize and Nazify the Luxembourg population, giving Luxembourgers many opportunities to resist their oppressors. A study of French, German, and Luxembourgian sources about this topic reveals a people that resisted in active and passive, private and public ways.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Elizabeth Clark for her guidance in helping me write my thesis and for sharing my passion about the topic of underground resistance. My gratitude also goes to Dr. Brasington for all of his encouragement and his suggestions to improve my writing process. My thanks to the entire faculty in the History Department for their support and encouragement.

This thesis is dedicated to my family: Pete and Linda Hubbart who played with and took care of my children for countless hours so that I could finish my degree; my husband who encouraged me and always had a joke ready to help me relax; and my parents and those members of my family living in Europe, whose history kindled my interest in the Luxembourgian resistance.

Approved:

_____	_____
Chair, Thesis Committee	Date
_____	_____
Member, Thesis Committee	Date
_____	_____
Member, Thesis Committee	Date
_____	_____
Department Head, History	Date
_____	_____
Dean, Graduate School	Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

During the Second World War, The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg was one of the many countries that was invaded and occupied by the Germans. The story of Luxembourg's resistance to the German occupation of 1940-1944 is unique. Luxembourgers were viewed as ethnically and culturally German by the Nazis and yet the small country had its own language and traditions that were completely unique to them. Therefore, resistance often built upon the antithesis of the claim that being a Luxembourger was the equivalent to being a German. However, without a standing army, there was no chance of a military victory over the Germans and thus the Luxembourg people had to fight the inevitable German occupation in unconventional ways.

Once the Germans realized that Luxembourgers would not easily accept the Germanization imposed upon them, they increased the restrictions upon the population. Thus, in the years of occupation, resistance became strongly linked to national pride and identity. "Resistance" became as easy as speaking Luxembourgish. The chapters below will depict the various forms that resistance (and collaboration) could take within Luxembourg, and it will be shown that the small country can accurately claim that the vast majority of its citizens opposed or resisted the German occupation of their land.

Luxembourg's story of the occupation years has largely been ignored by English-language publications. And when digging for scholarship on the resistance within Luxembourg, it becomes even more difficult to find books or even articles in English. The vast majority of English-language books about Luxembourg during the Second World War are either about the Battle of the Bulge or combine Luxembourg's story with that of Belgium, the Netherlands, or others. However, some works which describe resistance to Hitler across Europe feature a chapter or a section of a chapter specifically on Luxembourg.

An example of this is Z.H. Wachsman's *Trail Blazers for Invasion*, published in 1943, while World War II was still raging. Wachsman writes accounts of underground resistance in Czechoslovakia, Norway, Holland, Poland, Yugoslavia, Luxembourg, and elsewhere. His goal is to show the Allies that they are not fighting for people engaged in an imaginary struggle. When the Allies reach Europe, there will be thousands of people in each country that will join them in fighting against the Germans. In his chapter on Luxembourg, Wachsman writes about individual and spontaneous actions that show the true feelings of the Luxembourgers: the Germans are not welcome in their country and they do *not* consider themselves Germans, but Luxembourgers.

Ronald Seth calls resisters "the undaunted" in his book by the same name, published in 1956. Without an introduction or conclusion, each of Seth's chapters tells the story of a single country's resistance. In his chapter on Luxembourg, Seth depicts Luxembourgers as heroic: their grand duchess fought for the country while in exile and Luxembourgers at home mirrored her courage in their resistance. Seth focuses on the well-known acts of Luxembourg resistance (a train derailment, the General Strike, etc.)

probably because he does not have access to other accounts so soon after the end of hostilities. However, his description of Luxembourgers' defiant, hostile attitude allows readers to see that there likely were thousands of smaller acts of resistance in the country.

D. A. Lande also examines resistance in Luxembourg. He devotes an entire chapter to the country in *Resistance: Occupied Europe and its Defiance of Hitler*. His book details small and large undertakings of resistance against the German occupiers because he believes that the thousands of small, relatively-unknown acts had an effect on Germany's eventual surrender. Often, no direct link can be shown between a deed of resistance and the result of this act, but when taken together, resistance across occupied Europe ensured that when the Allies arrived, they would have plenty of help liberating each country from the Germans.

A final example is Harry Stone's *Writing in the Shadow: Resistance Publications in Occupied Europe*. Stone describes underground publications in the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. He describes not only the content of these papers, but the risks which the resistance took in producing them. Stone argues that the printers of the underground press were as heroic as the resistance fighters aboveground. Stone includes only two paragraphs on Luxembourg where he mentions the population's solidarity against the Germans and two newspapers that were published by resistance movements. However, as will be shown below, Luxembourg's resistance published several different newspapers, some running the length of the occupation. Other countries, the Netherlands in particular, receive much more attention in Stone's history of underground newspapers during the Second World War.

While books specifically about Luxembourg's story of resistance are very rare, it is possible to find scholarly monographs written in English about the French, German, and Polish resistance movements (among others). Each country's occupation was unique and the books written about these countries' resistance are often vastly different. None of these works can provide a template for telling the story of Luxembourg's resistance, but the background of European resistance in World War II is important. Furthermore, the diversity of the books that are published on other European countries' resistance to the Nazis illustrate the many different ways in which resistance can be defined and studied.

Although many fiction movies and books about World War II use the French *maquis* as a representation of European resistance to Hitler's Germany, the vast scholarship on French resistance shows that the movement was not monolithic but had diverse forms. In *Choices in Vichy France: The French Under Nazi Occupation* , John Sweets examines Clermont-Ferrand's resistance movements. Rather than focus on the *maquis*, Sweets examines the entire population and argues that the people in this town in Southern France can neither been seen as collaborators nor resisters. Although many people were passively unhappy with the Vichy government, they did not chose to actively resist for the first few years of the war. Sweets argues that as the war progressed, the French in Clermont-Ferrand responded by participating ever more in resistance activities. The author describes various ways in which people resisted in their daily lives, but he focuses his book on military-style resisters (usually men).

Sweets uses this study of Clermont-Ferrand to illustrate what he believes can be seen as an example of many towns in Southern France during the Nazi Occupation. Clermont-Ferrand was not under official occupation until l942; however, the Vichy

government and its policy of collaboration with the Germans caused many hardships from 1940 onward. Sweets describes the immense economic hardships that the Clermontois faced, especially as Germany used France to feed its war machine. This caused many people to turn to the black market, an example of resistance to the government. In spite of this, Sweets argues that the forced labor draft in mid-1942 affected the Clermontois the most and was the biggest reason why the population began to resist their government in one way or another. In 1943, as the resistance groups became more unified, this labor draft turned thousands more people to the resistance as they evaded deportation to Germany. Then the resistance became more military-like because the armed men available to fight against the Germans grew exponentially.

Sweets gives his readers a long list of moral and legal laws and precedents set by Vichy and then analyses the public's response to these. He consistently comes to the conclusion that the population of Clermont-Ferrand was never truly happy with Petain's government. However, discontent with Vichy, in and of itself, is not equal to resistance. Sweets also argues that some French civil servants stayed in their posts and worked with the Germans in order that they might help others. This argument is seen in Luxembourg as well. Next the author discusses the Legion and other backers of Vichy. He argues that the Legion's list of enrollees cannot be considered truly accurate, since some people signed up for various reasons but had no inclination to participate. Sweets's research finds many instances where the Legion was unable to find anyone to attend meetings or to take any action for the government. This is similar to the situation of the VdB and RAD in Luxembourg.

Sweets admits that there were some French men and women who were happy to follow Vichy's orders and who were truly collaborators with the Germans, however, he argues that these people were mostly on the fringes of society. He also strives to show the differences between the French police and the *Milice*. The French police, while generally obeying the Germans as well as Vichy often did so without enthusiasm. Sweets shows that many police officers demonstrated a passive resistance towards discriminatory measures. On the other hand, the *Milice* was often willing to take harsh measures against the population and happily complied with German demands.

Sweets describes various resistance groups and how they evolved as the war progressed. His book shows how some of the groups became very unified towards the end of the war and states that the transition to the new government was so smooth in part because of the successful resistance. Most of Sweets's description of the resistance is based on men (and a few women) who took action, usually with arms, or who made preparations for a new government after the fall of Vichy. These *résistants* are more easily studied than individuals who risked their lives but did so in a more private way (such as hiding the *maquis*' arms in their house). When Sweets finally notes these less public *résistants*, they are just used to show how difficult it is to find an accurate number of resisters. Sweets does not attempt an analysis of this type of resistance.

Sweets' argument about the lack of true, grass-roots support for Vichy is believable, although he never professes to be the final authority on the figures that he uses. The author strives to show that although many outwardly obeyed Vichy's new laws, had they had a choice, the majority of Clermontois would have preferred an alternative government. Halfway through the text, Sweets asks if the apathy and

indifference of which many French were accused "might be better interpreted as *opposition* than *support* of a political regime." In other words, the people who did nothing, either publically or privately, were not collaborating any more than they were resisting. Here it is easy to see Sweets's inclination to give the Clermontois living in the grey area between resistance and collaboration credit for their resistance efforts while minimizing their collaboration. Sweets's lack of information about less public *résistants* shows that much scholarship is still needed in this field and his book gives readers ample evidence that by digging through archival materials, they can find out about many forms of resistance to both Vichy and the Germans.

Another work on the French Resistance is Margaret Collings Weitz's *Sisters in the Resistance: How Women Fought to Free France, 1940-1945*. Focusing on women's roles, the author tells the stories of several resisters while giving historical background on why women in France would choose to resist. Weitz uses interviews, biographies, and memoirs, as well as archival sources and secondary sources such as Robert Paxton's *Vichy France: Old Guard and New Order 1940-44* (1972) to show that women played an important role in the French resistance, even if they themselves played down their roles.

Weitz details the lives of women in the highest ranks of Resistance groups as well as women whose work was much less public, such as allowing resistance members to stay in their homes or hiding documents for other men and women. Weitz makes it a point to note that these "smaller actors" risked their lives by their actions. Just as she wants to show that women have been left out of many resistance histories, Weitz allows for women of all roles to have a voice.

By studying women's roles in the resistance, Weitz must look elsewhere than the *maquis* as women were often discriminated against when they wanted to take up arms and fight alongside men. Weitz believes that the occupation of France naturally brought civilians into the war and with men away fighting, women had to step into unfamiliar roles. In the war years, women resisted not only in the sphere of their home, but openly as well. Thus, women who worked for the resistance usually had more public roles than they would have had in France without the situation of war and occupation.

Weitz includes a chapter on collaboration where she shows that there were many forms and descriptions of collaboration, much like resistance. The majority of the women whom she describes are in some way sexually connected to the German occupiers, whether as mistresses or as prostitutes. Although Weitz has looked for the diverse ways in which women used their skills to help the resistance, she does not seem to have access to this same research when it comes to collaboration. She admits that accounts of collaboration are even more rare than those about resistance. Throughout the accounts of the *résistantes*, Weitz notes the coquetry that some women used to their advantage as they worked against their government and against the Germans. The author argues that this was a natural action for French women; some used it to help their resistance work while others used it as they collaborated with the enemy.

Weitz's book shows the diverse ways in which women helped the resistance. She argues that some of the actions, such as providing room and board were typical for women's roles in France at the time. However, many women provided very atypical services as well. These women all took part in resistance work because they felt a duty to their country. They were not looking to become public figures or to prove that women

needed more rights. The *résistantes* often play down their own actions and state that they were just doing what needed to be done at the time. Weitz gives these women a voice and describes them as some of the unsung heroes from France's occupation. By researching women's roles in the resistance, Weitz necessarily comes across less public and less well-known means of resisting the Nazis and those working with them. Readers can quickly see that the *maquis* were not the only French resisters. Sweets and Weitz's works each describe French resisters that do not fit in to the mold of the tradition French *maquis*. France, like other occupied countries, had many types and levels of resistance and collaboration.

The German story of resistance is unique because any opposition to Nazi policies was regarded as treason against the government. Thus, patriotic Germans had a very difficult time betraying their country's leadership, even when they opposed everything for which Hitler and the Nazis stood. Klemens von Klemperer delves into this topic in *German Resistance Against Hitler: The Search for Allies Abroad 1938-1945*. He specifically examines the Germans who sought help from the Allies and failed over and again to gain assistance in releasing Hitler's hold on their own country. His book details the different men who were part of various resistance movements in Germany and the ways in which they sought help from Great Britain and the United States in order to bring down Hitler. These men risked their lives on a daily basis, but they were not able to assassinate or overthrow Hitler. However, just because the resistance was not successful does not indicate that the men were any less noble and Klemperer argues that the resistance movements within Germany deserve a careful study.

Klemperer strives to show his readers that for men in the resistance in Germany, life was much more difficult than for participants of resistance movements in other countries. The men in Germany necessarily had to come to terms with the fact that their actions, should they be discovered, would be seen as treason. However, the men were dedicated to the removal of Hitler and his Nazi party. Klemperer argues that the men of the German resistance were patriots; they loved their country and they sought to save it from Hitler.

Klemperer describes many of the older members of the German resistance, such as Carl Goerdeler, as extremely patriotic. In fact, these men were not against Hitler's expansionism to a certain point. However, they could not tolerate Hitler's tyranny and racial policies. In the early years of the resistance movement's search for help from the British and Americans, many of the Germans could not see eye to eye with their foreign counterparts on the issue of Germany's new borders, should the regime be overthrown. In January 1943 the decision of unconditional surrender by the Allies became a major point of contention for the agents of the resistance. However, the Germans who were trying to overthrow the Nazis were never able to convince Great Britain or the United States to rescind their policy of a total military victory over Nazi Germany. Some of the men were so patriotic that it actually impeded them in saving their country from the Nazis' continued rule.

The younger set of actors (such as Adam von Trott) were more flexible on the issue of Germany's borders, however, many of them had socialist views of which the Allies were leery. Again, Klemperer shows how this hindered their work with the Allies. This younger group of men did not simply want a return to the old order of things. As the

war progressed and the British and Americans became more distrustful of Stalin's designs, many arguments that the German resisters made for their cause already began to be seen through the lens of Cold War dichotomy. Anything that was not anti-Soviet could be pro-Communist or pro-Bolshevik. The Allies realized they could help Trott overthrow Hitler, but they did not want to risk the chance of a socialist Germany in the center of Europe. This new Germany could become an important ally of the Soviet Union and help spread socialism further west. All these reasons made it more difficult for two groups, the Allies and the resistance in Germany, who shared a common goal, to work together for a solution to free the world from Hitler.

Klemperer's book shows that throughout the years 1939-1944, the Prime Ministers of Great Britain remained leery of negotiating with the German resistance. The British wanted to see some form of action on the part of the resistance to be reassured that they were not dealing with Nazi spies or double agents. Klemperer states that the British were clearly not aware of what life was like under the totalitarian rule of Hitler. As the war progressed, the resistance continued to reach out to the Allies, although they met with even less success or support than before. The men of the German resistance gave in to many of the Allied demands in order to get some outside assistance in the overthrow of Hitler. It is ironic that as Trott scaled back his wishes from the Allies, they became more distrustful of his identity as solely a member of the German resistance. He apparently seemed so desperate for the Allies' help, that they believed him to be a German propaganda agent. Klemperer argues that the Allies were never able to grasp that there were "Nazis" and "Germans" in Germany. They never fully trusted the members of the German resistance as a part of the "other Germany".

As the Allies and Grand Alliance drew closer together, the German resistance realized that they would have an even harder time obtaining any help from these countries. They continued their work all the same, even as they realized that soon their country would be defeated and probably partitioned and occupied. The men of the German resistance, notably Goerdeler, John, and Trott, remained true to their cause until the bitter end, without regard for their own lives. Klemperer wishes readers to see the heroism of these men and to understand how they continued to work to rid their country of tyranny even in the face of hopelessness. These men were not fatalistic; they were simply resolute and truly moral men. Klemperer's account shows the unique situation of resistance members inside of Germany.

Poland was one of Hitler's first conquests and a nation that experienced the Holocaust to a greater extent than many other countries. Thus, the literature on Poland and its resistance or lack thereof is bountiful and varied. The Warsaw Uprising in Poland in 1944 and the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising of the previous year are two of Poland's most famous examples of resistance, although both ended in failure for the resisters. Vlodzimierz Borodziej's *The Warsaw Uprising of 1944* outlines the 63-day battle in vast detail. In his work the author focuses on the military aspects of the uprising, while describing the Polish resistance as fluid and diverse. He argues that resistance in the country was grassroots-oriented as often as it was initiated by those in command positions in the resistance movements. Furthermore, many individuals resisted on their own initiatives, even if they were part of an organization with specific resistance goals.

Borodziej argues that Poles have had a long history of resisting foreign occupiers or rulers in their land and that this is one reason why resistance was widespread, diverse,

and common during the German occupation. He states that there was espionage and sabotage as well as a wide range of civilian systems that supported these activities. Furthermore, resistance was not only practiced from the top down. Borodziej argues that the grassroots resistance movements, of which there were plenty, were just as important as the ones that had clear political and military ties. These two groups were fluid and members moved from one group to another.

The Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of August 1939 and the double occupation of Poland made the Polish resistance's choices more difficult than those of movements in other countries where there was a single occupying power. Borodziej argues that although the British stated that Poland would be defended, they were unable to do much for Poland because of the Polish-Soviet relations. Even as the Allies promised support to the government-in-exile for the Polish resistance, they were limited because of restrictions that the Soviets placed upon them. Borodziej does not necessarily fault the Allies for their lack of help; he is clearly more concerned with the Soviet Union's actions.

Borodziej outlines the difficulty of the Polish Resistance in communicating with the government-in-exile and the lack of understanding between politicians in London and military commanders in occupied Poland. This caused the chain of command of the Home Army (*Armia Krajow*, hereafter: AK) to become less clear as the occupation continued. By the time surrender to the Germans became imminent, the government-in-exile realized that the leaders of the AK were better suited to make decisions about the fighting in Warsaw. The book also illustrates disagreements within the AK itself, namely over when to begin the Uprising. Borodziej empathizes with the soldiers who were eager to begin since they had already endured the occupation for so long. Others worried that if

the city was liberated from the Germans by the Soviets without the Polish soldiers beginning the fight, the Poles' demands after the war would never be taken seriously.

Borodziej next describes the sixty-three days of the Uprising in detail, focusing almost solely on the AK's military decisions and maneuvers. For Borodziej the "resistance" is limited to men (and a few women) participating in the fighting, although he mentions some activities that civilians undertook in order to help the Uprising. In the first days of relative freedom, civilians helped the resistance fighters by offering them food and blankets. Others removed German street signs and even organized volunteers to assist the fighters. Other than this mention, however, Borodziej's description of civilians is based upon their morale and living conditions during the Uprising.

Borodziej's epilogue discusses the politics of remembering and commemorating the Warsaw Uprising, especially during Poland's Communist era. Borodziej argues that the Uprising was a failure, but not a total loss. He believes that the Poles needed to see their impotence in 1944 otherwise, they may have had a very bloody war in 1956 (like the Hungarians). Furthermore, Borodziej believes that in some way, the defeat of the Uprising led to the creation of Solidarity and the peaceful break from the USSR in 1989. This last belief is a stretch, but the author does not want the work of the Polish resistance discounted just because it failed at its most public moment. National pride is often evident and must be taken into account when authors write about their own country's resistance.

One final monograph about the Second World War shows yet more examples of the diversity of resistance to the Nazis. Emily Greble's *Sarajevo, 1941-1945: Muslims, Christians, and Jews in Hitler's Europe* concentrates on Sarajevo's multiconfessional

character which she argues remained intact throughout the first and second world wars. She explains to readers how this was possible in the midst of occupation and genocide. Throughout the work, Greble cites examples of the city's civic institutions and leaders, and how the population continued to rely on them throughout the Second World War. Greble argues that the civic and religious institutions remained intact and useful to citizens throughout the war years, although they were often at odds with one another. Furthermore, Sarajevans relied on these frameworks rather than ideas of race, nationality, and politics to define their agendas.

One theme that runs through Greble's book is the ineptness of the Ustashas in Sarajevo. She argues that the city was well run by the municipal leaders from different faiths and ethnicities before the war began and citizens of Sarajevo were used to a strong social support system. Furthermore, many religious groups supported the city's population as well. The Ustasha regime in Sarajevo was unorganized and wholly unable to handle the social demands of the city, especially once refugees began arriving. Greble states that the city workers who ignored the Ustasha's new laws were not necessarily resisting the new regime. However, these men felt they could better meet the needs of their citizens by ignoring some aspects of the new laws. Once the genocidal policies of the NDH (Independent State of Croatia) became evident, more people did become opposed to and horrified of the new regime and this led to more direct resistance activity.

In her fifth chapter, Greble brings up resistance and the forms that it took in occupied Sarajevo. She argues that military resistance in the region has been overemphasized by other scholars because of the Partisan victory. Thus, Greble aims to introduce other types of resistance. In fact, she introduces many types, but there is no

comprehensive discussion of these elements. Rather, she focuses once more on the civic responsibilities that the Sarajevan municipal authorities faced. However, Greble does show that the different groups within the Catholic and Muslim faiths that resisted often did so in contrast to their religious leaders' beliefs. The Catholic Church was linked to the NDH and the fact that some Catholics decided to oppose the regime shows that Catholicism as an identity was eroding in the face of the NDH's policies. Muslims, on the other hand, were often targeted by the NDH but as they resisted, they undermined their leaders' conservative views on many subjects.

Greble slowly incorporates the Partisans and their importance to Sarajevo into her book. She emphasizes over and again that the citizens were so hesitant to join either the Partisans or the Chetniks because these groups were seen as uncivilized and uncultured by the more cosmopolitan Sarajevans. As the Germans felt more threatened from the rebels outside of the city, they began to mistreat the city's population and Greble argues that this finally led Sarajevans, particularly Muslims, to join the Partisans. However, she argues that this was because life had become so difficult under the NDH and German occupation that many people simply felt that had to resist. This does not mean that they sided ideologically with the Partisans; in fact Greble believes that Communism was not widely accepted because the city's elite had worked throughout the war to uphold social and cultural traditions. Greble continues to emphasize the importance of the city's leadership and Sarajevo's traditions even in the last months of the war.

Greble's study introduces some topics that could benefit from further elaboration, such as the different layers of civilian resistance within Sarajevo that were not tied to civic or religious organizations. However, her account of Sarajevo during the Second

World War gives readers a good indication of the many reasons why people began resisting the Ustashas and Germans. Furthermore, her work shows the different identities that Sarajevans held and the varying ways in which each of these was affected during the war years.

Most of the French and German-language scholarship on resistance in Luxembourg dates from the immediate post-war years. There are even a few works in the Luxembourgish language from this period. The few scholars that currently write about Luxembourg are historians and other scholars that are Luxembourgers; not many foreign authors write about the small country. The most recent monograph on Luxembourg during the years of occupation is from Vincent Artuso, entitled *La collaboration au Luxembourg Durant la Seconde Guerre mondiale (1940-1945): Accommodation, Adaptation, Assimilation*.[1] Since resistance and collaboration are so closely linked, Artuso's book about collaboration discusses resistance in Luxembourg in great detail. The author argues that for Luxembourg, there was no "collaboration" but rather "collaborators." Most Luxembourgers working with the Germans were doing so for their own personal reasons, rather than as part of a larger movement. Artuso argues that at least twenty percent of the population collaborated in some way during the years of occupation.

When describing the collaborators and their deeds, Artuso shows that these same men and women were often simultaneously resisting. For example, he tells of how the deputy chief of the SA in Luxembourg allowed the BBC to be listened to at his inn. Artuso states that levels and means of collaboration evolved throughout the years, and the

[1] *Collaboration in Luxembourg during World War II (1940-1945): Accommodation, Adaptation, Assimilation*

same is true for resistance. People and organizations collaborated in various ways and for assorted reasons, but the well-known collaborators who openly and actively worked with the Germans throughout the occupation years were hated by almost all Luxembourgers.

Benoît Majerus is another professor working in Luxembourg and he writes extensively about Luxembourg (and Belgium) and their experiences during the Second World War. Many of the articles he has published, in French, German, and even English, are available online in full-text. Some relevant examples of his works are: "Weak and Strong Nations in the Low Countries: National Historiography and its 'Others' in Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," "*Les Ortsgruppenleiter au Luxembourg: Essai d'une analyse socio-économique*,"[2] and "*Kollaboration in Luxemburg: die falsche Frage?*,"[3] and "Conceptualizing the Occupations of Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands (1933-1944)". Using the sources listed above, and drawing on the wealth of documents at the Archives Nationales de Luxembourg, it is possible to gain an understanding of the true picture of resistance within Luxembourg. The following chapter will describe the background of the country before and during its occupation, which is essential to understanding the resistance of the Luxembourg people.

[2] *The* Ortsgruppenleiter *in Luxembourg: Essay on a Socio-Economic Analysis*
[3] *Collaboration in Luxembourg: The Wrong Question?*

CHAPTER II

PREWAR AND WARTIME LUXEMBOURG

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg is located in Western Europe, bordering France, Germany, and Belgium and covers only 999 square miles. This small country is thus often forgotten in accounts of Western European history. On May 10, 1940, Luxembourg and its population of approximately 300,000 people was invaded by Germany for the second time in less than thirty years. Since the Luxembourgers were considered by the Nazis as "ethnically German," they experienced the years of occupation in a unique way and the Grand Duchy's story of the years of the Second World War, and its peoples' resistance to the German occupation should not be overlooked.

Luxembourg celebrates its independence date as 1839; its borders have not changed since then and neither has the system of the Grand Ducal government. In 1939 as Germany became increasingly aggressive, Luxembourg celebrated its centennial with events that continued during half of the year. The events surrounding the festivities of the 100-year old nation showed a people proud to be "Luxembourgers," not French, Germans, or Belgians, although the country had linguistic and economic ties to each of these nations. These feelings were only strengthened as the occupation of the Second World War began.

It is worth noting here the linguistic situation of the Grand Duchy in the 1930s. Luxembourg was (and continues to be) essentially a trilingual country, with Luxembourgish spoken at home (truly the mother tongue), and German and French used as administrative languages and taught in schools. Prior to World War I, many peoples in Europe used their language as a marker of national identity and in the inter-war years, Luxembourgish became tied to Luxembourg nationalism. The codification of the language was a topic that was periodically promoted by various cultural groups, and any proposals for furthering the use of the language were always launched by local groups, rather than the government[4]. It is important to know that during this time German was the "only language that every Luxembourgian citizen can read fluently and can write relatively correctly."[5] The Luxembourgish word for "German" is "*Deitsch*" and the word for "Prussian(s)" is "*Preis*(*s*)." In most Luxembourg documents from the period (and in contemporary accounts in Luxembourgish about the war), Luxembourgers continually refer to all Germans as *Preis*; rarely is the word *Deitsch* used. The word Nazi is used occasionally when referring to specific Nazi policies or individuals. When the French language is used, Luxembourgers refer to the Germans as *Boche*.

Although Luxembourgers by and large recognized that their language was either a dialect of German or of German origin, during the occupation Luxembourgish increasingly became to be seen as a symbol of the country's national identity, in opposition to the German identity that the occupation forces attempted to impose. It may be that the outlawing of Luxembourgish by the Germans was the catalyst in the change of

[4] Pit Péporté, Sonja Kmeck, Benoît Majerus and Michel Margue, eds., *Inventing Luxembourg: Representations of the Past, Space and Language from the Nineteenth to the Twenty-First Century* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 267-272.
[5] Péporté et al., *Inventing Luxembourg*, 285. Quoting Pierre Frieden *Courrier des écoles du Grand-Duché du Luxembourg* I (1949), 6.

view that Luxembourgers had towards their language. By outlawing their "mother tongue" the Germans were proving the uniqueness of Luxembourgish and the population saw that using their own language (which the Germans could not entirely understand) was another way of resisting the occupiers.[6] It can be seen by the various spellings of the word "Luxembourg" in the Luxembourgish language that there truly was no one codification of the language, although all Luxembourgers could read the different spellings that were used.

World War I

In the First World War, Germany invaded Luxembourg and occupied the country between 1914 and 1918. Luxembourg's political elites, including Grand Duchess Marie-Adelaide, remained in the country during the occupation in order that the Grand Duchy could remain neutral during the war. The government accommodated the German occupation forces while retaining a level of autonomy.[7] However, because of this accommodation, Grand Duchess Marie-Adelaide and the government became perceived by the population as collaborators when the war ended. In 1919, in order to keep the country independent and to maintain the dynasty, Grand Duchess Marie-Adelaide abdicated in favor of her sister Charlotte. A referendum of that same year led 80 percent of voters to favor keeping the country independent.[8] Charlotte, the grand duchess during the German occupation of the Second World War, was unwilling to risk the future of the

[6] Péporté et al., *Inventing Luxembourg*, 279-282.
[7] Benoît Majerus "Conceptualizing the Occupations of Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands (1933-1944)," in *Experience and Memory: The Second World War in Europe*, Jörg Echternkamp and Sefan Martens (eds.), (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 11.
[8] Sonja van 't Hof "Collective Suffering: Consequences of World War II in Luxembourg," in *The Politics of War Trauma: the Aftermath of World War II in Eleven European Countries*, Jolande Withuis, Annet Mooij (eds.), (Amsterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers, 2010), 169.

dynasty or the Grand Duchy and she and her family fled the country during the German invasion of 1940.

World War II

Since 1933, when they first came to power, the Nazi ideologists made no secret that they believed Luxembourg was essentially German and belonged to the Reich. When the Germans became more militarily aggressive, Luxembourg did all it could to remain "neutral" so as not to give her neighbor any reason for invasion. This actually "allowed Nazi Germany to strengthen its influence on the Grand Duchy…and affected Luxembourg's cultural activities."[9] Although it sought to remain neutral, Luxembourg's government's policy of appeasement toward Nazi Germany did not stop an invasion.

On May 10, 1940, Germany invaded the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg. Although a small country, Luxembourg had considerable resources (notably steel and iron) and Hitler and the Nazis considered Luxembourgers as ethnically and culturally Germanic.[10] Thus, the invasion of Luxembourg did not simply pave the way to France and Belgium, but the Nazis believed it brought more Germans into their proper place in the Reich. Since Luxembourg had no standing army, it could not defend itself; however, France came to its aid and many Luxembourgers believed in a swift victory for the French army. The fighting between the French and Germans was particularly fierce in the south of the country, and approximately 100,000 Luxembourgers had to evacuate their homes, fleeing

[9] Paul Lesch, "The Reception of the *Deutsche Wochenschau* in Luxembourg during the German Occupation," in *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 24 (2004), 35.
[10] van 't Hof, "Collective Suffering," 167.

to the north of the country or to France. Most of these refugees would return by September of 1940. [11]

The government of Luxembourg clearly remembered the humiliation that the First World War brought to the country's leaders and in the early hours of May 10, 1940 the grand duchess, her family, and the minsters of the country evacuated the Grand Duchy. They fled to France, then to Spain, and the decision to flee the continent and separate herself from Luxembourg and its people for the duration of the war weighed heavily on Grand Duchess Charlotte. However, she used her time in America and London to speak out against the German occupation and oppression of the Luxembourg people.[12]

After the defeat of France in June 1940, the Germans instituted a military administration in the Grand Duchy. This was replaced in August 1940 by a civilian administration which lasted until Luxembourg's liberation in September 1944. This civilian administration was designed to integrate the Grand Duchy into Germany's planned "New Europe."[13] The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg was incorporated into the existing Gau Coblenze-Trier which was renamed the Gau Moselland. Gustav Simon became the Gauleiter of the country.[14] Simon answered directly to Hitler, and only to Hitler. This was supposed to lead to a quick annexation and Nazification of Luxembourg, as Simon had autonomy in these areas.[15] However, Simon's 300,000 new

[11] Ronald Seth, *The Undaunted: The Story of Resistance in Western Europe* London: Frederick Muller Ltd, 1956), 140.
[12] *Leif Letzebuerger: D'Grande-Duchesse am exil 1940-1945*, directed by Ray Tostevin (2008; Luxembourg: Grace Productions), DVD.
[13] Christoph Sauer "Structures of consensus-making and intervention: the concept of Nazi language policy in occupied Holland" ("Deutsche Zeitung in den Niederland 1940-1945") in *Language, Power, and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse* edited by Ruth Wodak (Amsterdam: John Banjamins Publishing Company: 1989), 16.
[14] Majerus, "Conceptualizing," 17.
[15] van 't Hof "Collective Suffering," 170.

constituents remained stubbornly attached to their identity as Luxembourgers and Simon's efforts to Germanize the country's populace rarely went over smoothly.

By all accounts, Simon was an ambitious Nazi who believed he could easily convince his new subjects that they were Germans and that they should pursue the Germans' goals for their country. He was sorely mistaken in this. Two years after the invasion, Simon reiterated the reason for Germany's invasion of Luxembourg: "We certainly did not come because 80 million Germans could not live without the 300,000 Luxembourgers. We came because of the high call of our blood relationship impelled us to win back the people of this German soil. It is because of this duty that we are forever approaching you, so that we may be your guides in your historic return to the Reich."[16] The Germans would indeed continue to approach Luxembourg's populace with their methods of Germanization until the country's liberation, but throughout the occupation, Luxembourgers resisted these policies.

The civilian administration brought many changes to the Grand Duchy, a number of which were imposed within six months of the initial invasion. On August 6, 1940, the arrival of the *Schutzpolizei* in Luxembourg occurred with much publicity; a *Sondergericht* was established on August 20 (this judicial body had the authority to carry out capital punishment, which was heretofore unknown in Luxembourg's legal code); August 23 saw the dissolution of all political parties except for the *Volksdeutsche Bewegung* ("Ethnic German Movement," discussed below). In September 1941 the *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei* ("National Socialist German Workers Party"; hereafter: NSDAP) arrived in Luxembourg. These actions were accompanied by

[16] "Germany's Unselfish Motives," *News Digest* No. 899 (August 14, 1942), trans. *Nationalblatt* (August 3 1942).

the ever-increasing presence of the Gestapo in the country.[17] Other Germans moved into Luxembourg as well and by the Fall of 1940 many of these worked within the state administration. Every Luxembourg civil servant's background was scrutinized. [18] Anyone whose political attitude did not align with that of the Nazis was dismissed and many Luxembourgers were transferred to Germany.[19]

In many ways, the German civilian administration of Luxembourg resembled that of other occupied countries. The policy of *Gleichschaltung* (coordination) was initiated and virtually all aspects of Luxembourgers' lives fell under the jurisdiction of the Germans. Censorship, both in the media and in the population's daily lives, became commonplace.[20] Francophiles in Luxembourg were arrested as well as the Germans tried to remove all French influences in the country.[21]

Catholicism was the dominant religion in Luxembourg and the people celebrated certain rituals that strengthened their national sentiments as much as their religious ones. The Germans however, viewed Catholicism as a French influence and "Catholic monasteries and convents were abolished in 1941 and their possessions confiscated, with the exception of female orders working in hospitals."[22] Education became the means by which the youth of Luxembourg were to be indoctrinated with the Nazis' policies.

---

[17] Willard Allen Fletcher "The German Administration in Luxembourg 1940-1942: Towards a 'De Facto' Annexation," in *The Historical Journal* 13 (September 1970), 537.
[18] Ibid., 540.
[19] As many as 50,000 Luxembourgers were deported during the German occupation; many of these were civil servants. Harry L. Coles and Albert K. Weinberg, *United States Army in World War II: Special Studies, Civil Affairs: Soldiers become Governors*,(Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History, 1964), 811, accessed April 20, 2015, http://www.history.army.mil/books/wwii/civaff/ch27.htm .
[20] van 't Hof "Collective Suffering," 170-171.
[21] In 1911 the intellectual Nicholas Reis argued that Luxembourgers' identity stemmed from the confluence of French, Germans, and Belgians. Marnix Beyen and Benoît Majerus "Weak and Strong Nations in the Low Countries: National Historiography and its 'Others' in Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," in *The Contested Nation: Ethnicity, Class, Religion and Gender in National Histories*, Stefan Berger and Chris Lorenz (eds.) (Hampshire, England: Palgrave Macmillian, 2008), 305-306. This obviously did not fit in with the Nazis' goals of the Germanization of the country.
[22] van 't Hof "Collective Suffering," 171.

