

Ellin Bessner. Interview with Rosemary Sullivan

Canadian Jewish News Daily, [Canada], 14-03-2022.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2ZvMxeyO9MY>

© Transcription by *Droog Magazine*. With thanks to W.M. Groenewegen.

Interesting parts (*click on the time in blue to go to that fragment*)

[7:09](#) – Sullivan about the composition of the cold case team

[22:52](#) – Sullivan about the criticism and behaviour of Ambo Anthos

[24:22](#) – A very strange mistake by the interviewer

[24:46](#) – Sullivan about the money

[26:27](#) – About the German version

[27:16](#) – Why, according to Sullivan, the Dutch publisher wasn't happy.

[28:02](#) – The 100,000 euro from the City of Amsterdam.

[0:00] Ellin Bessner: “And joining us now from Toronto is Rosemary Sullivan. Thanks so much for being on the CJN Daily. ”

[0:06] Rosemary Sullivan: “Pleasure to be here”

Ellin Bessner: “It is really great to talk to you. I know our listeners and viewers have been either reading or reading about the new book, about *The Betrayal of Anne Frank* since the publicity started a couple of weeks ago. I wanted to ask you, you know, if you were, if anyone tuned in last week to the Jewish community centre's virtual story teller, they would have seen Heather Reisman and you and the chief investigator, have a chance to speak to the Canadian audience.¹ I wonder, was this the first time that you were able to sort of address all the controversy in a Canadian context? I don't know whether you had chances before, but in such a Jewish Canadian context?”

[0:54] Rosemary Sullivan: “In a Canadian context that was probably the first, though I had interviews with New Zealand, Australia, France, certainly a number in the United States, and been able to confront the complexity of the response to the book.”

1 A deep conversation with Rosemary Sullivan & Heather Reisman. Virtual Jewish Community Center, Schwarz/Reisman Centre, Bathurst Street Vaughan, Ontario, 2-03-2022, <https://virtualjcc.com/watch/storyteller-betrayal-anne-frank>

[1:14] Ellin Bessner: “Is the Canadian response any different than what you've been receiving elsewhere around the world as you just mentioned?”

[1:21] Rosemary Sullivan: “Well, I could say that because I am known as a Canadian author and I would presume have a reputation of a degree of integrity, because of the biographies I've done of, say, Elizabeth Smart and Gwen MacEwen and Margaret Atwood and then later *Villa Air-Bel* and *Stalin's daughter*, which was astonishingly the recipient of a number of prizes, it would be assumed that I began the investigation and my involvement with the investigation with a degree of commitment and pursued things as seriously as I could.

There has been some question about motivation, that has come out of the Netherlands, for instance, why a book about the betrayal of Anne Frank, is it sheer opportunism, I think it was the interviewer on *60 Minutes*² who kind of said, well, he understood Vince Pankoke's motives, and he understood my motives, but he was suspicious of the initial impulse behind the project to investigate the betrayer of Anne Frank.

So I would say I feel more comfortable with my Canadian audience and I think they understand that the book is really relevant now because, well, the initial idea was to decide how and what happened on August 4, 1944, that the people in the Annex were discovered and arrested, was it a phone call from an informant, was it happenstance et cetera?³ It soon became something larger I feel, larger is not the right word, something, eh, a bit accompanied this concern, which was, what is it like to live under military occupation and how does it happen?⁴

For me it was very important, I had to convince the investigative team of my strategy, but it was very important to me to have a portrait of Otto Frank, with the Frank family, and that moment in 1933, that soon, when he's at dinner with his wife and friends, and they hear that Hitler has been appointed chancellor, and the friends say: “Let's see what the man can do”, and you go from that moment which we've had in this contemporary world, to the all out war and living in a society that is plagued by betrayal, terror, fear, silence, who can you trust, et cetera.

