General misconduct and popular reprisals

Three main forms of misconduct involving both men and women can be identified: denunciations, working for the Germans and espionage. As with sexual misconduct, there was a strong belief among locals that compatriots engaged in such activities, but the line between perceptions and reality is and was often blurred. Nevertheless, as will be demonstrated, the strength of belief in misconduct and disdain for perceived traitors was so great that the latter were the victims of popular reprisals and revenge during and after the war. Such extreme expressions of the occupied culture, whereby those who breached its norms deserved punishment, suggesting that it was adhered to by more than just the middle classes.

Denunciations

On 10 June 1915, M. Blin described the ‘sensational’ events taking place at Roubaix’s hôtel de ville. The Germans had installed a ‘locked window display’ accompanied by the following sign: ‘Documents available to the public. Anonymous letters in which the French slander [Blin’s wording] their compatriots.’ Blin was disgusted but perversely hopeful on seeing this, noting, ‘This shameful wound, displayed in broad daylight, this public ridicule of the cowardly accusations expressed in a revolting crudeness, may stop, henceforth, the pens of the villainous individuals who have the shamelessness to employ this procedure unworthy of real French people.’

The following day, many people came to read the anonymous letters, and on 12 June Blin himself took a closer look, remarking:

Many curious people stop in front of the display. I note in particular two new letters: the 1st is signed: ‘A soul devoted to your soldiers’ (Is it actually
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Their soul … & a free devotion?); – the second: ‘a female friend devoted to Germany’. They therefore come from women, like the majority of the others.3

Blin echoed a widespread belief: those who denounced compatriots to the Germans were overwhelmingly perceived to have been women, often those engaging in sexual misconduct.4 Gromaire put forward both the demographic and cultural arguments for female misconduct and especially denunciation, writing that, ‘There were more women than men among the bad elements, because of the excessive numbers of women and the familiar rapportsthat established themselves between these types of women and the invaders’.5

References to denunciation can be found regarding localities across the Nord. Individuals engaging in such actions were referred to as dénonciateurs/dénonciatrices, délateurs/délatrices, as well as ‘indicators’ – usually signifying a more official role, working for the German police or secret service and being financially compensated for information provided.6 Denunciation was usually via anonymous letter but was sometimes verbal and involved informing the Germans of compatriots contravening German orders, such as those hiding goods that should have been declared or requisitioned, or hiding Allied servicemen. Sometimes individuals were denounced for having insulted Germans or those associated with them (voluntary workers and women in relationships).7 The motives for denunciations are often unclear, although some reasons include settling personal scores, financial compensation from the Germans,8 or jealousy – for example, of a neighbour who hid goods when others had their goods requisitioned.9 Tierce, denounced during the occupation for hiding English soldiers, recounted in her memoirs that the Germans actively encouraged denunciation – although they had little trust in denunciators because ‘They know they don’t give their information out of love of the Germans, but simply to satisfy some private revenge’.10

However, it was believed that many female denunciators did act out of (sometimes literal) love for the Germans. Mme Louvion from Masnières was said to be ‘intimate’ with a German sergeant-major, ‘partied’ with him and others, and was a denunciator.11 The aforementioned Mme Gilain from Croix ostensibly denounced her husband, who died in prison, in order to sleep with Germans.12 Thirty-five-year-old Mme Piette from Fourmies was said to be ‘in constant relations with the Kommandantur’, where officers called her ‘the mother of the officers’, and
she ‘caused considerable damage to inhabitants by her denunciations’. In a somewhat oedipal accusation, she was also allegedly the mistress of numerous officers. In Valenciennes, Mlle Leroy:

had numerous lovers. She ostensibly received [these] day and night and generated her means of existence from the generosity of her passing friends [...] She was known under the name ‘Gold Helmet’ and to attract all the friendship from Germans she denounced inhabitants […] Also she was very feared and everyone was scared of her.

Such allegations conflate legal but unacceptable sexual misconduct with genuinely illegal misconduct.

The link between relations or contact with the Germans and denunciation may not have always been justified, as non-occupied French authorities realised. A summary of a convoy of rapatriés from Anzin noted that the Germans constantly carried out searches, but the public was wrong to think that they originated from denunciations; it recorded that every individual entering the Kommandantur, often for a personal matter, was immediately suspected of being a denunciator, and every victim of a search immediately accused their neighbour of denunciation. Thus, the strong belief in widespread denunciations could have been based on misunderstandings, but misunderstandings that formed around the norms of the occupied culture and its notions of good and bad behaviour.