Students had to join the *Hitlerjugend* or the *Bund Deutscher Mädel*; if they (or their parents) refused, expulsion followed.[23]

Another way in which Gauleiter Simon determined to successfully Nazify the Luxembourgers in his domain was by the establishment of Nazi spies (both Germans and some Luxembourgers) throughout the country: *Ortsgruppenleiter, Zellenleiter*, and *Blockleiter.*[24] They spied on the population and reported anyone not complying with German policies or exhibiting anti-German attitudes. Freedom of speech and action was eliminated in the Grand Duchy within a matter of months after the invasion of May 1940. With the defeat of the French and increasing unlikelihood of a British liberation, many Luxembourgers lost hope in their country regaining its freedom. This led some within Luxembourg to accept the idea of the German occupation and to accommodate themselves with the presence of the German authorities in the country.[25]

Jews in Luxembourg

As in the rest of occupied Europe, Jews in Luxembourg suffered at the hands of the Germans (and those Luxembourgers collaborating with them) during the occupation. Beginning in the 1930s, the Grand Duchy had taken in many Jewish refugees from Germany. On the day of the invasion, Luxembourg had approximately 2,500 permanent Jewish residents and between 1,000 and 1,500 Jewish refugees.[26] During the initial military occupation, no special measures were taken against the Jews. Once the military

[23] van 't Hof "Collective Suffering," 170-171.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Jan T. Gross, "Themes for a Social history of War Experience and Collaboration," in *The Politics of Retribution in Europe: World War II and its Aftermath*, Istvan Deak, Jan T. gross, Tony Judt (eds.), (Princeton: Princeton University Press: 2000), 29.
[26] Ruth Zariz, "The Jews of Luxembourg during the Second World War," trans. Hannah Lasch, *Holocaust & Genocide Studies* No 7 (1993), 51. Because of the large numbers of Jewish refugees from Germany and Austria beginning in the 1930s it is difficult to find accurate numbers. Another source states that in 1935 of the 3,144 Jews in Luxembourg, only 840 were Luxembourgers and 2,274 were foreign. D.A. Lande, *Resistance!: Occupied Europe and Its Defiance of Hitler* (Osceola, WI: MBI Publishing Co, 2000), 138.

administration was replaced by a civilian one, however, Jews began being persecuted in various ways. Their property was confiscated and they were enrolled in forced labor crews. Thus, many Jews attempted to flee the country during this period. On September 5, 1941, the Nuremburg Laws began to be enforced in Luxembourg.[27] And in November 1940 transports of Jews to Spain, Germany, and Austria began; the following October, transports of Jews from Luxembourg to the East began. The Jews remaining in Luxembourg were mostly elderly and they were concentrated at the Funf-Brunnen (Cinqfontaines) Camp.[28] At the country's liberation, a handful of Jews emerged who had been in hiding.

If there is little scholarship on Luxembourg and its resistance against the German occupation, there is even less on the Jewish population of Luxembourg during the war or Luxembourgers' actions towards the Jews in their country. Speaking about the Jewish situation over sixty years later, Luxembourgers admit that there was some anti-Semitism in their country before the German occupation began. However, they also point out that Luxembourgers refused to take over Jewish businesses that were closed and this pointed to the Luxembourgers' solidarity with their fellow countrymen.[29]

No pogroms against the Jews occurred in Luxembourg, and although some Luxembourgers did risk their own well-being by hiding, feeding, and assisting Jews, these acts were not publicized and after the war; they were not equated with resisting the Germans.[30] One account of resistance member Albert Stoltz states that he forced a fellow resistance fighter, Gabriel Bach, to choose between saving/smuggling Jews and "patriotic

[27] Zariz, "Jews of Luxembourg," 54.
[28] Ibid., 55.
[29] "La discrimination des Juifs," *Heim ins Reich: Wei Letzebuerg sollt preisesch ginn*, directed by Claude Lahr (2004; Luxembourg: Nowhere Land Productions), DVD.
[30] Ibid., 64.

work." Bach ultimately gave up his chance at helping Jews and continued the other work with Stoltz.[31] After the war it was discovered that an anti-Nazi German living in Luxembourg was responsible for hiding and feeding several Jewish families in the country.[32] At best, Luxembourgers seemed to have been indifferent to the fate of the Jews in their country, and post-war publications of all genres rarely mention Jews. Yad Vesham's website listing worldwide rescuers of Jews records only one Luxembourger (Victor Bodson) as "Righteous Among the Nations".[33]

***Volksdeutsche Bewegung* (VdB)**

As mentioned, the *Volksdeutsche Bewegung* (VdB) had become the only legal political party in Luxembourg by August 1940. Its motto was "*Heim ins Reich*" ("Home into the Empire") and it sought to convince Luxembourgers that they were Germans who truly belonged to the Third Reich. This organization affected almost all Luxembourgers and was used as a source of propaganda during the occupation by the German administration. The Luxembourg resistance, on the other hand, used membership in the VdB as one way to measure collaboration.

The VdB in Luxembourg was established by Josef Schmithüsen, a German-born Luxembourger. Dr. Damien Kratzenberg, a German-born professor living in Luxembourg was head of the VdB during the German occupation and his name became synonymous with traitor.[34] Kratzenberg had four men working directly under him: of these one was a

[31] "Rapport Concernant Gabriel Bach," ANL, Jt-211.
[32] Zariz, "Jews of Luxembourg," 60.
[33] "The Righteous Among the Nations," http://www.yadvashem.org/yv/en/righteous/statistics.asp accessed March 26, 2015; last updated January 1, 2014.
[34] In 2014, Luxembourgers are still hostile towards the name; a native Luxembourger met Damien Kratzenberg's son at a dinner and was shocked that he had never changed his name because of the negative connotation it carried.

Luxembourger, the other three were Germans.[35] Initially, the organization served to unite all collaborators in Luxembourg, but when it became a political party, the VdB was able to wield a great deal of power over the Luxembourg population. [36]

VdB membership eventually grew to about 70,000, a significant number considering Luxembourg's population numbered 300,000 at the invasion. The Nazis often cited this large membership as proof of Luxembourgers' desire to claim their German heritage. However, many of these members joined only to keep their jobs or to escape from violence and the Germans were well aware of this. In a speech in May 1942, Dr. Kratzenberg admitted that within the 74,000 members of the VdB, many still lacked an "inner conviction." He claimed that the numerous Luxembourgers fighting for Germany were proof that eventually Luxembourgers would be convinced of their Germanic origins.[37] Although initially VdB membership would allow Luxembourgers to keep their jobs, eventually, simply joining the VdB did not safeguard an individual who did not also display pro-German attitudes.[38]

Various resistance publications give different definitions of the level of collaboration that membership within the VdB entailed. The Luxembourgers that joined before they were threatened with losing their jobs, deportation, or imprisonment were judged more harshly by resistance organizations. Prominent members of the community that joined the VdB were also castigated because of the influence they held over other Luxembourgers, some of whom may have seen their membership as a sign of approval of

[35] "Le VdB: les collaborateurs s'organisent," *Heim ins Reich: Wei Letzebuerg sollt preisesch ginn*, directed by Claude Lahr (2004; Luxembourg: Nowhere Land Productions), DVD.
[36] Majerus "Conceptualizing," 17.
[37] "74,000 Members of the Volksdeutsche Movement," *News Digest* No. 819 (May 13, 1942), trans. *Westdeutsche Beobachter*, (April 1, 1942).
[38] Fletcher, "The German Administration in Luxembourg," 541.

the German occupation. Some resistance groups recognized that the Germans used the membership numbers to claim German identity over Luxembourg and they attempted to counteract this propaganda by encouraging those who had not joined to refrain from doing so and to be proud of the sacrifice they were making for their country.

Though not as prevalent as the VdB, the *Reichsarbeitsdienst* (RAD) also significantly affected Luxembourgers' lives under the German occupation. This service was compulsory for both males and females between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five. Much like the VdB, Luxembourg volunteers for the RAD were lacking, so Gauleiter Simon introduced a draft into the labor service. Eventually 14,800 Luxembourgers worked in Germany through the RAD.[39] In 1942, the Nazis were still trying to convince the Luxembourgers of the benefits of joining the RAD.[40]

Resistance

"Resistance" within the many countries under the German occupation of the Second World War could have many forms. D.A. Lande lists the following forms of resistance: passive acts; underground newspapers; escape lines; intelligence; sabotage; assassination; guerilla warfare – maquis and partisan; and secret or "shadow" army.[41] As will be seen, Luxembourg contributed to each of these forms. Because of the lack of a standing army, the Grand Duchy did not have many men who were trained militarily. Sonja van 't Hof states this is why "[a]rmed resistance, sabotage and espionage were therefore hard to organize and occurred only sporadically."[42] However, at least one of Luxembourg's resistance organizations prided itself on espionage and this activity took

[39] van 't Hof, "Collective Suffering," 173.
[40] "Persistent Opposition to the Labour Service," *News Digest* No. 851 (June 19, 1942), trans. *Nationalblatt* (June 12, 1942).
[41] Lande, *Resistance!*, 9.
[42] van 't Hof, "Collective Suffering," 171.

place in the country throughout the war. Furthermore, there is at least one known incident of high-profile sabotage that was carried out by the Luxembourg resistance: the derailment of a train by a member of the Luxembourgian Red Lion, another resistance group.[43] Guerilla warfare may have been lacking in Luxembourg, but resistance was nevertheless consistent, diverse, and at times, very effective in slowing the Germans' goals in the country.

Luxembourgers resisted the Germans in many ways. Not all joined organizations, but passive and active resistance was widespread nonetheless. Examples of the Luxembourgian resistance against the Germans can be found in the *News Digest*, a daily publication produced by the Ministry of Information in London which translated and published news stories from the occupied countries. In these daily accounts, it is obvious that Luxembourgers resisted, even if many did so on a small scale.

A very brief listing of some of the various acts that the Germans chose to publish (and punish) show the wide range of anti-German activities taking place in Luxembourg. These actions could all be labeled as "resistance," although, as will be seen, they vary in the degree of severity of the crimes committed. The first example of local resistance took place in Bettendorf in January 1942. Here, riots broke out in order to protest a German parade. Luxembourgers sang separatist songs and the demonstration was so large that residents of the village began to take part.[44] Another case from later that year, involves the arrest of a Luxembourg man who answered "Heil Hitler" with "Heil Moskau."[45] *News Digest* reports of another man who was arrested because he refused to send his

[43] Seth, *Undaunted*, 149. See also "La Résistance: activitiés, idéologies," *Heim ins Reich: Wei Letzebuerg sollt preisesch ginn*, directed by Claude Lahr (2004; Luxembourg: Nowhere Land Productions), DVD.
[44] "Riots at Bettendorf," *News Digest* No. 813 (May 6, 1942), trans. *Nationalblatt* (April 30, 1942).
[45] "Heil Moskau!," *News Digest* No. 813 (May 6, 1942), trans. *Nationalblatt* (April 30, 1942).

child to the *Hitlerjugend*, did not submit his potato quota, and was caught listening to illegal radio broadcasts.[46]

Furthermore, the German press published lists of people who had been dismissed from their jobs because these men "have not given proof through their behavior that they will always and unhesitatingly support the German 'Volkstum' during and after working hours."[47] One last example is perhaps the most shocking: a "Luxembourg collaborator, a teacher named Thill, was found beheaded. No one has claimed responsibility for this act."[48] Here spontaneous acts of resistance are witnessed as well as actions that were premeditated in some way or another. All of these Luxembourgers protested the Germanization of their country. While these accounts all illustrated the ways in which individuals resisted, the Grand Duchy also had several underground resistance organizations.

During the occupation, as early as August 1940, resistance organizations were formed in Luxembourg. The earliest known organization is the *Lëtzeburger Patriote Liga* ("Luxembourgian Patriot League; hereafter: LPL). This group formed in Luxembourg and had strong ties to Belgium, especially in regards to its clandestine newspaper. Other groups who published underground newspapers include *Lëtzeburger Freihétsbewegong* ("Luxembourgian Freedom Movement"; hereafter: LFB), *Alweraje* (this name was made up of the beginning of the names of the group's founders: Albert Wingert, Wenzel Profant, Raymond Arensdorff, and Jean Doffing), and *Formation des Patriotes indépendants luxembourgeois* ("Formation of Independent Luxembourgian

[46] "Resistance Cases," *News Digest* No. 836 (June 2, 1942), trans. *Luxemburger Wort* (May 27, 1942).
[47] "Lukewarm Railwaymen Dismissed," *News Digest* No. 828 (May 23, 1942), trans. *Nationalblatt* (May 15, 1942).
[48] "Luxembourg Resistance," ANL, AE-03999-152. This pamphlet draft states that 8,000 people have been arrested in Luxembourg.

Patriots; hereafter Pi-Men). In March 1944, *UNIO'N vun de Letzeburger Freihétsorganisatio'nen* ("Union of Freedom Organizations"; hereafter *UNIO'N*) was formed by combining the LPL, *Lëtzeburger Ro'de Lé'w* ("Luxembourgian Red Lion"; hereafter: LRL), and the *Letzeburger Vollekslegio'n* ("Luxembourgian People's Legion"; hereafter LVL). In September 1944, the LFB joined the *UNIO'N*. At least four other organizations existed as well.[49]

The goals and motivations of these organizations varied: Luxembourg, although a small country, was not politically nor economically unified before the German occupation began. Some resistance organizations were communist in nature, others had political beliefs that were as far right wing as the Nazis, however they still opposed the occupation of their country. What the resistance groups had in common was the belief that Luxembourg should remain an independent country and that actions needed to be taken to make sure the German occupation did not lead to the removal of Luxembourg from the map of Europe. For these reasons, the intense Germanization of the country that Simon, the Nazis, and the VdB led was strongly opposed by those Luxembourgers resisting.

Resistance took many forms in Luxembourg because of the all-encompassing nature of the Germanization and Nazification the country endured during the four year occupation. However, the nature of the German occupation, in the Grand Duchy and elsewhere in Europe, persuaded many people to work alongside the Germans. This could

[49] These include LS *Lëtzebuerger Scouten;* LL *Lëtzebuerger Legio'n* ("Luxembourgian Legion"); LFK *Lëtzeburger Freihétskämpfer* ("Luxembourgian Freedom Fighters"); TLS *Trei Lëtzeburger Studenten* ("True Luxembourgian Students); and ALEF *Aktiv Letzeburger Enhétsfront ge'nt de Faschismus* ("Active Luxembourg Coalition against Fascism"); see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Luxembourg_Resistance accessed April 13, 2015, last updated November 8, 2014.

have many forms, including accommodation, collaboration, and treason[50] and the separate resistance groups had different ways to define who was a resister. During the occupation, some Luxembourgers participated in a range of activities that could be classified as collaboration, while also resisting the Germans in various ways. Depending on the definition of resistance used, it can be argued (as many do argue, especially in the immediate post-war years), that "all Luxembourgers" resisted. This argument is strengthened if the occupier's definition of resistance "'*deutschfeindlichkeit*' in attitude or behavior" is used.[51] Some have even claimed that "Luxembourg earned the distinction of having almost no collaborators"[52] However, this was certainly not the case. If collaboration is to be defined as broadly as resistance then the truth is that many (if not most) Luxembourgers resisted; however many of these same individuals also collaborated in some form or another.[53] The difficulty in determining accurate and lasting descriptions of the these two terms is apparent when reading documents from resistance groups produced both during and after the war.

The "*Drei mal Letzeburgesch*" Referendum

There are two major successes of the Luxembourg resistance and these are still celebrated and recognized today. The first is the "*Drei mal Letzeburgesch*" ("Three times Luxembourgish") referendum or census of October 1941 and the second is the General Strike of 1942. Each of these events was led and publicized by resistance organizations to counteract specific German policies. Throughout the years of occupation they were

[50] Gross, "Themes for a Social History," 35n48 gives the following list: "cooperation, collusion, compliance, complicity."
[51] van 't Hof, "Collective Suffering," 171-172.
[52] Lande, *Resistance!*, 138.
[53] Frank Trommler writes of the difficulty in juxtaposing compliance to and resistance against the Nazi regime within Nazi Germany itself. See Frank Trommler, "Between Normality and Resistance: Catastrophic Gradualism in Nazi Germany," in *Resistance against the Third Reich: 1933-1990*, ed. Michael Geyer and John W. Boyer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 123-124.

cited as proof of the Luxembourgian resistance to the oppression of the Germans. The General Strike in particular received international attention, a major goal of some resistance groups who feared their country, a small nation struggling against the German yoke, would be forgotten by the Allies.

Each year on October 10, Luxembourg celebrates its national day of remembrance about the war.[54] This date is significant because it was the date, in 1941, that Gauleiter Simon issued a referendum to the people of Luxembourg to prove that they were, in fact, Germans. Although Simon chose to issue this census to make a name for himself in Berlin,[55] Luxembourgers defeated his goal and showed that they still considered themselves Luxembourgian above all. On the referendum, Luxembourgers had to fill out census information, including what their mother tongue was, their national affiliation, and their ethnicity. Answering "Luxembourgish" was strictly forbidden, in writing, on the forms. However, the resistance learned of this upcoming referendum, and both the LPL and the LFB warned their countrymen, both by word of mouth and by flyers, to answer "Luxembourgish" for each of these three important questions in order to prove to Simon that Luxembourgers did not consider themselves German (and did not wish to be annexed to the Third Reich). The initiative as led by the resistance was referred to as "*Drei mal Letzeburgesch*" and it met with great success on the day of the referendum. Some literature claims that up to 98 percent of Luxembourgers answered "Luxembourgish" on these questions, although the Germans gave up counting the answers and an exact figure is unknown. Either way, Simon was forced to give up the idea of a referendum for the

[54] van 't Hof, "Collective Suffering," 173.
[55] Seth, *Undaunted*, 143.

time being and this was seen as a major victory for the resistance and the Luxembourg people in general.

General Strike

The defeat of the gauleiter's referendum was the first major victory of the Luxembourg resistance. The next was the General Strike, which took place less than a year later, in August of 1942. The strike was a reaction to Simon's August 30, 1942 announcement of Luxembourg's annexation into the Third Reich and the military draft that was to accompany it.

In the months leading up to this announcement, Simon claimed many Luxembourgers were volunteering to fight with the Germans; however, he often gave speeches asking for more volunteers (either directly or indirectly). Despite the Nazi propaganda, it can be inferred that not many Luxembourgers were actually signing up to join the German military and this led the Gauleiter to institute the draft. The LPL had received news of the impending annexation and draft and they urged the population, through flyers, to protest the measures by taking part in a strike. On August 30, 1942, Gauleiter Simon announced the forced military conscription of all Luxembourg males between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four.[56] This order was met with a spontaneous, general strike throughout the country, just as the LPL had suggested. The General Strike, as it became known, remains Luxembourg's most visible and well-known act of resistance against the German occupation forces. It began in Schifflange, at Aciéries Réunies de Burbach-Eich-Dudelange (ARBED), the steel syndicate, and quickly spread to factories in Differdange, Esch, and Dudelange. Workers in leather works in Wiltz also walked out of their jobs, followed by miners and foundry workers, industrial workers,

[56] Lande, *Resistance!*, 130.

teachers, shopkeepers, postal workers, and other clerical workers. Even children left their schools to strike against the proposed annexation measure.[57]

In response to the strike, Simon issued a state of emergency on August 31 and set up special military courts within the cities where the strikes occurred to try leaders of the strikes. These courts had the authority to sentence the strikers to death and to have them executed immediately.[58] In this way, twenty-one "leaders" of the strike were summarily executed. This was followed by mass arrests and the Gestapo then began increasing their efforts against resistance organizations throughout the country. Hundreds of people were arrested and imprisoned in the months following the strike; 125 people were sent to concentration camps as a result of these arrests and 240 high school students were transferred to special camps "for indoctrination."[59] The men that were executed in the days following the strike became instant martyrs for the Luxembourg resistance movement. The Musée National de la Résistance in Esch, Luxembourg, has a permanent exhibit about the strike and its twenty-one martyrs.

The Luxembourg General Strike was the only known strike to take place in a German-occupied country at that time. The *New York Times* and *News Digest* both reported on the strike. On September 13, 1942, the *New York Times* reported that German force and cruelty might crush the strike, but that it could never crush the "indomitable spirit" of the people of Luxembourg.[60] The British Ministry of Information added that the strike was particularly important because it was first strike to occur in an

[57] Seth, *Undaunted*, 146.
[58] "Annexation Defied by Luxembourgers: General Strike is Effective in Grand Duchy, Says Prime Minister Dupong Here," *New York Times*, September 10, 1942.
[59] Seth, *Undaunted*, 147.
[60] "Hull Assails Hitler on Luxembourg Step: Writes Denunciation in Note to Minister of Grand Duchy," *New York Times*, September 13, 1942.

occupied country in response to a particular German political action, and because of Luxembourg's capability of steel output.[61] American Labor even responded to the strike by congratulating the Luxembourg workers and by promising to help them by supporting their own government in the war against Germany.[62]

Although the purpose of the strike: to stop or alter the policy of the draft upon the youth of Luxembourg did not succeed, the strike brought the reality of Luxembourg's situation to international view. Luxembourg, a small country, often feared it was forgotten as a nation trying to escape the German occupation. As late as August 1944, Luxembourgers, including Foreign Minister Bech and Prime Minister Pierre Dupong, were worried when their country was not mentioned in speeches by Roosevelt and Churchill, as one of the "captive and subjugated" nations.[63] However, the General Strike showed the world that Luxembourgers had not resigned themselves to being part of the Third Reich. Furthermore, if this one large act of resistance led to so many arrests, the resistance within the country must have been great. London acknowledged that the strike proved the falsity of the German propaganda: Luxembourgers were not voluntarily joining the *Wehrmacht* nor did they desire German citizenship.[64]

Luxembourg's General Strike may have shown the world that the country still considered itself independent and strove to break itself from the yoke of German oppression, but the draft still took place and 11,160 Luxembourg youth were

---

[61] Ibid.
[62] "Unions Here Greet Luxembourg Labor: Congratulations on General Strike Against the Nazis Sent by Short Wave," *New York Times*, September 30, 1942.
[63] Eliezer Yapou, *Governments in Exile, 1939-1945: Leadership from London and Resistance at Home*, (Published independently online, 1998.), accessed April 20, 2015, http://governmentsinexile.com/yapouluxembourg.html.
[64] "Annexation Defied by Luxembourgers: General Strike is Effective in Grand Duchy, Says Prime Minister Dupong Here," *New York Times*, September 10, 1942.

conscripted.[65] The General Strike would be cited by resistance members, during the war and after, as an example of Luxembourgian heroism. The "*Drei mal Letzeburgesch"* referendum and the General Strike were the two most visible and well-known acts of resistance against the German in the occupation years. However, primary sources from the years 1940-1944 show ample evidence of resistance activities that were much less obvious. A case study of one of Luxembourg's earliest resistance organizations reveals the way in which Luxembourg resistance members worked for their country.

[65] Lande, *Resistance!*, 130.

CHAPTER III

LËTZEBURGER PATRIOTE LIGA – RESISTANCE ORGANIZATION 1940-1944

Of the many Luxembourg resistance organizations, the *Lëtzeburger Patriote Liga* ("Luxembourgian Patriot League"; hereafter: LPL) became the most well-known during the war. It not only published a clandestine newspaper that reached the Luxembourgers, Belgians, and the Allies, but stories of one of its leaders, Raymond Petit, circulated in several English-language publications. After the war LPL members and outsiders wrote about the activities of the group. The LPL officially joined the *UNIO'N vun de Letzeburger Freihétsorganisatio'nen* ("Union of Freedom Organizations"; hereafter *UNIO'N*) in March 1944 and this group would remain intact until after the liberation of Luxembourg. The LPL participated in a variety of resistance activities, both passive and active. The organization was not primarily antifascist in nature; its main purpose was to counteract the Germanization of the country under the occupation. A closer look at the history of the LPL and its clandestine newspapers shows the variety of resistance activities available to Luxembourgers and the goals of the LPL throughout the occupation of Luxembourg.

A group known as the Lëtzeburger Patriote Liga had already existed during the First World War, so it is perhaps not surprising that two separate organizations emerged during the Second World War that claimed the same name. Raymond Petit, a twenty-year-old man from Luxembourg City founded the organization in Clerveaux in

September 1940. Two months later, Alphonse Rodesch and Theodore Lesch, a pastor, founded an organization of the same name in Clerf.[66] Eventually these two separate groups joined together to work towards resisting the German occupation.

Before the merger of Petit's group (LPL – Petit) and Rodesch and Lesch's group (LPL-RL), the two organizations were distinct. LPL-Petit believed that the LPL was not an organization for faint-hearted, albeit patriotic, Luxembourgers. Rather it was for those who meant to take risks for their country. Petit wanted revolutionary young men to fight against the tyranny of the Germans using espionage and sabotage. Shooting drills were organized for members and LPL-Petit was also involved in taking up collections for the needy and hunting down Luxembourg traitors.[67] LPL-Petit wanted a centralized organization with many departments that all followed orders given by a central command, rather than a people's movement. Petit, who urged active resistance, also participated in passive resistance by simply refusing to change his last name to "Klein" as the German administration demanded.[68]

LPL-RL, on the other hand, believed that all "true Luxembourgers" could be members of their resistance organization. Rodesch and Lesch believed passive resistance was as important as active resistance. The group called for people to avoid joining the VdB and to impede the annexation of Luxembourg to the Third Reich. LPL-RL wanted their resistance group to be built from the ground up. Rodesch and Lesch had post-war visions for Luxembourg (as will be seen in the clandestine newspapers) and they wanted to bring the idea of a "people's movement" into Luxembourg after liberation.[69]

---

[66] "Abbé Théodore Lesch und die LPL," Archives Nationales de Luxembourg, DH-IIGM-056.
[67] Ibid.
[68] "The Story of Raymond Petit," ANL, AE-05896A.
[69] "Abbé Théodore Lesch und die LPL," ANL, DH-IIGM-056.

Josy Fellens, a recruiter for the LPL, brought the two separate groups together in the spring of 1941.[70] In spite of their contrasting approaches to the management of their branches of the LPL and their differing ideas of what it meant to resist (and thus who could enlist in their resistance organization), Petit and Rodesch and Lesch joined their forces and merged into the LPL. Both groups' founders were dedicated to the cause of resistance and were willing to risk their lives for this cause. They also knew that together they could accomplish more for their cause. Not long after the merger, members of the LPL did not know which group they had initially supported.[71]

After the merger of the LPL, the organization worked towards several goals. The LPL initially desired to function as a bulwark against the VdB in Luxembourg. This organization was growing and some Luxembourgers recognized that their country's identity was threatened by the increasing membership of this political party.[72] Outsiders may not have understood the coercion that led many Luxembourgers (almost a fourth of the population) to join the VdB, and therefore Luxembourg might be seen as voluntarily joining itself to the German cause. Therefore, the LPL believed refusal to join the VdB was the correct place to begin resistance against the Germans.

Another goal of the LPL was the gathering of information about various aspects of the occupation with the intent of distributing this material to other countries, especially Great Britain. The LPL members would collect the proclamations of the Civil Administration, the production numbers of ARBED, and other relevant information and smuggle the information to London. The LPL worked alongside another resistance

[70] Ibid.
[71] In April of 1942, after fleeing from the Gestapo for several months, Petit killed himself rather than surrender to the Germans.
[72] Ibid.

group, the LFK (*Lëtzeburger Freihétskämpfer*) in its mission to let the Allies know of the Grand Duchy's plight.

In 1942 the LPL found another way to reach the Allies with news of Luxembourg. One of the leaders (pseudonym: "Jean Vercel") of the resistance organization had escaped Luxembourg and fled to London to meet with the government-in-exile. While there, Vercel gave an interview to the *Daily Telegraph* about the work of the LPL. He claimed that the LPL had hundreds of members, directed the opinions of the Grand Duchy's inhabitants, and represented virtually the entire country. Vercel described the "cell system" by which the LPL operated. This system ensured that no single member knew too many others, in case of an arrest. Luxembourgers knew arrests of resistance members were generally followed by torture, and the leaders of the LPL safeguarded their organization in this way.[73]

Vercel told the *Daily Telegraph* that the resistance organization was truly "a State within a State." He also claimed that Luxembourg was unified in its support of the LPL.[74] He did not acknowledge the other resistance organizations in the country, nor their varied goals. Vercel was attempting to convince the Allies that Luxembourg had no desire to become incorporated into the Third Reich. By claiming all Luxembourgers supported the LPL, he was petitioning the Allies for help. Vercel wanted the Allies to know that Luxembourgers were struggling against the Germans; he did not want the Grand Duchy's situation to be forgotten. Although resistance members were working against the Germans in various ways, they knew that a military defeat of Hitler's forces was necessary to free their country and they relied on the Allies to provide this defeat.

[73] H. R. Madol, "Freedom's Voice Has Never Been Silenced in Luxembourg," *Daily Telegraph,* September 8, 1942, ANL, AE-05896A.
[74] Ibid.

Other work of the LPL included setting up wireless transmission posts in order that Luxembourgers could listen to the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC).[75] This "black listening" was strictly forbidden by the German authorities and many Luxembourgers were imprisoned, fined, or sent to labor camps because they were caught listening to the BBC. The group was also involved with smuggling *réfractaires* across the border to Belgium. After liberation Abbé Lesch continued to work for his country by assisting the American troops in reading German maps to find out where their artillery was located.[76]

The LPL also distributed fliers and underground newspapers to the people of Luxembourg on a regular basis. They announced and protested various measures of the German administration in the country. The LPL was one of several resistance organizations who warned the Luxembourg people about the referendum of October 1941 and the group called for the General Strike of 1942. The LPL's clandestine newspaper: *De Freie Letzeburger– Ons Hemecht* ("The Free Luxembourger – Our Homeland") began its publication run in October 1941 and ran through seventeen editions.[77]

A history written after the end of the war by Jean Ferdinand Fischbach about *De Freie Letzeburger* tells the story of the LPL in Belgium, focusing mostly on Fischbach's time as editor of the newspaper. This underground newspaper was not only distributed in Luxembourg and Belgium, but it was also sent to London in order to show the Allies and the Luxembourg government-in-exile the situation of Luxembourgers under the German occupation. The newspaper was not subsidized by the Luxembourg government in

[75] Ibid.
[76] "Abbé Théodore Lesch und die LPL," ANL, DH-IIGM-056.
[77] Fischbach, Jean Ferdinand, n.d. History of *De Freie Letzeburger – Ons Hemecht*. ANL, DH-IIGM-57.

London; it was funded by Luxembourgers residing in Belgium and Belgians sympathetic to the Luxembourgers' cause.[78]

This history shows the international scope of resistance, especially in a country as small as Luxembourg. Fischbach gives credit to Belgians for supporting the LPL's publication with time, effort, and money. He recognizes that these Belgians risked their security to help a neighboring country who was fighting the same enemy as they were. Both countries felt the oppression of the German occupation and worked together to resist it. The multilingualism of Luxembourg was extremely useful for contacting Belgian and French resisters; Luxembourg *réfractaires* could also flee to one of these countries and not be completely separated by a language barrier.

Fischbach states that the goal of *De Freie Letzeburger* was to counteract the German propaganda that was ubiquitous in Luxembourg. Although the LPL initially focused on Luxembourgers refusing to join the VdB, the group later targeted other forms of German influence on the populace. The newspaper aimed to raise the hope of the Luxembourgers, especially in times of despair. True Luxembourgers were encouraged towards passive and active resistance. In addition to gathering information to send to the Allies, the newspaper also called out traitors and collaborators in order to stop their damaging work within the Grand Duchy.[79] As seen above, the LPL was involved in many types of resistance and the members used their newspaper to urge their compatriots to follow their example in this.

Although there was a scarcity of paper, *De Freie Letzeburger* was printed regularly. Fischbach states that when an edition was not published on its regular date,

[78] Ibid.
[79] Ibid.

distributors would immediately hear complaints, so great was the thirst for truth in the country.[80] The Gestapo went to great lengths to stop the publication and distribution of the LPL's newspaper, including stopping railway traffic, spying on printers, and confiscating reading materials in the street from innocent people. This proves the effectiveness of the paper: had Luxembourgers ignored the calls of the LPL, the Germans would not have spent so much time and effort in attempting to stop *De Freie Letzeburger*. Fischbach believed the Germans would have had to put a seal on every copier in Belgium in order to discontinue the publication.[81]

The impending German announcement of Luxembourg's annexation and the conscription of Luxembourgers into the German military in the summer of 1942 demanded action from the LPL. Josy Fellens, an LPL member working in Luxembourg, brought information about the proposed annexation and forced military service to Brussels so that flyers could be published and the people of Luxembourg could be warned about the upcoming policies. On August 30, 1942, *De Freie Letzeburger* announced Germany's plans for Luxembourg's annexation and the conscription that would follow; the LPL urged Luxembourgers to participate in a general strike to publicly protest these measures. The flyer called for Luxembourgers to close all stores, mills, and cafes, to stop all iron and steel traffic, and to stay home from work and school.[82]

Fellens recalls that when the Germans executed the twenty-one so-called leaders of the strike, Luxembourg was shocked. No one had expected the brutality of the Germans against these innocent people. The resistance groups who called for the strike could not help but feel guilty that people following their orders were executed within

[80] "…la revue fut rapidement mise à la distribution des assoiffés de la vérité.", ibid.
[81] Fischbach, Jean Ferdinand, n.d. History of "*De Freie Letzeburger – Ons Hemecht*." ANL, DH-IIGM-57.
[82] Ibid.

days of the call to strike.[83] Although the LPL was proud to resist the Germans and members of the organization knew they were risking their lives, they had not intended to sacrifice their countrymen in this call for a general strike. The strike and the German response to it illustrate the effectiveness of *De Freie Letzeburger* and the LPL. After the strike and the state of emergency that followed, the Gestapo stepped up their efforts against Luxembourg's many resistance organizations. So many resistance members were arrested that some groups simply collapsed, like a house of cards.[84]

The LPL, however, survived this wave of arrests, due in part to the group's cell system. The members continued their work in Belgium against the Germans including the publication of *De Freie Letzeburger*. In Brussels, the LPL managed to send one of their flyers through the mail using official German VdB envelopes. This meant that the Germans covered the postage of these mailings.[85] Another feat of the LPL that reached an international audience involved a portrait of President Roosevelt. On October 28, 1943, a member of the LPL created a portrait of the American president using only typewriter symbols. Thousands of copies of this image were distributed and they attracted international attention when they were republished in newspapers in London and America.[86] The group demonstrated their support of the Allies as it communicated to the world that Luxembourg was not accepting the German claims upon its people and territory.

Fischbach states that the Spring of 1944 was the most difficult phase for *De Freie Letzeburger* because so many people connected to the paper began to be arrested. The

---

[83] "La grève de 1942 et l'enrôlement de force," *Heim ins Reich: Wei Letzebuerg sollt preisesch ginn*, directed by Claude Lahr (2004; Luxembourg: Nowhere Land Productions), DVD.
[84] Ibid.
[85] Fischbach, Jean Ferdinand, n.d. History of "*De Freie Letzeburger – Ons Hemecht*." ANL, DH-IIGM-57.
[86] Ibid.

platemaker for the journal was arrested in mid-March 1944. A few weeks later Charles Diederich, one of the editors, was arrested after a denunciation. More arrests followed as the Gestapo stepped up their efforts to eliminate the resistance in Belgium. Fischbach, who had several aliases during his time in the LPL, was left to edit the newspaper alone, in the face of an imminent arrest. His friends insisted he go into hiding but he refused and even continued to help Luxembourg *réfractaires* in the Ardennes while publishing *De Freie Letzeburger*.

By mid-April 1944, Fischbach knew his arrest was imminent. He literally met the Gestapo agents on the way to his home to arrest him as he was making his escape. He answered their questions, continued on his way and went into hiding where he produced a new edition of *De Freie Letzeburger* within two weeks.[87] The Germans became even more determined to find Fischbach and to stop the publication of *De Freie Letzeburger*. They stopped trains, examined and reexamined identification cards, searched passengers, and widened their net on the streets. Fischbach notes the efficiency of the police force and the inclusion of Luxembourgers within this force; some of these same Luxembourgers obtained positions of power in the post-war government.[88]

Fischbach continued risking his life by working on *De Freie Letzeburger* until liberation came. The day before Belgium's liberation, Fischbach went to the meeting place he had set up with a Luxembourger from Clerveaux, Theo Wagner, who helped to distribute the copies of the *De Freie Letzeburger*. Wagner never showed up: he had been arrested the day before and was executed only days before the liberation of his country. Fischbach's narrative about *De Freie Letzeburger* shows the determination of the LPL to

[87] Ibid.
[88] Ibid.

continue to provide support and encouragement to the people of Luxembourg regardless of the risks it posed to those taking part in the publication.

The Newspapers of the LPL

De Freie Letzeburger reached a wide audience and the resistance organization certainly did influence the country to resist in the General Strike and in other instances. A deeper analysis of a few of the LPL's newsletters gives insight into the goals of the organization and the different ways in which Luxembourgers could resist the oppression of the German occupation. Several trends can be detected from these publications, whose dates range from August 1942 to May 1943. The first of these is no surprise: the LPL consistently asked Luxembourgers to remember and to show that they were not, and did not want to become, Germans. The LPL also consistently referred to the Referendum of October 10, 1941 and the General Strike as examples of the desire of the population to maintain a distinct Luxembourg national identity. Most of the newsletters analyzed depicted a desire for revenge on the Luxembourgers who did side with the Germans. The LPL also addressed the post-war period in its earlier editions, rather than as the war drew closer to an end.

On August 2, 1942, the LPL published a four page newsletter written in Luxembourgish. The motto at the top was "*Letzeburge de Letzeburger*" or "Luxembourg for the Luxembourgers". The sections were divided by "LETZEBURGER!" Just by glancing at the first page, it was obvious that the LPL wanted to distinguish the Luxembourgers from the Germans. In addition to differentiating between Germans and Luxembourgers, the LPL called out Luxembourgers whose actions disqualified them from being "*trei Letzeburger*" (true Luxembourgers). They outlined special categories

for the traitors of the country, making it obvious that many collaborated with the Germans in different ways and in varying degrees. The LPL also discussed post-war Luxembourg and the country's much-needed reforms in this newspaper.

The authors began by raising the morale of the Luxembourg people; they claimed that freedom was coming as Germans were dying on the Russian steppes while America and England prepared their offensive. Then came a list of accusations against Gauleiter Simon for all the lies, misery, and death he had brought to Luxembourg. Soon, the LPL claimed, the sun would shine on all the traitors of the country. The LPL stated that the "Luxembourg volunteers" about whom Simon liked to brag were not Luxembourgers at all. Rather they were Germans who lived in Luxembourg, by the grace of the small country.[89] This same argument is seen in another clandestine newspaper *Ons Zeidong*, published by the resistance group *Alweraje* two months earlier, in June 1942. The LPL placed the Quisling Kratzenberg in the same category; he was actually a German who happened to live in Luxembourg.