2 Jon Wertheim. Who betrayed Anne Frank and her family. *60 Minutes*, CBS, New York, 16-01-2022. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/anne-frank-betrayal-investigation-60-minutes-2022-01-16/>

3 All of this was extensively investigated and reported before. See: Gertjan Broek, *An Investigative Report on the betrayal and Arrest of the Inhabitants of the Secret Annex*. Anne Frank House, Amsterdam, 2016. https://www.annefrank.org/en/downloads/filer_public/4a/c6/4ac6677d-f8ae-4c79-b024-91ffe694e216/an_investigative_report_on_the_betrayal_and_arrest.pdf

4 This is quite misleading – the book is about a so called “cold case investigation” for the traitor of the people in hiding in the Secret Annex.

[04:21] So, as it turns out, as we'll certainly discuss a little further on, the fact that it seems likely that the betrayer, so called, the person who gave the address of the Annex, was a Jewish notary. He was as much a victim as anybody else. Who can judge somebody who knows that their family is going to be sent to an extermination camp? And you have a list of addresses, no names, you don't even know what is behind those addresses, possibly you convince yourself that people will have moved on. But how can you judge such a man? So the controversy that has arisen over the identity of the betrayer, I think it is misplaced, I think the issue is how, as we see with Putin, how do you get that level of violence? Supported by an army, a populace and people seem to be almost numb to it. It's shocking."

[5:32] Ellin Bessner: "You came into the project a couple of years after they originally began. What was your, sort of, requirements or, you know, you said to them "only if this and this will I take it on."

[5:49] Rosemary Sullivan: "I was told by my agent, Jackie Kaiser,⁵ that, or perhaps it was the publisher, the editor, who said to me: "HarperCollins, the director of HarperCollins, Jonathan,⁶ has asked me to ask you if you would be interested in this project." That in itself was confirming,, because I had all my books with HarperCollins, and so my impulse was, well, let see what this is. And then I contacted Thijs and Pieter, and we discussed their motivations for doing this project. Then I flew to Amsterdam and met Vince Pankoke and the cumulative impact of that, I thought this is a very serious investigation, I've never done anything quite like this before. I had always been entirely responsible for my own research, I did all the research for instance with Stalin's daughter and had some [she giggles] extraordinary experiences ... [6:53] the subtext of the biography is almost more interesting than the biography, what you go through in your search for that information."

[6:59] Ellin Bessner: "How did you deal with, you know, critics, historians and people that say: "No, this isn't right!" and then you have to go proving it? So you had thirty pages of amend notes."

[7:09] Rosemary Sullivan: "Well, as I say, this was a completely different experience, because it wasn't just Thijs Bayens⁷, Pieter van Twisk⁸ and Vince Pankoke.⁹ It was a whole slew of investigators. Whether they were professionals

5 Jackie Kaiser, of Westwood Creative Artists; <https://wcaltd.com/jackie-kaiser/>

6 Jonathan Burnham.

7 Project director, company CEO Proditione Media BV.

8 Head of research, company COO Proditione Media BV.

9 Lead case agent, retired FBI special agent

from the forensic departments of the Dutch police,¹⁰ linguists,¹¹ typeface specialists,¹² psycho analysts et cetera, and then there were the whole slew of young women, mostly, though there were a couple of young men, researchers doing their post docs or who were already accredited historians.¹³ So there was at one point twenty-three people involved, so my dilemma was not where the information came from and so on, it was to actually find a narrative to make the information coherent.

[8:02] I did feel that the integrity of the information was dependent on them and not on me. Then I met Vince Pankoke, you know. He is like a nice grandfather, you have no idea that this is the man who is involved in Colombian drug raids and Wall Street shenanigans and so on. He had the black and white mentality I have to say, of a certain kind of investigator, you know, he believes in Evil. And he believes in Good. I found myself trusting his research, which was impeccable.

[8:39] Now what they did, as you probably know by now, was, put ... Vince set up these projects, which he called the Residence Project, the Arrest Warrant Project, the Statements Project, the Tracking Project. And each of these, each of the suspects they came up with, thirty at the beginning, which they narrowed down to about twelve, which they narrowed to four, you know, they would look at these issues. For instance, Residence Projects, you would discuss who lived where around the Annex.