Instances of named denunciators in repatriation and post-liberation reports regarding the Nord are actually rather infrequent: fourteen women among those subject to the immediate post-liberation investigations were linked to denunciations, although for others denunciation was often implied. Sixty-six women, twenty-five men and one family were signalled as possible denunciators or ‘indicators’ in the Évian testimony examined. British intelligence files relate eight suspected female denunciators, three male, and one whole family. Such suggestive figures do not, however, give an indication of the full extent of the phenomenon; many denunciations were anonymous, thus it was difficult for occupés to provide accurate information on the authors.

Nevertheless, the perception of frequent denunciations was strong among French and Germans alike. In March 1915, the Kommandant of Tourcoing remarked that ‘Recently anonymous letters have been multiplying’, some even addressed to him personally, containing ‘coarse remarks’. He ordered the Mayor to put up a poster stating that anonymous letters to the Kommandantur or other officers were forbidden; the
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municipality would face a fine of 1,000 francs for each letter received for which the author could not be discovered. These may not have been letters of denunciation per se – the tone of the Kommandant suggests that some letters insulted the Germans – but this request nevertheless demonstrates the existence of frequent anonymous letters. Not all Kommandanten reacted angrily: in Douai, in early 1917, it was said that letters of denunciation were so commonplace that the Germans were both shocked and amused by this. Similarly, a summary of February 1917 interviews with 471 rapatriés, mostly women and children, from the Nord recorded that, ‘Numerous denunciations have as their motive private vengeances; the principal authors are sacked housemaids and workers working voluntarily for the Germans. They [the denunciations] denote such base sentiments that the German Kommandant at Valenciennes declared he was shocked by them.’ Further summaries of interviews of hundreds of people from Caudry and Villers-Guislan speak of the frequency of denunciations and note that women ‘in relations’ with Germans served as ‘indicators’; in Caudry, these women had previously had ‘an irreproachable conduct.’ Across the Nord, according to rapatriés, the Germans mocked the ‘French people who are tearing each other apart [se mordent entre eux]’ via ‘the system of denunciation.’

Men were also believed to have been denunciators or informants, albeit less commonly. The twenty-three male denunciators signalled in repatriation interviews came from all walks of life: mechanic Ernest Lecopyer from Fourmies allegedly denounced his boss for hiding 30,000 kilograms of copper; Augustin Longatte from Gouzeaucourt, owner of a bar frequented by Germans, allegedly denounced his neighbour for hiding a horse; M. Delobel from Lille was named as a denunciator and close friend of the Kommandant; and an unnamed builder from Roubaix ostensibly denounced a man for whom he had constructed a hiding place for goods. However, a recurring form of denunciation involved men in positions of authority, themselves denounced by compatriots during and after the liberation. This is examined further in the following chapter; a few examples will suffice here. The Mayor of Saint-Rémy-Chaussée was suspected of threatening citizens with denunciation if they did not do what he said. In Denain, the Adjunct to the Mayor, M. Delphien, was accused of similar threats, although he was also on the Deuxième Bureau’s list of ‘trustworthy persons’ during the war. The curé (parish priest) of Anstaing accused the Mayor of denouncing the fact that he had hidden photographic equipment, but the investigation into the matter concluded that this was not the case.
General misconduct and popular reprisals

The German-nominated Mayor of Boussois, M. Boulogne, was accused of having denounced people to the Germans for being involved in cross-border trade. M. Lesaffre, Adjunct to the Mayor of Comines, appears to have denounced a compatriot to the Germans for hiding his car; the letter of denunciation was also printed in *Le Progrès du Nord* on 12 June 1919, a few days before investigations began.

It is therefore evident that local populations believed a large number of denunciations took place during the war, and that they often viewed possibly arbitrary German actions against them as a directed ‘attack’ resulting from denunciations. Many denunciations may have been in the *imaginaire*, itself demonstrative of occupation expectations, but genuine cases did exist, with no discernible chronological pattern. In Tourcoing, according to police reports, in May 1915,

An individual came to the gendarme station [...] he had denounced unregistered neighbours [of working age obliged to register with the Germans].

[...] The denunciator was seemingly getting revenge on the pretext that he is annoyed by them [the neighbours] because his son works at the Selliez factory in Roubaix, for the Germans.