The second section of this edition discussed the beginning of the LPL's resistance movement and the lack of courage displayed by the individuals in Luxembourg in positions of power. The LPL declared that its members and all *trei Letzeburger* could look back at the occupation years with pride at the courage they showed towards the Germans.[90] The history of the LPL began in January 1941, when the organization made its first call to the Luxembourg people; the organization was then quickly set up with members. However, the agencies most responsible for the country, the chamber, the courts, and the government, gave up on the people. The LPL stated that the functionaries

[89] LPL, *Letzeburg de Letzeburger*, August 2, 1942, ANL, DH-IIGM-045.
[90] Ibid.

of the country were paid to be loyal to their land, yet they were among the first to join the VdB and *Heim ins Reich*. These disloyal Luxembourgers believed they could change their allegiance when the English won the war, but they were mistaken. The LPL held those in positions of power to a higher standard; this theme was elaborated on later in the newspaper.

The next section discussed the proposed annexation of Luxembourg into the Third Reich by Gauleiter Simon. The author argued that annexation could not happen because it meant that 30,000 men would be drafted into the *Wehrmacht* and probably 10-12,000 would die in battle in Russia or Africa. Furthermore, if Luxembourg were annexed, the Allies might forget about Luxembourg's plight as a country under occupation; the resistance needed its country to remain separate from Germany to show that it was still on the side of the Allies. The LPL stated that by putting the brakes on the VdB membership and by answering Luxembourgish on the Gauleiter's referendum of October 1941 the country had already shown that it had no desire to be annexed and to become part of the Reich.

The LPL also cited British Broadcasting Corporation (hereafter: BBC) reports from London that gave the Luxembourg people reason to show they were separate from Germany. A May 1942 broadcast declared that for Luxembourg there could be no neutrality; Luxembourg was on the side of the Allies and it was the duty of all Luxembourgers to fight for their country, even if it meant dying for one's country.[91] This repudiation of a neutral Luxembourg could be applied to the individual level.[92] If

[91] Ibid.
[92] This same argument against neutrality was made just two months earlier by Deputy Gauleiter Reckman who acknowledged that many Luxembourgers joined the VdB for economic reasons. He stated "It is disgraceful to watch events passively in these tremendous times." "Luxembourgers May Still Become

Luxembourgers were doing nothing to resist the German occupation, they were not being neutral, rather, they were operating against Luxembourg and the Allies. Many Luxembourgers listened to and relied on these BBC reports and the LPL realized that they could use these broadcasts to further their own goals.

The following section of this August 1942 newspaper was two pages long and concerned the post-war period, specifically questions regarding the future government and the punishment of traitors of Luxembourg. The LPL first reiterated what it said in a prior publication: when the war ended, politics in Luxembourg would have to change. One of the most important measures would be the *Sanktionefrô* (questions of punishment), which should be decided by the people as soon as the grand duchess returned to the country. Furthermore, the LPL designated who would be voting for their representatives in the future cantonal committees: individuals who were eighteen years or older; were members of the LPL or otherwise showed themselves to be true Luxembourgers; and did not collaborate with the enemy in any way. These *Cantonalcomité* would then be the juries that decided on the *Sanktionefrô*.

Next these *Sanktionefrô* were outlined. The LPL stated that the VdB began the high treason in the country. With the help of the Gauleiter, the members of the VdB created a separatist clique in the land which sold out its country and the true Luxembourgers. These traitors carried the burden of guilt for all those in concentration camps and prisons and all Luxembourgers agreed that the traitors need to be judged. The LPL laid out three categories of traitors: Category A *Haptverräter* (high treason),

---

Good Germans," *News Digest* No 849 (June 17, 1942), trans. *Nationalblatt* (June 8, 1942). Here readers see evidence of the LPL responding to German propaganda within Luxembourg.

Category B *D'Feiglingen an d'Spekulanten* (cowards and speculators), and Category C *Mannerwichteg Fäll* (less important cases).[93]

Those in Category A were those people who joined the VdB, NSDAP, SS, SA, or *d'Jugendführer*, volunteers in the German army of Luxembourg nationality, *Dénuncianten* (denouncers), and all other active collaborators. When the *Haptverräter* were judged by the Luxembourg courts, their minimum punishment would be annulment of Luxembourg nationality, exile from Luxembourg, and confiscation of possessions. The LPL believed a list of these *Haptverräter* should be compiled now, in the midst of the occupation, to prevent those who would change sides at the last minute from being freed from the consequences of their treason.

Category B encompassed the "cowards and speculators". These were eminent people in Luxembourg who worked in industry, commerce, medicine, or the government who may have stated that they did not support the Germans, but who joined the VdB at the first chance. Given their positions in the country and their communities, these men were influential and therefore their actions were under more scrutiny than others'. By joining the VdB at its inception, these individuals influenced others in the country, both directly and indirectly. For *D'Feiglingen an d'Spekulanten*, the punishment would be on an individual basis, rather than across the board, like those accused of high treason. The punishment for these, according to the LPL, should be that they had their right to vote revoked, they would pay according to the accusations against them, and they would possibly be removed from their positions.[94]

[93] LPL, *Letzeburg de Letzeburger*, August 2, 1942, ANL, DH-IIGM-045.
[94] Ibid.

Category C, the less important cases, covered all others that were not true to Luxembourg (in the way in which the LPL defined). The punishment for them would be to lose their right to vote for a few years and to pay according to their offenses. The LPL added notes to illustrate other cases that did not fall into these three categories, such as workers and other middle and lower employees that joined the VdB. Furthermore, businessmen, tradesmen, and day laborers who were forced into the VdB in order to keep their jobs would not be punished. Some joined this organization so that they could keep their job and use their positions in order to further patriotic activities (such as working for the LPL) and these individuals would not be punished. Luxembourgers who were living in foreign countries and who collaborated with the Germans would be judged by the new Luxembourg government. The Cantonal Committees would take care of these questions of punishment, but the LPL stated that there were still important issues to be addressed. These three categories, along with the comments that accompanied them, depicted a country whose population was under immense pressure and among whom many had chosen the easier route of collaboration. After the liberation of the country, Luxembourg, like most occupied countries, was unable to easily track down and prosecute all "collaborators." If definitions were blurred during the war, after the war it became increasingly difficult for the returning government to mete out justice in a way that satisfied the resistance organizations, the general public, and the government.[95]

The post-war reforms that the LPL addressed fall into four categories: City Council Reform, Homeland Language, Administration Reform, and Naturalization. City

[95] For more on Luxembourg's post-war reconciliation policies, see Sonja van 't Hof "Collective Suffering: Consequences of World War II in Luxembourg," in *The Politics of War Trauma: the Aftermath of World War II in Eleven European Countries*, Jolande Withuis, Annet Mooij (eds.), (Amsterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers: 2010), 178-179.

Council Reform, in the eyes of the LPL, meant that *Parteipolitik* could no longer exist in Luxembourg. The current (pre-war) government and legislature accomplished nothing except for political infighting, according to the author of this editorial. Furthermore, money and individuals who were tempted (and allowed) to become dictators ran the country. For Luxembourg, the LPL argued, a chamber was needed that represented the various classes of people and all professions. This chamber would stop political fighting and do actual work for the people of Luxembourg; it would also preclude a dictator coming to power through a certain party.

The *Hemechtssprôch* (Homeland Language) needed to be reformed in that Luxembourgish needed to become the official language of the country. The LPL argued that it was a crime that Luxembourgish was not the official language of Luxembourg and furthermore that the banning of Luxembourgish during the German occupation had falsified the Luxembourgian identity. The LPL desired that all street names and names of villages would be changed to Luxembourgish. The courts and the schools needed to be conducted in Luxembourgish as well. The only thing that was allowed to be in any other language was memorials: their inscriptions could be written in both French and Luxembourgish. It is not surprising that the Luxembourg resistance members did not want any signs of German in their country after living through the German occupation. By allowing memorial plaques to be written in French and Luxembourgish, the LPL showed that Luxembourg and France had a mutual struggle against the Germans. Since language is intimately tied to national identity, this reform was natural for a people attempting to maintain their identity in the face of oppression.[96] Despite these calls for

[96] See for example, Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 1983) and Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1983).

recognition of Luxembourgish, after the war, the country's official status regarding languages did not change. French and German continued to be used as the administrative and legal languages.[97] However, Luxembourgish began to be used with increasing frequency in the Chamber of Deputies in early 1945.[98]

The Administration Reform as outlined by the LPL was simple and straightforward. They claimed that the poor state of affairs in Luxembourg was due to the fact that the administration of the country was not made up of Luxembourg descendants; this had become obvious during the war. The LPL envisioned a law that allowed only individuals who could prove that their grandparents were Luxembourgers to work in government administration. Here racial policies for which the Nazi regime was so infamous were at work in the LPL and its post-war vision of Luxembourg.

The final reform that the LPL brought up was the reform of *Naturalisationen*. Again, their solution was uncomplicated: *Eraus mat de Preisen!* ("Out with the Germans!") The LPL wanted all Germans and other foreigners' naturalization from the past fifty years to be annulled. In some special cases, individuals would be allowed to go before the courts to have their citizenship reinstated if they had been loyal to Luxembourg. Finally, business licenses would no longer be given to Germans. These reforms would create a country whose identity was much more "Luxembourgian" than before.

As noted above, Petit's leadership was not concerned with post-war reforms, as were Rodesch and Lesch. Just months after Petit's death, the LPL published reforms and

---

[97] Melanie Wagner and Winifred V. Davies, "The role of World War II in the development of Luxembourgish as a national language," *Language Problems & Language Planning* 33:2 (2009), 118.
[98] Pit Péporté, Sonja Kmec, Benoît Majerus, and Michel Margue, *Inventing Luxembourg: Representations of the Past, Space and Language from the Nineteenth to the Twenty-First Century* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 283.

sanctions that the other two leaders had probably never stopped compiling. The reforms that the LPL listed would create a Luxembourg "for the people," where money did not influence politics. Furthermore, the people of Luxembourg that benefitted from post-war reforms would be "Luxembourgers:" those born in the country and able to speak and appreciate Luxembourgish.

The LPL's August 1942 newsletter concluded with a call to action for the people of Luxembourg. The LPL stated that they could only recommend the reforms that Luxembourgers wanted, but if the people did not work for these reforms, the guilt would be upon them. There was a post-script that stated that the LPL did not have a membership list for reasons of security. However, the members comprised the 100,000 true, loyal Luxembourgers who had followed the commands of the LPL and sabotaged the Gauleiter's annexation. When freedom came, the members would know one another! After addressing the problems with the country (collaborators and traitors, and the problems evident in the Luxembourg government before the war), the LPL assured readers that there were in fact many true Luxembourgers and they would be recognized when the occupation ended.[99] This morale raising continued in other LPL newsletters.

The LPL published another newspaper on New Year's Day 1943 that began by discussing the losing situation of Germany in the war. It stated that "every child" knew that Germany was being defeated in Africa and in Russia and now the Germans were finally realizing it.[100] This could be seen in the nervous demeanor of the Germans in Luxembourg. Another sign was that the Germans in the country were now receiving the same rations as the rest of the population. The Germans had also been warned against

[99] LPL, *Letzeburg de Letzeburger*, August 2, 1942, ANL, DH-IIGM-045.
[100] "*Jidder Kand wéss wât an Afrika and Russland geschitt.*", ibid.

hamsteren (a Luxembourgish word that can be loosely defined as secretly going to farms to beg for food), although this practice was not yielding results for them anymore.

What followed was an appeal to the Luxembourg people to hold their heads up high as an Allied victory could not be far off. Luxembourgers were warned not to blindly sign up for the VdB or other German organizations. The LPL believed "*Jidderèn soll nemmen dât man, wo' hien nött kann nèn soen*." ("Each person should only do what they cannot say no to").[101] Every person must resist, but each individual could choose how to do this. Luxembourgers needed to show the Germans that they were not welcome in their country. This was the debt that was owed to the heroes who had died for their homeland. The LPL stated that every person who signed up with the VdB (even if it was just to save their job) hurt the memory of the Luxembourg martyrs. Although the LPL made distinctions based upon the reason someone would join the VdB, they still argued that each individual Luxembourg VdB membership hurt the country's identity.

The author of this newsletter stated that every German flag and every picture of Hitler in Luxembourg was a lie. The Germans called the Luxembourg heroes cowards, and this was simply another lie. The LPL stated that there would be a time in 1943 that Luxembourg would welcome back Grand Duchess Charlotte and then tell her that throughout the years of occupation they stayed true to their country. This page from the LPL sought to raise morale for the coming year. By promising an end to the war in the next twelve months, the LPL believed Luxembourgers could hold out longer before making any concessions to the Germans. This newsletter had one theme: raising the morale of an oppressed and pressured people. The LPL was not concerned with calling out traitors or warning collaborators. Rather, the author just sought to give the population

[101] Ibid.

hope that this trial will come to an end soon.[102] Since Luxembourgers had seen an increase in violence, executions, and arrests in the last months of 1942, this encouragement was necessary. Unfortunately for the country, the German occupation would not end that year.

Six weeks later, on February 20, 1943, the LPL published another newsletter titled "*De Freie Letzeburger: Ons Hemecht*" ("The Free Luxembourger: Our Homeland"). In this three-page newsletter, the LPL asked Luxembourgers to fight against the Germans at all costs. The LPL gave several examples of the nature of the Germans, on individual and national levels. A story about a young German and a poem about Luxembourg written by "Peter" (another German) showed Luxembourgers how Germans felt about and treated their country. The pieces about the Gauleiter and his policies in Luxembourg represented the official German attitude towards Luxembourg. Luxembourgers had already shown their desire to remain independent of Germany on two occasions (the Referendum and the General Strike). However, Gauleiter Simon had proceeded with annexation and this led to obligatory military duty for thousands of young Luxembourgers. This was the reason for the LPL's call to Luxembourg to fight against, not for, the Germans.

The LPL began with a story of the "well-known German friendship". This was an anecdote about a young German who kindly sold many of his presents of food that he had received from his family to a Luxembourg café-owner (who was in dire need of rations). This Luxembourger told of her good fortune to a member of the LPL who sent in a *Vertrauensmann* (intermediary) to examine these packages. He realized they were all stolen from the post office and the food items were meant for German youths. The LPL

[102] LPL, January 1, 1943, ANL, DH-IIGM-045.

claimed this young German was typical of all Germans: they would steal, even from their own people, to gain anything for themselves.[103]

This story was followed by a warning that once a Luxembourger joined the VdB, he was not allowed to cancel his membership. He would be subjected to marches and weekly indoctrination of Nazi theory. Later, the LPL stated that Luxembourgers were even trying to show their hatred of Germany by sending back their VdB membership cards. This backfired, however, as these same men were called up to fight almost immediately. A certain Luxembourger who was forced to join the VdB (due to circumstances) and participated in these courses overheard a German officer saying that the Germans would have used gas on the Russians a long time ago, if they had not had to turn their attention to the "Tommys" on the Western Front. Here the LPL acknowledged that some Luxembourgers simply had no choice but to join the VdB. However, this Luxembourger was still doing his duty to his country by reporting what he learned about the Germans. The LPL (representing Luxembourg) was not impressed with the Germans, but rather glad that they had to fight their enemies on two fronts.

The second page of the newspaper addressed the situation after September 1, 1942, which marked the end of the General Strike. This was almost six months ago, showing what an impact this event had on the Luxembourg people. The LPL reminded Luxembourgers that many were killed and hundreds were imprisoned because of the strike. Furthermore, between 6,000 and 7,000 Luxembourg youth were called up for military duty. The Germans wanted to have the Luxembourgers fight in their military to show that Luxembourg was fighting against the Allies. The LPL urged all Luxembourgers to avoid fighting in the *Wehrmacht* at all costs. The true patriots would

[103] LPL, *Ons Hemecht: De Freie Letzeburger*, February 20, 1943, ANL, DH-IIGM-045.

not fight for the Germans. The LPL reminded Luxembourgers that in October 1941, 96% of Luxembourgers refused to call themselves Germans. Again, in the General Strike, Luxembourgers paid with their lives in their refusal to accept annexation to the Third Reich. Six months after the end of the strike, action was still needed, but now in the form of a refusal to fight in the German military against the Allies.

The LPL then related the Gauleiter's claim that Luxembourgers were given the present of German nationality. For Luxembourgers, however, this gift came with a price: 30,000 men would go fight for Germany (this included men up to forty years old). Obligatory military duty meant Luxembourgers would become cannon fodder on the Russian front. The LPL tried to give courage to the Luxembourg people by repeating that Luxembourg would not be moved by the threats made to its people. They would continue to fight to stay what they were. This encouragement was needed, especially after the brutal execution of the "leaders" of the General Strike. Furthermore, Luxembourg deserters to the *Wehrmacht* faced immediate execution if caught.[104]

The LPL admitted these crimes committed by the Germans were not restricted to Luxembourg. The Germans were taking these action in all the occupied countries in Europe. Next followed a description of the bloodthirstiness of the Germans: they strangled the freedom of the people in the occupied countries. The LPL maintained that Luxembourg and the other occupied countries wanted freedom and independence. Luxembourgers would never consider Germans their brothers, only their enemies. By depicting the evil of the Germans all over occupied Europe, the LPL was giving Luxembourgers another reason to remain true to their country.

[104] "Les cachettes des déserteurs," *Heim ins Reich: Wei Letzebuerg sollt preisesch ginn*, directed by Claude Lahr (2004; Luxembourg: Nowhere Land Productions), DVD.

The third page of the LPL's February 1943 newsletter began with a German poem by "Peter," a German who was writing of Luxembourg. He wondered why the Germans even wanted the cowardly Luxembourgers fighting with them. He stated that all they did was listen to the English and follow their advice. The Luxembourgers showed the Germans no respect. Obviously, the Germans did not respect the Luxembourgers and their desire for freedom. Again the author of this section of the LPL newspaper showed how the Germans maligned the Luxembourgers and, by doing so, made another argument against any Luxembourger joining the German cause.

The final section in this underground publication was about a "E "Quisling" e'schter Class" ("A quisling or traitor, first class").[105] This example of the LPL exposing traitors to Luxembourg calls out Fritz Simon from Pe'téng. He had dressed himself up as a French soldier and then went through the region looking for people who would help him once he was disguised in this manner. Several people assisted him and they were all arrested shortly thereafter (since Simon turned in their names to the Gestapo). One of the men who was arrested died in prison. The LPL asked Luxembourgers to remember Fritz Simon and put his name as the first on the list of traitors. Simon had chosen Germany over Luxembourg, and he was warned that his days were now numbered. The LPL not only warned collaborators, it also showed the dire consequences of working alongside the Germans. An elderly man died in prison because of this quisling's deception. This warning to Fritz Simon concluded a newsletter that tried to convince Luxembourgers to fight for their country and against the Germans at all costs. [106]

[105] LPL, *Ons Hemecht: De Freie Letzeburger*, February 20, 1943, ANL, DH-IIGM-045.
[106] Ibid.

This clandestine newspaper served as a call from the LPL to resist the Germans in every and any way. By giving examples of how Germans regarded Luxembourgers, the LPL exposed the futility of a Luxembourg believing German lies about their country. Each section showed Luxembourgers why the German could never be their allies: Luxembourgers honored freedom and respected ethics; Germans, on the other hand, quenched freedom at every chance and perpetrated lies and violence.

Another issue of *De Freie Letzeburger: Ons Hemecht* was published on May 10, 1943. This newsletter was not just raising the morale of the Luxembourg people, it also provided concrete help to those fleeing the country. The first section of the paper was written in Luxembourgish and the remainder in French. This newspaper began with a list of wrongs that the Germans (*Preisen*) had committed against the Luxembourgers. First, 15,000 patriots were in Germany, German prisons, or had been executed by the Germans. This left thousands of families in need as the main supporter of the household was longer able to work to provide for the family.[107]

The author next described the resettlement ("*emgesiedelt*") process and took pains to ascribe responsibility for the misery of this procedure. The Germans resettled hundreds of families who had to leave their homes, belongings, and/or farms and travel to a foreign land to live in camps. If this was not bad enough, Nazi bandits then seized any possessions they left behind. The Gestapo and the "*Gielemännercher*"[108] (Luxembourgers working with the Germans) allowed this thievery to occur. The

[107] Ronald Seth claims that "Raising funds for the victims of the Occupation was in fact that great work of the Luxembourgish Resistance." in *Undaunted: The Story of Resistance in Western Europe* (London: Frederick Muller LTD, 1956), 152.

[108] *Gielemaenecher* literally means "little yellow men" in Luxembourgish. Milly Thill describes the "*Gielemaenecher*" as Luxembourg traitors who wore the yellow Nazi uniforms in *Milly's story: A Young Gil's Memoires of the Second World War, Luxembourg 1940-1945* (College Station, TX: Virtualbookworm.com Publishing Inc., 2004), 121.

Gielemännercher and the Nazi party bosses worked with the *Ortsgruppenleiter* to accuse people and then the Gestapo and the German police would begin the resettlement process.

The LPL author then reminded readers that these same people were the ones who claimed to spread culture to the Luxembourg people. If this was German "culture" in the twentieth century, the LPL preferred the more civilized culture of the Zulus of Africa. The LPL continued a theme from its previous publications by claiming that the forced military duty was the worst crime of the Germans. The resistance group believed that Luxembourg would provide no loyal soldiers for Germany. In their prior publication from February 1943, the LPL had tried to convince Luxembourgers to make a sacrifice for their country by refusing to join this draft. Although the LPL cannot receive sole credit for desertion, approximately 3,500 of the 10,211 Luxembourgers called up in the draft did desert.[109]

This section of the newspaper ended with a promise for justice. The author stated that all the crimes committed by the Germans would not go unpunished. The Luxembourg government-in-exile, working with the Allies, had already begun working on a law regarding reprisals after the war and since the grand duchess had signed off on it, it already had the rule of law. When the time was right, all the Germans and Luxembourg traitors would answer for the treason they had committed.[110]

The newsletter now shifted from raising morale to providing information to Luxembourgers, particularly those resisting the Germans by fleeing the country. The previous LPL publication from February 20, 1943 had asked Luxembourgers to defend their homeland by refusing to fight in the *Wehrmacht*. This call seems to have worked,

[109] "Widerstand in Luxemburg," by André Hohengarten http://luxemburg.blogsport.eu/ accessed April 13, 2015, last modified October 13, 2011.
[110] LPL May 10, 1943, *Ons Hemecht: De Freie Letzeburger*, ANL, DH-IIGM-045.

since now a section was needed to give information to those who were fleeing the country. This section, written entirely in French (perhaps because the information given was about France), began with the title "What I need to know about Toulois"[111] and was followed by information about this town. General statistical details were given first, such as population, number of communes, and in which canton the town was located. Directions to Toulois were given as well as the distance between the town and other cities (Nancy and Paris). Next names of leaders in the town were given, such as mayor, police commissioner, archpriest, postal worker, and lawyers. The LPL then gave details on the commerce in the town; it was known for its wine, water, and earthenware stoves. There was a note on who the butchers were and the location of a company with moving trucks.

Next, readers learned "What a *réfractaire* must know about the locality of Le Perray." Le Perray was over 400 km from Luxembourg City. Much of the same types of information was given about this town as Toulois. In the section on directions to Le Perray there was a note on where the *réfractaires* could fish in the vicinity. Two garages were noted in Le Perray and an expert on cars was named.[112]

The next town described was Beaune, France, which was approximately 369 km from Luxembourg City. Again, general information about the town was given to readers and a rather lengthy section on the commerce and industry in the town. There was a large wine industry, mining, a water distillery, factories that produced farm equipment, cask and barrel making, jewelry makers, breweries and other industries. It can be inferred that the *réfractaires* or other Luxembourgers fleeing to France could have looked here for

[111] "Ce que je dois savoir sur Toul:" in LPL May 10, 1943.
[112] LPL, *Ons Hemecht: De Freie Letzeburger*, May 10, 1943, ANL, DH-IIGM-045.

work.[113] Refugees and *réfractaires* living in Luxembourg needed assistance getting jobs, food, housing, and transportation. Letters from Luxembourgers living in France found in the Luxembourg Archives attest to these needs.[114] The LPL was providing crucial information to Luxembourgers who had fled the country. This work of gathering and distributing such information was rarely mentioned in resistance reports. It was, however, of vast importance to the Luxembourgian *réfractaires*, deserters, and refugees.

The LPL also published an undated document titled "*Auf Grund Geraten*" ("A Stern Warning"). In the lower right corner of this one page newspaper, there was a two and a half inch picture of a clock with Hitler's head at the twelve. The clock had only one hand, and it was in the form of a dagger. The dagger was placed a little past the nine. The document was written in German, in contrast to the other LPL newsletters that have been analyzed. Clearly, this was meant for a German audience. Without a date, and with no specific events mentioned, this document could have been produced at almost any point after the beginning of the occupation on May 10, 1940. Since the LPL merged with the UNIO'N in March 1944, the document must have dated before then.

This underground resistance newspaper referred to Germany's losses that Hitler and the Nazis tried to disguise as wins or conceal altogether. The LPL stressed that the Allies were drawing closer and the Germans knew this: it was shown in their nervous behavior at work and the ever-expanding ordinances that they imposed on the

---

[113] Ibid.

[114] Some letters (most of which are dated 1940-1943) even ask for clothing and underwear to be sent to the Luxembourgers. Others state that families preferred to live in the country because of the increased availability of food. Inadequate heating in houses in the winter, dilapidated housing, and the need for a bike for transportation to work are all mentioned as problems the Luxembourg refugees and *réfractaires* faced. See ANLUX FD-108-09. See also Sonja van 't Hof "Collective Suffering: Consequences of World War II in Luxembourg," in *The Politics of War Trauma: the Aftermath of World War II in Eleven European Countries*, Jolande Withuis, Annet Mooij (eds.), (Amsterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers: 2010), 171.

Luxembourg people.[115] The LPL sarcastically suggested to the occupying forces and their Luxembourg collaborators that maybe if they confiscated all radios the Luxembourgers would start believing what the Germans were telling them. But no, the LPL stated that Luxembourg would still rely on Churchill, the Allies, and its beloved Grand Duchess Charlotte.

The LPL warned the Germans that their resistance organization was growing daily. Also, the author addressed part of the newsletter to the Luxembourgers who were working with the Germans. These Luxembourgers were warned that they would not be able to change allegiances after the Germans were defeated without facing consequences. The LPL stated that it would have revenge; it was following these Luxembourgers every step of the way.

In this undated newsletter, there was no call to resist and no views on post-war Luxembourg. Rather the paper, which was to be spread around as much as possible, was written for Luxembourgers who were working with the Germans and for the Germans themselves. It was not even a call to have them stop collaborating with the enemy, but it was simply a warning to keep them up at night. When the war ended, and the Germans lost, these people would be punished, no matter who they were or how they tried to make up for their actions. This memo was unique in that it was not addressed to resisters or Luxembourg people, but only to the enemy. It did not seek to raise the morale of the Luxembourg people, but to lower the confidence of the collaborators.[116]

The LPL's newspapers had one recurring theme: to convince the Luxembourg people to resist the German occupation of their country. The underground publications

[115] LPL, *Auf Grund Geraten*, Undated, ANL, DH-IIGM-045.
[116] Ibid.

also sought to raise the morale of the oppressed Luxembourgers under the German forces. They looked forward to the time when Luxembourgers would once again rule the country and the Germans and their Luxembourg collaborators would be punished. Furthermore, the LPL asked Luxembourgers to resist in every way they could and specifically, to avoid fighting for the Germans. Finally, the organization worked to help Luxembourgers who heeded their advice and therefore needed help finding housing, food, and/or jobs. The LPL repeatedly pointed out the difference between Luxembourgers and Germans. The organization also hoped that the post-war Luxembourg would apply these distinctions and ensure that Luxembourg became a country primarily for, and ruled by, Luxembourgers.

Conclusion

The LPL resisted the German occupation in many ways, both actively and passively. Thus, they provided a model that they hoped their countrymen would follow. Their actions and the words from their publications show that they understood the pressures faced by Luxembourgers living under the oppression of the German administration. Consequently, they did not condemn all members of the VdB equally or ask all Luxembourg workers to make the same sacrifices. Rather, the LPL recognized the diverse levels of collaboration and resistance that existed within the country and they believed that all Luxembourgers could do something to resist the German occupation of the Grand Duchy.

The LPL was not only concerned about reaching out to Luxembourgers and urging them to resist. The organization worked towards gaining international attention for the cause of Luxembourg and its resistance against the German occupation. The LPL

wanted the free world to realize Luxembourgers were struggling for their independence, not sitting by and accepting the German claims upon their small nation. It is no wonder that some of the LPL resistance members wanted to have a say in Luxembourg's post-war government. They had risked their lives at home and abroad to ensure their country's voice would not be drowned out by other, more powerful or populous, nations. Finally, the LPL did not work alone in its pursuit of resisting the German occupation. The group worked with the LFK (*Lëtzeburger Freihétskämpfer*) in gathering information and smuggling it to the Allies. Lesch also worked with the Pi-Men before his arrest and subsequent incarceration at Hinzert.[117] Post-liberation inquiries into various Luxembourgers' activities during the occupation of the country give proof of members of the LPL being assisted by members of the LRL. The two groups worked together to smuggle people, ammunition, and underground publications across the border between Luxembourg and Belgium.[118] Just as the two separate LPLs realized in the Spring of 1941 that they could accomplish more by working together, throughout the war, various resistance groups worked together to resist the Germans. Although some of these groups had clear political motivations, their goals against the Germanization of their country aligned. Some of these same goals are found in other resistance groups' clandestine newspapers, as will be seen below.

[117] "Abbé Théodore Lesch und die LPL," ANL, DH-IIGM-056.
[118] See letters and notices in ANL, AE-AP-102.

CHAPTER IV

LUXEMBOURG'S UNDERGROUND PRESS 1941-1944

During the Second World War, whenever the Germans occupied a country, taking control of the press was one of the first orders of business. German propaganda had proven very useful for Hitler's regime, and he and Joseph Goebbels (the Reich Minister of Propaganda) knew the detrimental effect that anti-German propaganda could have on their forces during the occupation of any given country. Luxembourg was no different. The *Luxembourg Wort* and the *Escher Tageblatt* published their last independent issues on May 10, 1940, the date of Luxembourg's invasion by the Germans. When the Germans exchanged Luxembourg's military administration with a civilian administration in August 1940, they formally took control of and reorganized the press. Other papers were shut down but the *Luxemburger Wort* and the *Escher Tageblatt* became Nazi newspapers beginning in October 1940. These two newspapers were now published, edited, and written by Germans and Luxembourg collaborators.[119] The Germans were not surprised when this led to an underground press and they immediately put measures in place to stop it.[120]

---

[119] Hilgert, Romaine, *Les Journaux au Luxembourg: 1704-2004*, ed. Service information et presse du gouvernement luxembourgeois (Luxembourg: Imprimerie Centrale, December 2004), 197-199. The Germans had no less than twenty-seven such newspapers (all written in the German language) in the occupied countries. See Christopher Sauer "Structures of Consensus-Making and Intervention" in *Language, Power, and Idology: Studies in Political Discourse* by Ruth Wodak 1989, 16.

[120] Stone, Harry, *Writing in the Shadow: Resistance Publications in Occupied Europe* (London: Frank Cass, 1996), 10.

Resistance organizations, which had begun forming in Luxembourg as soon as the invasion took place, began publishing their own newspapers as early as 1941. Some were published sporadically, others more or less regularly; some were long and others brief. However, each of the members of the resistance organizations tied to the underground press risked their lives to create, edit, print, and distribute these newspapers. Paper and ink were rationed in Luxembourg during the German occupation of 1940-1944 and it was illegal to own a printing press. In most cases in occupied Europe, the penalty for actively producing a clandestine newspaper was death.[121] These facts must be kept in mind when reading upon which topics the resistance organizations chose to spend their precious resources.

In *Writing in the Shadow: Resistance Publications in Occupied Europe* Harry Stone only mentions two underground newspapers for Luxembourg: *Our Homeland* and *The Free Luxembourger* which "was published by proxy by the Belgians."[122] These are the names of the LPL's newspapers that have already been analyzed. However, the LPL was not the only resistance organization to produce clandestine newspapers; other publications put out by groups such as the LFB (*Lëtzeburger Freihétsbewegong)*, *Alweraje*, Pi-Men, and *UNIO'N* did exist, and several of their editions can be viewed in the Luxembourg archives. Luxembourg's resistance organizations had various goals for their newspapers, such as relating news and inciting others to resist. Many of them sought to raise the morale of the Luxembourg people, often by claiming that the Germans were losing the war and that the end of the occupation was very close. Some newsletters were dedicated to a specific purpose, for example, defeating the Gauleiter's referendum

[121] Stone, 10-11.
[122] Stone, 47.

on the annexation of Luxembourg to the Third Reich.[123] Finally, the underground press often addressed post-war issues, namely punishing collaborators and establishing a more equitable post-war government for Luxembourg. The newspapers published near the end of the war most often dealt with post-war reforms, although one publication from 1942 already addressed the topic of a post-war government and its role in punishing collaborators.

Letzebuger Freihèts-Bewégong

Two of the earliest clandestine newspapers analyzed here were published by the *Letzebuger Freihèts-Bewégong* (hereafter: LFB) in the fall of 1941 and each is an example of resistance organizations using the underground press to achieve a particular purpose. They both addressed the upcoming referendum by the German administration in Luxembourg, scheduled for October 10, 1941. The first paper, which was undated, addressed what Goebbels, the German Minister of Propaganda, told Gauleiter Simon needed to be done in Luxembourg. Goebbels wanted Germany to be able to show that Luxembourg was connected to the Third Reich and that essentially Luxembourgers considered themselves to be German by language and national affiliation (*volkszugehörigkeit*).[124]

The LFB asked the Luxembourgers to write in ink on this referendum that Luxembourgish was their mother tongue and national affiliation. If Luxembourgers affirmed that they were ethnically German, they would be selling out their homeland. Furthermore, if Luxembourg became part of the German Reich, the youth of Luxembourg would have to fight for the Germans. The Luxembourgers were asked to have courage

[123] See, for example, the LFB newspapers published in the Fall of 1941, cited below.
[124] LFB, "LETZEBURGER!!!!," undated, Archives nationales de Luxembourg (ANL), DH-IIGM-58.

and to write "Luxembourg" in big letters on questions seven and eight that asked about language and national affiliation, respectively. After the brief history about why this referendum was to take place, the LFB concisely told the Luxembourg people what action to take against it. The main reason for defeating this measure was so that Luxembourgers would not be called up to fight in the German military.[125]

A second paper from the LFB addressing this same issue was longer and was dated October 1, 1941, nine days before the referendum was scheduled to take place. It was the "last call" for the Luxembourgers to hear about the census before it took place. The LFB called the German's so-called "personal census" (*Personenstandsaufnahme*) a ploy to prove that Luxembourgers were Germans. The LFB stated that the Germans would give the Luxembourgers eleven questions and assumed that Luxembourgers would put "German" on question seven and eight.[126]

Question seven of the referendum asked for the mother tongue of the individual and Germans argued that Luxembourgish was simply a dialect of German. However, the LFB argued the Germans did not understand that Luxembourgers learned Luxembourgish from the time they were infants on their mothers' laps. Their true "mother tongue" was Luxembourgish. On question number eight, the Germans wanted Luxembourgers to agree that their national affiliation was German. The LFB refuted this: "We are Luxembourgers and want to remain what we are".[127] This quote would be seen in other underground publications and it became one of the mottos of the Luxembourg resistance. In this publication, the motto showed that there was a distinction between Luxembourg and German both in language and in national affiliation. Next, this brief newsletter from

[125] Ibid.
[126] Letzeburger Freihéts-Bewégong, *Leschten Appell!* October 1, 1941, ANL, DH-IIGM-58
[127] "*Mir si Lezeburger a mir wolle bleiwe wat mir sin*.", ibid.

the LFB stated that Luxembourg's independence and self-determination was stolen in May 1940 and the organization sought to raise morale in the occupied country by arguing that Germany was a long way from winning the war.[128]

The members of the LFB who penned these two short newspapers viewed this census as a small step with potentially disastrous consequences. If Germany could claim that Luxembourg was essentially German, then Luxembourg youth would have to go fight for the Germans. The LFB asked Luxembourgers to leave the questionnaire blank, except for lines seven and eight, where the people were to write "Luxembourg." The LFB also compared the census to the *Volksdeutschebewegung* (hereafter: VdB). The LFB stated that many joined the VdB and because of this they were now considered citizens of the Reich and were liable to be called up for war.[129] It was bad enough that many Luxembourgers had already been called up to fight for the Germans because they had thoughtlessly signed up with the VdB. If Luxembourg became "German" due to this census, the consequences would be even worse: Luxembourg's youth would be drafted into the German military as citizens of the Third Reich.