[9:18] Now what makes this a different investigation? If you are a historian, and you know, I have been an academic for thirty-five years, you are dealing not with the kind of information that a police investigation would undertake. I can't imagine, to this day, any of the specialists, whose work we consulted, actually having a residence tracking project. You needed a database and then you needed an AI platform to determine that. So Vince was able to, with Pieter van Twisk, and with Brendan Rook, one of the Australian International Court volunteers¹⁴, were able to locate where the N.S.B.¹⁵ lived, members, where known informants lived, you know, around the corner and the bicycle shop there was a known informant, down the street with, you know, so they were looking at information that isn't likely information that the academics search for.¹⁶

10 As far as is known these gave only advise at the start of the project.

11 Consulted only for the text on the anonymous note – which was too short to base any conclusions upon.

12 Consulted only for the copy of the anonymous note.

13 All “public historians”.

14 This gentleman was a former International Criminal Court employee.

15 N.S.B. – Nationaal-Socialistische Beweging, Dutch Nazi party.

16 This is nonsense. Every thorough researcher, academic or not, will look into this. David Barnouw and Gerrold van der Stroom did so and concluded in their 2003 report, that looking at the people living in the direct neighbourhood was, after all, quite futile, as there had been many, and many weren't registered there at all.

David Barnouw and Gerrold van der Stroom. *Who betrayed Anne Frank?* Netherlands Institute for War

[10:24] And I found the issue of an investigation of that kind really interesting. For instance – certain things might appear circumstantial, but you're putting together a puzzle. And when all the pieces of the puzzle are put together maybe you can come up with the conclusion.”

[10:46] Ellin Bessner: “Some people when they're writing books have like a portrait of somebody beside them or they have some kind of music playing, or something that sort of marks that entire journey of writing the process. Did you have something like that? And what was it?”

[11:02] Rosemary Sullivan: “You know, for me the writing is the process. You know, I did expect, but I didn't really think it through, the response that the book would generate. For me the challenge, I mean it was huge, of trying to make a coherent narrative out of all these pieces. So, if I have anything that is my [she laughs] guiding it is my computer screen, as I am trying to put chapter after chapter after chapter together. And I get attached to one thing, and the one thing that I was attached to was the opening of the book, the raid and the green policemen. I am going actually impose on you and tell you I want to read a little bit from that. Would that be o.k.?”

[11:55] Ellin Bessner: “Sure”.

[11:56] Rosemary Sullivan: “It is just that it seems to me so significant, that ... ”

[12:01] Ellin Bessner: “Was that your screen saver, that pictures of the green policemen and then the raid, or did you have something on that computer screen that you looked at every day when you were writing it or over... that was what I sort of was getting at.”

[12:12] Rosemary Sullivan: “No! It is hard enough. It is an incredibly painful subject. There were moments where, you know, I was close to tears. The idea of the people... there's a wonderful book which is the accounts by six women who encountered Anne Frank, and the last one [said?]: “It is easy to die alone in a concentration camp” My god, what else can you say? So I couldn't aborn having something one my screen, friendly, because it was all too painful as it was. But this is where we get Otto Frank's account of the raid. It is one of the few instances where I could actually quote Otto Frank, because I wasn't given permission to quote him.¹⁷ In this case Otto Frank is describing to the

Documentation (NIOD), Amsterdam, 25-04-2003, page 33.

<https://divtprfbgt2m.cloudfront.net/2021-09/Who%20betrayed%20Anne%20Frank.pdf>

¹⁷ This is nonsense. You can always cite from a book.

journalist/writer Ernst Schnabel, in 1957, what happened during the raid and his description is so poignant, because he remembers that he was giving Peter van Pels, who was six-, seventeen and the [undecipherable], he was given him a lesson in grammar, and he was spelling “double” incorrectly, in English there's only one “b”, and suddenly there's a man with a gun. But the thing that is shocking is the response of the SD, the German intelligence officer, Karl Silberbauer, who in 1963, from '45 to '63, in 1963 he's finally tracked down and he is interviewed by a young journalist, Huf,¹⁸ and Silberbauer replies:

[14:04, she reads from the book] *“The people I took from their hiding places, did not leave an impression on me. It would have been different if it had been a man such as general De Gaulle or some major resistance member or other. Such a thing you don't forget. If I wasn't on the clock at the moment my colleague got a call... I would never have come into contact with that Anne Frank. I still remember that I was just about to go out to eat something. And because this whole case blew up after the war, I am the one dealing with the mess... (etc).”*

[15:06] And to me, that duality, of the suffering on the one hand and the indifference and the self indulgence, you know, we're living it now.”

[15:23] Ellin Bessner: “I've heard you say it, read it before, I've read the book, but it is still hard to process, and, you know, even today, as you said, watching what is happening in the Ukraine, but I want to pivot back towards some of the things that the researchers and filmmakers have said, post publication. The lead researcher said he's working on a reaction to the criticism. This was in a Dutch language newspaper. What does that mean? What is he doing, do you know?”

[15:53] Rosemary Sullivan: “Yes, he has done it. He has created a blog, in Dutch, in which he has responded to the major criticisms.¹⁹ The major criticism is that there are no tangible physical holding your hands lists of hiding places. So how do we know there were hiding places? I have to backtrack for your readers perhaps, for the few who may not know, that in 1945 when Otto Frank returned from Auschwitz, he found a note addressed to him. In the note was, it was anonymous, and it said: “Your hiding place was betrayed to the Centre for Jewish Emigration by Arnold van den Bergh of such and such an address.”

18 Jules Huf.

19 This is: <https://www.coldcasediary.com/>

[16:51] One critic has said that note wasn't delivered until 1957,²⁰ when there's a letter from, I think it is Kugler, I'm sorry, it might be... I think it was Kugler, who says..."

[17:04] Ellin Bessner: "Kugler by the way moved to Toronto and lived in Canada. He was one of the people who had helped hide them. Anyway, go on."

[17:10] Rosemary Sullivan: "One of the hidiers said: "Who would send a note at such a time?" And so the scholar assumed that the note had just come. But in fact they had failed to check the police investigative report in 1963, in which the detective Van Helden, in his forty page summary, speaks of the note that Otto Frank said he got just fter returning from Auschwitz. He doesn't say what date, but he gave Helden a copy of the note.²¹ So. there are errors that are being directed at us which we haven't made, and so on.

[17:49] So Pieter put together a reponse, as did Vince, to this issue of did lists exist, and I think people are being... are not entering the reality of 1944, August. It was... the war was winding down, it was clear to a lot of people that the Germans were losing. In particular there was a sense that a lot of the... ah ... I.V.B. 4²², the IV B4, the Jew hunting unit, Dutch policemen, had to cover their act, they had to do things, so that when the war was over, they wouldn't be considered traitors.

[18:36] It is very likely that one of them may have given a list of addresses to Van den Bergh as a way of protecting himself.²³ There is a guy called Moesbergen²⁴, who was known to have lists of addresses, there were references to lists of addresses, et cetera. So the fact that a physical list doesn't exist, is not an indication that there wasn't a list."

[18:57] Ellin Bessner: "Back to..."

20 The critic in question, yours truly, wrote that this note was first mentioned in a letter by Johannes Kleiman (not Kugler), March 31, 1958 (not 1957), in an article published on March 6, 2022. Kleiman asked in that letter why "only now" this accusation against Van den Bergh was made.

Bart FM Droog. De datering van het anonieme briefje. *Reporters Online*, Haarlem, 06-03-2022.

<https://reportersonline.nl/de-datering-van-het-anonieme-briefje-de-canard-van-het-verraad-van-anne-frank-de-tweede-wereldoorlog-als-industrie-3-iv/>

English translation: <https://www.droog-mag.nl/2022/the-betrayal-of-anne-frank-canard-4-the-dating-of-the-note.html>

21 In December 1963!

22 She first pronounces it in letters, I, V, B, then corrects it in numer IV (Latin 4) letter B, followed by the no. 4.

23 This is an entirely new theory, invented by Sullivan in this interview. No such thing is even suggested in the book, let alone by the critics. It is also very hard to believe, as Van den Bergh went early 1944 into hiding himself.