Other evidence can be found: Irma Lemaire from Fourmies stated during her repatriation interview that she had denounced the Mayor for possessing alcohol and for engaging in gold trafficking in Belgium; she claimed that the Mayor got his revenge by stopping her *allocation*. In another case, in Mouvaux in December 1916, a Frenchwoman was responsible for German gendarmes carrying out detailed searches of the local French police station. The Germans found nothing and admitted to the Commissaire that they had been acting in response to a letter of denunciation written by a woman. The French police later discovered her identity. When Germans searched David Hirsch’s shop in late November 1917, they immediately found his hidden stock and informed him that they had been alerted by a letter of denunciation. He had to go to the nearest police station the following day. Hirsch had no way of identifying the denunciator; perhaps the letter was a forgery intended to sow distrust among the population, but that would not explain how the Germans came to know of the hidden goods.

Nivet calls denunciation the form of collaboration with the most serious consequences. Those harbouring Allied personnel or helping them escape could and did face imprisonment or the death penalty (see Chapter 8). In Cambrai, the Directrice of the Hospice Général
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helped 100 French soldiers return to France but was denounced by two Frenchmen and a Frenchwoman and condemned to ten years’ imprisonment. Many others denounced for hiding goods or breaching other German rules were fined, imprisoned or deported. For instance, on 20 June 1915, in Faches-Thumesnil on the outskirts of Lille, one Mme Devilde denounced a man hiding a revolver and munitions in his house; he was sentenced to death by a war tribunal, commuted to five years’ forced labour, where he died. In Denain, M. Guidez was denounced by Frédéric Dejaeghère for being absent from work and was punished to twenty days’ imprisonment, then sent to a discipline battalion; in Le Cateau, Mme Lénéchal was denounced by Henriette Dauon for having hidden copper and other goods, and fined 100 marks.

It is therefore unsurprising that verified authors of denunciations – men and women – were punished in the post-war period, notably by the Cour d’Assises du Nord. For example, Eugène Delforge from Monchecourt (an arrondissement of Douai) was found guilty in October 1920 of intelligence avec l’ennemi and subsequently sentenced to three years’ imprisonment. His crimes mainly involved denunciations: among others, he denounced a woman for hiding a gun, another woman for travelling without a pass, five hidden French soldiers and, on numerous occasions, the Mayoral Adjunct for hiding weapons and harbouring an escaped English aviator. That same month, Mme Auvertin of Lille was sentenced to two years’ imprisonment for having denounced an Alsacien man who had been hiding from the Germans; he was subsequently punished with over ten years’ imprisonment. In Tourcoing in July 1915, Frenchwomen had denounced French gendarmes Rousseau and Scritte for purportedly calling the Germans cochons (pigs), which led to Rousseau’s imprisonment for six months. Rousseau claimed the women had misheard the word couchez (sleep). One Mme Anvelier was found guilty of this fact in January 1922 and was sentenced to four years’ imprisonment. Julie Hoedt was also sentenced for this crime in July 1923, punished (in absentia) with deportation to ‘fortified prison’. Therefore, some denunciations recorded during the occupation were proven to have been correct. Renée Martinage has demonstrated that around thirty of the forty-three persons condemned from 1919 to 1925 by the Cour d’Assises du Nord for intelligence avec l’ennemi were found guilty of denunciation, and many of the others were guilty of multiple illegal actions, including denunciation. The wartime gendering of denunciation was evident at these trials: all but one of twenty-eight women put on trial were accused of denunciation; sixteen of the
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forty-three individuals found guilty were women, fifteen for denunciation.49 Around a dozen individuals were also investigated during and after the liberation for denunciation.50 Such numbers are small, but they represent only those cases where concrete evidence could be provided for a crime usually carried out in anonymity, and nevertheless suggest that there was truth behind some accusations of denunciation.