The LFB was not concerned with punishment or defining collaboration. They had one specific goal in these two newsletters: defeating Gauleiter Simon's referendum. In this underground publication there was no mention of the VdB as an organization of collaborators; rather, the VdB had created more victims in Luxembourg. Luxembourgers were pressured to join the organization for economic reasons, however, once they were members, the men could be called up to fight in the German army. The LFB educated Luxembourgers on the meaning and consequence of this referendum so it would not be

[128] "*ewell d'Preisen hun de Krisch nach lang nit gewonnen.*", ibid.
[129] Ibid.

ignored or seen in the innocent light in which the Germans wanted to portray it. All Luxembourgers, regardless of VdB membership were asked to vote in favor of their homeland. This referendum did fail for the Gauleiter, in large part due to this request from the LFB. However, Luxembourg was still annexed to Hitler's Third Reich and on August 30, 1942, military conscription was introduced.[130]

Ons Zeidong

The next clandestine newspaper to be analyzed is *Ons Zeidong: O'ni Maulkuerf* (*Our Newspaper: Without a Muzzle*) from June 1942. This newspaper was published by the resistance group *Alweraje* and operated from August 1941 until July 1942.[131] This particular issue was six pages long and was written in French, German, and Luxembourgish. It covered many topics, including Gauleiter Simon's speeches, the VdB, *Mein Kampf*, and Hitler's impending death. Overall, the newsletter was a call to the people of Luxembourg not to lose heart in the face of the many terrors of the Nazis and a call to unite in their resistance against the Nazi occupation. In this paper, the word "Preiss" that was seen so often in Luxembourg documents from this period was still used, but the resistance members used "Nazi" just as often. "Deutsch" was also used to refer to the German occupying forces. Some of the authors may have seen a delineation between Nazi and German, although judging from most of the paper, all Germans were considered Nazis and all German policies were hated during this time.

Alweraje's June 1942 newspaper began with a salute to the R.A.F., written in French. This short poem was followed by an editorial about Gauleiter Simon's speech in Rodingen on May 1, 1942. The author related Simon's claim that since the Luxembourg

[130] Le Grand-Duché de Luxembourg pendant la deuxième guerre mondiale, ed. Musée National de la Résistance (Leudelange, Luxembourg: Reka, No date), 44.
[131] Hilgert, 202.

people would not vote to be part of Germany, they had given up their votes and their democracy.[132] Almost four months before the formal annexation, Luxembourgers were told that they were now Germans, whether they wanted to be or not. Gauleiter Simon went on to say that in Germany there was no freedom of opinion and things were now the same for Luxembourgers. The newsletter then recounted the Gauleiter's criticism of workers in Esch who had demanded better working conditions. The author asked readers to continue to struggle against Germany, since it could be seen that Germany would not provide freedom to Luxembourgers as long as the occupation remained in force.[133] *Alweraje*'s opposition to the Germans stemmed from the restrictions of their freedom that Luxembourg endured under the occupation of the country.

The next section, titled "Europe against the Third Reich!", related news from France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, and Yugoslavia. Reprisal killings were mentioned in France, and other German punishments were enumerated, against both passive and active resisters. The section reminded readers that there were many people who were fighting against Hitler's Third Reich while their countries were under German occupation. What should Luxembourg do? The author believed that passive resistance against the German forces was the least that each Luxembourger had to do. An example that the newspaper gave was to produce as little as possible in the workplace. The Luxembourg people had to unite and take action.[134] They could not wait for the English and American forces to come to their aid.

---

[132] Alweraje, *Ons Zeidong: O'ni Maulkuerf,* 18, June 1942, ANL, DH-IIGM-45.
[133] Ibid.
[134] "Jeder zielbewusste Luxemburger muss wissen, dass er nur durch die Tat befreit werden kann. Deshalb jerdern wir auch auf. Nur durch passiven Wiederstand gegen die Preussen können wir hoffen befreit zu werden. Wir können Wiederstand leisten, indem wir auf unserer Arbeitsswäfte so wenig wie möglich produieren.", ibid.

Ons Zeidong next discussed *Mein Kampf.* Passages of the book were quoted in German and the commentary on Hitler's work was written in Luxembourgish. The author focused on Hitler's premonition of his death. The author believed that "no time was too short"[135] for this event to occur and described Hitler as pitiless, ruthless, and stubborn. For example, even if a top aide, such as Göring, were to try to change his mind about the persecution of the Jews, the writer of this section stated that Hitler's views on the matter would not change one iota. The author believed the only comfort that the Luxembourgers had was knowing that Hitler would not escape his justified punishment. He would not triumph over those whom he had oppressed. The author used *Mein Kampf* to depict the true nature of the leader of the Third Reich; Luxembourgers could not be content to be ruled by this man.

Next, the newspaper addressed "Nazi-Kultur" and ironically described the sort of culture that the Luxembourgers received from the Germans. The author stated that everyone in Luxembourg was forced to learn the German views on history and culture: children in schools, teachers, farmers, workers, administrators, and tradesmen. The best example of Nazi culture was the SA (*Sturmabteilung* or Storm Troopers) men beating people in the streets. Luxembourgers hated Nazi culture and everything else that came from Germany. The author urged Luxembourgers to *show* that they felt this way. They must stay out of all Nazi societies and they must sabotage the Nazis' work in the country.[136] Just like the section on *Mein Kampf*, this portion of the newsletter served to give impetus to Luxembourg resistance and to combat the complacency some Luxembourgers had with the German occupation. This section was written in

[135] "*Keine Zeit ist nur kurz*", ibid.
[136] Ibid.

Luxembourgish, perhaps because it was easier for the authors to convey sarcasm in their mother tongue.

When urging Luxembourgers to abstain from all German societies, *Ons Zeidong* used the *Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt* (hereafter: NSV) as an example. This sub-organization of the NSDAP was a welfare organization that also handled the racial policies of the Third Reich. This group was responsible for the Winter Relief Fund.[137] The author reminded readers that the statute of the NSV stated that no Jews or foreigners could join, meaning that if Luxembourgers joined the NSV they were agreeing that they were German, rather than Luxembourgian. The NSV, as a social welfare program, might have seemed like an innocuous group to join, even if it was a part of the NSDAP, but *Ons Zeidong* warned readers of the danger in belonging to *any* German organization.

This issue of *Ons Zeidong* next defended the true history of Luxembourg that German propaganda was trying to supersede. The Germans' version of Luxembourg's history showed that the small country had always been tied to Germany, but the author reminded Luxembourgers and Germans alike (this section was written in German) that in World War I, 1,000s of Luxembourgers fought with the Allies against Germany. Luxembourg would always remain patriotic; four patriots had already paid with their lives for standing up to Nazi Germany. Many more Luxembourgers were in prisons or concentration camps because of the loyalty they showed towards their country. Each decent Luxembourger was instructed to be prepared to sacrifice for his country.[138]

---

[137] William Sheridan Allen, *The Nazi Seizure of Power: The Experience of a Single German Town 1922-1945* (Danbury, CT: Franklin Watts, 1984, 274. According to Allen, many Northeimers (Germans) joined the NSV because the work "seemed so apolitical and beneficial."

[138] Alweraje, *Ons Zeidong: O'ni Maulkuerf* ,18, June 1942, ANL, DH-IIGM-45.

The author then condemned Kratzenberg and three other collaborators (Dr. Antony, Dr. Modernach, and Dr. Houdremont) who claimed that many Luxembourgers willingly belonged to German organizations. The traitors named above along with their allies deserved the gallows for their acts of treason.[139] The author concluded this section by stating that Luxembourg did not rely on the Great Powers, but rather on the patriotism of its citizens. This patriotism, however, demanded action from the Great Powers. When the Allies did liberate Luxembourg, the country would have received its due. Finally, the political criminals now in charge of the Grand Duchy would have no rights when the war ended; they would only give restitution to the last bit.[140]

The next section in this document was titled "*Die 1000 Freiwillige*" ("The 1,000 Volunteers"). Here the author refuted the German propaganda that 1,000 Luxembourgers had already volunteered to join the *Wehrmacht* and that 1,000 more would soon follow. According to *Ons Zeidong*, the 1,000 were mostly *Reichsdeutsch* (Germans living in Luxembourg) with compulsory military duty and the remainder were made up of the "national scum" (*Volksabschaum*)[141] which were found in every country. This section concluded with a call for Luxembourgers to ignore all German propaganda and to stay away from all Nazi societies, especially the NSV. *Ons Zeidong* argued that 200,000 Luxembourgers must be ready to fight against the Nazi leaders in their country. Most of the sections above were a reaction to German policies. The authors of *Ons Zeidong* sought to redeem their country for the Luxembourg people. One can only assume that the

[139] Ibid.
[140] "*Denn von politischen Verbrechern wird kein Recht sondern nur Wiedergutmachung bis ins kleinste hienein geferdert*", ibid.
[141] Ibid.

propaganda in Luxembourg was extremely prolific in the Spring of 1942 and this was why the authors so often refuted Nazi claims about Luxembourg and its people.

The last section "Lokales" gave news from several towns in Luxembourg from the previous months. Most of the news concerned arrests by the Gestapo and deportations, but two of the stories stand out. The first related an incident in Luxembourg City, in May 1942, when the Nazi police raided a local concert and arrested all the women there without male companions. The women were taken to jail and afterward underwent a health checkup. Those women who apparently had an illness were to be sent to a garrison where the German troops were usually stationed. Only through the intervention of three high officials was this plan stopped and the women released.

The next story was not about resistance or even Nazi justice. On Easter Monday (April 6, 1942) in Müllertal there were parties filled with eating and drinking at the Hôtel Lentz and Hôtel Schaack. Here one could find the General Director of ARBED (Luxembourg's steel conglomerate), Alois Meier, Herr Wagener of Soclair (another large industrial company), various fat cats of the civil administration, the *Deutsch Arbeits Front* (D.A.F.), and other Nazis all in uniform. The menu of the banquets was rich and luxurious and if Luxembourgers wondered where all this money came from, *Ons Zeidong* answered: the clear links between Nazis, ARBED, and capital. [142]

Here readers see the types of information the resistance was able to access and what they chose to relate to their audience. The stories about the women taken from the concert and the banquets were more unusual and more memorable that the others, although all the news stories served the same purpose: to alert readers to the uncivilized nature of the German forces in the country. These stories also served to remind

[142] Ibid.

Luxembourgers that they would not see peace, freedom, or happiness as long as their country was occupied by the Germans. The authors of *Ons Zeidong* reacted to German policies and related information about the harsh reality of the German occupation in order to convince all Luxembourgers to resist the Germans.

Formation des Patriotes Indépendants Luxembourgeois

Next, two clandestine newspapers from the Letzebueger Pi-Men Formation (*Formation des Patriotes Indépendants Luxembourgeois*) or Pi-Men for short, are examined. These two papers, dated September 1943 and July 1944, each provided multiple of definitions of resistance and collaboration. These roles were defined very precisely because the Pi-Men were aware that many resisters collaborated in certain ways and that many collaborators would change their allegiance as soon as the Germans were evicted from the country.

In September 1943 the first newsletter was produced by the Letzebueger Pi-Men Formation and it focused on the membership requirements of this newly-formed group. The motto of the Pi-Men was "*E Vollék dât séng Freihèt resp. Nationalitét nött verteidegt, verdéngt se nött*." ("A people that does not defend its freedom (and therefore its nationality) does not deserve it.")[143] As shown in their definitions below, the Pi-Men were not referring only to physically fighting to defend their homeland. This newsletter was a call to all the individual and largely unorganized resisters fighting against the Nazis to unite, establish contacts among one another, and work together. The Pi-Men also desired to bring all traitors to light after the war.

The Pi-Men reassured readers that they were not trying to change anyone's passive or active resistance, but they were simply trying to gain strength for the

[143] Letzeburger PI-Men Formation, untitled, September 1943, ANL, DH-IIGM-40.

resistance. The Pi-Men also claimed that they had no political agenda and no one person was trying to gain prestige. They stated that after the war, this would become obvious. The Pi-Men realized that once Luxembourg was liberated, some individuals would attempt to use their resistance actions and/or membership for political influence. The group believed it was their duty to join together various resisters because international help could more easily be obtained for an organization than for an individual.[144] Their new organization would act for the homeland and to honor the patriots who had already died for their country. The Pi-Men took action now in order to affect government proceedings after the war and to make sure that all the criminals of Luxembourg (Quislings, *profiteurs, double-jeus,* etc.) would be brought to light and punished.

Identity was very important to the Pi-Men, evidenced by the three separate lists of membership criteria in this two-page newsletter. First, the Pi-Men claimed that their organization had existed since May 10, 1940, although the members were not unified at that time, but working independently of one another. Pi-Men argued that since international help was available now to resistance groups, it was time to unite all these members. Secondly, the organization stated who the Pi-Men were: those who were completely honest and understood patriotism and their duty to defend their homeland. All those who secretly helped the Germans could not be a part of the organization, nor were members of the LVL, LPL, or LRL welcomed. The Pi-Men would accept anyone twenty-one years or older who had shown themselves to be an upright citizen and had been "anti-Boche" since the first day of occupation.[145]

[144] Ibid.
[145] Ibid.

The recognition of an official Pi-Men organization began today (assumedly at the moment that members read this newspaper), but no oath of membership would be taken. This was done because the leaders of Pi-Men considered honorable conduct more important than an oath or a signature. Furthermore, they believed some people who joined organizations did so only for recognition. The author referred to these individuals as "*publikumspatriot*" (someone who wanted to be seen by others as a patriot) and "*profiteur*" (profiteer) and assumed these people were usually traitors.[146]

The author then reiterated the six requirements for joining Pi-Men: 1) patriotism was ideal; 2) had been against the Nazi-Regime from May 10, 1940; 3) desired to sacrifice for his homeland; 4) was willing to take the consequences of his actions; 5) held up the grand duchess as symbol of freedom and loyalty; and 6) honestly joined the organization. These requirements almost all dealt with the thoughts and feelings of Luxembourgers rather than concrete actions. The Pi-Men believed some in Luxembourg were truly patriotic and loyal to their homeland, even if their personal situation made it difficult for them to take forceful actions against their oppressors. However, as seen in another section of this newspaper, the Pi-Men believed that doing nothing to hurt the German cause was not acceptable for Luxembourgers.[147]

This was followed by another list of what defined the Pi-Men where they enumerated fourteen different items. In this list, some of the definitions from the first list were repeated, but others were new. Someone could join Pi-Men if they had never believed Nazi propaganda. Individuals who would rather live in hunger as a refugee in a foreign country than under Nazi Germany or who would rather put on a foreign uniform

[146] Ibid.
[147] Ibid.

and fight against the Germans than wear a German uniform were welcomed into the resistance group. Luxembourgers that had been sent to labor camps by the Germans, individuals who would rather be in prison or in a concentration camp than join the RAD or *Wehrmacht*, and all those who filled out the October 10, 1941 referendum as Luxembourgers to shame Gauleiter Simon could join the ranks of the Pi-Men. The group also included all those who were executed because of the General Strike in August 1942 as eligible members.[148] By including these twenty-one men, who were already national heroes, the Pi-Men were claiming some measure of fame, although they stated early in their newspaper that prestige was not a goal of their organization. The group was also giving victims of Nazi deportation policies credit as resisters, thus increasing their membership based on German policies rather than actions of individual Luxembourgers.

This introductory newsletter from the Pi-Men concluded with a statement that the members knew who they were: they worked against the Nazis by small acts of passive resistance and by bigger, noticeable actions and not thru complacency that only put other Luxembourgers in further misery.[149] This statement, along with the earlier mention of not having a written oath, was similar to the LPL's statements in the conclusion of their August 1942 newsletter. While the Pi-Men did not believe armed action was necessary to be a patriot, they also believed that no action was essentially collaboration. Any action, no matter how small, could be counted as an act of resistance against the occupiers of the country. However, those Luxembourgers who choose to do nothing and hoped that they could wait out the time of occupation were betraying their homeland.

[148] Ibid.
[149] Ibid.

The Pi-Men focused on those that were not already organized. This was brought up repeatedly in this newsletter. The Pi-Men did not want to antagonize other organizations by "stealing" their members or overriding leadership, nor did they want to combine different organizations into one. There was also some indication that the Pi-Men did not fully trust the members in certain organizations. The new group believed that some other resistance groups existed solely for political reasons, not to free Luxembourgers from the tyranny of the Nazi occupation. Certainly, the *UNIO'N* (discussed below), was formed, in large part, to have a say in Luxembourg's post-war government.

The Pi-Men gave very general and often broad descriptions of resistance, including all those Luxembourgers who were deported, sent to concentration camps, imprisoned, etc. After the war many Luxembourgers would claim that "all resisted" and by including victims of Nazi policies as resisters, this claim could be furthered. However, it was not as though all those Luxembourgers living in concentration camps, in prison, or having been deported to other countries would read this document. In other words, these "members" would not even know they have now been claimed by the Pi-Men association. Rather, these broad and general descriptions informed Luxembourgers at home that those suffering for their homeland were doing so for patriotic reasons. As seen in many underground newspapers, raising the morale of the population was a significant task for the resistance, and by claiming a large membership in a resistance organization, the Pi-Men gave hope to Luxembourgers.

Almost a year later, in July 1944, the Pi-Men newsletter was focused on the military involvement in the liberation of Luxembourg and the post-war situation, notably,

what to do with collaborators. The newsletter began by claiming that the time was "5 op 12" meaning it was five minutes to midnight, it was almost time for the Nazis and Quislings to pack their bags. Luxembourg had to endure only two more months of the German occupation until it was liberated by the Allies.

The Pi-Men were still creating definitions of resistance and collaboration. This time their focus was on whom to punish and exclude from the honor of "resisting." They even had definitions for the acronyms that they created: HIR, P, A, 2, E, and L. HIR stood for *Heim-in-Reich* and defined any who helped the Germans spread this belief. P stood for *Profiteurs* that belonged to German organizations to gain a better position or for a better income. A was for *Angschthûeson*[150], those that joined through angst (not to say cowardice). *Double-Jeus*, (shortened to 2) were all those that joined up with the Germans in order to work against them with more effect. E was for *Etrangers*, foreigners whom the Pi-Men believed most often would deserve severe punishment after the war. L were *Letzebûrger*, those that actually deserved the name "Patriot". It is not clear if these initials would be used for something specific after the war or if these abbreviations were simply part of the list of definitions. These classifications illustrated that the Pi-Men knew that there was no clear cut definition of collaboration for Luxembourgers. Just as there were many reasons a Luxembourger would join a resistance group, there were many reasons someone would collaborate with the Germans. Interestingly, Pi-Men uses the term "*profiteur*" to refer to resisters who joined a resistance organization simply for political clout in their previous newsletter. This same term is now used to describe those Luxembourgers who belong to German organizations to further their careers. The Pi-

[150] This literally translates into "fear bunnies". Letzeburger PI-Men Formation, *5 op 12=Appel von de "Pi-Men"*, July 1944, ANL, DH-IIGM-40.

Men probably realized that once Luxembourg was liberated, the lesser-known collaborators would try to justify their actions. The group prepared for this by labeling their actions as collaboration while the occupation was still in force.

There was a separate rubric for the Nazi functionaries and their Luxembourg compatriots that had turned Luxembourg into a terrorist business in the past four years.[151] These included the *Gestapo*, *Sicherheitspolizei*, *Sondergerichts*, ZdZ-*Hampelmänner*, *Schutzpolizei*, SS, SA, NSDAP, DAF, NSKK, VDB, etc. The Pi-Men warned that all of these individuals would have their addresses noted (even those in Germany) and put in a file with their photographs, if possible, in order to detain them if they tried to escape with a false passport after the war. These Nazi functionaries were not simply collaborators, but terrorists, and would be treated more harshly than the *Double-Jeus* or *Angschthûeson* mentioned above.[152]

In anticipation of the Allies' arrival for the liberation of Luxembourg, the Pi-Men gave instructions as to who could participate in fighting with the Allied troops as shock troops. All true patriots were instructed to listen the BBC to await instruction. They were to form small groups with a single police officer (one with only the best political background) and one or two individuals from resistance groups. Only politically perfect and courageous units were allowed to join the shock troops. Furthermore, no volunteer paramedics, antiaircraft defense forces, or firefighters who worked for the Germans could join the shock troops. Many of these individuals might have felt they had to work for the Germans in order to protect themselves or provide for their families, but regardless of the

[151] "*Eng extra Rubrik ass fir all dé Nazi-Fonktionnären and hir Letzebûrger Komplizen dé während 4 Jôer and der Hémecht "Berufts-Terrorist" gespillt hun*" in Letzeburger PI-Men Formation, *5 op 12=Appel von de "Pi-Men"*, July 1944, ANL, DH-IIGM-40.
[152] Ibid.

reasoning behind their collaboration, they would not be allowed to join the Allies in liberating Luxembourg.[153] Again, the Pi-Men realized that there were many reasons why a Luxembourger would collaborate with the Germans; however, no matter what the reasoning behind their collaboration, these men would have no part in Luxembourg's military liberation.

Also, no "heroes" who switched loyalties at the last minute would be permitted to fight against the Nazis.[154] This last criterion proved the Pi-Men knew exactly what many collaborators would do as soon as Luxembourg was liberated. In this newspaper, the group alerted Luxembourgers of the ways in which collaborators would try to hide their occupation activities once the Germans were forced out of the country. Although reports directly after the liberation show that peace and order was maintained in the country without mass arrests of collaborators; once the Battle of the Bulge began, collaborators would become feared again.[155]

Finally, within the Pi-Men units, there had to be some independent and resolute fighters in case others tried to alter the plans of the liberating armies.[156] The Pi-Men, while looking forward to their country's liberation, did not naively believe that the Allies would have an easy time and that the Germans would leave Luxembourg without a fight. And history would prove them correct. After the initial liberation of Luxembourg, the Battle of the Bulge, which took place in the Ardennes, in Northern Luxembourg, began three months later and the Germans used all forces available to them to try to regain

---

[153] Ibid.
[154] Letzeburger PI-Men Formation, *5 op 12-Appel vun de "Pi-Men*, July 1944.
[155] Harry L. Coles and Albert K. Weinberg, *United States Army in World War II: Special Studies, Civil Affairs: Soldiers become Governors*,(Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History, 1964), 815, accessed April 20, 2015, http://www.history.army.mil/books/wwii/civaff/ch27.htm.
[156] Letzeburger PI-Men Formation, *5 op 12=Appel von de "Pi-Men"*, July 1944, ANL, DH-IIGM-40.

control over their lost territory. Clearly, if former collaborators were allowed to partake in fighting alongside loyal Luxembourg troops, these men could easily return to the German side if it looked like this would be a safer bet for them.

Towards the end of the paragraphs on the shock troops, it became clear why the Pi-Men were so concerned about the identity of the Luxembourg troops. The newsletter stated that some foreign resistance members (particularly Belgians) would undoubtedly be part of the Allied forces that would liberate Luxembourg and the Luxembourg resistance may have its command disregarded in its own country's liberation.[157] The Pi-Men were not only concerned with collaborators undermining the Allied liberation; they were also worried that the Luxembourg resistance would not get credit for bringing about its own liberation. This would not only hurt the reputation of Luxembourg as an independent and freedom-loving country, it could also compromise the country politically after the war's end. Other countries shared in the concern that their resistance actions would not be credited to them after the war and that they would have little say in their post-war status.[158]

Finally, this July 1944 newsletter stated that some in Luxembourg believed that after the war everything would simply be forgotten. The Pi-Men, not surprisingly, had a plan in place so that this would not happen. They were forming a "Vengeance-Police"

---

[157] Ibid.

[158] See for example, Norman Davies *Rising '44: The Battle for Warsaw* (New York City: Viking Adult, 2004) for Poland's fears. Czechoslovakian partisans also worried that because their military might had been destroyed, the world would believe they held no part in their country's liberation. See Chad Bryant, "The Language of Resistance? Czech Jokes and Joke-telling under Nazi Occupation, 1943-1945," *Journal of Contemporary History* 4 (2006), 133-151. Resistance in Germany sought to show the world that Germans were not united in their support of Hitler and the Nazis. See for example, Frank Trommler, "Between Normality and Resistance: Catastrophic Gradualism in Nazi Germany," and Christiane Moll, "Acts of Resistance: The White Rose in the Light of New Archival Evidence," both in *Resistance against the Third Reich: 1933-1990*, ed. Michael Geyer and John W. Boyer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 130, 195.

(V-Pi) who would become famous once they began taking action. The V-Pi were the elite patriots who would not rest until all political criminals were made known and judged. These patriots would not be satisfied with a government that said they would judge later (while hiding certain aspects of collaboration).[159] The backbone of the V-Pi, however, would be those who were political prisoners under the German occupation. These former prisoners would work with those of other countries (notably, France, Belgium, and Holland) and their collaboration would be strong enough to justly and mercilessly give the war criminals their due. The V-Pi would take vengeance for all those who died for their country as a sign of the Luxembourgers' desire for freedom. These former political prisoners would not easily forget the actions taken by those in power during the Nazi occupation.[160] In anticipation of Luxembourg's liberation, the Pi-Men, whose organization was only a year old, continued to focus on post-war justice and defining resistance.

This group, although not physically organized, was very organized on paper. Their Luxembourgish underground newspapers were composed of lists, goals, definitions, and acronyms. This was in stark contrast to some of the LPL newsletters that contained poems and anecdotes. Furthermore, the overt raising of morale that was found in most underground publications was missing. Because of the recognition that Luxembourg's liberation was near, the Pi-Men were too focused on the business at hand to spend precious ink and paper on stories about German brutality and/or stupidity. Rather, they were concerned that some Luxembourgers would undeservedly receive

[159] "…Elite-Patriôten vun der Letzebûrger Resistenz dé sech zum Ziel gesât hun nött iéschter ze rôhen bis all politisch Verbriéchen dé bekant sinn, gerächt sinn, och dann nött wann enger spéder Reigerong eventuell versiche sollt, döst oder dât ze vertuschen!", ibid.
[160] Letzeburger PI-Men Formation, *5 op 12-Appel vun de "Pi-Men"*, July 1944, ANL, DH-IIGM-40.

recognition of "resistance" and this would dilute the claims of true patriots who fought for their country and who made real sacrifices during the four years of German occupation.

As liberation drew closer, the Pi-Men became more concerned with the post-war status of collaborators than resisters. Their definitions of what it meant to be a collaborator were created in order that no Luxembourg collaborators would go unpunished once the Germans retreated from the land. The Pi-Men knew that when the Germans were no longer in control many Luxembourgers would suddenly change their allegiance and claim to never have believed in the German cause. For Luxembourg's post-war future, and a regaining of the country's independence, these collaborators could not be allowed to influence the country after the war. The Pi-Men believed that if their delineations were not upheld, the post-war political landscape of the country would be impaired.

UNIO'N vun de Letzeburger Freihétsorganisatio'nen

The final underground resistance publication to be analyzed was produced by the *UNIO'N vun de Letzeburger Freihétsorganisatio'nen*, hereafter referred to as *UNIO'N*. For a brief history on the *UNIO'N*, a memorandum from July 7, 1944 gave background information on the organization and its goals and challenges. The *UNIO'N* itself was fairly new: in March 1944, the LVL (*Letzeburger Vollekslegio'n)*, LRL (*Lëtzeburger Ro'de Lé'w)*, and LPL (*Lëtzeburger Patriote Liga*) merged to create this new group. The central committee of this new organization addressed all members of the group to reinforce the fact that these individuals were now part of the *UNIO'N*; they were no longer members of the LPL, LRL, or LVL. The Central Committee of the *UNIO'N* was

the head of all of these members and had the authority to give instructions to all of them. When new members joined, they did not join the LPL, but rather the *UNIO'N*.[161] Here it can be inferred that since the merger of these resistance organizations in March 1944, there had been conflict in regards to authority and chain of command.

This was the background of the *UNIO'N* newsletter published in the same month. Since the history of the LPL shows that in one organization alone there were two separate leaders (both claiming to have founded the group) who had drastically different views of how to best "resist" the Germans, merging multiple organizations into one can only have led to exponentially more disagreements about how best to accomplish the goals of Luxembourg's resistance. Therefore, the *UNIO'N*'s first task was to unify their members and confirm the authority of the group's leadership.

The *UNIO'N*'s July 1944 newsletter *Fir Freihét* (For Freedom) followed some of the same themes of the LPL newspapers examined above. This lengthy newsletter was written in Luxembourgish and its ten pages contained several sections (including two poems) many of which were written by different authors. The first newsletter put out by this organization had three focal points: the future of the country, the difficulty of distinguishing between "*gudd Letzeburger*" and the rest of the country, and the importance of codifying the Luxembourg language.

The newsletter began with a short history of the Nazi occupation of Luxembourg. This, as in most other accounts in the clandestine newspapers, was descriptive and emotional, displaying the brutality of the Germans and the victimization of the Luxembourgers. The *UNIO'N* answered the question that it believed most Luxembourgers were asking themselves: how did the Germans occupy our land and rule

[161] UNIO'N, untitled, July 7, 1944, ANL, DH-IIGM-130.

over us for the past four years? The *UNIO'N*'s answer was first and foremost that the tyranny of the Nazis (which should be an anomaly in the twentieth century) was so brutal, that there was no question whether or not Luxembourg would submit to these inhumane methods. Most Luxembourgers, according to *Fir Freihét* were victims. The few "so-called" Luxembourgers who worked with Germans did so for profit and they brought the most misery to the land, even bringing death to their fellow countrymen. By collaborating with the Germans, these Luxembourgers betrayed their nation and forfeited their nationality.[162]

The *UNIO'N* then discussed the Luxembourgers that were not necessarily "for Germany" but were still too complacent and did too much to make things easy for the Germans during the years of occupation. These people, for example, were those who joined the VdB in its first days of existence. They may have done this because they were afraid to lose their jobs, but this was no excuse. Especially after the grand duchess made it known that was she was on the side of the Allies, Luxembourgers should have shown allegiance to her. But many chose to take steps to protect themselves from the possibility of imprisonment or deportation. The *UNIO'N* argued that it was not enough to wait quietly and complacently while the Germans were terrorizing the country. Those that did nothing to stand up for their beliefs needed to be held accountable for their actions.[163]

Luxembourgers who were in positions of power at the time of the invasion were then addressed by the *UNIO'N*. These Luxembourgers should have stood firm for their country because they were the role models for the rest of Luxembourg. The *UNIO'N* believed that if these men had refused to show any acceptance of the German occupation

[162] UNIO'N, *Fir Freihét*, July 1944, ANL, DH-IIGM-130.
[163] Ibid.

and administration, a strong resistance would have followed. Instead, the resistance movement was started by patriots of all classes from all parts of the country. Organizations were created that stood up against the German tyranny in the land, held up Luxembourgian traditions, and called all Luxembourgers to work together. In March 1944, these organizations joined forces to form the *UNIO'N*, which was still working for these same goals today.[164] The *UNIO'N* judged those with power and influence more harshly than other citizens; because of their status, they should have been loyal to Luxembourg, thereby setting a high standard for others to follow. This argument was also seen in the LPL newspaper from August 1942. It is obvious that this is one reason that post-war reforms are needed; the country's new leaders need to be dedicated to Luxembourg, even under pressure.

Next, the *UNIO'N* tackled the matter of Luxembourg's post-war future. The members believed that things were not perfect before the war and therefore a *neiopbau* (new construction or new building up) for Luxembourg was being discussed. This new Luxembourg would be free, happy, and independent. It would be for all Luxembourgers, whether rich or poor, and therefore the *UNIO'N* asked for solidarity among all Luxembourgers. The members of *UNIO'N* would not pay a role in the government unless it did change. They argued that this utopian vision was what the members had been fighting for and this was the goal for which many of their friends lost their lives. There was strength in solidarity and the country would need this unity to deal with the problems that it would face after the war. The *UNIO'N* had unified the resistance organizations and it now sought to unite the Luxembourg people also.[165]

[164] Ibid.
[165] Ibid.

After a lengthy poem entitled "1789," the *UNIO'N* published a dialogue between two fictitious(?) Luxembourgers ("Misch" and "Jacques") who were discussing the future of the country. The less educated man taught "Jacques" that no matter who came in to rule over the Luxembourgers, the people would never be anything other than Luxembourgers. "Misch" gave the example of not ever becoming Welsh or Austrian, but remaining Luxembourgian. This example is interesting since the country had been trying to prove that it was not German for the past four years. It also seems that in the future, the problem would be making sure Luxembourgers were treated separately from the French and the Belgians.[166]

Three commands were given after this dialogue: Think about the Luxembourgers who are residing in foreign lands! Only buy from Luxembourgers! Give employment to Luxembourg's youth. The *UNIO'N* believed that Luxembourgers working with the Germans were undeserving of Luxembourgian nationality, but those citizens in foreign lands were victims: Luxembourgian victims of Germany. The last two commands showed concern for the Luxembourg economy. It had suffered during the war and the *UNIO'N* wanted a strong economy for post-war Luxembourg. Since much of Luxembourg's resistance focused on rescuing the youth from the *Wehrmacht* draft, it is no surprise that the youth of Luxembourg are specifically mentioned for employment.[167]

The next page was titled "What we want" and it addressed questions that would come up after the war. The members mentioned helping the "good Luxembourgers" and working towards peace and order. They also demanded that the criminals in Luxembourg would be judged for their actions. The *UNIO'N* did not want a revolution, a state regime,

[166] Ibid.
[167] Ibid.

or a government controlled by the Christian-Socialist party. Rather they wanted the government-in-exile to work with legitimate men to build a new government based on the organization's program. This new government would consist of a Democratic Monarchy and the *UNIO'N* would have at least three members in the legislature. The parliament would be voted in by the people. There would be freedom of religion, although Catholicism could be the national religion. Furthermore, the rights of the church would remain, but it would need to be separate from politics. In recognition of the sons of the country, the *UNIO'N* wanted a state-sponsored youth organization to be established.[168]

Other reforms were then addressed. The members of *UNIO'N* also desired reform in the naturalization laws of the country; many people would have their Luxembourg nationality annulled. The laws regarding the security of the nation needed to be strengthened; there needed to be military reform and an increase in criminal police. Freedom of the press was also addressed. The members also wanted the Luxembourgish language used more regularly. They wanted reforms in finance, economics, and commerce. They demanded an annulment of socialist laws and desired good relations between Luxembourg and other foreign countries, specifically America. The *UNIO'N* considered itself the inevitable culmination of the unity that the resistance believed in from the beginning of the occupation period.[169] Many of these desires, such as freedom of the press and the Luxembourg language initiatives were reactions to German policies from the past four years. Others, such as the desire for a separation of the Catholic Church from Luxembourg politics and the rejection of a Christian-Socialist government, are a reaction to politics in the 1930s in Luxembourg. The government that was in place

[168] Ibid.
[169] Ibid.

in May 1940, before the German invasion and occupation was "predominantly Catholic, corporatist and anticommunist." Furthermore, the government rarely imposed any restrictions on German organizations, many of which were influenced by Nazism. This may have been done in order to avoid giving the Germans any pretext to claim the country was not upholding its neutrality,[170] however, the *UNIO'N* argued that the government had been sympathetic towards Nazi politics and therefore its legitimacy could be questioned.

On page seven the newsletter outlined another dialogue between two Luxembourgers, "Niki", and an unnamed individual. The conversation between the two depicted the *UNIO'N*'s description of a "good Luxembourger". Niki began by claiming that there were good Luxembourgers who hated the Germans and yet were friendly to them. The other said that could not be; today there were no Luxembourgers who were friendly with Germans or the Luxembourg traitors.[171]

Niki then told a story about a businessman that he knew whom he saw treating a German respectfully, and then defending his actions by stating that if he were not cordial, he would be attacked by the Germans. Niki was also a businessman and he understood this perfectly. He stated that he knew of a farmer who was known for being a good Luxembourger, however, when the Germans asked him for food (which they often did), he always gave them something. Niki saw no problem with this scenario, although he acknowledged that the farmer had every right to refuse the Germans anything and therefore his was a private matter rather than a business matter as with the business

[170] Sonja van 't Hof "Collective Suffering: Consequences of World War II in Luxembourg," in *The Politics of War Trauma: the Aftermath of World War II in Eleven European Countries*, Jolande Withuis, Annet Mooij (eds.), (Amsterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers, 2010), 169.
[171] UNIO'N, *Fir Freihét*, July 1944, ANL, DH-IIGM-130.

owner. He concluded by stating that good Luxembourgers had no consequences from the Germans if they outwardly helped and/or tolerated them and only privately maligned them.[172]

Niki's friend agreed with the lack of consequences for these citizens. However, he pointed out that there were many Luxembourgers who did take risks and they were the real Luxembourgers. These individuals showed the Germans at every opportunity that they were not welcome in their country. They did this in support of the patriots who had died or been imprisoned for the country. The dialogue ended with an exclamation: Luxembourgers show that you are Luxembourgers![173]

In this dialogue, the second theme of the newsletter was addressed again: the *UNIO'N* was attempting to define what characteristics constituted a "good Luxembourger" – a term that came up numerous times in this publication. The businessman and the farmer each condoned the German presence in their country by obliging them in business and private matters. Niki's friend believed this excludes these two from being "good Luxembourgers." If a Luxembourger was not sacrificing (by facing consequences for upholding his or her beliefs) he or she was essentially working with the Germans. Each Luxembourger needed to show the Germans (not just his fellow countrymen) that the Germans were not welcome in Luxembourg. Two months before Luxembourg's liberation, the *UNIO'N* drew a line between resistance and collaboration.