24 Eduard (Eddy) Moesbergen (1902-1980)

[18:59] Rosemary Sullivan: “And then the second issue is, is it some kind of antisemitism on the part of the investigative team, that they've focused on Arnold van den Bergh? Because it is a case that wouldn't hold up in a court of law. You know, it is probably 85 to 90% credible, but there's always the possibility that, you know, there's an error made, somewhere, and what the critics aren't taking into account I think, is the double-sidedness of this search. On the one hand there is the existence of this anonymous note. It made a big difference when Vince realized that what was being said, was “your address was given”, not your name, so “addresses” and... ehm... and then the other side of the equation is Otto Frank's response. And that is very moving. Otto Frank.... I mean, there was nobody you could trust more than Miep Gies, frankly. I mean, her integrity cannot be put into doubt. That moment where she described giving the diary back to Otto Frank when he returns in 1945, having saved it to give it back to Anne, and she knows that Otto has said to her: “they are not coming back”. When she gives it to him, a look passes between them that, she says, only happens once in a lifetime. And the same thing happened earlier, when he asked her if she would help him hide.

[20:42] So Miep Gies tells father John Neiman, a catholic priest, at the Academy Awards for Miep's book, the *Anne Frank Remembered*, she tells him that Otto Frank knew who the betrayer was and that she knew who the betrayer was. On another occasion she says that, in public, that the betrayer was dead by 1960. These little snippets would slip out. Now if Otto Frank knew who the betrayer was, why didn't he say, et cetera? Without Otto Frank's response it is an anonymous note. With Otto Frank's response it is a silver... Arnold van den Bergh died in 1950, I'm not Jewish, I don't know what it is like to live in a family like that, but my dear friend described how her mother lived in a small town in Poland, and all the Jews were collected and they were sent into a field to run and they were shot. And a friend of his came, of hers came, and said she was alive, no she's dead, and on that basis she escaped... What is compelling is that the life she lived after that, if Kitty hurt her knee, she couldn't tell her mother, because her mother was so terrified of pain.

[22:13] When her father wanted to give her swimming lessons, her mother said she might drown, I mean, there are ongoing repercussions to this kind of thing, so why wouldn't Otto Frank want to close that door? You know, he was not a man that was interested in revenge, he thought that... he told Miep Gies that he didn't want to hurt Van den Bergh's children. Though she would have said, “he didn't want to hurt the betrayer's children”; she never ever used the name Van den Bergh, nor did Otto Frank.

[22:52] This is not the issue. If people disagree with the book, fine! Yeah, it is their prerogative. And in fact there should be a conversation.²⁵ What the shock is, is that the publisher, the Dutch publisher Ambo Anthos apologises for the book. And puts in their apology “we apologise to anyone who is offended by this book.” Anyone? Are the fascists offended? Come on, gimme a, you know, and then, then they say to Pieter and Vince: “We officially apologise, but we still support the book and the investigation.” [*Silence, then a short laugh*].

[23:38] So how is that possible? Alright, and when Pieter and ah, they say that they consulted us, which they never did, we were never asked to defend the book; this blog was set up separately,²⁶ and then they said, well, let's have a meeting, it was supposed to be last Wednesday. As a courtesy Pieter took down the blog,²⁷ and suddenly on Wednesday the commercial director was sick and the editorial publishing director went on holiday.

[24:09] So, and Ambo Anthos continues to sell the book. Now, if they believe that this book is insufficiently supported by evidence and has offended people, they should stop selling it.”²⁸

25 In fact Rosemary Sullivan, Pieter van Twisk and Vincent Pankoke evaded all direct confrontations and questions from specialists and journalists from Germany and the Netherlands. Up to the transcription of this interview, Sullivan has not given a single interview to any well informed specialists – only to rather gullible interviewers from Canada and Poland.