Working for the Germans

Occupés of both sexes were believed by compatriots to have worked for the Germans voluntarily in tasks as varied as making sandbags, manufacturing munitions, nursing, farming, chopping wood, cooking, cleaning, even being part of the German police. Evidence suggests that voluntary labour involving a small minority of people was commonplace in the Nord. Among the women investigated in November 1918, fifteen suspected prostitutes were accused of this.51 I(b) (British intelligence) reports contain seven men signalled as voluntary workers, two of whom – a father and son – were said to have been working in a munitions factory.52 The early 1917 repatriation interviews mention alleged voluntary labour thirty-two times across twenty-two communes, mostly comprising summaries of the extent of voluntary work rather than lists of named individuals.53 In Roisies, it was reported that numerous men were forced to work; however, ‘Lots of people work at the German military depot; among them many volunteers. They earn 3 francs a day.’54 A man in Denain appeared in multiple repatriation reports, suspected of being an interpreter and journalist for the Germans, writing for the Gazette des Ardennes and the Bruxellois.55 Also in Denain, Céline Blinette admitted during her repatriation interrogation that she had made 200 sandbags for the Germans, for which she was paid 30 francs.56 In Peux-aux-Bois, between 125 and 150 people aged seventeen to forty allegedly worked voluntarily for the Germans in Morval forest. They made posts ‘that they know are destined to support barbed wire in trenches’.57 A widow and mistress of a German officer in Valenciennes ostensibly not only worked for the occupiers but also actively aided them in recruiting further female volunteers ‘for the confection of blankets, belts, shirts, but in reality to make sandbags[;] the women did not protest because they were paid 15 francs a day’.58

However, it was and is often unclear whether work, especially factory or agricultural labour, was genuinely voluntary because French communes were forced to pay both voluntary and forced labourers.59
Also, the Germans often forced workers to sign documents demonstrating that they had chosen to work for them ‘voluntarily’.\textsuperscript{60} Reported German methods of ‘persuading’ people to work included imprisonment, beatings and physical torture (see Chapter 8). Avoiding punishment likely encouraged some to work voluntarily. Another motive was better treatment: for example, in April 1917, a poster put up across occupied France and Belgium announced that those working for the Germans voluntarily could write and receive a letter of four pages of ten lines once a week, whereas forced labourers could only receive a single, shorter postcard (usually containing pre-written responses to be crossed out).\textsuperscript{61} The final reason for voluntary work was increased pay, as mentioned above, which was particularly tempting as penury and hunger increased, and which may have pushed the poorest into accepting German work.\textsuperscript{62} Nivet suggests that the number of volunteers increased over time,\textsuperscript{63} which would fit in with this argument, although unfortunately the sources examined here do not allow for such a precise assessment.

The distance between reality and perceptions, but the importance of the latter for inter-French judgement, is evident in events in Tourcoing in June 1915. The Germans demanded the municipality provide workers to clean the railway station.\textsuperscript{64} The municipality complied, ordering the police to procure the required number of workers. One of these was M. Cesse, whose wife wrote to the Mayor, asking if her husband could be exempted from such work because

\begin{quote}
I have four small children of young age and the fifth that he will come [sic] and we are criticised by everyone and we have a lot of distress both of us and we want to repair our honour if you would allow us[,] I hope Monsieur Dron that you will not refuse my demand please for we are in desolation both of us.\textsuperscript{65}
\end{quote}

It seems that the source of Mme Cesse’s distress was the affront to her family’s honour and the attendant criticism resulting from her husband’s perceived employment by the Germans. Such criticism was felt acutely by this working-class family, despite the fact that M. Cesse was not a volunteer; he was considered to be working for the enemy, and that was enough.

Even in alleged cases of voluntary work there were blurred lines: for instance, repatriation testimony remarked that at Hautmont women were not forced to work and some volunteered; men were forced to work in factories, but ‘there are also volunteers’.\textsuperscript{66} In Valenciennes, women initially worked voluntarily for the Germans, but when they wanted to stop
they were forced to work. Yet some historical works note with pride that the German policy of forced labour was implemented precisely because there were so few volunteers. The occupiers did repeatedly call for volunteers (even to construct third-line trenches), suggesting that volunteer levels were not adequate. In rare instances where the number of volunteers is recorded, it is low. At the Pollet textile factory in Tourcoing in May 1915 (during the work-stoppage crisis discussed below), local police reported thirteen voluntary ('or so-called') workers creating sandbags, and at least twenty-one in June. A report seemingly written by the French police noted that 170 civilians 'work with the Germans' in six factories in Roubaix-Tourcoing at the end of July 1915, although some factory owners had been imprisoned to encourage workers to recommence work, so the voluntary nature of this is questionable. In Mouvaux, according to a post-war police report, twelve people had worked voluntarily for the Germans during the occupation – one of whom, Arthur Vercaigne, also spied for them.