The last three pages of the *UNIO'N* newsletter addressed the third theme in the newsletter: the Luxembourg language. Use of Luxembourgish had been outlawed in the country in 1942 and the Germans' policies on language usage varied widely within the

[172] Ibid.
[173] Ibid.

occupied countries. Some countries or portions of countries, for example the eastern part of Czechoslovakia and France, were to be taught German through language schools run by the Deutsche Akademie. Poland, the Soviet Union, and the western part of Czechoslovakia did not have these schools, in part because "their populations were considered to be racially unworthy of participating in the German language and culture."[174] The Netherlands' Dutch language was considered to be a dialect of German (as was Flemish).[175] Luxembourg seems to be the only occupied country that had its "mother tongue" outlawed. Although the Nazis certainly looked to race first to unify a people, by promoting their language abroad and especially by forbidding the use of Luxembourgish (seen by the Germans as a dialect of German) it can be seen that they considered the German language to play at least a small role in the identification and unification of the German people.[176]

The *UNIO'N* first used a poem to address the issue of language reform. This poem by "D.S." emphasized that the Luxembourg language was good and simple. The author made fun of the French used by the Luxembourgers, claiming it was poor anyway. The poem questions why the language learned by babies from their mothers had never been codified with rules on grammar. The fact that children (as well as adults) were then

[174] Eckard Michels, "Deutsch als Weltsprach? Franz Thierfelder, the Deutsche Akademie in Munich and the Promotion of the German Language Abroad, 1923-1945," *German History* 22 (May 2004): 225.
[175] For an example of this, see Georg Schmidt-Rohr on 1rd July 1942, quoted in Simon, Gerd. "Materialen uber den Widerstand in der deutschen Sprachwissenschaft des Dritten Reichs", in *Sprachwissenschaft und politisches Engagement*, Gerd Simon (ed.) Weinheim & Basel: Beltz. 1979: 193; translated by Andreas Michael in Christoph Sauer ,"Structures of Consensus-Making and Intervention," in *Language, Power, and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse* by Ruth Wodak 1989, 18-19.
[176] Marnix Beyen and Benoît Majerus, "Weak and Strong Nations in the Low Countries: National Historiography and its 'Others' in Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," in *The Contested Nation: Ethnicity, Class, Religion and Gender in National Histories*, Stefan Berger and Chris Lorenz (eds.) (Hampshire, England: Palgrave Macmillian, 2008), 306.

punished for using this language, their mother tongue, in public, was terrible.[177] This lighthearted piece addressed an issue that affected Luxembourgers on a daily basis. As seen in other newsletters, the Luxembourg language became a source of pride for a population suffering under the Germanization of their country.

The poem was followed by an editorial about why it has become so important for Luxembourgers to recognize their language and to codify it. Throughout the occupation, the Germans insisted Luxembourgers were ethnically German and they claimed one proof of this was that Luxembourgish was simply a dialect of German. The *UNIO'N* claimed this was not the case at all, but it also argued that if Luxembourgers could not even write or read their own language, then the Germans did have some case against them. This was why this task needed to be taken up: to solidify the claim that Luxembourg was a language of its own, not simply a dialect; it would also allow the Luxembourg people to identify with this language by seeing it in print, rather than learning it as an oral tradition.[178]

This editorial outlined several arguments that might have been made against codifying the language, and it refuted all of these. The author stated that French was at one point made up of several different forms, but then it was codified and there was no reason that Luxembourg could not do this today; it was not too hard a task for the country. If people had been giving their lives for their country, why could they not take up this task for the homeland? In conclusion, the author stated that Luxembourgers had lost their language through cowardice and complacency. Furthermore, if Luxembourgers were unwilling to recognize and honor their own language, then they did not deserve to

[177] UNIO'N, *Fir Freihét*, July 1944, ANL, DH-IIGM-130.
[178] Ibid.

have a free nation. As with all other pages, this last page concluded with an imperative: "Luxembourgers! Remember your history and the language of your homeland!"[179] The Luxembourg language was one identifier of the Luxembourg people; their history also provided national identity. Language and history have been characteristics of nationalism for centuries; however this initiative and the argument the *UNIO'N* was making was another reaction to the German policies of altering Luxembourg's history in propaganda and school curriculums and the outlawing of the use of the Luxembourg tongue.[180]

Since the LPL had addressed this same reform of the *Hemechtssprôch* it may be assumed that after the end of the war, Luxembourg's language policies would be revamped. However, no major legal changes occurred in the post-war period. Rather, the rapid increase in immigration in 1970s brought about official changes to the status of the Luxembourgish language.[181]

In July 1944, only two months before liberation, the *UNIO'N* focused on post-war questions and challenges. While newsletters from 1942 and 1943 often claimed that the war would end soon, they did not outline specifics for a post-war vision for Luxembourg. Resistance organizations may have included this claim to raise morale, while believing it themselves. However, here the *UNIO'N* knew that the war would end soon and Luxembourg would be liberated. While they celebrated this, they also knew that the future of the country would depend on its post-war government and this government's decisions regarding collaborators and resisters and social, political, and cultural reforms. At the country's liberation, the *UNIO'N* did in fact temporarily step in to fill the power

[179] "*LETZEBURGER: Halt er Geschicht and Hémeschssprôch an E'ren.*", ibid.
[180] Ibid.
[181] "The role of World War II in the development of Luxembourgish as a national language." By Melanie Wagner and Winifred V. Davies. June 1, 2009 in Language Problems and Language Planning. Pg 112-113.

vacuum that was left when the Germans fled the country and Luxembourg awaited Allied troops or the return of its pre-war government. American reports on the country stated that the *UNIO'N* was the only functioning police force and that they had stopped all transportation routes throughout the country[182] (presumably to keep order and to stop collaborators from escaping the country and the punishment that they were due). The *UNIO'N*'s role in Luxembourg during and immediately after the liberation of the country is discussed in the concluding chapter.

The members of the various resistance organizations of Luxembourg risked their lives to produce newspapers that they believed could raise the morale of the oppressed Luxembourg people, incite them to oppose German policies in the country, and provide a vision for an improved post-war government. These newsletters were important in counteracting the German propaganda that was omnipresent in the country. There were differences in the newsletters, especially in terminology, but the goals of the authors were essentially the same. In the vast majority of the works analyzed above, especially the ones written in Luxembourgish, the resistance members referred to the Germans (their enemies) as "*Preiss*". This Luxembourgish word is the equivalent of Prussian. Very rarely was the word "*Deitsch*" used, which is the Luxembourgish word for German. If the title "Nazi" was specifically used, like in Nazi Tyranny, it has been noted above. "*Boche*" was used only once (in "Anti-*Boche*" by the Pi-Men). It is a derogatory French word used during the Second World War to refer to the German occupiers.
These differences in terminology also applied to vocabulary about Luxembourgers as seen in the various terms used to describe Luxembourgers who did not betray their

[182] Harry L. Coles and Albert K. Weinberg, *United States Army in World War II: Special Studies, Civil Affairs: Soldiers become Governors*,(Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History, 1964), 810-811, accessed April 20, 2015, http://www.history.army.mil/books/wwii/civaff/ch27.htm.

country during the occupation years. The terms varied, (*gudd Letzeburger*, *trei Letzeburger*) but the goals were the same: creating a distinction between collaborators and resisters. As seen above, some organizations believed that there was no neutral ground. This distinction was important because the post-war government in Luxembourg would be affected by it. In a country the size of Luxembourg, having a few collaborators in the post-war government would not only minimize the efforts of the truly loyal Luxembourgers, it could also compromise the future independence and freedom of the country.

CHAPTER V

JOHANN BAPTISTE HENCKES: *DEUTSCHFEINDLICHKEIT* AS RESISTANCE

In late 1948 an investigation was begun in Luxembourg to uncover what happened to a member of the resistance who was allegedly shot by a fellow resistance member. In the course of this investigation, several binders were discovered in the apartment of Leon Langers. One of these binders contained German reports from the years of occupation regarding the investigation of Johann Baptiste Henckes. These documents, although they are incomplete and do not tell the full story of Henckes's investigation and punishment, tell much about the investigation system of the Germans, the various degrees of "collaboration" within the occupied countries, and the importance of the population's public attitude towards the Germans.

During the Second World War, collaboration with the Nazis, especially in occupied countries took on various forms. There was immense pressure upon the occupied populations to conform to German law and sometimes this conformity could be seen as collaboration. Even people who led resistance movements often had to show outward acceptance of the German occupation in order to continue their underground work. Furthermore, after the war, both individuals and entire companies were accused of willingly helping the German cause. During World War I, Luxembourg had to rely solely on Germany to feed its population; this made collaboration an easy choice when

the alternative was starvation.[183] World War II brought a different set of circumstances to the small country; however, German coercion and repression again ensured that collaboration would be an easier choice than resistance.[184]

ARBED (Aciéries Réunies de Burbach-Eich-Dudelange), a major iron and steel producing company in Luxembourg, turned out materials for the Germans during both world wars. The company was formed in 1911 by the merger of three Luxembourg companies and in 1920, COLUMETA (Comptoir Metallurgique Luxembourgeois) was set up by ARBED to handle trading and sales aspects of the company, much of which was international. Emile Mayrisch was the technical director of ARBED until his death in a 1928; Aloyse Meyer succeeded him. ARBED, the largest industrial employer in the country, did experience reduced production throughout the years of German occupation, but industrial collaboration within the company has not been thoroughly researched.[185]

It is indisputable that the company was critical to Luxembourgers because of the amount of jobs it produced; it was also important to the Nazis because of the industrial output of which it was capable and which was very valuable to the Nazi war machine. The German investigation and conviction of Johann Baptiste Henckes, a director of ARBED, in 1940-1941 gives insight into the complicated nature of employee/employer and Luxembourg/German relations during the occupation years. Furthermore, the importance of membership in the VdB (*Volksdeutsch Bewegung*) in Nazi-occupied Luxembourg becomes clear. This organization was formed by Damian Kratzenberg (Luxembourg's most infamous collaborator) in July 1940 and it became the only

[183] Peter Lieberman, *Does Conquest Pay?*, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1996), 84.
[184] Lieberman, 55.
[185] http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/ARBED-s-a-history/ Accessed on November 13, 2013.

authorized political movement in the country. The VdB membership peaked at 84,000 but many of these members only joined in order to retain their jobs.[186]

Henckes was investigated on at least two counts: his relations with his employees and his anti-German sentiments. A third account of money handling comes up in several documents as well. The legal documents about this case depict the totalitarian nature of the German occupation in Luxembourg. It also becomes clear that the Germans demanded 100 percent loyalty from the people in the territories they controlled. The following testimonies from Henckes's colleagues and employees illustrate the difficulties Luxembourgers faced when confronted by the Germans about their fellow countrymen. These documents give evidence of statements that were given to the Germans, but readers are left wondering how much is unsaid in these testimonies. Readers will also wonder if any of the witnesses came under investigation themselves. The German reports that are included also highlight the goals of the Germans and bring up questions about the use of Gestapo agents during these investigations.

The earliest document is from November 25, 1940 and it gives a few sentences on Henckes's past experiences and contacts. The Sonder-Abteilung reports that Henckes lived in Antwerp in September 1904 with his friend, the author Norbert Jacques who was then writing his first novel "The Ports." The report further states that the two friends moved about in various circles. This report ends with a sentence that the matter of Leclerc still needs to be looked at.[187]

---

[186] "Luxemburg Collaborationist Forces in During WWII," http://www.feldgrau.com/a-lux.html Accessed on November 26, 2013.
[187] Supplement to earlier report to Sonder-Abetilung 25 November 1940, Archives nationales de Luxembourg, JT-277.

Norbert Jacques is best known today as the screenwriter for his films featuring Dr. Mabuse (some of which were directed by Fritz Lang); however, this Luxembourg-born writer used his works to direct the public toward his political and nationalist opinions.[188] Jacques left Luxembourg in 1900 and travelled all over the world during the years preceding World War I and in the interwar period. During World War I, Jacques worked as a war correspondent and used his Luxembourg passport to travel to Belgium, France, the low countries, and England. He usually wrote pro-German articles and wrote with contempt for his native Luxembourg. After the war, he continued to write about Luxembourg with disdain for its provincialism and conservatism. He was more attracted to the German nation's culture and people, but after rise of National Socialism there, Jacques gave up his radical ideas.

In 1934 Jacques was asked by the government of the Grand Duchy to write tourist guides for the country. Jacques continued to have an affinity for Germany, even after being arrested and incarcerated by the Gestapo. In May 1940, he began to write for the Nazi propaganda machine in Luxembourg and he continued to work for the Nazis until the end of the war. After Luxembourg's liberation, he was arrested and tried for high treason as a collaborator and after four months in prison in Luxembourg, he was expelled to Germany.[189] Jacques would have been well known in Luxembourg and in Germany during World War II.

The significance of Henckes's relationship with Jacques in 1904 is not apparent, although it seems safe to assume that Jacques was already a Germanophile at this time, especially since he was living outside of Luxembourg. The novel "Der Hafen" that the

[188] http://www.autorenlexikon.lu/page/author/342/3421/FRE/Jacques%2C%20Norbert.pdf Accessed on November 14, 2013.
[189] Ibid.

report refers to is about Jacques's strained relationship with his parents and the parallel relationship he has with his native country. Since this report is written in November of 1940, Henckes's relationship with Jacques could have actually helped him, since by this time Jacques was writing pro-Nazi tracts.

This vague report from November 1940 shows how the Nazi investigation looked at all aspects of a person's life – even seemingly frivolous episodes from decades past. Whether or not Henckes knew it at the time, the Germans were taking their time looking at any episodes in his life that could add to the case against him. The testimonies that follow begin in the last weeks of February of the following year. The Nazis had months to collect evidence of Henckes's character before they began to question people with whom the director worked.

On February 24, 1941, a statement from Dr. Mathias Faber was recorded. He had worked at ARBED since January 1923 and is now a Prokurist at COLUMETA with Director Henckes as his superior. Faber states that at first, he had no problems working with Henckes. However, in the autumn of 1932, he had disagreements with Henckes, particularly because of the way Henckes was handling certain Argentinian accounts. Henckes had done things specifically prohibited by company policy and when he was found out, he tried to blame these things on Faber. Faber began by describing Henckes's business ethics and it is easy to see that Faber might have had a personal vendetta against his director.

After this, Faber began describing Henckes's personality: the director was excitable and violent-tempered. He would become extremely angry in front of his employees and staff members who worked closely with him could not help hearing his

opinions, for example Blanpain, Conradt, Schmidt. The following people suffered under Henckes's infamous temper: Weirich, Faber Mathias, Gillen, Pfeiferg, Ferdinand Türk, and Walter Türk. Faber stated that he suffered a nervous breakdown in 1937 because of Henckes. An office clerk (Nemers), who was already a nervous person, suffered a breakdown in that same year. Faber then listed Dr. Welter and two other individuals who could confirm these statements. With the matter of Henckes's relationship with his employees, Faber claimed that Henckes's willingness to state his opinions in front of anyone went hand in hand with his temper. The man had no restraint and Faber was quick to list those who could back up his statements.

Next, Faber discussed Henckes's political views. He started with a strong statement: Henckes always had an anti-German attitude, and this has not changed to this day. Henckes made his political views known to all and did not seek to hide them. Faber said this is how he knew, for example, that on January 24, 1941, Henckes referred to the German army occupying the country as "*Sauhunde*". Faber stated he even went home that evening and told his wife about this. On January 27, the Prokurist Zanen came from Henckes's office and walked around the office while warning Faber and Roller that so many people had been arrested (presumably by the Germans), that it could happen to anyone. If anyone was arrested, they should say nothing and say that had heard nothing. On February 21, Henckes made a statement about the Nazis' plans in Bulgaria and he referred to Hitler as "this guy"[190] in front of Faber, Goedert, and Conradt.

Next, Faber referred to an incident on February 1, when Henckes told Blanpain that the Germans (whom Henckes referred to as "*Les Boches*") were trying to get the Belgians to only work for them. Faber stated he wrote this statement down right away

[190] "dieser Kerl," Statement of Dr. Mathias Faber, reported 24 February 1941, ANL, JT-277.

and that he could not imagine that Blanpain would have forgotten this. However, Blanpain apparently had forgotten these statements from Henckes because he did not mention them in his testimony.

Faber then described an incident where General Secretary Ferdinand Türk called together the department heads and told them that no one should enroll in the VdB. The employees would hear from Henckes when it became absolutely necessary to enroll, but they should give their word now to abstain. Faber claimed that Türk's statements referred to the Germans as "*Die Schwinehunde und Sauhunde*."

In case the foregoing testimony was not enough to have Henckes convicted, Faber claimed that so many other things of an anti-German nature were said by Henckes that he could not write them all down; he also heard of second-hand information regarding these things. Concerning Henckes's relationships with his employees and his personality, Faber gave the year or the season in which something occurred; for Henckes political views, Faber gave the exact date something was said. Faber knew that the anti-German sentiments were more important for the Germans than the other two counts against Henckes. Otherwise, a man who suffered a nervous breakdown and had to take three months of off work to recover from it, would probably spend more time detailing exactly the way in which Henckes behaved towards him. However, Faber gave a succinct description of Henckes's personality but spent much more time detailing many incidents, word for word when possible, about Henckes's political views.

Faber's last paragraph stated that on February 14, Henckes told Faber that he had been denied entrance into the VdB. However, the next day, Henckes came to work with evidence showing he had been accepted after all. Faber stated that he told Roller about

this irregularity but he could not give an explanation for it. Although Faber did not elaborate on Henckes's entrance into the VdB, his mentioning of it shows the importance of membership in this organization, especially for people's economic well-being.[191]

This first testimony from Mathias Faber gives a strong indictment of Henckes on three counts: he was an unethical businessman, he treated his employees horribly, and he expressed anti-German statements at any chance he got. Faber not only sought to indict Henckes, but he also gave the Germans fodder for further investigations. Türk made clear anti-German statements and Zanen warned employees to give the Germans no information about anyone or anything going on in the company. Furthermore, Faber is clear about who else should be asked about Henckes and what exactly they should say and remember about their director. However, the testimonies from Türk and Blanpain give a different picture of Henckes. Finally, Faber's recording of these incidents shows that he may have known about the investigation for a long time; it seems likely he was already watching his colleagues for the Germans.

In a report dated March 4, 1941, a transcript of Herr Ferdinand Türk's statement from February 25, 1941 was given. Türk began his statement by defending Henckes: he stated that Henckes, in dealing with his employees, sometimes used the wrong expressions. But in all his dealings, Henckes had business goals in mind in his handling of employees. Türk stated that Henckes's business was so multidimensional that often his encounters with his employees were very strict and direct. Furthermore, Türk made a special mention that Henckes was concerned with his staff, especially those working in the lower positions. He stated that Henckes helped out three of his staff members when it

[191] Statement of Dr. Mathias Faber, reported 24 February 1941, ANL, JT-277.

came to illnesses, although he can only remember two of their names: Goedert and Frau Hammer.

In this testimony, Türk only addressed the issue of Henckes's relationships with his employees. However, Türk defended Henckes's mannerisms by stating that he was just so concerned with business he was too abrupt but it was nothing personal to the employees. Türk's mention of Henckes's concern with the well-being of his employees shows that he really wanted to give a different picture of Director Henckes than Faber.

Türk's last statement was an explanation of a previous (unavailable) report: he said that when he stated in his first testimony that Henckes was not especially pro-German, he only meant to say that Henckes was a "*guter Luxemburger*."[192] Since no other statements concerning Hencke's pro- or anti-German sentiments have come up in this testimony, it is likely that Türk had already been questioned on these points in his previous interview. Türk may suspect that he said too much before and was now backtracking. Since Türk seemed to want to defend Henckes, this last statement may very well be said in defense of Henckes as well.

This particular phrase "*guter Luxemburger*" is underlined (nothing else in the document is underlined or marked) and therefore needs further consideration. This phrase would have vastly different meanings for different people at this time in the small country. It could be a code to signify that Henckes was true to his country and also participating in the resistance. It might mean that Henckes is acting as a Luxembourger should according to German laws. Or perhaps, Türk is just trying to give a noncommittal answer that will keep himself and his superior out of trouble.

[192] Statement of Herr Ferdinand Türk from 25 February 1941, reported 4 March 1941, ANL, JT-277.

If Faber's testimony about Türk is accurate, then it should be no surprise that Türk would defend Henckes and would give as little information to the Germans as possible. If Türk himself has uttered anti-German statements in front of his employees, it seems very likely that he would be unwilling to lend the Germans aid. It is also unlikely he would try to incriminate Henckes, knowing he might be the next subject of a German investigation.

The next testimony on February 24, 1941 is from Raimond Blanpain, a Belgian citizen who works in Luxembourg at COLUMETA. Blanpain stated that he and Henckes got along well and never had any difficulties. Blanpain admitted that Henckes was a very nervous man and that the employees did not like to go to him, but this was all he said regarding Henckes's treatment of his employees.

Blanpain then stated that he and Henckes did not talk politics, and when it came up in conversation, Blanpain kept his opinions to himself, since he was a Belgian citizen. Blanpain admitted that from certain things he said, it could be inferred that Henckes was not happy with the war situation. Henckes also said that the Luxembourgers did not need the Germans and would be luckier if they were gone. Blanpain states that Henckes believed he could say such things to him because he was Belgian.[193] It is interesting that here Blanpain puts himself in a situation for the Germans to investigate himself, because he was basically stating that Henckes said these anti-German statements to him because he felt they had a common enemy. Blanpain then stated that this was all he could remember Henckes saying about the Germans and the war situation. Perhaps Blanpain felt that, as a Belgian, he had less to lose than a Luxembourger for admitting that he may have anti-German feelings because Belgium was run by a German military administration

[193] Statement of Raimond Blainpain, reported on 24 February 1941, ANL, JT-277.

rather than a civilian administration. However, it seems unlikely that the German law would differentiate between nationalities when it came to prosecuting people in the occupied countries for their anti-German sentiments.

A report from February 26, 1941 discussed J. B. Henckes and the amount of money he made while working in the construction materials industry. The report noted that Henckes had contacts with Gaston Barbassons, the Belgian president of ARBED who is referred to as "*deutschfeindlichen*". Henckes also knew Leo Laval-Tudor, the president of "Sogeco" who was known to have sympathies with the Allied cause. Next the report directed its attention to Rene, Henckes's son. He was known to have been a part of the group "Assoss," an anti-German student organization. Rene is now married to Berta Gehlen from Luxembourg-Limpertsberg and is a lawyer in Luxembourg City (at the main court there).[194] "Assoss", a student association founded in 1912, was not necessarily an anti-German association. It was comprised of students and others who supported liberal and social democratic principles; however, in 1933, it did publicize its struggle against fascism.[195]

This report began with Henckes's profits as an industrial businessman, but it is clear that the amount of money he made was not the real concern with the German police. Although the report stated that Henckes was making unrestrained profits, this is apparently a problem mainly because of his association with two men who were also high up in the construction industry in Luxembourg and were known to have anti-German sentiments. Furthermore, there were no criminal charges against Henckes's accumulation of wealth; he was not accused of dishonesty, money laundering, insider trading, or

[194] VM 533 berichtet, Nr. II6. 26 February 1941, ANL, JT-277.
[195] Ben Fayot, "Le Bal de l'Assoss au Cercle Municipal," *Ons Stad* 96 (2011): 34.

anything else. Rather, his large profits were somehow incorrect or immoral because Henckes worked with the French and Belgians who did not support the German occupation of Luxembourg. Since the documents do not reveal that Henckes was ever charged with any criminal financial activity, it seems likely that the money handling investigation, much like that of employee management, is just a front to help the Germans prosecute Henckes on the significant charge of harboring anti-German sentiments.

A notice on March 12, 1941 from Prokurist Weirich[196] of COLUMETA accused the other witnesses of withholding information regarding Henckes. Regarding the charges of "*Deutschfeindlichkeit*," Weirich stated that Henckes said things in front of Türk, Conradt, Goedert and others that these individuals should have remembered and brought up in their testimonies. Since they left them out, these witnesses were even worse than Henckes since they choose to protect him. They would be called up one more time (with immunity) so they could give the proper testimony.

Weirich believed the same situation had come up with the issue of "*Verhalten gegen die Beamtenschaft*" or the handling of employee management. Here other Prokurists knew about Henckes's behavior but they did not come forward. Since they did not go to their superiors with this information, they were also guilty.[197]

Weirich was another COLUMETA employee who appeared ready to help the Germans to the utmost: he was not even concerned with Henckes's conviction, but rather with the behavior of his colleagues and employees who he claimed were not cooperating with the investigation. The men withholding incriminatory evidence regarding

[196] Weirich's first name does not appear on any of the documents examined.
[197] Notice of Prokurist Weirich, 12 March 1941, ANL, JT-277.

Henckes's anti-German sentiments were mentioned by name and will be called to retestify; those withholding information about his behavior with his employees were just generally admonished. Weirich also knew which charge was particularly important for the German authorities in this case.

A report from the following day, March 13, showed a list of documents relating to Henckes that were to be sent regarding his investigation. They include a letter to General Director Alphonse Meyer of ARBED, an excerpt of a letter written to his son, Renatus[198], and two other notices. Although these specific items are not included in the binder that the resistance kept, the paragraphs below this list about Henckes's son's boss, Georg Brasseur-Mayrisch again show the details about people's lives with which the Germans were concerned.

The report stated that when Henckes wrote to his son, he specifically mentioned the famous Brasseur. Brasseur must be well-known to the German police because they next give details about his intended emigration to the United States of America. Brasseur applied for permission to emigrate, but he was denied permission by the Germans because he was very wealthy and he intended to take his wealth out of the country. Brasseur was in communication with the Luxembourg government-in-exile during this time as well.

The document ends with a sentence that Brasseur-Mayrich is the Director of Ore and Metal Trade Society (Erz und Metall Handles-Gesellschaft) and is he especially active as a propagandist for the "*Alliance francaise*."[199] It is no wonder he was not allowed to emigrate and although it is believable that the Germans did not want Brasseur

[198] Note that the Germans have changed Rene's name to Renatus.
[199] Report 443/41 II H (Ba.),13 March 1941, ANL, JT-277.

and his wealth to leave the country, it is very likely that the Germans planned to keep an eye on Brasseur and his connections with the "*Alliance francaise*."

Brasseur is mentioned and his particular circumstances are described on this notice because Henckes mentioned him in a letter to Rene. The German investigation leaves no stone unturned in this case against Henckes. If Brasseur is (as the report states) well-known in Luxembourg, then Henckes may simply be mentioning him as general gossip or even a business connection. Regardless of what Henckes's letter said about Brasseur, this document proves the meticulousness of the German's investigation. Even a mention about a person who was known to be *deutschfeindlich* could become evidence of a suspect's disloyalty to the Third Reich.

On March 18, 1941, another notice was given from Prokurist Weirich from COLUMETA. Weirich stated that on March 11, 1941, he spoke with Dr. Diehl, who wanted to discuss the Henckes case with him. Weirich explained he could not discuss the case because he was a witness in the case, but Dr. Diehl continued to speak about the case. He related the following to Weirich:

Dr. Bernhuber told Dr. Diehl that Henckes's arrest came as a surprise to him, because he thought he had already been removed. Dr. Bernhuber had met (on two separate occasions) with Geisen and Distriksleiter Didesch, but neither of these men could give Bernhuber sufficient evidence to have Henckes arrested. However, after these (secret) meetings, Henckes began acting differently with his staff. It was arranged with Distriksleiter Didesch that Henckes would not be allowed into the VdB and therefore Bernhuber was extremely surprised when Henckes received his green card of admission. In parentheses it said that Henckes was well known to the Ortsgruppenleiter Ecker.

Weirich concluded by stating that he had the greatest reservations while listening to this speech. Here it is evident again that non-admission into the VdB could have serious repercussions. Bernhuber and the others trying to get rid of Henckes did their best to keep him out of the organization. However, Henckes's personal connection with Ecker allowed him to have a membership card after all. Unfortunately for Henckes, this VdB membership was not enough to make up for the anti-German "evidence" piling up against him. He was arrested nonetheless.

The comments regarding this testimony from Weirich stated that the files regarding the interview between Bernhuber, Diehl, Didesch, and Geisen are of especial interest because of their remarks of the Gestapo interrogation system.[200] There is a question mark handwritten out to the side of this statement, signifying that one of the readers of this document was confused about this statement. Perhaps one of these men was working for the Gestapo, and these seemingly innocuous meetings were actually attended by Gestapo agents. The Germans may be pleased with these results and have therefore made this comment. Given the report from Weirich earlier, it is very likely that he was working for the Germans and possibly was a Gestapo agent himself.

In a report on March 20, Weirich discussed the issue of Henckes and his punishment. He began with the statement that the political character of Henckes was for the Germans the most important thing. By reading the testimonies above, it is obvious that Faber and Weirich were well aware of this. The next statement regards ARBED and its directors. Prior to this time, Weirich states, the directors of ARBED, due to their high position in the company and the company's high position in the economy, were untouchable. They were not prosecuted for their actions, no matter how egregious.

[200] Notice of Prokurist Weirich,18 March 1941, ANL, JT-277.

However, Weirich was proud to say that under the German rule, this is changing. The German laws apply to every man, no matter how high his position. Weirich concluded by stating that because the Germans went after a director in ARBED, the biggest employer in the country, the people could trust in the German law and know that it will provide absolute, equal justice for all persons.[201]

Although Weirich's report is about Henckes's punishment, it is really not about Henckes at all. Rather, it is about the administration of German law and justice in Luxembourg. Any reader must wonder if Henckes is simply being prosecuted as an example. He may have been chosen and convicted simply because of his high position in the company because the Germans could hereafter refer to his case to show that no one in Luxembourg will escape their laws. The statement regarding the Luxembourgers' ability to trust in German law must have been received with irony by much of the population.

Due to the censorship within public life that the Nazis imposed on the populations in the occupied countries, they often had to gather *Stimmungsberichte* from various sources in order to gauge public opinion. The Germans used these public opinion reports to get a sense of how ordinary people were viewing certain aspects of the German occupation. In addition to the testimonies about Henckes and the reports from Weirich and others, the Germans used at least two of these public opinion reports to document how people, specifically COLUMETA employees, were reacting to Henckes's arrest

A report on public opinion from March 11, 1941 concerning Henckes states that Dr. Conter says that all the employees believe the arrest of Henckes is a positive thing for the civil administration of the occupied territory. The employees agree that Henckes was rightly convicted. Conter adds that the Germans should not stop half way, but that

[201] Report of Prokurist Weirich, 20 March 1941 regarding punishment of Henckes, ANL, JT-277.

Director B from Dommeldingen also needs to be removed. He states that the evil needs to be pulled out by the roots and that those even in the highest circles cannot remain immune.

The remarks on Conter's statement state that he is a clerk at COLUMETA under Prokurist Faber. He has not shown himself to be anti-German nor pro-French. He has joined the VdB.[202] Conter's statements correspond with those of his superior, Mathias Faber. He also goes further than other witness in showing his support for the Germans by naming another person who should be investigated. The German remarks on the report stating that Conter has joined the VdB again shows the ubiquity of this organization in occupied Luxembourg in early 1941.

Another *Stimmungsbericht* from March 18, 1941 shows that on March 13, 1941, two statements were recorded. One was from Schneider, a Belgian clerk at COLUMETA in department H whose supervisor is Prokurist Conradt and the second is from Heuertz, a head clerk at COLUMETA whose superior is Prokurist M. Goedert. Schneider states that regardless of a person's political opinion, Henckes only got what he was searching for. The remarks about Schneider note that during the war, he was arrested by the Germans and spent some time in prison. Heuertz says almost the same thing: he states it is a joy to work now and the company runs 100 times better than before. He also says that Henckes received what he earned.[203] Although this report is brief, it is of note because in this case the Germans are collecting public opinion reports from clerks in COLUMETA, not just directors and prokurists.

[202] Stimmungsbericht 11 March 1941, ANL, JT-277.
[203] Stimmungsberichte, 13 March 1941 reported on 18 March 1941, ANL, JT-277.

These *Stimmungsberichte* give the Germans information on the opinion of the general public, but these opinions are always qualified with the German remarks on the individual. Although the Germans use reports from sources outside of their administration, they recognize that the information given is not sufficient if the background of the speaker is not examined. Although these three items do not show any anti-German statements from the observed men, if they had, they could easily be used in a future investigation. If these public opinion reports are unofficial and the subjects do not realize that their words will be related to the German authorities, then it does seem that Henckes was very unpopular with his employees. However, after Henckes's arrest, the men working under him may have been very careful to make sure that nothing they said could be seen as anti-German in any way.

Finally, there is an undated paper, which is not even a full-length sheet and only has two sentences on it, but these two sentences bring up as many questions as do many of the long reports. The first sentence states that the writer (unidentified) has called Mrs. Henckes and told her to bring nightclothes for her husband. The second states that Kanis has been ordered to go to a meeting.[204] The brevity of this notice is in contrast to the long report from Faber and others regarding Director Henckes's investigation. The first sentence forebodes Henckes's (possibly lengthy) imprisonment and the second brings up questions as to who Kanis is and why he must come to a meeting. Henckes's fate is unanswered and we must wonder if he was questioned, tortured, or killed by the Germans.

Although the documentation from the Henckes's case is incomplete in many aspects, the German investigation into an ARBED director illustrates what life was like in

[204] Undated and untitled report regarding Frau Henckes and Kanis, ANL, JT-277.

Luxembourg during the German occupation. Weirich proudly tells the Luxembourgers that the Germans will let no one get by without following German law in every way. Anti-German sentiments were just as much of a crime as financial dishonesty or mismanagement of employees. Furthermore, Henckes's colleagues give different accounts of his character. Some, like Faber, are willingly helping the Germans with their investigation and they invite the Germans to investigate other individuals who may be showing anti-German feelings. Others give away as little information as possible, but even this can be dangerous, as is seen in Weirich's summons to certain individuals who will need to retestify. Luxembourgers could not escape the German presence in their country and they had to outwardly accept the VdB in order to remain in their workplaces. Lastly, the Henckes case illustrates the meticulous way in which the Germans investigated individuals accused of anti-German sentiments. Legal statements, reports, public opinion reports, and Gestapo agents were used to gather evidence from all aspects of a suspect's life.

Based upon the information above, Henckes could, for some be a Luxembourg resister. He was *deutschfeindlich* which was enough for the Germans to arrest him. He also delayed joining the VdB and seemed to agree that all Luxembourgers should avoid joining if possible. However, Henckes did join the group eventually and furthermore, he worked as a director at a company that directly helped the Nazi war machine. For these two reasons, some Luxembourgers may accuse him of collaborating with the enemy. Whatever Henckes's true role in "resistance" and its various means, his case distinctly shows the grey area between the two extremes in which most Luxembourgers necessarily lived.

This study of the documents relating to Director Henckes's investigation reveal several things about the German occupation in Luxembourg. First, the occupation was totalitarian in nature. The Germans were able to use any source available when conducting an investigation. Even letters to family members were no longer private affairs. Gestapo agents reported on coworkers, neighbors, and even total strangers, and these reports would be filed away indefinitely in case they were needed to indict a future suspect. Secondly, in the investigation, the Germans could dig as deeply as they desired in order to convict a suspect. A relationship from twenty years ago was as relevant for the case as was a hastily-spoken word to a coworker. Finally, in the midst of an investigation, suspicion could fall on witnesses or other individuals involved in the matter. Certain German agents were quick to point out someone withholding information to protect a friend or coworker. By defending a fellow Luxembourger, a witness put themselves at a higher risk of being investigated themselves. Loyalty was not cheap; in the German occupation the price someone paid for patriotism to Luxembourg could easily be their freedom or their life.

CHAPTER VI

MEMOIRS OF LUXEMBOURG'S OCCUPATION: RESISTANCE, COLLABORATION, AND ACCOMMODATION WRITTEN BETWEEN THE LINES

Memoirs and biographies provide myriad details on life in certain historical contexts that are usually missing from more objective, historical accounts about the same events. Numerous accounts of Luxembourgers' experiences during the Second World War have been written and a few are dedicated to describing resistance by Luxembourgers. However, most Luxembourg memoirs are only available in French or German, and no English translation is available.[205] Furthermore, many of these are out of print and are very difficult to acquire. There are, however, four English-language books available that offer Anglo-American scholars an indication of what life in Luxembourg during the German occupation entailed. Father Jean Bernard, a Catholic priest arrested for his resistance activities, wrote *Priestblock 25487: A Memoir of Dachau* shortly after Luxembourg's liberation, in 1945. The other three narratives are written by women who

[205] See, for example: Victor Delcourt, *Meine glückliche Vorkreigszeit oder die rosagrünen Jahre: Erinnerungen 1919-1939*, Franz Delvaux: *Luxemburg im Zweiten Weltkriege: ein Kreigstagebuch*, Camille Keiffer "Erinnerungen an Volks- und Hauptschule im Zweiten Weltkrieg," Thérèse Kieffer-Marx, "Mein Kriegstagebuch 1939-1940: die Evakuierung einer Familie aus dem "Minett": vom 10. Mai bis 27. Juni 1940," Marc Limpach and Marc Kayser, *Wir glauben an die Demokratie: Albert Wingert, Resistenzler: eine Monographie,* Madeleine Weis-Bauler, *Aus einem anderen Leben*.

experienced the war as young girls and teenagers. Marguerite Thill-Somin-Nicholson (*Surviving the Nazi Occupation of Luxembourg: A Young Woman's WWII Memoir*), Anni Adams (*The Meeting of Anni Adams: The Butterfly of Luxembourg*), and Milly Thill (*Milly's Story: A Young Girl's Memories of the Second World War, Luxembourg 1940-1945*) all wrote their accounts long after the end of the war. Anni Adams and Marguerite Thill-Somin-Nicholson became war brides and moved to America very shortly after Luxembourg's liberation. Milly Thill remained in Luxembourg and this causes certain aspects of her book to differ markedly from the other women's accounts.