26 This “blog” was actually started in 2017, a.o. to raise funds;
<https://web.archive.org/web/20171002225810/https://www.coldcasediary.com/>

27 He removed an article posted on February 16, 2022, a copy of which is saved on:
<https://web.archive.org/web/20220217161951/https://www.coldcasediary.com/press/>

28 Which happened, eight days after this interview, after this was published: Prof. dr. Bart Wallet, dr. Bart van der Boom, dr. Petra van den Boomgaard, (independent historian), dr. Raymund Schütz, dr. Laurien Vastenhout & Aaldrik Hermans. 'Report. The Betrayal of Anne Frank: a refutation. Critical analysis of the argumentation and use of historical sources. Amsterdam, 22-03-2022.
https://admin.spuu25.nl/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Refutation_ENG_PDF.pdf

[24:22] **Ellin Bessner:** “They are selling it [Bessner means *The Betrayal of Anne Frank*] for 2.99, 2 euro 99, in bookstores outside of Amsterdam.²⁹



I've pictures of one of them, I can send it to you. Which is nothing. Did you... so I read that you didn't make much money on this yourself. How much of your own personal money did you invest in writing the book, because I know a lot of authors do that.”

[24:46] **Rosemary Sullivan:** “No. I didn't make much money. For three years of work, which it was, I was making maybe 30,000 a year, which isn't a lot of money. But my expenses were paid for, which would have been my trip to Amsterdam, and I was put up by the society of Dutch writers in a beautiful apartment downtown.³⁰ And then, expecting to go continuously to Amsterdam, but the pandemic prevented that. So most of my work was via Zoom, via, I mean, I had access to 'The Bookcase',³¹ which, you know, had something like seven thousand files, sixty-six Gigabytes of material, and so, I mean, I had tens of thousands of letters that come from researchers, not just the three major researchers, other researchers, the young women who worked with me, so, and I really, it will be a long time before I'm, you know, anybody makes further money from this project, because of the expense of the project, i mean, no expense was spared, there were trips to Germany, in the United States et cetera.³² I don't think Vince made

29 The book offered for €2.99 was not *The Betrayal of Anne Frank*, but a special low price edition of Anne Frank's Diary (Dutch title: *Het Achterhuis*, the Secret Annex), published by a completely different publishing house, Prometheus. See: <https://geefeenboekcadeau.nl/> / <https://web.archive.org/web/20220406085514/https://geefeenboekcadeau.nl/>

30 She means: The writer's residence of the Dutch Foundation for Literature, a state financed semi-governmental organization. <http://www.letterenfonds.nl/nl/>
This foundation didn't respond to the question how much tax payer's money was spent on Ms Sullivan's stay in the Netherlands, May 2019. See: Jaap van den Born & Bart FM Droog. *The Betrayal of Anne Frank. A 21st century canard.* (1). *Droog Magazine*, 07-02-2022. <https://www.droog-mag.nl/2022/the-betrayal-of-anne-frank-canard.html>

31 The digital archive of the cold case team.

32 Mostly unnecessary trips, for that matter, as most material in the archives can be consulted or gathered via Internet.

money, he certainly, everybody had their expenses paid for, but to think, I think my agent said the Americans would have to sell half a million copies before I would ever make any royalty, and then there would be an issue of the books they would hold, or, you know, the returns, so, it would be a few years...*[she laughs]*."

[26:27] Ellin Bessner: "But in terms of what is coming next – I read the German version is gonna be published with revised and annotated pages. Do you, are you involved with this? What do they ask you? What questions do they ask you guys to fix?"