Nevertheless, the existence of voluntary workers, however small in number and whatever their motives, provoked strong emotions. Fellow occupés found their actions morally and patriotically repugnant, although it is likely that those forced to carry out war-related tasks by the Germans also came under attack from compatriots. Antoine Redier cited the testimony of a woman who claimed to have been forced to work in the fields for the Germans, alongside voluntary workers. Locals did not take kindly to seeing this group: ‘People on the road screamed at us: “Look at this scum, these bitches [ordures] who are passing by!”’ Within occupied culture, perceived volunteers were treated as traitors. A clandestine publication from November 1915 used that exact word to describe 'men and women who work for the German authority [and] assist in the pillage of our towns, ransack our factories, lay to waste the material of our mills, assist in the dilapidation of France [and] the ruin of our country, work against those who must defend our Patrie.'

In September 1917, Blin demonstrated the continued disdain directed at those perceived to be working for the Germans of their own free will:

Bourgeois opinion is not favourable to roubaïsien workers who, turning up voluntarily to German summons, work on the outskirts of Wambrechies & Linselles. Other than their daily salary of 7fr. they return with wood, green and other beans, potatoes, etc. that they sell at a good price. [H]umanity, conscience, patriotism, honesty, all the sentiments that make man dignified fade away before such narrow selfishness!
Mme Marie Prouvost from Roubaix echoed Blin’s class-based criticism in her repatriation testimony, remarking in early 1917 that the ‘old bourgeoisie of Roubaix’ remained as patriotic, dignified and courageous as ever, whereas the ‘working class, small shopkeepers, women of ill repute and [sic] (whilst there are numerous exceptions) have lost the sentiment of honour or patriotism because of daily contact with the enemy. Many work voluntarily, attracted by the high salaries offered by the Germans’. Similar classist critiques appear in repatriation testimony concerning Saint-Amand-les-Eaux, a spa town surrounded by forest whose inhabitants were seen as especially willing to work voluntarily, including men aged between twenty and twenty-five felling trees and ‘demolishing’ factory material, and many women bottling water. One report focuses in particular on the testimony of M. Bottiau, chief tax official, who claimed that the working class ‘accommodated itself the best’ with the occupiers, having such ‘familiarity’ with the Germans and such high salaries that they wished for the war to continue. He concluded:

As for patriotism, it does not exist […] the major part of St-Amand is composed of antipatriotic elements […]

In the workers’ milieu, one feels more and more the hatred of the poor against the rich, the worker against the boss. The workers work for the Germans, demolish the industrial material with a ferocious animosity […] It is to be feared that after the war, the struggle of classes will be livelier than ever. It is necessary to add, however, that if the population of St-Amand is very antipatriotic, this same sentiment does not exist or exists a lot less in the surrounding area.

Such an account is likely exaggerated, but it demonstrates the centrality of bourgeois criticism to occupied culture. However, while the working class was criticised in such accounts, certain workers also adhered to this culture, as will be seen.

The negative reaction to perceived voluntary labourers outlasted the occupation, demonstrated in a letter from one Mlle Munch to the Mayor of Lille, dated 9 November 1918. She had spent the occupation with her mother in her village of Pérenchies, and her only brother was killed in a gas attack. The letter praised the courage of the French army and demonstrated her belief that the Mayor and Lille suffered a Calvary. She attached a poem she had written in 1916 criticising Belgian and French men digging German trenches voluntarily. The poem spoke directly to these workers, starting by using the formal, plural ‘vous’ and ending with the informal, singular ‘tu’ – suggesting that she was talking to one
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worker in particular. The men are told that ‘for your brothers you are making tombs [...] / For money, oh!’ She invoked a desire for revenge which would manifest itself when French soldiers ‘will punish the bad people without pity’, because:

You [tu] have sullied my sacred earth,
Turning over weapons to Germany
You are a stranger to your brothers
Finally, go die far from France.79

This self-identified ‘Frenchwoman of heart’ therefore points to the existence of French (and Belgian) civilians working for the Germans. Even if they were not doing so voluntarily, in the eyes of Munch there was no distinction: working for the Germans was treasonous and cowardly. The mention of money suggests that she was writing about voluntary labourers, which would certainly explain her hatred and desire for revenge.