In these Luxembourgers' stories, as in all memoirs, readers must be aware that a person's memories change over time, some memories are lost altogether, and some experiences are not actually remembered, but by oral repetitions, people believe they do "remember" a certain event. Furthermore, individuals' memories of the Second World War are often unintentionally overlaid with national myths. Many of these developed immediately after a country's liberation from the German occupation and these myths served to legitimize new political structures.[206] Other "histories" surfaced many years later as claims to victimization under the oppression of the Germans was applied to assorted groups.[207] Although an individual's memories cannot be divorced from the emotions linked to them, personal testimonies are still useful in studying history. "Ideally, history critically tests memory and prepares for a more extensive attempt to work through a past that has not passed away."[208] Memoires, as long as they do not

[206] Jan-Werner Müller, introduction to *Memory & Power in Post-War Europe: Studies in the Presence of the Past*, ed. Jan –Werner Müller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 4.
[207] Sonja van 't Hof, "Collective Suffering: Consequences of World War II in Luxembourg," in *The Politics of war Trauma: The Aftermath of World war II in eleven European Countries*, ed. Joland Withuis and Annet Mooij (Amersterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers, 2010), 179-187.
[208] Dominick LaCapra, *History and Memory after Auschwitz* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1998), 8.

usurp historical accounts, contribute to an understanding of national and international events on an individual level.

These four books provide countless details on life as a Luxembourger during the German occupation of 1940-1944. All of them show the deprivations faced by Luxembourgers under the German authorities, both in regards to food and to basic civil liberties. Although Bernard's memoir mostly covers his time in the concentration camp, his story still shows what Luxembourgers were treated like and expected to do as citizens of the Reich and as "ethnic Germans". From the three women, readers learn how families, mothers, fathers, children, students, and others were affected and often traumatized by their country's occupation. Although Lonnie Story, the author of Anni Adams's biography, includes historical details and incidents, the other memoirs gloss over, or leave out altogether, events which, although important and well-known, did not personally affect them or their families.

Although none of these works claims to be about resistance or collaboration, examples of Luxembourgers participating in both of these activities are found throughout the books. Bernard was arrested by the Gestapo for resistance activities, however, his book gives the least information on the ways which Luxembourgers did resist their occupiers. His memoir, written directly after the war ended, focuses on remembering and honoring his friends in the camp. All three women discuss specific acts of resistance, with differing degrees of emphasis. However, they all three speak with equal hostility toward the open, obvious Luxembourg collaborators. While none of the authors attempts to define what it meant to resist the Germans, they each could easily identify traitors to their country.

Luxembourg Priest Jean Bernard wrote his memoir, *Priestblock 25487: A Memoir of Dachau*, which describes being arrested by the Germans and transported to Dachau Concentration Camp in Germany in 1945, three years after his release. He was arrested in mid-May 1941 and released in August 1942. By writing his memoirs so soon after the events occurred, Bernard is able to remember many of the details that often slip from a person's mind with the passage of time. He relates day-to-day activities of camp life and how they changed for the priests as the Germans changed their policies on religion. His account is highly personal: he speaks of friendships made and strengthened in the midst of the terrible conditions of the Dachau concentration camp.

Dachau, a large camp in Germany, near Munich, was established in March 1933. It served as a model for other Nazi concentration camps and SS concentration camps guards were trained there.[209] Although Dachau was not an extermination camp, it was still a place of incredible hardship and humiliation for the prisoners. They were treated worse than animals and survival in the conditions of the camp was a daily struggle. Bernard remembers the cruelty of many alongside the kindness that others showed. His account of his incarceration illustrates the effect that a prisoner's mental attitude could have on his survival, or lack thereof. His close friend in the camp, priest Batty Esch, had an attitude that was almost the polar opposite of Bernard's. Bernard was constantly encouraging him and lifting him up to try to get his friend through his time in the camp. Readers get the impression that if it were not for Bernard, Esch would not have survived

[209] "Dachau" http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005214 accessed March 24, 2015. Page last updated June 20, 2014.

the hardships of the camp for more than a few months. Esch was still alive when Bernard was released, but died only two months later, euthanized by the Nazis.[210]

Bernard's memoir speaks volumes for the way in which the German occupation of Luxembourg strengthened the ties between Luxembourgers, the majority of whom sought to keep their identity as Luxembourgers rather than Germans. Whenever Bernard met another Luxembourger in the camp, it was the highlight of his week. He and other Luxembourgers would often risk their lives to meet with their fellow countrymen who had just been transferred to the camp. These accounts show the close-knit community of Luxembourg, as it was not just priests who looked out for one another. Bernard includes a very moving account of Batty Esch and Frantz Clément, a journalist, meeting each other shortly after Clément's arrival and forgiving one another of their past differences. When Luxembourg *Wehrmacht* deserters arrived, it was no different, even though Bernard and the other priests may not have known the newcomers personally. They still welcomed their countrymen and did what they could to get them safer jobs and even extra rations. Back in Luxembourg, most people saw themselves as Luxembourgers, not "Germans," and in the camp at Dachau, attitudes were no different.

Bernard's memoir attests that even imprisoned Luxembourgers faced pressure to conform to the German's ethnic policies. He recounts a day when the priests were to lose most of their special privileges in the camp, but the head prisoner told them that any "ethnic German priests" simply needed to step forward and they would retain their special places. These privileges were not inconsequential: they included extra rest time, being exempt from hard labor, and more consistent meals. In Dachau these special

[210] "Jean Baptiste Esch" http://www.autorenlexikon.lu/page/author/163/1631/FRE/index.html accessed January 9, 2015.

privileges quite literally could have made the difference between survival in the camp or death. Bernard related that the temptation to claim this right as an "ethnic German" was terrible; however, none of the Luxembourgers moved. Bernard stated that only one person stepped forward at this call: a Polish priest. In the three weeks before his transfer to the German priests' block, no one spoke to the Pole.

After realizing the Luxembourgers would not easily give in to the temptation of choosing privileges over loyalty to their homeland, the commandant called all Luxembourgers to come forward. Bernard was then called into a barrack to give the names of the Luxembourgers. "Are you ethnic Germans?" the adjutant asked. "We are treated as such," replied Bernard, and with this reply he and the other five Luxembourgers gave up any special treatments. Bernard was proud of his reply and proud of all the Luxembourgers who refused to fall into the trap that the Germans had laid for them. The "free" Luxembourgers living in their occupied country were refusing to consider themselves Germans and the prisoners were no different. They remained true to their homeland.[211]

In February of 1942, Bernard was released from Dachau for ten days to attend his mother's funeral and in his memoir, he shows the control of the German authorities and their constant use of propaganda. When he reported to the Gestapo in Luxembourg City, the German officials asked how he and the other five Luxembourg priests were doing in the camp. Bernard realized what the Nazi was getting at when he asked, "Have the gentlemen's attitudes softened up a bit?" Bernard remembered that he held his friends' lives in his hand. He could have said that they had come around and the Nazis would

[211] Jean Bernard. Translated by Deborah Lucas Schneider. *Priestblock 25487: A Memoir of Dachau* (Bethseda, MD: Zaccheus Press, 2004), 64-65.

have released them all after their "re-education" in Dachau. This would have been great publicity for the Germans, as priests in Luxembourg were considered (justifiably) as "centers of patriotic resistance."[212] However, Bernard did not give in. This incident, much like the one above, is related with pride by Bernard. It was vitally important to him to remain true to his homeland and to the many Luxembourgers who were suffering at the German's hands, just as he was. Before returning to the concentration camp, Bernard was told that he would be released soon. The priest states that this was the single reason he returned to the camp: knowing that he would soon be a free man.[213] Bernard suffered many physical ailments in his last six months in the camp and came perilously close to death before his release in August 1942.

Bernard does mention individual acts of resistance within Dachau.[214] Prisoners shouting "*Vive Luxembourg*" while on work duty, is only one example of this;[215] however, Bernard's resistance was often related to survival for him and for his friends. Much like the Luxembourgers suffering under strict rationing, Bernard and his fellow inmates took every opportunity to obtain extra food. Bernard internally resisted the mindset that the Germans tried to instill in prisoners' minds of focusing solely on taking care of himself. Instead, he helped others when he could, stood up for strangers, and encouraged other prisoners.

Bernard's memoir illustrates the importance of Luxembourgers remaining "Luxembourgers" even under immense pressure. As a victim of the Nazi's attempt to erase patriotic sentiments in the occupied country, Bernard's memoir proudly relates that

---

[212] Robert Royal, biographical note to *Priestblock 25487*, 175.
[213] Bernard, 85-86.
[214] Although many resistance members were incarcerated at Dachau, there does not appear to be any record of organized resistance within the camp itself.
[215] Ibid., 103.

even the harshest German policies could not entice Luxembourgers to claim to be ethnic Germans. Preserving Luxembourgers' identity as a people separate from the Germans was a key work of the resistance. The Germanization of the country which the Nazis sought to instill in the population applied to all areas of life and therefore Luxembourgers had many different ways in which they could resist their occupying forces. As Catholicism was closely tied to Luxembourgers' identity, Luxembourgers could show their resistance by supporting their priests, attending church, and observing rituals. In the three memoirs that follow, readers learn how Luxembourgers at home responded to the German policies in their country.

Marguerite Thill-Somin-Nicholson, with the help of her daughter Cynthia Somin, who transcribed and translated her mother's memories, provides a concise book about her specific experiences during the Second World War as a Luxembourger, titled *Surviving the Nazi Occupation of Luxembourg: A Young Woman's WWII Memoir*. Born in 1927, Marguerite was a young girl when war broke out and was still a teenager when it ended. She was living in Esch-sur-Alzette during the Spring of 1940 when Luxembourg was invaded by the Germans and her family was forced to evacuate the south of the country, as thousands of other Luxembourgers were. Her memories are often very detailed, especially when describing situations that were singularly uncomfortable or disturbing to her. Thill-Somin-Nicholson's account shows the way in which the German occupation affected every detail of the family members' lives. Like other memoirs, her account of Luxembourg during 1940-1945 focuses on events that directly impacted her and her family while the more well-known events of the war are often missing from her memoir.

After the violent upheaval of Marguerite, her three sisters, and her parents from Esch, the Thills became refugees in France. Thill-Somin-Nicholson often notes that the French government took pains to take care of these refugees from Luxembourg. The family may not have had much, but the French were doing their best to take care of them, both with provisions and with employment for the family. As France succumbed to the German war machine, the Thills experienced occupation again. The French village in which they were living was overtaken by the German army and Marguerite remembers being able to communicate with a German soldier because she had been taught some German in school. She states that the German soldier did not recognize Luxembourgish although "He knew that it was not French or German."[216] She states that German was easy for Luxembourgers to learn since "our language is of German derivation."[217] Thill-Somin-Nicholson honestly states the similarity between the two languages, although in Luxembourg during the years of occupation, this simple statement would have been loaded with political meaning.

Many of the resistance publications and other articles written about the war state that the boys being drafted to fight in the *Wehrmacht* was the worst possible crime committed against the Luxembourg population. Thill-Somin-Nicholson mentions the draft only as a matter of course, probably because there were only girls in her family and she did not experience the loss of a brother first hand. She instead shows how the military draft affected girls and women. "With our boys being drafted into the German Army to serve on the Russian front, the girls had to do a lot of work that the boys normally would have. My sister Marechen was put to work in a spaghetti factory, which

[216] Marguerite Thill-Somin-Nicholson, *Surviving the Nazi Occupation of Luxembourg: A Young Woman's WWII Memoir* (San Bernardino, CA: Xlibris Corporation, 2008), 26.
[217] Ibid., 26.

was very hard on her health."[218] Marechen's life would change even more dramatically later in the war. When Luxembourg girls began being sent to work on farms in Germany as part of the *Reichsarbeitsdienst* (RAD), Marechen quickly married in order to be exempt. Thill-Somin-Nicholson states, "You can see how our lives were changed in every which way."[219]

Marguerite went to work in a bank in Esch, because so many males were gone, starting in 1942. She liked her job there, worked hard at it, and rarely made errors. However, she lost her job as soon as the men came back after the war (regardless of her experience and the extra lessons in French that she took to further improve her work). Marguerite remembers that all the other employees at the bank were Luxembourgers. "The only German (if he was a Nazi, I did not know) was the president of the bank."[220] The author discerns between Germans and Nazis and does not show any ill will towards this German man. Her other memory about her job at the bank is the hunger that was always with her. She would often take naps during her lunch because of her hunger and exhaustion. She made a friend at work who would sometimes share food with Marguerite. Although this fifteen-year-old was earning almost as much as her parents, she was unable to buy extra food because of the rationing system.

Thill-Somin-Nicholson does mention different ways in which she and her family resisted, but she does not emphasize these acts. For example, the author's family listened to the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), an act seen as a major offence by the Germans. The whole family could have been imprisoned for listening, but she mentions this act in passing when describing the situation in London during the war. Thill-Somin-

[218] Ibid., 37.
[219] Ibid., 38.
[220] Ibid., 38.

Nicholson also writes about skipping the forced German youth meetings, for which she "was eventually called in front of some official, but I can't remember for the life of me what took place at this meeting. I obviously somehow got away with it."[221] This is also an example of the straightforward tone of Thill-Somin-Nicholson's memoir. There is not much room for emotion, exaggeration, or florid language. Her goal is to tell her story as accurately as possible, and she is not concerned with how "patriotic" her family was during the war years.

One intentional act of resistance in which Marguerite engaged was helping her boyfriend (whom she does not name) get a gun before he went into hiding. He was drafted into the German army and on a return home on leave, he decided to go "underground." Marguerite and he walked three or four hours (one way) one night to procure a gun for him, which was a serious offence, had they been caught. She states that she and her boyfriend thought about her going into hiding with him, but she could not do that to her family. She even went to the train station pretending to look for him when she knew he would not be going back to the Russian front, just to keep up appearances. Thill-Somin-Nicholson credits the close-knit community of farmers in Luxembourg for saving the lives of many hundreds of young boys by hiding them in caves, under straw, in dugouts, and in other ways.[222] The fact that the small country had so many *réfractaires*, and that those hiding within the country were being helped by other patriotic Luxembourgers, is very much a part of Luxembourg's history of the Second World War.

Another account of Luxembourgers resisting that Marguerite remembers was the flying of the Luxembourg flag. She states that it was a common occurrence to see people

[221] Ibid., 38.
[222] Ibid., 41.

being arrested, and even executed for simple infringements on the Germans' many laws. Her sister's boyfriend was executed in front of his house for flying the Luxembourg flag.[223] "After killing someone in this way, the Nazis would print their names and plaster them all over for us to see, a way of keeping us in shape. But that backfired. It made us hate them all the more."[224] This obvious propaganda technique did not work on Luxembourgers, most of whom honored their fallen compatriots.

The author's memoir also describes a couple of acts of Luxembourgers collaborating with the Germans. For example, she had an uncle whom she admired and enjoyed spending time with, until she discovered (first-hand) he was working for the Gestapo. She told her parents what she had learned and after that the man was no longer welcome in the Thill's home. Although Thill-Somin-Nicholson notes her fear of and disgust with her uncle's actions, she mentions that it is possible that when the uncle warned her father to "keep his mouth shut", (her father "hated the Nazis so much that he would talk against them"[225]) he may have saved her father's life and the family should have been thankful. In Marguerite's view, even collaborators could help resisters and it is significant that she mentions that the family should have shown gratitude to a traitor to the country. In this way, Thill-Somin-Nicholson's memoir shows the danger in creating black and white categories for collaborators and resisters during the occupation years. This is seen in Milly Thill's memoir as well.

Thill-Somin-Nicholson later describes other Luxembourgers being punished as part of the *épuration*: "some girls that had been friendly with the Germans had their heads shaved and were walked through town for everyone to see. Thank God there were

[223] Ibid., 39.
[224] Ibid., 39.
[225] Ibid., 45.

not too many. We saw men who had been friendly with the Germans beaten in the town square. It was brutal and very sad. So much misery, but they had had a choice, so they were responsible for the choice they took."[226] This sums up the author's views on the occupation period. Each person had four years of occupation to endure and many choices to make during that time. As all Luxembourgers were equally responsible for their own actions, she does not show much remorse for collaborators.

Marguerite married an American soldier and left Luxembourg for America in 1945. Her account, as told to her daughter many years later, puts particular emphasis on events that mattered to her as a young girl and that impacted her family directly. When speaking of her boyfriend deserting the German army and going into hiding, Thill-Somin-Nicholson reminds readers that this was a very sad time for a fifteen-year-old. The war did change every aspect of their lives, and the young Luxembourgers often had to grow up very quickly.

Some of Thill-Somin-Nicholson's statements show that she wrote her memoir at a distance, both in years passed (her book was published in 2008) and in physical distance from Luxembourg. She does not weigh the political impact of her memoires and her book does not put forth the same arguments as the Luxembourg government, media, and veterans' societies do in the new century. Rather, her book is truly based upon her experiences at the time of the occupation and her viewpoints at that time. Thus, she has no qualms about saying that Luxembourgish was of German derivation and she does not dwell on the forced conscription of the young men of Luxembourg. Rather, she objectively tells readers her personal story of the occupation and lets them make their own judgments. This objectivity is not found in the next publication analyzed.

[226] Ibid., 47.

In 2003 in Florida, Lonnie Story met a different Luxembourg war-bride, the seventy-six-year-old Anni Adams (née Neuman). The two of them struck up a friendship and Story was so captivated by Adams's life that he wrote a biography of her, *The Meeting of Anni Adams: The Butterfly of Luxembourg*. Story's account of Anni's life is written with so much florid language that it is at times hard to take seriously; the number of times he mentions her beauty and describes her as a butterfly is distracting. Story traveled to Luxembourg with Adams to visit the sites discussed in the book and states that he helps Adams remember some of the events that are described. This can obviously distort Adams's story, even if the author does so unintentionally. Story also adds a lot of dialogue to Adams's story. It is unbelievable that Adams can remember conversations word for word more than sixty years later and there are conversations she never would have witnessed that Story includes. Nevertheless, the account of Anni Adams' life gives a very detailed account of what life was like for a young girl in Luxembourg before, during, and after the German occupation that began on May 10, 1940. This biography differs in many ways from the memoirs written by Luxembourgers themselves, but in the introduction to the book, Adams states that Story wrote "this biography just the way I lived it."[227]

Story's biography is not only about the years of Luxembourg's occupation by the Germans, but it spans Adams's entire life, which began November 11, 1926 in Esch-sur-Alzette. As Story traces her development from birth, he emphasizes the way in which Anni dealt with conflicts that came her way. By reading this biography with a focus on the years of 1940-1945, readers learn how the war and occupation affected the daily,

[227] Lonnie D Story, *The Meeting of Anni Adams: The Butterfly of Luxembourg*, (Eugene, OR: ACW Press, 2004), 12.

mundane aspects of Luxembourgers' lives, especially in the context of a family unit. Obvious acts of resistance and collaboration are described throughout the book; they are not dwelled upon or emphasized, but they were necessarily a part of Luxembourg's occupation experience. However, when describing accommodation or perhaps complacency with German policies, Adams gives a lot of explanation to defend certain actions that her family took.

Story's account of Adams's life revolves around her family. She was very close to her brother, Albert Jr, called "Bubby", her father, and also, but to a lesser extent, her mother and other two siblings. Story not only describes Adams in very complimentary words, he also describes the other members of the family in this way, particularly Adams's father Albert Neuman. He is described as a man's man, a heroic, patriotic Luxembourger who ensured the survival of his family throughout the war years. Albert Neuman was arrested and imprisoned after the occupation for an alleged collaboration with the German forces. He served three years and upon his release continued to love his homeland, Luxembourg, and according to Story, never spoke badly of it. Readers wonder if Story defends Neuman and his actions so frequently throughout the text because of his arrest. It is as though Story is preparing readers to believe that Neuman was wrongly accused of conspiring with the Nazis.

Immediately after the German invasion of Luxembourg, Anni's family had to flee their home and their flight was filled with near-death experiences, outdoor camps, and cattle cars full of people without food, toilets, or any other basic necessities. Anni remembers the fear and uncertainty that they experienced while leaving their homeland. While bombs are exploding all around them, Story writes, "Not that the average soldier

or airman of the Wermacht [sic] is that incarnate evil. They are enlisted men, under compulsion by threat of life to carry out their deeds. Their actions are necessary compliance to the true deeds of the hierarchy that pushes them by threat of death or worse. Soldiers doing what they have to do and obeying orders. In the instant case, these soldiers and airmen are conducting a campaign of total annihilation against anything and anyone that is not of their order, the Nazi regime."[228] In the same way that Story describes the Nazi soldiers, he looks at Luxembourgers "just doing what they had to do." Story endorses the view that there was no option for resistance to the Nazis, neither from Germans nor from Luxembourgers.

Story states that in September 1940, "two Boy Scouts, Josy Wengler[229] and Josy Wirol, had been arrested by the Gestapo at the ages of thirteen and fourteen for suspicious behavior, clearly leaders of a budding resistance force to fight the unwelcomed occupying forces."[230] Here readers get a glimpse of the complete submission to the Germans that was required of Luxembourgers. Boys as young as thirteen were arrested by the Gestapo less than six months after the occupation began. Furthermore, Story's inclusion of this incident reinforces the argument that Luxembourg's organized resistance began very early in the occupation. However, this is more than likely not a memory of Anni's but research found by Story. Without footnotes or bibliographical data, it is impossible to tell, but since Adams does not seem to have known the two boys personally, and no other details are given about their lives, it seems logical to assume that Adams did not relate this to Story.

---

[228] Story, 103.
[229] This is probably the same Joseph Vengler that Ronald Seth refers to in *Undaunted: The Story of Resistance in Western Europe*, Page 142.
[230] Story, 157.

Anni remembers how she came to realize that the Germans were transporting thousands of people in cattle cars through Luxembourg. Story includes historical background to this memory by explaining that in September 1940, 15,000 Jews were deported from the Rhineland to camps in France via the Luxembourg railways.[231] Anni and her brother watched these trains go through their country on more than one occasion. Bubby pointed the trains out to Anni, as there were so many of them at an unusual time. As they asked themselves why so many cattle cars would need to be transported, the wind came up and the siblings smelled the same putrid scent that they remembered from their trip to France as refugees. It became clear to them that these were trains full of humans, not animals.[232] Anni and Bubby did not discuss this incident; they tried to forget it.

Much of Story's account relates to Albert Neuman's handling of various decrees and laws put into place by the Germans. As stated, Adams was very close to her father, and it makes sense that she would remember the difficult decisions her father made throughout the years of German occupation. It is also very likely that because of her love for her father, she told these incidents to Story with the constant reminder that her father had "no choice" and only did what was best for his family. Adams actually participates in resistance against the Germans, but she does not underscore these activities. As her character never came into question, she does not spend as much time defending her own patriotism.

Many Luxembourgers were arrested for listening to the BBC, but Story states that the Neumans do not listen to any radio programs at all "just to be safe."[233] Later, when Neuman announces that the family must destroy the Luxembourgian flag, Story states

[231] Ibid., 157.
[232] Ibid., 165-166.
[233] Ibid., 167.

that he does so with tears in his eyes. "I will put out this [Nazi] stinking flag tomorrow and bring it in as required to the minute, but I don't want to see the repulsive thing unless we have to do it again. OK?" [234] He also tells his wife, "if we are caught with the flag of our homeland we will be sent to a work camp as punishment for a term of no less than one full year. No trial, no defense, nothing. We may all go or just me. They decide as they please and many people do not come back after the year, understand?"[235] It is doubtful that Anni remembered these words from her father, sixty years later, but Story inserts words, actions, and feelings to the tell story and the elaboration serves as a defense of the family's actions. Since this is a biography (rather than a first-person memoir like Thill and Thill-Somin-Nicholson's accounts), it is hard to tell whose motives are being fulfilled with the inclusion of dialogue and emotions.

When describing Neuman's new job, Story describes Adams's father's compromises which could very well have left him open to charges of collaboration after the war.

> Papa has found work as a teacher again by complying with the indoctrination process disseminated by the Nazis. He doesn't care about politics and despises war. He has only one driving concern: work and provide for his family. That he does, he begins teaching once again at the school and starts working within a new program offered by the Germans to gain his gold-level title in gymnastics. With it, comes a professorship, a much coveted position, and a higher salary to feed his family…He has to raise his right arm in salute symbolizing loyalty and dedication to the

[234] Ibid., 167.
[235] Ibid., 167-168.

> Reich, a creature he doesn't even know and hates all that it represents. It isn't about his loyalty to the Reich or his determination to survive for himself. His family is his only waking thought and that drives him to utter humiliation inside and staunch compliance on the outside. He will do what a man has to do to keep his family safe and pray for the storm to end.[236]

Later, after returning from Germany from one of his gymnastics competitions, Story states that Albert Neuman is beginning to receive insulting looks from other Luxembourgers for his trips. "It disturbs him because he knows his heart and loyalty are to his family first and his country second. However, the two are almost one in his mind. He loves Luxembourg and despises the politics and the war. In his mind though, these are events beyond his control. What is in his control is his hard work, caring for his family, his love of his sport and teaching. These things he continues to perform with excellence."[237]

Neuman complies with German policies to provide for his family. In the context of the occupation, his ambition to earn more money (even if the family needs it) and gain a better position earned him the label of collaborator, or at least "*profiteur*". Some in Luxembourg believed it was more noble to stay in a lower position and suffer the hardships of the rationing system than to comply with German demands in order to improve one's life. Story, through Adams's account, argues that Neuman's ambition was simply a result of a hard work ethic. The fact that he is now working for a German institution makes no difference to Neuman.

---

[236] Ibid., 173.
[237] Ibid., 202.

Later in the book, Story gives an account of the family's reception of the news that Bubby is being sent to school in Germany. The teenage boy came home with a large package that informed his parents that he was to be ready to depart to Germany by August 20, 1942. "Gredy," the mother, was in tears and asked Neuman to do something to keep her oldest son at home. He replied, "if he stays here they will conscript him in two years. Then we will lose him to the Wermacht [sic] and he could be killed. It is better this way. At least we will know he is safe. We have no other choice… It is all we can do."[238] Again, Neuman choses the path of least resistance against the German regulations, regardless of if he agrees with their policies. Also, Neuman's statement "we have no other choice," shows that the family did not even consider Bubby going into hiding, as many young men in Luxembourg had already done.

In contrast to her father, Anni made the choice to blatantly disregard some of the German laws in Luxembourg. Throughout the text, readers learn of Anni's resistance, although the author does not underscore these actions or define them as resistance. Story's first account of Anni's secret resistance work is when she delivers a piece of mail from Maria, the grocery-store owner, to a gentleman waiting in the church close to her home. Although Story elaborates this anecdote by including Maria's thoughts on Anni and very detailed dialogue between Anni and the gentleman in the church, he does not give any indication of Anni's thoughts on her actions at the time. He states that "Anni feels suddenly strange" but does not give a clue as to whether Anni knew she was disobeying German orders or had any thoughts on resisting the German occupation. Perhaps the thirteen-year-old girl was not thinking about these things, but readers are disappointed that this account ends and the author simply goes on with the account of

[238] Ibid., 198.

Adams's life as though this act was not a big deal.[239] However, by mid-1942, Anni realized that her mail runs for Maria were considered illegal by the German authorities, but she nevertheless continued with them. And when speaking of the mail runs in the following year, 1943, Story admits that Anni "realized more and more that it is dangerous and something is definitely going on, but the less she knows, the better, and it stays that way."[240] Adams does not emphasize her illegal activities, although she knew she was breaking the German laws with these activities.

Story relates an account from December 1942 when Anni had to make moral compromises of her own: this time in church. As she entered the confessional, Anni sensed someone else, other than the priest, was listening to her. "The dirty Gestapo have started listening in on confessions, threatening the priests with certain death and mayhem should they not cooperate with their secret little activities. Even the church has now been poisoned by these insidious creatures. They … listen and just maybe entrap a repentant sinner in crimes against the German government."[241] Anni copes with this by lying at confession. From that day forward her confession is always the same: she stole an apple on the way home from school. The way the author describes this, Adams is not doing this to hide her covert activities of delivering mail and groceries in secret. Rather, she is not willing to divulge any private, spiritual matters to the Germans; she will keep that part of her world to herself, although the totalitarian German rule seeks to impenetrate *every* aspect of Luxembourgers' lives.

Adams's description of a Luxembourg collaborator later in the story, shows a marked contrast between her disgust with the man and his actions and her father's

[239] Ibid., 163-165.
[240] Ibid., 211.
[241] Ibid., 203.

"neutral" position. On Christmas Day 1942, the Neumans have family over: a distant cousin and her husband. The husband is telling Anni's father that he should come see him at his office. "There are many things I can do for you. All you need to do is become pro-active with us and get on the wagon," he entices Anni's father. "Look at what I have at home and what I am accomplishing. It is the only way to go now and it is better for us all. We should join in and not be so terribly obstinate and resistant." As a sixteen-year-old girl, Anni knows this man is a traitor to Luxembourg. Story describes Anni's thoughts about the man in detail: "he is one with an evil heart and a mind poisoned by the Nazi demons. He sells out his neighbors and his family for favors or money, sometimes both, to the Germans. He treats the Germans favorably and deprives his own people and nation. He is a traitor, an adulterer, a liar, a thief and all that goes with being self-appointed to pride and rejection of Godly character and morality."[242] In her mind, Adams disowns him. She also realizes that if this man knew about her secret mail runs for Maria, the whole family would be arrested and imprisoned either in Luxembourg City or in forced labor camp. Here readers see a definite acknowledgement from Adams that she was a resister. Although she never explicitly defines resistance or puts a label on her father's activities, she can undeniably recognize a collaborator.

Later in the narrative, Story relates some of the propaganda efforts of the Germans that remained firmly implanted in Adams's memory. At the end of March 1944, the efforts of the SS, Gestapo, and German police "to stop uprisings and espionage are made an offensive tactic. They don't wait anymore for suspicious behavior, instead they are now routing people out of house and home, church, workplace, factory or streets. People are literally being shot where they stand. Others are taken away never to be seen

[242] Ibid., 204.

again."[243] Here Story gives an account of Anni and her classmates watching, at the instruction of her teachers, as the staff from the college where her father teaches are lined up against the wall and told to salute "*Heil Hitler*." Those who raised their arms more slowly than others were immediately shot. Then every fourth person in the line was shot, point-blank, and killed. Fortunately for the Neumans, Albert happened to be number three in the count and the man next to him was shot while he was spared.[244] Story later brings up this incident when Newman was convicted of conspiring with the Germans. The irony that Neuman was almost senselessly shot by the Germans at his German workplace, a position that helped him to be accused of collaboration after the war, is not lost on readers.

Another account of German propaganda illustrates the way in which school children were indoctrinated by the Nazis. One of Story's accounts from the Spring of 1943 shows Adams's direct confrontation with the German propaganda machine. Anni and other students were taken on a government-sponsored field trip to Luxembourg City, where they were greeted by a German in uniform. The official assured them that the Germans were keeping them safe from the uprisings and resistance occurring in the country. The students were then led into the Gestapo and SS headquarters, where uniformed men interrogated men and women of all ages. Some Luxembourgers were working for the Germans, but Adams did not give any thoughts on her countrymen's work. Instead, she remembers, "The entire place smells of fear, dread, discipline and

[243] Ibid., 219.
[244] Ibid., 219-220.

dark soullessness. Evil incarnate is at work here behind typewriters, telephones and a network of spy operations and police work."[245]

The students were then given a tour of the prison cells where they saw beaten, bloodied prisoners. The German leader told them again that the officers were keeping the people safe from these criminals who were plotting against the government. This field trip was clearly designed to indoctrinate the children with fear and obedience to the authorities. They were encouraged to turn in anyone, even family members who may be putting their country in danger by subverting German interests. Anni left the field trip disgusted with the Germans and their attempts to indoctrinate the Luxembourgers. This explicit, obvious attempt at winning over the Luxembourg youth did not work on Adams. However, more subtle German propaganda did work on the sixteen-year-old, as seen below.

In April 1944, Anni and a friend from school traveled to Luxembourg City where they learned about the *Reichsarbeitsdienst* (RAD). Story writes,

> They have an opportunity to leave school early and volunteer to enter into their conscript to mandatory RAD.… It is usually a two-year service that all "Germans" must serve as civilians for their country and government. There are some thirty-nine farms and other such labor camps throughout greater Germany proper. After one year of labor on farms and in factories, the second year must be fulfilled by more dangerous work such as working in the munitions factories or other sites supporting the military. Anni and Lillie have collectively decided that volunteering would speed them to a better chance at higher education. Should they volunteer and

[245] Ibid., 210.

> complete one year now, the reward would be having their time cut short and also being permitted to go to school in Nancy, France for college-level learning. For the two of them, they know it is the right thing and best thing to do, not only for themselves but for their families.[246]

It is interesting that Anni learned about the RAD and made this decision and these assertions herself, and then just asked her parents for permission to go. She probably fell sway under the propaganda of the authorities that educated the students on the benefits of the RAD. She was thinking about what the Germans would provide for her in two years, after her service ended, not knowing that her country would be liberated within five months. However, her father agreed with her decision and allowed her to go. For him, it was the rational decision: the family "is slowly starving" and it was one less mouth to feed; she would have food and shelter in Germany, and "no one will be trying to kill her without cause or reason."[247] Anni and Lilli's time at "the oatmeal farm from hell," as Story refers to it, was a short passage in their lives. The two girls left the farm the first week of August (after approximately four months of work) and had to travel on foot (which took seven days) to get back home.

Here Adams's story of the war and occupation wraps up very quickly. She returned home, bathed for the first time in months, and then readers are told that within a month Luxembourg is liberated by the American troops; Anni's family in Esch experienced the liberation on September 11, 1944. Bubby had already escaped his work in Northern Germany and fled back to the home. The fifteen-year-old realized that if he stayed, he would be drafted at any time. No liberation day stories are included, but Story

[246] Ibid., 220.
[247] Ibid., 220.

mentions the Battle of the Bulge, as the Neuman family had to take up residence in a bomb shelter during the fighting. After this final battle on Luxembourg soil was over, the family was able to return to normalcy, at least somewhat. Story then relates in great detail when and how Adams met Charlie D. Adams, an American soldier, whom she would later marry.

The Neuman family's war story does not end with the liberation of their country or the end of the Battle of the Bulge. In March 1945, Anni returns home from school to find her father gone: he has been taken to a camp. Readers learn that the resistance forces were arresting men and even teenagers from all over the country and putting them in camps to await trial. Story attributes the following words about the event to Maria, the family's close friend and neighbor: "People just get paranoid. Too much suspicion or rumors have taken a toll."[248] "Right now, there are just a lot of accusations going on and people are being taken for questioning. They mean the best for us, I am sure, but they still feel they have to know who was with the Nazis and who was against them."[249] Later, as the family was allowed to visit Neuman in this camp, they learned that he was charged with conspiring with the Nazis.[250]

Albert Neuman was convicted of this charge and served over three years for his crime. Story describes the man's unjust situation as follows:

> Albert Neuman never joined the Nazi Party. In fact, all his actions, words spoken and things unspoken, showed his detest for the Party. He never actively engaged in any activities whatsoever that would further their cause nor harm or tarnish the pride of being a Luxembourger. *He was*

[248] Ibid., 264.
[249] Ibid., 265.
[250] Ibid., 267.

> *clearly a victim of circumstances.* He did work as a professor in the predominantly German-staffed college. He did teach and train German youths in gymnastics. He did attend and compete in sporting events in Germany. He did do his job as best he could….He was a professor of sports and he was working to provide for his family. Politics was something he hated all his life.[251]

Story characterizes Neuman as a victim, first of the Germans and now of the new Luxembourg system of justice. As seen in resistance publications, for some leaders of the resistance doing nothing to hurt the German cause was the same as furthering it. Story continues,

> A man forced to salute "*Heil Hitler*" and yet stand before a firing squad outside the college. A man forced to wave a flag from his home window that represented an evil cause in direct conflict with his own home, nation and national pride. All of which was his to swallow and endure as a man. He would stand trial for doing what he had to do. Necessity had constructed one more victim among the countless millions. Conspiring with the enemy. Work with, or die by, the hands of the killers in their town. Save your family or let them suffer. He made a choice to survive and he was being tried for his decisions.[252]

Many Luxembourgers faced the same circumstances and made the same decisions to safeguard their families as Neuman did and Story's defense of Neuman could be applied to many Luxembourgers. Not long after Albert's conviction, Adams's life changes

[251] Ibid., 268 (italics mine).
[252] Ibid., 269.

drastically: she agrees to marry Charlie and they move to America, making Adams one of hundreds of Luxembourg war brides.

Adams and Story's book shows the fine line that divided resistance from collaboration during the years of Luxembourg's German occupation. From a collaborator's standpoint, Neuman was "obstinate and resistant," yet, resisters labeled him as a conspirator. The grey area in which Neuman operated was defined differently by various people. Furthermore, within the same close-knit family, one member was accused of conspiring with the Germans, while another was making secret deliveries of mail and food, presumably to the underground Luxembourg resistance or others who were hiding from the German authorities. Here, Adams's argument that men and women with families to take care of had "no choice" but to obey the Germans can still be applied. It is likely that as a teenager, Adams believed if she were caught making her deliveries, her punishment would not have the dire consequences that her father's disobedience could have led to.

Since Story's account is filled with overtly flattering descriptions of Anni and her father, the book is missing an objective view of Neuman. Story and Adams's narrative seeks to convince readers of Neuman's innocence and his loyalty to his country. Readers can take Adams's word that her father never betrayed his homeland or they may wonder if there were other actions of Neuman that caused him to be indicted after the war. Regardless, the difficult choices that Luxembourgers, especially those responsible for the safety and well-being of their families, faced, is abundantly clear in Adams's story.