[26:44] Rosemary Sullivan: "No, I haven't heard of revised or annotated pages. What I have heard is that it will begin with Pieter's preface, replacing mine, which is about arriving in Amsterdam, and it is a very good preface, it is a very serious preface. And it will have an afterword, which will be Vince's and Pieter's rebuttal and I will be asked to elaborate more than..., you know. Anything else, I haven't heard of any other changes."³³

[27:16] I will say, I have never been so carelessly treated by a publisher as Ambo Anthos. They were not happy with the whole issue of the 72% of the population, the Jewish population, of being deported. Of the 107,000 people who were deported 5,500 returned. Of the 25 tot 27,000 people who went into hiding, one third were betrayed... I was... it is painful, it is like Canada having to deal with our reparation issue and so on. It is painful, but you got to face it."³⁴

[28:02] Ellin Bessner: "Amsterdam just came out last year with the Wall of Names."³⁵ And they have done, you know, there was a big ceremony, in fact the city of Amsterdam gave the researchers for your book, and the project I should say, 100,000 euros, which they now are hoping to get back, what do you know about that?"

[28:24] Rosemary Sullivan: "Oh, really?"

[28:24] Ellin Bessner: "Yes."

[28:25] Rosemary Sullivan: *[laughing]*

33 According to sources in Germany (in late march) the German publisher was very reluctant to publish the German version *at all*.

34 It is painful indeed, yet this is common knowledge in the Netherlands. The reason why Ambo Anthos is "not happy" with the book, is because of the anger it evoked. Firstly, because of the unfounded accusations against the notary (and the suggestion that only Jews who collaborated with the Nazis could have survived the war). And secondly because of the sloppy "research".

35 The National Holocaust Names Memorial, <https://www.holocaustnamenmonument.nl/en/home/>

[28:25] Ellin Bessner: “It is all in the Dutch newspapers. Two city councillors have launched an investigation, one for culture and the other one... they want the money back...”

[28:36 Rosemary Sullivan: “[unintelligible] people are making comments on the basis of hearsay, they haven't read the book, you know. I find it... it's... we live in an age where people aren't willing to investigate the truth. They will, you know, make a comment from the top of their... but anyway... what I am going to say is that eventually Ambo Anthos said, “oh no, all we are changing are things that the Dutch already know, for instance where the train station is or something like that.” I said, well, I still like a list, I never got a list, and... ehm... they said that they loved the book. They really... the agent, Marianne, sent a letter, “Oh, it is so wonderful, they love the book.” And then the minute there were criticisms from the very vocal Dutch specialists, then they backed down completely.”

[29:38] Ellin Bessner: “All this invading turf syndrome, I am going to call it that way, that is something I understood from your interview with Vindigo.”³⁶

[29:47] Rosemary Sullivan: “Wonderful, a very well known doctor, friend of mine, said: “Oh, I recognize it is the acute violated turf syndrome,” hahaha... You know,... a conversation should be had, not this hysterical response. Because this is, as you saw with Heather Reisman, this is a book that is a moving account of what it is like to live in a world where untruth is weaponized, you know, and fascism is mainstream. Fear dictates how people relate to each other and you can't trust anyone. So let's stop short of that. Because we are moving in that direction.”

[30:40] Ellin Bessner: “Some wise person I respect always said that, don't call me late for dinner, as long as they are talking about you, it doesn't matter how, just as long as they are talking about you, so...”

[30:49] Rosemary Sullivan: “Well, I would rather they not talk in this way. It is not... frankly, I want to say this right, it doesn't damage me, I did my work, I wrote, I think, a moving book. The persons³⁷ that are most hurt by this would be Pieter van Twisk, who thinks that now he may never be able to make a living in Amsterdam again, because of this level of vehemence that is been directed. And much of it for the wrong reasons.”

36 That interview is unknown to us, but Sullivan spoke about the “invading turf syndrome” in this interview, d.d. February 23, 2022, page 4: <https://www.droog-mag.nl/2022/interview-rosemary-sullivan.pdf>

37 Apparently she had more persons in mind, when starting this sentence.

[31:27] Ellin Bessner: “What is the worst hate mail so far you have received since the book came out? Or e-mail?”

[31:32] Rosemary Sullivan: “The one you would expect. “So now you have encouraged antisemitism”. I've had only three or four, I had dozens of positive letters, but one woman wrote that her mother had been a survivor of Auschwitz and she read many of these stories and it was painful. Period.”