The final memoir, *Milly's Story: A Young Girl's Memories of the Second World War, Luxembourg 1940-1945*, was written by Milly Thill, a retired Luxembourg school

teacher, and was published in 2004. Born in 1930, Milly was ten when the war broke out in Luxembourg and fifteen when her hometown of Olingen was liberated on September 12, 1944. Many of her stories are told in the voice of the young girl in which Milly experienced the war and occupation. She sometimes displays naiveté and often looks at the bright side of the terrible years of violence and deprivation. Her book is not organized very chronologically and so several incidents that she describes cannot be placed in the larger context of the war and occupation.

While often looking at the occupation as a positive experience, Thill also shows a balanced view of her country. She illustrates class differences and a variety of local attitudes in Luxembourg, rather a perfectly unified country. Her book does not focus on resistance but, in passing, she illustrates many varied ways in which Luxembourgers could and did resist. Thill states that "We [Luxembourgers] never for one moment tamely submitted to any of the restrictions the Nazis imposed on us and cheated our occupiers on every possible occasion."[253] Examples of Luxembourgers cheating the Germans are found throughout the text.

In contrast to Anni and Marguerite, Milly's family, although prepared for a quick evacuation, never had to flee their home. Because of this, one trauma was avoided by her family. Instead of a massive upheaval, homelessness, and refugee life, Milly's first months of Luxembourg's occupation were filled with uncertainty. This may be why Thill is able to view the occupation years in a more positive light; when the war came to Luxembourg her family was anxious; for the refugees, their lives were immediately threatened.

[253] Milly Thill, *Milly's Story: A Young Girl's Memories of the Second World War, Luxembourg 1940-1945* (College Station, TX: Virtualbookworm.com Publishing Inc., 2004), 38.

Thill's story is different from Adams and Thill-Somin-Nicholson's for other reasons. As a "country girl", Milly's family had advantages over those living in the cities. Her family was able to raise chickens, rabbits, and pigs, as well as grow a large garden. This helped her family survive and it gave them currency in the bartering system that quickly developed throughout the country once the Germans began rationing everything. Although people in the cities kept rabbits and had small gardens, this did not compare to what the country people were able to provide for themselves. Furthermore, in general, people in the country had more freedom from the presence of their occupiers than those living in the cities.

Another reason why Thill's story differs from the other two women's memoirs is because she remained in the country and still lives in Luxembourg today. This had an impact on her memories in at least two ways. First of all, she was able to see the locations and people associated with the war years on a daily basis, triggering memories. Secondly, Thill mentioned still being friends with some of the people with whom she shared her occupation experiences. She was able to relive her memories by talking with others about their shared past. However, this "reliving" and retelling of stories could have altered her memories.

Thill is able to see the humanity behind the German soldiers' uniforms and includes some humorous stories about Luxembourg's occupying army. One spring day, she and her friends from school saw the German soldiers resting, eating, and having their wounds bandaged and Thill describes them as "Just ordinary boys having a good time and joking with their comrades."[254] In another incident, Milly and her friends were spying on several German soldiers who were lodging in a house nearby. The children

[254] Thill, 31.

were caught watching the men shave and "suddenly one of the young Germans turned and pushed his soapy brush into the face of one of our gang. We all shrieked with laughter, including the German boys. Even the blackest times have their brighter moments."[255] She relates several other such incidents and later states "Strange to relate, but I have many happy memories of that time."[256] Here readers hear the voice of a young girl still able to enjoy life in the midst of her country's occupation.

When Thill talks about her country's liberation, she is not without pity for the defeated Germans. She mentions how sad it was to see the hospital trains full of wounded Germans going back East. Thill also remembered seeing Luxembourg collaborators pushing carts loaded with their belongings as they fled the country after Luxembourg's liberation. Locals were yelling after them and harassing them and Thill says that there were two small children hovering near their mother at a cart; "I felt so sorry for those poor little innocents. I have never forgotten that desperately sad scene."[257] A last example of Thill's balanced viewpoint is her description of her new German teacher, Gierens, who arrived after the Luxembourg teacher, a collaborator, was promoted to Germany. She states that although Gierens was a German, this is not why the children hated him: "at first he seemed to be all right, and we would even have accepted him had he not been a Nazi"[258] Thill sees a difference between Germans and Nazis and in other incidents in the book she shows compassion on some people who were later condemned as collaborators.

[255] Ibid., 35.
[256] Ibid., 35.
[257] Ibid., 166.
[258] Ibid., 46.

Thill's book describes her home life and her family but not to the extent that Adams does. Milly's father was sent to Germany twice for hard labor, but she does not mention his leaving as a big event. She just mentions in passing that he was in Germany during a certain event, or that he was home on leave. In contrast to Adams's story, it is strange that she does not focus on what could be a very traumatic event for a young girl: having her father sent away to another country. Perhaps her mother and father were as optimistic as she was and they did not dwell on the unfortunate events of the war.

Thill states concisely that "the civic rights we enjoyed as a free independent nation were abolished at a stroke. The Nazis had become the rulers in our country, our masters, answerable to no one but themselves."[259] Then immediately she mentions the hardship of food rationing that the Nazi rule imposed. Especially for a young girl, this was probably the most memorable part of the Nazis' rule. She responds with her characteristic attitude, "but it would be idle to complain about this measure because it did ensure that food was distributed more evenly and fairly and that no Luxembourger actually died of starvation during the war" [260] This leaves readers to wonder if hunger and/or distribution of food was a problem in Luxembourg prior to the Summer of 1940. Furthermore, Thill's attitude sounds communistic, and readers may wonder if Thill's father was perhaps sent to Germany to work because of his political views.

Much of Thill's memoir is devoted to the German's strict rationing system and the ways in which Luxembourgers circumvented this system. Thill states that the rationing led to a full-scale bartering system, mostly between people from the country and those that traveled from the city. The people from the city "came secretly by foot,

[259] Ibid., 37.
[260] Ibid., 37.

train, or bicycle with soap, coffee, cloth, and wool, underwear and shoes and similar goods which they traded for the food that was in such short supply in the urban areas."[261] After discussing the various ways in which farmers bartered with others, Thill says "By and large, however, it all worked out pretty well, with many old acquaintances and friendships being renewed in this meeting of town and country, but sometimes racketeers turned up and tricked the farmers into giving them bags of food they claimed they needed for their families and then went away and resold them to the needy at inflated prices."[262] This is one example of a memory that was probably not experienced by the ten-year-old Milly. More than likely, she would have learned about this "racketeering" later as an adult.

Thill's story shows how the totalitarian rule of the Nazis applied to all Luxembourgers, no matter their age. After her priest, Father Zeimes, was denounced, Milly blamed two of her classmates for accusing him. These two students were Germans (Trinn and Mia Busch) and Gierens, Milly's teacher, also a German, lived with them. Mia told Milly to watch what she said and the following day she received a letter ordering her to see the Ortsgruppenleiter in Roodt-Syr. This man was a Luxembourger and according to Thill, he hated her family and was "responsible for my father being sentenced twice to two years' hard labor on the German railways."[263] Milly was thoroughly frightened and "like most other Luxembourgers, I kept my mouth shut in the future."[264] Although still an elementary school student, Milly's freedoms were severely limited. Not only were the youth held to the same standards of restricted speech and

[261] Ibid., 54.
[262] Ibid., 55.
[263] Ibid., 70.
[264] Ibid., 71.

activities, but Milly's young classmates, the Busch's, were participating in collaboration and denunciation, regardless of their ages.

Thill makes specific mention of the BBC broadcasts, both those from the ministers in exile and those from the Grand Duchess Charlotte. She states that during one broadcast a minister said that any Luxembourger who joined the *Volksdeutsche Bewegung* "would be held responsible after the war. We really didn't need that. It only went to prove they had no idea what it really was like for the ordinary people living under the jackboot of the Nazis in Luxembourg. Everyone was upset by this lack of understanding."[265] She continues, "These broadcasts should never have been made. They had a bad effect on local morale and succeeded only in confusing the people of Luxembourg."[266] Her attitude towards the minister's speeches is that of an adult rather than a young teenager. Thill writes very differently of the speeches of the grand duchess: "It was different, however, when the voice of Her Royal Highness the Grand Duchess Charlotte came across the airways, strong and ringing with sincerity. She really was able to convince us that one day we would all be free again. In our heart of hearts we believed every word she said, but in the meantime we could hardly wait to be rid of the Germans, whose occupation of our country bore down more heavily on us day by day."[267] Charlotte's words lifted up the country, while the ministers often discouraged their fellow countrymen. [268]

[265] Ibid., 111.
[266] Ibid., 111.
[267] Ibid., 133.
[268] Here Thill corroborates what the *Leif Letzebuerger* documentary claims about Grand Duchess Charlotte's speeches to the Luxembourgers. *Leif Letzebuerger* states that Charlotte's ministers wrote and/or heavily edited most of her speeches, and this proves that they were concerned with keeping the monarchy intact. They made sure Charlotte was in tune with her people, even if they themselves were not.

Thill's memoir contains several accounts of active, obvious resistance to the Germans and the author tells the stories in a matter of fact way. "Everywhere the story was the same. Some of our young men resisted the German forced conscription and joined the underground resistance, the "Maquis," while yet others hid in forests and secret places prepared by their families and friends, thereby endangering their own lives and those of the people who protected them."[269] She states that the men and women who took risks to feed the boys who were hiding in the forests, avoiding the German draft are just as heroic as the *réfractaires* themselves. [270] Much like a child, she does not wonder about the awful consequences that the resisters faced, nor the honors that they may have received after the war. She tells the stories of resistance as she must have witnessed them as a child: as events that were part of her community.

The first such story is from early in the occupation: on a stormy November night in 1940, two French soldiers knocked on the Thill's door, after having escaped from a German POW camp. Milly's parents gave them food, coffee, rations for their journey, and before they left, dry socks and shoes and new hats. This exciting event obviously stayed with Milly and her brother, Marcel. After the French soldiers left, the children asked their parents question after question and after giving a few answers, the parents warned the children not to tell a living soul, especially not any children, because the parents would be thrown into jail. This scared the children so much that they kept their family's secret.[271] From Thill's account of this event, her parents did not hesitate for one moment before risking their lives to help the French POWs and the family prayed for the men's safety after they left.

[269] Thill, 132.
[270] Ibid., 56.
[271] Ibid., 39-43.

Another obvious act of resistance that Thill describes is the derailment of a train at Manternach in June 1942. She states that at the time, no one in her village believed the derailment was due to sabotage because "No one would dare move against the Germans at that time."[272] Milly's family worked at the station house and so they were immediately affected by this incident. The derailment was followed by an explosion that awoke the whole family. A train had derailed, several carriages were completely crushed, and rails were broken. All rail traffic along the line was immediately stopped and soon everyone in the small town was affected when the SS and German troops moved into the area to keep an eye on the crash site and investigate what may have caused the massive railway accident. The Germans' thorough search did not yield them any answers although they offered a 100,000 Reichsmark reward for information leading to the arrest of the saboteur.[273] Thill concludes, "The saboteur was never caught by the Germans. It was not until some years after the war, when he received an award from Prince Felix, that we discovered he had been a member of the Luxembourg Resistance from Grevenmacher. His courage may well have been heroic at that stage of the war, when the Germans seemed to be well on their way to final victory, but his heroism was at the expense of a guiltless village of some 200 people whose lives he had put in extreme danger. He was not considered a hero in Olingen."[274] Thill shows readers that local prejudices remained strong in Luxembourg after the war. Although she acknowledges the heroism of the saboteur's actions, she remains engulfed in her own feelings from the viewpoint of a

[272] Ibid., 74.
[273] Ibid., 73-79.
[274] Ibid., 79.

villager in Olingen. She does not even name the saboteur, who is probably Jos Hittesdorf, a member of the LRL.[275]

Thill, during her narration of the derailment states, "In September the Germans started mass deportation to Germany of all Luxembourgers suspected of anti-German activities anywhere in the country. It was not in fact specifically connected with the derailment in Olingen, though that is not how people in the village saw it at the time, including my own family."[276] In fact this policy of the Germans was a response to the General Strike, but since this event did not affect Thill personally, she does not relate it. Much like Thill-Somin-Nicholson and Adams's stories, the "big" events in the country were often overlooked in favor of those smaller incidents of the authors' everyday lives.

Thill, in passing, shows readers the grey area between resistance and collaboration, where many Luxembourgers operated during the occupation years. Still speaking of the train derailment incident, Thill states that no one from her village or from Olingen was taken away after the increase in arrests and imprisonments in September 1942. "We owed our good fortune to the abovementioned 'Ortsbauernfuehrer' [sic], who stood up for the village under close Nazi interrogation and defended us against all accusations of implication in the act of sabotage. Unfortunately, no one spoke up for him after the war when he was thrown into jail."[277] This man is mentioned again later in the book when he warns Thill's neighbors to be more careful about openly listening to the BBC. As seen in Adams's story, after the liberation, people who were found guilty of any degree of collaboration were imprisoned. Most likely, a few good acts would not

[275] http://www.cna.public.lu/fr/film-tv/productions-nationales/filmographie/documentaires-long/heim-ins-reich/dossier-de-presse-en-def-reduced.pdf, page 13. Accessed January 21, 2015.
[276] Thill, 79.
[277] Ibid., 79.

save the *Ortsbauernführer* from jail, especially since Thill tells readers the man was a native German.

Thill's neighbor "the miller" and his wife and nephew are discussed throughout her memoir. She mentions off-hand several activities in which they participated that could be classified as resistance, and later in the book an entire chapter details their various resistance activities. First, the couple had a radio and listened to the BBC whenever possible. This was especially important Sundays at 9:00 a.m. when the grand duchess, Prince Felix, or a member of the exiled government would broadcast a message specifically for their people. The miller, because of the lock and mill pond around his mill, was able to provide electricity for his residence even when the Germans cut off electricity to the rest of the country because of these broadcasts. However, so many people began coming to the mill to listen to the BBC there, that the Germans caught wind and made a sudden appearance one Sunday morning. Fortunately for all the Luxembourgers there, Emil, the miller's nephew saw the Gestapo coming and no one was found out.

Unknown to Thill until after the country's liberation, the miller and his wife participated in an act of resistance far more dangerous than listening to the BBC. They were hiding a Luxembourg deserter from the *Wehrmacht*, Josy Puetz from Oberanven, in the mill. This young man was on a month's leave from the Russian front in February of 1944, and he decided not to return. Thill states that two of the man's family members had been asked if they would hide him, but they refused "because to do so risked imprisonment or even death."[278] The miller of Olingen, a distant cousin of Josy, and his wife agreed to hide the man immediately. In this story, readers also learn that it was

[278] Ibid., 113.

especially dangerous for Josy to be hidden at the mill because the "farmers from all around came with their horse-drawn wagons to have their grain milled, not only for their own families but also for undercover delivery all over the country."[279] Josy also knew "the miller supplied the flour for bread for the Luxembourg boys of conscription age hidden from the Germans in the forest of "Hondsbësch" (the dogs' forest) in Differdange. He could endanger the entire network."[280] One boy had previously been hidden at the mill, but had left because of the pressure. The miller and his wife were resisters, not just on a small-scale. They risked their lives for Josy Puetz and the other unnamed *réfractaire*. They helped famers supply food to the deserters in their regions and they gave their own flour to the hidden boys in their vicinity. It is unclear if this couple was ever honored for these activities, and since Thill does not give the names of the miller and his wife, it is very difficult to find out. Although Thill mentions her surprise after the liberation when she learned of Josy Puetz, she does not emphasize the risks taken by the miller or the heroism of his family.

Thill also includes many lesser-known resistance activities, several of which are related to the rationing system, and the different ways that Milly's family and others challenged this system. Although not as dangerous as hiding *réfractaires*, these "smaller" activities are still seen as resistance by many Luxembourgers, because they did undermine the Germans' authority in the country.

Throughout her book, Thill brings up her Catholic faith and reports on the impact that the occupation had on Luxembourg Catholics and their churches. Due to her enduring belief in Catholicism, she vividly remembers events concerning her parish

[279] Ibid., 114.
[280] Ibid., 115.

priest. For example, once Gierens, the newly-appointed Nazi schoolteacher, began mocking the Bible, Father Zeimes retaliated by telling the children in Sunday School how important and true the Bible stories were. He was arrested by the Gestapo shortly afterwards and placed in a concentration camp. Later, in a chapter titled "An Act of Defiance," Thill states that by going to attend the Octave Mass in the cathedral in Luxembourg City, the German soldiers knew "our religious procession was more than it seemed, a form of silent insubordination, an act of defiance."[281] The religious procession, unique as it was to Luxembourg, was seen as a way for Luxembourgers to cling to and assert their independence from Germany.

Thill's story about her brother Marcel's first communion outfit illustrates the deprivation of the war on all Luxembourgers and the power of the black market and the bartering system.

> As usual, in Luxembourg at that time, my parents had to resort to the most popular means of exchanges in wartime use – black market barter…They had a calf secretly slaughtered at the mill and secretly sent the meat along with the flour to the underground resistance in the forest at Differdange. After a few days, some top-quality dark-blue wool material appeared on the table at the mill and was soon transformed by Tin the tailor into two handsome suits to be worn on the big occasion by my brother and his friend Emil from the mill.…For Marcel's black lacquered shoes and silk armband, some chickens and geese had to make the

[281] Ibid., 137.

> ultimate sacrifice and my mother sent a rabbit, eggs, and butter [for a hat for herself]. [282]

The danger of these activities is not noted by Thill. Also, the way that Thill tells the story, readers do not get the impression that her parents' primary goal was to help the underground resistance. Rather, her parents really wanted the proper outfit for their son's first communion and they simply did what they needed to obtain this outfit.

Thill devotes an entire chapter to the illegal slaughter of a pig in February 1943 when her father was home on leave from his railway job in Germany. The entire family helped in the illegal slaughter: mother, father, son, and daughter. Another friend, Knaeppjes Leo helped and Uncle Lou, the other worker at the railroad house, also knew about the act. The story is told in Thill's characteristic easygoing style, but the family did put itself in real danger by the illegal slaughtering of the pig. When the weighing master, Mr. Birebam, whose job it was to "weigh the slaughtered animals, note their weight and pass on the information to the German food office"[283], realized the family's scale had been tampered with, he could have reported the family to the authorities, but instead he just reweighed all the parts of the official animal and turned those numbers in to the food office. Thill reports that her mother then offered Birebam a handful of cigars and the weighing master finally accepted her father's offer of schnapps. Fortunately for the Thills, Birebam never suspected about the other pig, the one that was illegally slaughtered (because it was not reported to the authorities at all). Thill does not note whether Birebam was a Luxembourger or a German. It did not matter to her and her family, it seems. All that mattered was that he did not turn the family in for adjusting

[282] Ibid., 62-63.
[283] Ibid., 100.

their scale and trying to cheat the authorities. The reason that Leo had tampered with the scale was to have the family report a smaller amount of pork and therefore have less meat ration tickets withheld.[284]

Thill, again due to her focus on the rationing, talks about her family raising rabbits and says, "Under the prevailing Nazi laws, some of the names we gave our rabbits were clearly seditious, such as Ribbentrop…and Kratzenberg, Luxembourg's notorious Gauleiter's right-hand man, whose name we bestowed on a poor unfortunate rabbit whose yellowish coat reminded us of the hated yellow Nazi uniforms worn by Luxembourg traitors, the '*Gielemaenecher*.'"[285] It is interesting how a girl of twelve or thirteen was familiar enough with the political goings on to understand that they were naming their rabbits after politicians and this was "seditious". Although "no one in Luxembourg tried to get around" the laws on keeping count of chickens and eggs because "the consequences would have been out of all proportion to the offence",[286] Milly's family did keep half a dozen chickens secretly that they did not report to the Germans. The main problem with keeping any chickens at all was finding enough corn and grain to feed them. However, Milly's father worked for local farmers on his days off and got extra feed for his chickens in this way. The bartering system truly was extensively used during this time.

Thill describes taking trips to Luxembourg City to see Mrs. Jacquemart, a family friend, whose son was imprisoned. She would secretly bring the Jacquemarts eggs, butter, flour, and vegetables. Other than the vegetables, these extra rations were received by the Thills as payment for the work they did on the local farms. Mrs. Jacquemart, by

[284] Ibid., 94-104.
[285] Ibid., 121.
[286] Ibid., 125.

bribing one of the guards at the prison, often managed to get these rations to her son. The rations he received in prison were very meager, and Thill states that Mrs. Jacquemart was very anxious for the Thill's gift of food.[287] This story is different from most of Thill's because here the illegal deliveries of food from the Thills to the Jacquemarts are given without anything received in return. Instead of the bartering system seen as usual, here readers see friends taking care of each other in the hard times of the occupation.

Thill has a chapter titled "A World of Make-Believe" where she discusses the German propaganda in Luxembourg. The "*Winterhilfswerk*" is one example of Luxembourgers being forced to participate in German organizations, much to their shame. Without giving specific dates or even a range of dates, Thill says that at first, Luxembourgers refused to take part in the collection, but "The Nazis were notorious for their methods of 'persuading' people in their power to cooperate with them."[288] The Nazis kept meticulous records of who helped collect, who gave donations, and who flatly refused to cooperate with the *Winterfhilfswerk*. She states that those unwilling to help were put on a blacklist and that put them "at serious risk of ending up in prison, being deported or sent to a concentration camp."[289] Many then agreed to pay when asked and others became collectors themselves. "What else could we do? In those dreadful dark days of Nazi occupation, when the war seemed to be going their way and liberation was only a dream, all we wanted to do was keep the Germans off our backs."[290] Thill's account reveals many different acts of resistance, but she nevertheless shows readers that sometimes Luxembourgers had no choice. The lack of choice came from the gravity of

[287] Ibid., 141.
[288] Ibid., 149.
[289] Ibid., 149.
[290] Ibid., 149.

the punishment in proportion to the act of "collaboration." For most readers, this seems reasonable, however, as seen in the *Alweraje* newsletter, *Ons Zeidong: O'ni Maulkuerf*,[291] this resistance organization urged Luxembourgers to hold fast and abstain from even the smallest acts of cooperation with the Germans. The resistance looked at the consequences of a population supporting this effort of the Germans rather than the consequences faced by individual Luxembourgers.

Milly, much like Adams, remembers mandatory events put on for students where the Germans glorified their Nazi ideology and tried to indoctrinate the youth of Luxembourg. Her class went to an exhibit titled 'Soviet paradise' in Limpertsberg that was supposed to teach students how primitive and savage the Russians were. The exhibit was also designed to frighten the students and Milly left thoroughly scared of meeting a "wild" Russian. However, for her, the forced membership in the Hitler Youth was the worst part of the Nazi propaganda. She states that most Luxembourgers avoided joining until 1942 when employees would face consequences if their children were not enrolled. Resistance against joining this organization was so strong that she and her school mates from Olingen were accused of "collaboration" by the farm boys nearby who had not yet joined. However, when the deportations began, the farm boys "quickly found themselves 'collaborating' with us" and going to the meetings each week.[292] Later, Thill notes that when she started her teacher training after the war ended, she was enrolled with thirty-four other girls, aged fourteen to twenty. Many of the students were girls who had not attended their German-run schools for the past two years because they had refused to join

[291] *Ons Zeidong: O'ni Maulkuerf* 18, June 1942.
[292] Thill, 152.

the Hitler Youth.[293] Despite the Germans' attempts to indoctrinate the youth of Luxembourg with Nazi ideology, many Luxembourgers resisted these efforts. According to both Thill and Thill-Somin-Nicholson, the Luxembourgers that did participate in the Hitler Youth did so defiantly, without believing a word of what their leaders were teaching them.

These four books teach English-language readers a great deal about the effect that the German occupation had on Luxembourgers. The occupation was not simply a military or political action; for over four years ordinary Luxembourgers of all ages lived their daily lives in the realm of a restricted, rationed world. Each day, especially for adults, could bring a difficult choice that had to be made, yet could have life-altering consequences.

Father Bernard, Adams, Thill-Somin-Nicholson, and Thill all show the many ways in which Luxembourgers resisted. Although Luxembourg had several resistance organizations, much of the resistance against the German occupation was done on an individual basis. The Germanization of the country was opposed by most Luxembourgers and as they sought to retain their identity as "Luxembourgers" these people could not help but resist the occupation of their country. The authors also illustrate the compromises that many Luxembourgers made, regardless of their patriotism or actual loyalty to their country. Readers also realize that "all Luxembourgers" did not resist, as some would like to believe, but they also cannot deny the fact that under the harsh conditions of the German occupation, sometimes Luxembourgers truly had no choice but to accept and conform to some German policies.

[293] Ibid., 178.

CHAPTER VII

A GENERATION LATER: REMEMBERING THE RESISTANCE

As described in the chapters above, the years of German occupation brought about many ways to resist the Germans. Directly after the war, and for many years thereafter, Luxembourgers were honored for their participation in resisting the German occupying forces. Many of these individuals were honored by organizations established by former resistance members. However, the Luxembourg government was involved in creating definitions of resistance as well.

A generation after the Second World War's end, newspapers in Luxembourg were still publishing articles about resistance ceremonies, monuments, and individual resisters, and the way in which resistance was defined changed throughout the years. Newspaper articles about specific ceremonies honoring resisters or monuments dedicated to the resistance tell more about the country and its view of how its history should be remembered, than about the actual resistance movement. The two newspapers with the largest distribution in the country are the *Luxemburger Wort* and the *Tageblatt*; however, there are several smaller papers in the country, such as *d'Letzebueger Land*, *Le Jeudi*, and *Letzebueger Journal*. Most articles in Luxembourg newspapers are written in French or German and people from countries around Luxembourg certainly do read these articles, especially those working or living in the country. Several of the editorials analyzed here

are written in Luxembourgish, showing that these are specifically for a Luxembourgian audience.

In 1967, the government of Luxembourg formed the *Conseil National de la Résistance* (CNR) whose object was to honor in various ways all the victims of the German occupation.[294] In 2000, the *Comité directeur pour le Souvenir de la Résistance* (CDSR) began to take over some aspects of Luxembourg's memory work on the resistance[295]. A couple of years later, in 2002, the CNR was officially supplanted by the CDSR.[296] These bodies, which each worked under the government's jurisdiction, were responsible for the ceremonies for Luxembourg's National Day of Resistance. This annual ceremony changed as the government entities responsible for its existence changed. Newspapers articles covering the ceremonies surrounding the National Day of Resistance describe resistance for Luxembourg in various ways and illustrate how the country wanted to identify itself in opposition to the German occupation.

In late February 1997, Luxembourg celebrated its first National Day of Resistance. An early article about this newly-established day of celebration is in Luxembourgish in the *Luxemburger Wort*. The author begins by pointing out that the *Conseil National de la Résistance* was established thirty years before the National Day of Resistance is finally being celebrated. This Luxembourgish editorial stated that the purpose of the day is to remember all of the Luxembourgers who died, either in

---

[294] Victimes d'actes illégaux de l'occupant accessed October 16, 2014, http://www.proyectos.cchs.csic.es/transitionaljustice/sites/default/files/maps/info/compensations/luxembourg_compensation_law_1967.pdf and Häftlingsverbände in Belgien, den Niederlanden und Luxemburg," accessed October 16, 2014, http://media.offenes-archiv.de/benelux.pdf .

[295] ""Das Andenken an die Resistenz wird bewahrt bleiben" [The Memory of the Resistance will be Upheld], LW- Gespräch mit CNR-Präsident Aloyse Raths und Resistenz-Kommissar Eugène Muller," *Luxemburger Wort*, March 1, 1998.

[296] http://www.chd.lu/wps/PA_RoleEtendu/MergeServlet?lot=C-2002-O-022-0002 accessed October 16, 2014

concentration camps, in "*Emsiddlong*" (relocation), or in some other way gave their lives for their country. This was the only description of the sort of "resistance" to be commemorated. In other words, Luxembourgers who died because of the German policies and terror in their country during the Nazi occupation of May 1940 through September 1944 will be honored as part of the national resistance, regardless of their actual participation in the resistance. Simply by dying because of the German occupation, Luxembourgers resisted. However, there was no description of the various ways in which Luxembourgers actually participated in resistance against the Germans, nor is there any remembrance of resistance members that are still living.

The article then listed the ceremonies that will take place and invited all those who were affected by the death of resistance members to attend these ceremonies. Again, death was honored and remembered, but no call was made to the surviving members of the resistance. The ceremony began with the "Hinzert Mass" (a mass said for all those that died at the concentration camp in Hinzert), followed by a ceremony at the Hinzert Cross in Limpertsberg, Luxembourg where Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish blessings were given for the dead, followed by military and national hymns. A reception in Luxembourg City concluded the day of ceremonies.[297] This article appeared a week prior to the ceremony and the three articles written directly after the event in the *Luxemburger Wort*, *Tageblatt*, and *Journal* simply reported on the celebrations that took place on the first National Day of Resistance. An outsider would have no idea what sort of resistance Luxembourgers participated in just by reading these newspaper articles. They would, however, have an idea of the importance of the dead in Luxembourgian society. By not

[297] ""Journée national de la Résistance" an "Hinzerter Mass"[National Day of Resistance and Hinzert Mass]," *Luxembourger Wort*, February 17, 1997.

listing any specific actions that Luxembourgers took to resist, Luxembourg is shown as a martyr of the German occupation rather than an actor.

The following year's reports from the *Luxemburger Wort* and the *Tageblatt* were more descriptive regarding the varied forms of resistance within the country, but there was still an emphasis on those who died. On March 2, 1998, the *Wort* described the importance for the date of the day of remembrance: to honor those twenty-three leaders of the Luxembourg resistance that died on February 25, 1944 in Hinzert. Furthermore, participants in this year's ceremony were also asked to remember the twenty-one strikers that were killed in September 1942, and all the other resistance members who lost their lives because they stood up to the German occupying forces.[298] The *Tageblatt* article about the ceremony related statistics from Aloyse Raths (a leading member of the resistance and current president of the *Conseil National de la Resistance*): 1,568 Luxembourgers died in death camps and during resettlement, 890 Jewish citizens died, and 243 patriots died (some by execution) in imprisonment under the Third Reich. Raths' statistics focused on numbers of deaths, rather than numbers of resistance members, or even simply numbers of those imprisoned due to anti-German activities.[299] Both articles also described the ceremony (which is very similar to the first year's). Although there were some more details about who died during the German occupation, the only specific resistance activity that was mentioned is participation in the General Strike of 1942. This act, along with its twenty-one martyrs, is the most well-known form

[298] "D'Undenken un déi héichhalen, déi fir äis geblutt hun [To Respect the Memory of those who Bled for Us]," *Luxemburger Wort*, March 2, 1998.
[299] "Überlebende und Autoritäten gedenken der Opfer des Widerstands [Survivors and Authorities Remember the Victims of the Resistance]," *Tageblatt*, March 2, 1998.

of collective resistance. The countless individual actions taken by Luxembourgers against the Germans are not noted.

In 1999 the newspaper articles about the National Day of Resistance offered readers much the same information as in the prior years; however, in 2000, for the fourth year of the ceremonies, *Le Jeudi* published an interview on February 24 that complemented the day of ceremonies dedicated to the resistance. Here Aloyse Raths, president of the CNR, described the activities of the resistance and provided many definitions of resistance. He portrayed the Luxembourg resistance as both unique and independent. The French maquis, one of the most famous international symbols of resistance, was neither a template for, nor a forerunner to, Luxembourg resistance movements. Raths argued that Luxembourg resistance began at the moment of occupation (although he does not elaborate on the forms that resistance took at this point in time). He then discussed the fear of German reprisals that caused so many Luxembourgers to join the VdB. It was only after this that resistance organizations began to give the population hope and eventually began to counteract the German presence in the small country.[300]

Raths described the resistance creating and distributing leaflets and organizing the *Dräimol Letzebuerg* Referendum and the General Strike of August 1942. Furthermore, the resistance supported the families of those Luxembourgers deported and/or killed by the Germans, Luxembourg deserters and *réfractaires*, as well as downed Allied airmen. They also created channels for those who needed to escape the country, many of whom then (re)joined Allied forces. The resistance also participated in espionage and

[300] "…d'abord pour donner à la population un peu d'espoir et de courage, puis pour contrecarrer les projets allemands dans la région." In "La peur des bottes à clous [The Fear of the Nail-Clad Boots]," *Le Jeudi*, February 24, 2000.

smuggling intelligence to the Allies. Finally, some Luxembourgers did join the French maquis in fighting the Germans. Raths gives an overarching description of resistance that is in direct contrast to simply remembering all those who died during the years of German occupation. Rath's description of Luxembourg resistance is varied and international in scope.[301]

In addition to Rath's interview in *Le Jeudi*, the *Luxemburger Wort* reported on 2000's celebration of the National Day of Resistance. This essay was entitled "A Message Delivered Even for the Youth" and it briefly described the history of Luxembourg resistance movements and the initiatives of the Germans to quash these movements. Furthermore, this year's ceremony differed from the prior years' traditional religious and patriotic ceremonies and added a piece from the youth theatre group, Namasté. The young Namasté actors of 2000 visually depicted what the youth of the occupation years endured and supported. Their routine included members reciting stories of their relatives from the occupation years.[302] With the introduction of Namasté to the memorial ceremonies of the resistance, Luxembourg began exploring how the youth of today would be taught the story of Luxembourg's occupation years, specifically its resistance to the occupation. Luxembourg sought to remember the resistance in a way that would engage the country's younger generation, and therefore moved away from simply remembering those martyred by the Germans. This development began in 2000 for the National Day of Resistance, but can be seen in other memory work as well.

The trend of engaging the youth explicitly continued as the 2001 National Day of Resistance was celebrated in schools. An newspaper article from *Luxemburger Wort*

[301] "La peur des bottes à clous," *Le Jeudi*, February 24, 2000.
[302] "Un message délivré également à la jeunesse [A Message also Given to the Youth]," *Luxemburger Wort*, February 28, 2000.

stated that this year's celebration focused on the deserters and *réfractaires*, who were most often youths.[303] Just as last year's Namasté act would have interested the youth more than a mass or national hymn, students would relate to the nineteen- to twenty-four-year-olds refusing to join or deserting the *Wehrmacht* more than they could identify with the older, working-class strikers. Middle school and high school students could identify with college-age Luxembourgers who refused to fight for the German *Wehrmacht*, but these same students may not have much in common with a miner who wanted better working conditions and therefore refused to work for the German-controlled steel industry any longer. Many deserters and *réfractaires* survived the war, which helped to move the focus of the ceremony away from the dead and toward the living.

Also, in 2002, CDSR replaced CRN as the public's representative body for all the organizations of resistance. It was given the responsibility of safeguarding the memory of the resistance. Erny Gillen, President of the CDSR, stated that the new generation needed to be taught about the resistance of Luxembourg before the generation of resisters all passed away.[304] New ways of remembering needed to be sought.[305] It seems that before 2002, talks were underway about changing the National Day of Resistance as the CDSR began working with(in) the CNR.[306] The CDSR's new way of engaging the youth, which began in 2000, would take hold and continue the following years.

In 2002 the *Journal* outlined the National Day of Resistance and focused on the crimes committed against the Luxembourg people during the years of the German

---

[303] ""Journée nationale de la Résistance" an de Schoule gefuerdert [National Day of Resistance is celebrated in Schools]," *Luxemburger Wort*, April 2, 2001.
[304] "Et dauert nët méi laang, dann ass kee méi vun eis do" in "Jongen, et wor nët fir näicht [Young Men, it wasn't for Nothing]," *Tageblatt*, March 5, 2001.
[305] "Jongen, et wor nët fir näicht," *Tageblatt*, March 5, 2001.
[306] ""Das Andenken"".

occupation. That the youth was forcibly enrolled to fight in the *Wehrmacht* and that those who resisted the Germans were persecuted for their resistance activities were specially mentioned as the worst crimes against the Luxembourg population.[307] Again, there was a focus on the youthfulness of the resistance members. Here there was also an argument that not only the dead should be honored; rather all those who resisted deserve recognition. Resistance activities were not defined by the author; the Luxembourg people were given credit for a broad range of activities which all deserved equal recognition.

In 2003, the CDSR further changed the definition of resistance by focusing this year's remembrance on the twenty-three leaders of the resistance that were killed at Hinzert on February 25, 1944, rather than, as the CNR called for in 1997, all those who died at the hands of the Germans during the occupation years.[308] The following year, the *Tageblatt* article about the 2004 National Day of Resistance was very similar. This year the twenty-three leaders were honored and their ages were specifically mentioned: the youngest was twenty-two and the oldest was forty-six.[309] This circumscribed the definition of resistance around the leaders of the movements and pointed to the youthfulness of these leaders. Although these principals of the resistance organizations were from the LVL (*Letzeburger Vollekslegio'n)*, LFB (*Lëtzeburger Freihétsbewegong*), LRL (*Lëtzeburger Ro'de Lé'w*), and other organizations that participated in active resistance (for example, smuggling and hiding *réfractaires* and/or Allied soldiers,

[307] "Souvenirs des crimes contre l'humanité [Remembering the Crimes against Humanity]," *Journal*, February 26, 2002.
[308] "Si hu Jo zur Fräitheet gesot a sech dofir agesat [They said Yes to Freedom and dedicated Themselves to its Cause]," *Luxemburger Wort*, February 24, 2003.
[309] "Erinnern wir uns: Es war vor genau 60 Jahren…,[We Remember: It was exactly 60 Years Ago…]" *Tageblatt*, March 1, 2004.

producing underground newspapers, providing false identification cards, etc.), there were no definitions of what it meant for Luxembourgers to resist their German occupiers. Also, resisters acting independently were not mentioned, ignoring the theme that was often seen that *all* Luxembourgers resisted on some level.

These articles show that the definitions of what it meant to be a part of the resistance in Luxembourg changed over the course of just a few years. When the National Day of Remembrance was initially created, the CNR wanted to honor all Luxembourgers who died during the years of occupation. They concluded that if the Germans punished a Luxembourger and this resulted in death, that Luxembourger must have been a patriot who resisted and his or her death should be honored today. When the CDSR became involved in Luxembourg's remembrance of resistance, it changed the definition of resistance from martyr to actor, by describing some of the specific activities in which resistors participated. The CDSR emphasized the fact that since the survivors and eye witnesses of the German occupation were aging and soon all would have passed away, the younger generation needed to carry on the memory of the Luxembourg resistance. This was partially based on the country owning its history. If Luxembourg did not begin to tell its story of the German occupation years, someone else would, and they might create definitions for the Luxembourg people that they do not accept. Thus, the CDSR often emphasized the youthfulness of the resistance members, particularly the deserters and *réfractaires*.

Although the National Day of Remembrance really began focusing on the youth's perception and engagement of the country's history of resistance in 2000, other articles had discussed the importance of Luxembourg's new generation remembering this history

prior to that year. In 1997 a book was published titled *D'Krichjoeren 1940-45 zu Letzebuerg: Wei eng Jugend de Krich erlieft huet* (*The War Years 1940-45 in Luxembourg: How a Youth Survived the War*). No author is given, but the book was put together due to backing from the Minister of Youth in Luxembourg. For this book the editors (the Club des Jeunes ELL) interviewed 20 people/resisters from Redingen and published the stories about their activities during the years of the German occupation. Since these interviewees, although now advanced in years, were often quite young at the time of their resistance activities, their stories should resonate with today's youth, many of whom have probably only heard stories about the years of occupation from aged relatives.[310]

This call for the youth of today to remember the resistance continued in articles about places in Luxembourg that sought to memorialize the country's resistance. Today, the Musée national de la Résistance in Esch-Alzette and the Mémorial de la Déportation in Hollerich represent the two largest museums and memorials dedicated to the resistance. While these two locations may show tourists about the Luxembourg resistance, other, smaller memorials set up in various locations throughout the country cater more to a Luxembourg audience. These memorials represent different aspects of the Luxembourg resistance and give insight into the way in which Luxembourgers want their legacy of resistance memorialized.

Several articles about places of remembrance in Kaundorf, Remich, Düdelingen, Esch, and Rumelage shed light on the way in which Luxembourg physically dedicated spaces to the legacy of the resistance. These monuments range from reconstructed

[310] "Wéi eng Jugend de Krich erlieft huet [How a Youth Survived the War]," *Luxembourger Wort*, February 27, 1997.

underground bunkers to stone monuments and plaques. Even in a country as small as Luxembourg, the various forms of its resistance movements are remembered in different ways.

Judging by newspaper coverage, the opening of the Kaundorf bunker as a memorial to the resistance was one of the best publicized events recognizing the Luxembourg resistance. Three newspapers, the *Républicain Lorrain*, the *Journal*, and the *Tageblatt*, wrote about the coming opening and encouraged Luxembourgers to attend this event. On November 5, 1987, the *Républicain Lorrain* discussed how the Kaundorf Bunker was a symbol of resistance for all Luxembourgers. The article opened with the mention of bunkers that were created throughout the country during the Nazi occupation of World War II. These were created by resisters and utilized by the *réfractaires*. Luxembourgers prided themselves on creating these bunkers to spare their young men from fighting against their own country in the *Wehrmacht*. The *Républicain Lorrain* commented on who will be at the inauguration ceremony: government representatives, resistance organizations, and hopefully, the youth.[311]

That same day, the *Journal* wrote a similar editorial and also mentioned the hope that the youth would be present for the ceremony. This newspaper also printed an invitation to all those "*Bunkerjongen*" ("bunker boys"), stating that it was impossible for the country to know about and invite all those whose lives were affected by these bunkers.[312] The *Tageblatt* also wrote about the upcoming inauguration ceremony. This editorial stated that these bunkers from the Nazi occupation period were now classified as

[311] "Le bunker de Kaundorf: un symbole de la Résistance [The Bunker in Kaundorf: A Symbol of the Resistance]," *Républicain Lorrain*, November 5, 1987.
[312] "Renovierter Bunker in Kaundorf wird eingeweiht [Renovated Bunker in Kaundorf will be Inaugurated]," *Journal*, November 5, 1987.

a monuments by the "*Service de Sites et Monuments Nationaux*". The *Tageblatt* newspaper article stated that these sites served to thank all those resisters who in some way risked their lives to save the Luxembourg youth. The sites being dedicated now would determine how the next generation of Luxembourgers remembered the time of the Nazi occupation. The *Tageblatt* placed special emphasis on the fact that it was the youth that were rescued by these bunkers; therefore, today's youth should pay their respects.[313] It also implied that all Luxembourgers resisted by helping the youth.[314] These three articles about the upcoming ceremony all emphasized the importance of the youth attending the ceremony. This is ten years before the National Day of Resistance began to be celebrated in 1997, when seemingly no attempt was made by the CNR to attract the younger generation to its ceremonies.

The ceremony for the unveiling of the renovated bunker consisted of speeches by the minister of cultural affairs and the head of the organization that initiated the renovation (François Huberty), a blessing from the curate at Bauschleiden, and musical performances. This was followed by a reception at a local café. The *gendarmerie*, fire department, and many resistance organizations were all invited.[315] After the ceremony, the *Républicain Lorrain* had a follow-up article discussing the inauguration. The article gave a list of all the organizations that attended the ceremony. These organizations represented, among others, deportees, *réfractaires*, *enrôlées de force*, and resisters. Judging by the groups that came to the Kaundorf bunker memorial site, these bunkers

[313] "Wou am Krich Jongen verstoppt waren: Bunker renoviert [During the War, Where the Youth were Hidden: Bunker Renovated]," *Tageblatt*, November 6, 1987.
[314] "…zum Dank an alle Patrioten, die einen Teil unserer "Jongen" vor den Nazis retten konnten." in "Wou am Krich Jongen verstoppt waren: Bunker renoviert," *Tageblatt*, November 6, 1987.
[315] "Le bunker restauré de Kaundorf inauguré: Des refuges qui n'existaient que grâce à la solidarité [The Renovated Bunker in Kaundorf inaugurated: Refugees who only Existed because of the Solidarity of those Who Helped Them]," *Républicain Lorrain*, November 8, 1987.

really did represent the Luxembourg resistance. All the resistance organizations remembered and honored the bunkers which were mostly just used by *réfractaires*. The article then discussed the threat that the bunkers and the youth which used them posed to the German occupiers. The *Sicherheitdienst* (Security Service, SS) in Diekirch demanded reinforcements to deal with the problem of the estimated 160 deserters in the district. Furthermore, in the summer of 1943, the Germans intensified their fight against these Luxembourgers and conducted raids, after which many *réfractaires* and deserters were executed. Fortunately, however, most Luxembourg *réfractaires* did survive the war. The Minister of Cultural Affairs stated that these bunkers were not just in the Bassin Minier region[316] (the southern part of the country bordering France and containing the cities of Esch-sur-Alzette and Dudelange) and he talked about the unity and solidarity among the survivors that has lasted to this day.[317] This article about the ceremony differed from several of the articles about the National Day of Resistance. At the bunker site, lives were remembered and actions were honored. This is in stark contrast to the reporting on the dead on the National Day of Resistance in 1997 and later.

Here in the articles about the Bunker of Kaundorf, readers see the unity of resistance organizations. Although many different types of resistance organizations attended the ceremony, there was not one that was elevated over any of the others. The youth were also called to remember the Nazi occupation by attending the ceremony. The youth may be particularly moved by these bunkers because it was the youth of 1940-1945 that mostly used them. These newspaper articles also sought to show that the

[316] "…s'est réjoui de cette inititiative, grâce à laquelle l'histoire concrete des bunkers ne reste plus confinée au basin minier…" in "Le bunker restauré de Kaundorf inauguré: Des refuges quie n'existaient que grâce à la solidarité," *Républicain Lorrain*, November 8, 1987.
[317] "Le bunker restauré de Kaundorf inauguré: Des refuges quie n'existaient que grâce à la solidarité," *Républicain Lorrain*, November 8, 1987.

Luxembourg resistance was widespread by stating that Kaundorf was just one of many bunkers around the country. Furthermore, the essay implied that most Luxembourgers were involved in helping deserters and *réfractaires*, and were therefore involved in the resistance. They also contend that the *réfractaires* were a serious problem for the Germans. In other words, however small Luxembourg may be, it did manage to slow down the Nazi war machine, and its resistance was not without effect. The reporting of the Kaundorf bunker's inauguration defined Luxembourg's resistance as unified, widespread, and effective.

In 1995 the *Tageblatt* published an editorial about a stone monument that would become the centerpiece of a new "Place of Resistance" in Remich. Although the Luxembourgish subtitle stated that the monument's purpose was to remember "the horrible times", the article gave absolutely no indication of what resistance was and whom or what the resisters were fighting.[318] Certainly there was more to be said about a bunker than a stone monument, but this article could say much more. However, there was no mention of the types of resistance in Remich or even what the "horrible times" entailed.

In April of 1999, a "Place of Resistance" was unveiled in Düdelingen and the *Tageblatt* reported on this monument as well. Albert Theis, the President of the Veterans of Dachau wanted to remember all the people who resisted the Germans under the Nazi occupation. He stated that if a country's history was not remembered, the

[318] "Eine "Place de la Résistance" für Remich: Zur Erinnerung an schreckliche Zeiten [A "Place of Resistance" for Remich: To Remember the Horrible Times]," *Tageblatt*, July 2, 1995.

country would be doomed to repeat it and this was why a monument was so important.[319] This monument in Düdelingen (which was not described in the newspaper account) will remember all the victims of the war. Theis also argued that by remembering the war in Europe, which occurred only fifty-nine years ago, it would encourage tolerance among people today. The French text on the monument read "Luxembourg courageously resisted the Nazi regime under the German occupation of 1940-45. Remember."[320] No definitions of resistance were given; however, the case was made that all Luxembourgers resisted. By leaving out specific resistance activities, the city of Düdelingen was able to claim that all took part in resisting the German occupation.

Later in 1999 a newspaper article was published about a memorial in Esch dedicated to the Luxembourg maquisards; the monument was even designed by a former Luxembourg maquisard. Although the essay was about Luxembourg resistance, it illuminated ties to the French resistance. The essay stated that after the August 30, 1942 order for conscription, 532 Luxembourgers went to France to join the maquis in the armed fight against the Nazis. Other Luxembourgers later deserted the *Wehrmacht* and escaped to France as well. These maquis also assisted with the Allied landing of June 1944. Namasté was at this unveiling, showing that the youth was targeted again. It was only the following year, in 2000, that Namasté began presenting at the National Day of Resistance ceremonies. Like the newspaper articles about the bunker, this editorial showed the impact that the Luxembourg resistance had during the Second World War.

---

[319] "Wer sich seiner Geschichte nicht erinnert, ist dazu verurteilt sie noch einmal zu erleben." in "Wider das Vegessen: Einweihung de "place de la Résistance" in Düdelingen [Against Forgetting: Unveiling of "Place of Resistance" in Düdelingen]," *Tageblatt*, April 26, 1999.
[320] "Wider das Vegessen: Einweihung de "place de la Résistance" in Düdelingen," *Tageblatt*, April 26, 1999.

Luxembourgers were liberated by the Allies, so to say that the Luxembourg maquis helped the Allied landing meant that they took part in their own liberation.[321]

In 2001 another editorial linked Luxembourg's resistance to the French resistance. The city of Rumelange had finally decided on a permanent location for its 1981 monument to resistance. Twenty years ago UPAFIL (*Union Nationale des Passeurs Filiéristes Résistants Luxembourgeois)* decided to locate a monument in Rumelange, a Luxembourg town close to the border of France, because it was a "hot spot" of resistance. The type(s) of resistance in which the citizens of Rumelange participated were not listed. In fact, the memorial was titled "Jericho" because of an operation of the same name by an RAF bombing of the prison d'Amiens, (located in German-occupied France). Because of this bombing, many French resisters managed to escape imprisonment and pending execution. Rumelange, the "hot spot" of resistance was given no actual credit for the Jericho operation. It is unclear if this border town helped smuggle resisters and Allies across to France or if it hid Allied airmen, or did something else entirely. Readers only learn about the RAF mission and the French resistance members who were helped by it.[322] Therefore, this article presented a fluid, international description of resistance in Luxembourg. It also implied that it took more than just Luxembourg resistance in the struggle against the Nazis.

It is possible that these local stories did not elaborate on a city's specific resistance activities because people living there (and reading these newspapers) already knew their city's history. These newspaper articles show that Luxembourgers were

[321] "Einweihung eines Monuments für die "Maquisards [Unveiling a Monument for the Maquisards]," June 17, 1999.
[322] "Un monument en homage aux héros de la Résistance [A Monument in Honor of the Heroes of the Resistance]**,"** 2001.

proud of their country's resistance and they sought to show its concrete effects on the German occupation. Furthermore, especially in towns close to France, Luxembourg resistance was often tied to the French resistance. Raths, in 2000, states that Luxembourg was not dependent on France[323], but there is no question that both countries' resisters contributed to the struggle against Nazi Germany.

The National Day of Resistance ceremonies, which the government-sponsored CNR and CDSR controlled, had specific, predetermined definitions of resistance. In 1997 resisters were simply anyone who died because of German imprisonment or resettlement, or otherwise perished at the hands of the occupying forces. Later, specific actors of the resistance were mentioned at the ceremonies, such as the General Strike participants, deserters of the *Wehrmacht*, and *réfractaires*. The CNR and CDSR's definitions did not necessarily correspond with the more instinctive definitions that emerged from the various local memorials, monuments, and places of remembrance that were created. These gave different and often broader definitions of what it meant for Luxembourgers to resist. Also, there was more often the claim that all Luxembourgers resisted. Finally, France's contribution to resistance against Nazi Germany was recognized at some of these monuments. While the government tried to define resistance for the population in a specific, constricted way, Luxembourgers continued to come up with their own meaning of resistance.

[323] "La peur des bottes à clous," *Le Jeudi*, February 24, 2000.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Liberation and Battle of the Bulge

The liberation of Luxembourg from the German occupation began on September 9, 1944 when Allied troops, mostly made up of Americans, entered the country. They were met with a hearty welcome by all accounts (of Luxembourgers and Americans); the Luxembourg population was overjoyed to have the occupation of their country brought to an end. When entering the country, the American mission made several observations about the state of the country: all banks, courts, public offices, stores, cafes, garages and repair shops were closed and had been since September fifth; no police force existed; the *UNIO'N* was the self-appointed authority; the population was orderly and health conditions among Luxembourgers were excellent; electricity and running water were operating at partial capacity and all communications were closed; transportation was at a standstill and industry was completely shut down.[324] Food shortages existed in the absence of the German authorities; this was an intensified version of what had been the case during most of the occupation. This description from the American troops shows a country that was in a state of waiting. Many German officials had already left the

[324] As many as 50,000 Luxembourgers were deported during the German occupation; many of these were civil servants. Harry L. Coles and Albert K. Weinberg, *United States Army in World War II: Special Studies, Civil Affairs: Soldiers become Governors,*(Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History, 1964), 811, accessed April 20, 2015, http://www.history.army.mil/books/wwii/civaff/ch27.htm , 810-811.

country and in the vacuum of power (since the grand duchess and the pre-war government were in exile), the *UNIO'N* took charge as the police force.

In the three months after liberation, civilian life had returned to normal in the Grand Duchy. The population was orderly, a police force had been established (and was supplemented by the *UNIO'N*), and welfare organizations aiding the population with food and shelter were making progress. There was order among the Luxembourg population because of a general belief held by Luxembourgers that the war was over for them. Peace was made with the collaborators living in Luxembourg. The population was more concerned about food, shelter, and a return to normalcy than retaliation. In other words, the dread of Nazi reprisals for those Luxembourgers working with the Allies was fading. When the Battle of the Bulge began, Luxembourgers worried that the German occupation might very well take hold of their country again and they started targeting collaborators out of fear.

The Battle of the Bulge began on December 16, 1944 and lasted through almost of all January 1945. A large part of the fighting took place on Luxembourg soil, in the north of the country. Thus, this battle changed the situation of the newly-freed country dramatically. When the fighting began, the American forces realized the precariousness of the situation for many civilians in Luxembourg. The Allies witnessed the prospect of evacuations from towns experiencing fighting, a recurrence of German violence against the population, and general state of hysteria and panic.[325] In view of these possibilities, the American mission used the "indigenous police", including the *UNIO'N* to enforce public order. They were given authority to enforce curfew and transportation regulations. They were also allowed to confine known German collaborators and to make arrests.

[325] Coles and Weinberg, *United States Army*, 813.

The American forces reported that the Luxembourg police were instrumental in keeping order during the Battle of Bulge.[326]

As seen in the previous chapters, the *UNIO'N* initially consisted of members of the LVL, LRL, and LPL and only organized in March 1944. As the group grew, it demanded that its members pledge allegiance to the *UNIO'N* rather than their former leaders. The *UNIO'N* heads sought this allegiance to foster unity among its members. As the Germans moved out of the country, the *UNIO'N* took control of maintaining order – an important role in the absence of the government, police forces, and many civil servants. The *UNIO'N* went as far as distributing leaflets that declared that they were "the responsible agency within the Grand Duchy for the preservation of life".[327] The resistance had worked for the country during the war in many ways, from providing food and shelter to *réfractaires*, smuggling people out of the country, and improving the morale of the general population. Now, as the moral authority in the country, they worked with the Americans to bring peace and order back to the country.

It should come as no surprise then that the members of the *UNIO'N* wanted a voice in the post-war government. Many members of the group desired a "monarchist, catholic, and corporatist state." When the government returned, *UNIO'N*, demanded "an important role: to act as advisory committee of the government, to be consulted on all appointments for high-ranking positions, and to be represented in all committees that dealt with the reconstruction and the purge of the country, and with the repatriation of

[326] Coles and Weinberg, *United States Army*, 815.
[327] Ibid., 811.

deported citizens." The Prime Minister refused these demands and resistance members had to look for other ways in which to impact the future government of their country.[328]

In the summer of 1945, many former members of the resistance created the *Groupement Patriotique et Démocratique* (GD) as a liberal-democratic party that sought to bring justice to collaborators, compensation to victims, and to repatriate deportees and the *enrôlés de force*. That fall, the GD won close to 20 percent of seats in the elected government and two of the party's members were appointed to cabinet posts.[329] These elected and appointed GD members would now work with the many groups that began to be formed by former resistance members, conscripted soldiers, and other victims.

Post-War Groups and Memory

Although the *UNIO'N* claimed to represent the resistance (although not all resistance groups joined this organization), other groups of Luxembourgers, including resistance members, organized themselves in order to influence the government. Some groups wanted political influence within the country while others desired compensation and/or benefits for their members. Just as there were numerous resistance groups, some with overlapping members, during the occupation, in the post-war period, a number of groups emerged claiming rights and compensation.

Before the Battle of the Bulge even began, some *réfractaires* founded the *Ligue, Ons Jongen*. This organization was not open only to those who avoided the draft, but conscripted soldiers as well. Then parents of conscripted soldiers formed their own group: *Association des parents des enrôlés de force*. Both groups asked to be recognized

[328] Sonja van 't Hof "Collective Suffering: Consequences of World War II in Luxembourg," in *The Politics of War Trauma: the Aftermath of World War II in Eleven European Countries*, Jolande Withuis, Annet Mooij (eds.), (Amsterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers: 2010), 176.
[329] van 't Hof "Collective Suffering," 178.

by the government as victims of the German occupation and for compensation by the government. The resistance immediately recognized that some of these conscripted soldiers had supported the Germans by voluntarily joining the *Hitlerjugend* and even the SA. They may have been conscripted against their will, but they were not Luxembourg patriots. However, the large numbers of the *enrôlés de force* ensured that their voices would be heard by politicians.[330]

"In December 1944, former political prisoners and political deportees founded the *Ligue Luxembourgeoise des Prisonniers Politiques et Deportés*, or LPPD." This group claimed to be politically neutral; its goals were to keep the memory of the war alive and for "moral and material compensation" for its members. The LPPD published its own journal and several books (*Livres d'Or*) which focused on the resistance or other aspects of the German occupation.[331] In 1960 a group appeared for all the victims of the war (including the *enrôlés de force*).[332] Altogether, over thirty organizations in Luxembourg emerged for various victims and opponents of the German occupation.[333]

As the war became a less vivid memory, an increasing amount of Luxembourgers began to claim that they were either resisters against or victims of the occupation, however, there were no official ways to determine who, in fact, could claim this title. Many Luxembourgers were no doubt physically, economically, and emotionally victimized by the German occupation and the many abuses that the Nazis committed while in power. These men and women deserved compensation. It is highly possible that some Luxembourgers who accommodated and even collaborated with the Germans

[330] van 't Hof "Collective Suffering," 177
[331] Ibid.
[332] van 't Hof "Collective Suffering," 177
[333] van 't Hof "Collective Suffering," 177

joined these groups as well, possibly as a safeguard against any future accusations or questions.

The many organizations that emerged after the war illustrate the different ways in which Luxembourgers recognized themselves as victims. And there were many Luxembourg victims of the German occupation, as the following statistics will show. During the initial invasion of the country, in early May 1940, an estimated 50,000 Luxembourgers fled to France and another 50,000 were displaced in other parts of the country[334]. In a country of 300,000, this is a significant number. Six thousand civil servants were removed from their posts (and often replaced by Germans or pro-German Luxembourgers).[335] The RAD sent approximately 14,800 men and women to work in Germany during the four years of occupation[336]. And "at least one out of seven Luxembourgers was sent to prison."[337] Luxembourg had 8,171 victims of the Second World War, or 2.8 percent of its pre-war population.[338] While a very small percentage of the overall victims of Nazism, Luxembourg did lose a fairly high proportion of its countrymen, compared to occupied countries in Western Europe.[339] Although one Luxembourger may very easily have been included in two or more of these figures, the numbers give an idea of the staggering changes brought about during the occupation years.

---

[334] Ronald Seth. *The Undaunted* 140.
[335] Willard Allen Fletcher "The German Administration in Luxembourg 1940-1942: Towards a 'De Facto' Annexation," in *The Historical Journal* 13 (September 1970), 541.
[336] van 't Hof "Collective Suffering," 173.
[337] Fletcher, "The German Administration in Luxembourg," 541.
[338] Edouard Jeitz, "*La Voie Vers la Deuxieme Guerre Mondiale"*Edouard Jeitz, October 2, 2014, 27
[339] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_War_II_casualties accessed March 9, 2014; lists France as losing 1.35%, Belgium 1.05, Denmark 0.8%, Norway 0.32%, and the Netherlands 3.45%. last modified on February 27, 2015.

As with other occupied countries, after the war many Luxembourgers simply did not want to talk about their experiences. This includes victims whose memories were too traumatic, and the general population that accommodated the Germans in various ways. Some people took advantage of the occupation of their country to profit personally or professionally, or even to take revenge upon others who could easily become victimized by the occupiers. Obviously these actions would be better forgotten. Even collaborators were only actively sought out for a short time after the end of the war. By and large, Luxembourgers wanted life to go back to normal.

The collective memory in Luxembourg immediately after the war "focused on the patriotic resistance and its alleged collectiveness. It highlighted the country's shared suffering and heroism."[340] In the immediate post-war years, the resistance "myth" emerged in Luxembourg, as it did all over Europe. Tony Judt uses this term to describe the way in which the occupied countries promoted the narrative that "all resisted" the Germans. As there was no historical research about the German occupation of Luxembourg for thirty years, the documents from that period reinforced this claim, since most were written by those men that participated in the resistance.[341] It took time for the memories of the war years to become less raw, and for a younger generation to begin asking questions about World War II and the German occupation of their country. It was only then that scholars began researching the real roles that people played during the occupation.

The post-war period blamed the Germans (and obvious collaborators) for the suffering of the years of war and occupation. A black and white picture of guilt and

[340] van 't Hof "Collective Suffering," 168.
[341] van 't Hof "Collective Suffering," 168.

innocence emerged where Germans were guilty and Luxembourgers (and French, Poles, Belgians) were innocent. Thus entire populations were deemed innocent and for years no one wanted to look at the facts of the war. In truth, black and white spaces rarely existed and most of the population lived in the grey areas in between these two extremes of guilt and innocence.[342] Judt argues that Nazi hegemony simply could not have been maintained across the continent if entire populations exclusively resisted. Rather "most of occupied Europe either collaborated with the occupying forces (a minority) or accepted with resignation and equanimity the presence and activities of the German forces (a majority)."[343]

As proven above, the ubiquitous penetration of Nazification and Germanization in every aspect of life gave Luxembourgers many opportunities to resist. In this small country, accommodation was practiced by virtually all the population, as was resistance. Even if antifascism was not the main motivator for resistance, the majority of the Luxembourg population, men and women, young and old, opposed the German occupation of their country. The more the Germans attempted to infringe on the Luxembourgers' freedoms, the more the people resisted, if for no other reason than that the means of "resistance" necessarily increased with the increase in oppression. Some Luxembourg resistance was certainly more heroic than others, but in a country that still refers to the Germans as "*Preiss*" more often than not, it is not untrue to say that "all resisted."

---

[342] *The Politics of Retribution in Europe: World War II and Its Aftermath*, István Deák, Jan T. Gross, and Tony Judt (eds.) (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000). In epilogue by Tony Judt "The Past is Another Country: Myth and Memory in Postwar Europe." Page 298-299.

[343] *The Politics of Retribution in Europe: World War II and Its Aftermath*, István Deák, Jan T. Gross, and Tony Judt (eds.) (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000). In epilogue by Tony Judt "The Past is Another Country: Myth and Memory in Postwar Europe." Page 295

REFERENCES

Archives

Archives nationales de Luxembourg (ANL)

Periodicals at ANL

Letzeburger Freihéts-Bewégong, *Leschten Appell!* October 1, 1941.

Letzeburger PI-Men Formation, September 1943.

Letzeburger PI-Men Formation, 5 op 12-Appel vun de "Pi-Men, July 1944

LFB, Undated

LPL, *Letzeburg de Letzeburger*, August 2, 1942.

LPL, January 1, 1943.

LPL, *Ons Hemecht: De Freie Letzeburger*, February 20, 1943.

LPL, *Ons Hemecht: De Freie Letzeburger*, May 10, 1943.

LPL, *Auf Grund Geraten*, Undated.

Ons Zeidong: O'ni Maulkuerf 18, June 1942.

UNIO'N, *Fir Freihét*, July 1944

Books

Allen, William Sheridan. *The Nazi Seizure of Power: The Experience of a Single German Town 1922-1945*. Danbury, CT: Franklin Watts, 1984.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities.* London: Verso, 1983

Artuso, Vincent. *La collaboration au Luxembourg Durant la Seconde Guerre mondiale (1940-1945): Accommodation, Adaptation, Assimilation*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang GmbH, 2013.

Bernard, Jean. Translated by Deborah Lucas Schneider. *Priestblock 25487: A Memoir of Dachau*. Bethseda, MD: Zaccheus Press, 2004.

Beyen, Marnix and Benoît Majerus. "Weak and Strong Nations in the Low Countries: National historiography and its 'Others' in Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries." In *The Contested*

Nation: Ethnicity, Class, Religion and Gender in National Histories, edited by Stefan Berger and Chris Lorenz, 283-310. Hampshire, England: Palgrave Macmillian, 2008.

Borodziej, Vlodzimierz. *The Warsaw Uprising of 1944*. Translated by Barbara Harshav. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2001.

Carbonell, Mauve. *De la guerre à l'union de l'Europe: Itinéraires luxembourgeois*. Bruxelles: P.I.E. Peter Lang, 2014.

Coles, Harry L., and Albert K. Weinberg. *United States Army in World War II: Special Studies, Civil Affairs: Soldiers become Governors*. Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History, 1964. http://www.history.army.mil/books/wwii/civaff/ch27.htm

Collings Weitz, Margaret. *Sisters in the Resistance: How Women Fought to Free France, 1940-1945*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 1995.

Fletcher, Willard Allen and Jean Tucker Fletcher. *Defiant Diplomat: George Platt Waller: American Consul in Nazi-Occupied Luxembourg, 1939- 1941*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2014.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism.* New York: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Geyer, Michael and John W. Boyer, eds. *Resistance Against the Third Reich: 1933-1990*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Greble, Emily. *Sarajevo, 1941-1945: Muslims, Christians, and Jews in Hitler's Europe.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2011.

Hilgert, Romaine. *Les Journaux au Luxembourg: 1704-2004*, ed. Service information et presse du gouvernement luxembourgeois. Luxembourg: Imprimerie Centrale, 2004.

LaCapra, Dominick. *History and Memory after Auschwitz.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Lande ,D.A.. *Resistance!: Occupied Europe and Its Defiance of Hitler*. Osceola, WI: MBI Publishing Co, 2000.

Le Grand-Duché de Luxembourg pendant la deuxième guerre mondiale, ed. Musée National de la Résistance. Leudelange, Luxembourg: Reka, No date.

Liberman, Peter. *Does Conquest Pay?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.

L.P.P.D., ed. *Livre d'or des Camps KZ an Emsiidlong: 45 e Anniversaire de la Liberation des Camps et Prisons.* Howald, Luxembourg: L.P.P.D., 1990.

Majerus, Benoît. "Kollaboration in Luxemburg: die falsche Frage?" in *...ët wor alles net esou einfach: Questions sur le Luxembourg et la Deuxième guerre Mondiale: contributions historiques accompagnant l'exposition*, 126-140. Luxembourg : Musée d'histoire de la ville de Luxembourg, 2002.

Müller, Jan Werner, ed. *Memory & Power in Post-War Europe: Studies in the Presence of the Past.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Péporté, Pit, Sonja Kmeck, Benoît Majerus and Michel Margue, eds. *Inventing Luxembourg: Representations of the Past, Space and Language from the Nineteenth to the Twenty-First Century*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010.

Remy. *Histoires de la resistance en Lorraine & Au Grand-Duche de Luxembourg*, Vol. 1. Geneve: Editions de Cremille, 1972.

———. *Histoires de la resistance en Lorraine & Au Grand-Duche de Luxembourg*, Vol. 2. Geneve: Editions de Famot, 1974.

Schreiner, Dr. N. *Passeur: Erzahlungen aus bewegter Resistez*. Esch, Luxembourg: Imprimerie A. Wagner, n.d., ca. 1945.

Seth, Ronald. *The Undaunted. The Story of Resistance in Western Europe*. London: Frederick Muller Ltd, 1956.

Stone, Harry. *Writing in the Shadow: Resistance Publications in Occupied Europe*. London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd, 1996.

Story, Lonnie D. *The Meeting of Anni Adams: The Butterfly of Luxembourg*. Eugene, OR: ACW Press, 2004.

Sweets, John. *Choices in Vichy France: The French Under Nazi Occupation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Thill, Milly. *Milly's Story: A Young Girl's Memories of the Second World War, Luxembourg 1940-1945*. College Station, TX: Virtualbookworm.com Publishing Inc., 2004.

Thill-Somin-Nicholson, Marguerite. *Surviving the Nazi Occupation of Luxembourg: A Young Woman's WWII Memoir*. San Bernardino, CA: Xlibris Corporation, 2008.

Van't Hof, Sonja. "Collective Suffering: Consequences of World War II in Luxembourg." In *The Politics of War Trauma: the Aftermath of World War II in Eleven European Countries*, edited by Joland Withuis and Annet Mooij, 167-192. Amsterdam: Aksant Academic Publishers, 2010.

Von Klemperer, Klemens. *German Resistance Against Hitler: The Search for Allies Abroad 1938-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Wachsman, Z.H.. *Trail Blazers for Invasion*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company, 1943.

Yapou, Eliezer. *Governments in Exile, 1939-1945: Leadership from London and Resistance at Home*. Published independently online,1998. http://governmentsinexile.com/yapouluxembourg.html.

Newspapers Most Frequently Used

d'Lëtzebueger Land (Luxembourg)

Le Jeudi (Esch-sur-Alzette)

Lëtzebueger Journal (Luxembourg)

Luxemburger Wort (Luxembourg)

Tageblatt (Esch-sur-Alzette)

Periodicals

Artuso, Vincent. "Double Jou" *forum* No. 304 (February 2011). P. 26-28

Bahr, Johannes. "Les grandes banques allemandes et leurs activités dans l'Europe occidentale occupée, 1940-1944" *Histoire, Économie et Société* No. 4 (October-December 2005). P. 495-511

Bryan, Chad. "The Language of Resistance? Czech Jokes and Joke-telling under Nazi Occupation 1943-1945" *Journal of Contemporary History* 4 (2006). P. 133-151.

Fletcher, Willard Allen. "The German Administration in Luxemburg 1940-1942: Towards a 'De Facto' Annexation" *the Historical Journal* Vol. 13, No. 3 (Sept 1970), pp. 533-544.

Lesch, Paul. "Film and politics in Luxembourg: censorship and controversy" *Film History* Vol. 16 (2004). P. 437-446.

———. "The Reception of the *Deutsche Wochenschau* in Luxembourg during the German Occupation" *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* Vol. 24, No 1 (2004). P. 35-44.

Michels, Eskard. "Deutsch als Weltsprach? Freanz Theirfelder, the Deutsche Akademie in Munich and the Promotion of the German Language Abroad, 1923-1945" *German History* 22 (May 2004) P. 206-228.

Newton, Gerald. "Radio Luxembourg in Peace and War" *German Life and Letters* No. 66 (January 2013). P. 55-76.

Schommer, Georges. "The Duchy of Luxembourg Awaits the Hour of Justice" *America* (February 22, 1941). P. 537-538.

Seibel, Wolfgang. "The Strength of the Perpetrators – The Holocaust in Western Europe, 1940-1944" *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions* Vol. 15, No. 2 (April 2002). P. 211-240

Thomas, Bernard, "Bruchstellen – Chronik des Escher Resistenzmuseums" *forum* No. 299 (September 2010), pp. 12-18.

Wagner, Melanie and Winifred V. Davies. "The role of World War II in the development of Luxembourgish as a national language" *Language Problems & Language Planning* Vol. 33 No. 2 (2009), pp. 112-131.

Zariz, Ruth. Trans. Hannah Lasch. "The Jews of Luxembourg during the Second World War" *Holocaust & Genocide Studies* No 7 (1993). P. 51-66.

Films

Heim ins Reich: Wei Letzebuerg sollt preisesch ginn, DVD. Directed by Claude Lahr. Luxembourg: Nowhere Land Productions, 2004.

Leif Letzebuerger: D'Grande-Duchesse am exil 1940-1945. DVD. Directed by Ray Tostevin. Luxembourg: Grace Productions, 2008.

Websites

"CDSR." Last modified December 7, 2012.http://www.secondeguerremondiale.public.lu/fr/acteurs/cdsr/index.html, accessed October 3, 2014.

"Centre Documentation et de Recherche sure la Résistance." Last modified June 18, 2003. http://www.legilux.public.lu/leg/a/archives/2002/0156/2002A37361.html accessed October 3, 2014.

"Dachau." Last modified June 20, 2014. http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005214 accessed March 24, 2015.

"Dossier parlementaire no 5021." Last modified March 9, 2008. http://www.legilux.public.lu/leg/projets/archives/2002/2002P0181.html, accessed October 3, 2014.

"Exhibition "Lebensbilder – Peintures À L'Huile de Madelieine Weis-Bauler"". Last modified June 11, 2012. http://www.esch.lu/culture/musee/en/pages/weisbauler.aspx accessed September 19, 2014.

"Father Jean Bernard." Last modified January 30, 2013.http://resistance-members.informationmart.net/Father_Jean_Bernard/item accessed September 19, 2014.

"Haftlingsverbande in Belgien, den Niederlanden und Luxemburg." http://media.offenes-archiv.de/benelux.pdf Accessed November 20, 2014.

"Heim Ins Reich." Last modified August 20, 2014. http://www.cna.public.lu/fr/film-tv/productions-nationales/filmographie/documentaires- long/heim-ins-reich/dossier-de-presse-en-def-reduced.pdf accessed November 20, 2014.

"Jean Baptiste Esch" http://www.autorenlexikon.lu/page/author/163/1631/FRE/index.html accessed January 9, 2015.

"Leif Letzebuerger – D'Grande-Duchesse am Exil 1940-1945." Last modified August 20, 2014. http://www.cna.public.lu/fr/film-tv/productions-nationales/filmographie/documentaires-long/leif-letzebuerger/dossier-presse-fr-reduced.pdf accessed November 20, 2014.

"Lily Unden". http://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lily_Unden accessed August 29, 2014.

"Lucien Dury." Last modified February 1, 2013.http://resistance-members.informationmart.net/Lucien_Dury/itemdetail accessed September 19, 2014.

"Luxemburg unter deutscher Besatzung 1940-1945: Die Bevölkerung eines kleinen Landes zwischen Kollaboration und Widerstand Paul Dostert." http://www.zug-der-erinnerung.eu/dostert.html accessed August 7, 2014.

"Memorial: Journal Officiel du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg." http://www.legilux.public.lu/leg/a/archives/1968/0010/a010.pdf accessed October 3, 2014.