Some rare individuals, mainly men, worked for the Germans in a manner that left little scope for misunderstandings. In March 1918, the Secretary of the Mairie of Hellemmes wrote to both the Préfet and the Procureur de la République to complain about Frenchman M. Astaes, who was part of the German police. He was said to have terrorised inhabitants and was protected by the occupiers.80 Post-war investigations and trials targeted such people and other voluntary workers. One concluded that at Trélon, twenty-year-old textile worker René Détrait had been a German policeman during the occupation, wearing an armband, helping out with requisitions, denouncing and ‘terrorising’ the local population. He had fled to Paris after the war, and it is unclear if he was eventually punished.81 Jules Bachy from Fourmies was found to have written for and distributed the Gazette des Ardennes, but because he was seventy-eight and in ill health in January 1919, he received no immediate punishment, and he does not appear in any judicial records.82 The aforementioned denunciator Eugène Delforge had accompanied Germans in their searches while wearing a German uniform and carrying a revolver.83 Two men from Eccles were punished in October 1920 for helping out with armed German searches.84 The same month, one Georges Gomy was sentenced to a year’s imprisonment after being found guilty ‘of having, in the arrondissement of Lille, in 1914, 1915, 1916, engaged in correspondence with enemy subjects, by working voluntary for the said enemy on works of military defence’.85 In January 1921, Belgian Frédéric Henri Dejaeghère from Fives-Lilles was sentenced to five years’
detention not only for denunciations but also for having worked vol-
untarily for the Germans, particularly commanding a company of other
French volunteers to help with the destruction of the Usine des Forges
in Denain. A man from Wattrelos had even, in 1914–15, dressed in
a German uniform and had overseen his civilian compatriots engaged
in forced labour. Another man had acted as an auxiliary policeman
in Cambrai throughout the whole occupation. The number of people
found guilty of this is low, and the severity of the punishments is not
surprising – working freely for the Germans constituted legal treason.
However, it is proof that voluntary workers did exist, suggesting that
there was some truth to accusations of such misconduct.

Espionage

A small number of occupés were believed to have spied for the Germans. There was some overlap with espionage, being a denunciator/indicator,
or working for the German police. For locals and the French secret
service, spying involved both providing information to the Germans
more generally and being a paid German agent – normally attached to
the German secret police or intelligence service engaged in counter-
espionage in the occupied area. Women, particularly those ostensibly
engaging in sexual misconduct, were suspected of this slightly more
than men. A total of thirty-six women and twenty men, mostly from
Lille or Roubaix, were accused of espionage in repatriation testimony.
Among the men, foreign civilians feature prominently (Italians, Dutch,
Swiss, Germans or those with German family). A handful of women
signalled as spies reappear across the testimony of numerous rapatriés
from Lille from late April to mid-March 1917. These women were
allegedly mistresses of high-ranking Germans, moved freely within and
outside the occupied area, and spied for the Germans in occupied and
unoccupied France. Rose Roussier from Lille, nicknamed ‘Zette’, was,
in April 1917, suspected of returning to France via Holland – a route
that could only be possible with the aid of the Germans, who sent her
on a mission. It was said she was accompanied to the Dutch border by
German soldiers. She had also been, in occupied France, the mistress of
Crown Prince Ruprecht of Bavaria, hence her second nickname: la petite
princesse. Roussier was apparently friends with other suspected spies
in relationships with Germans: Jeanne Defrance and Alice Rousseau/
Desrousseaux from Lille (apparently another mistress of the Crown
Prince), and Micheline Foures and Fernande ‘Mouton’ Matton from La
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Madeleine. According to one statement, Matton was forcibly repatriated because she gave the Kommandant of La Madeleine a sexually transmitted disease.  

Some of these suspects were repatriated and interrogated in March 1917. Alice Desrousseaux made no mention of her alleged espionage, but she and a fellow woman themselves denounced another woman from Lille as a spy, providing considerable detail: Rachelle Van den Bulke (known as 'Régina') of 30 rue Faidherbe helped a French agent called ‘Fournier’ exchange correspondence between occupied and unoccupied France. Fournier entrusted her with the letters, but she handed them to the German intelligence service, for whom she worked. She went to the German intelligence office at rue Victor Hugo in Tourcoing and received 1,200 francs a month for her services. Van den Bulke appears in other testimony, sometimes with a different spelling, and in one case both her and Desrousseaux/Rousseau are credited with passing a letter to the French Minister of War. Fernande Matton was interrogated twice. The first time, she confirmed that Rose Roussier had indeed been the mistress of the Crown Prince of Bavaria; the second time, she herself denied being his mistress. She outlined a complex series of events: rejections of advances from Germans, splitting up with her boyfriend, finally entering into relations with Max von Wittenhorts, a gendarmerie commander, until December 1916 when he was forced to leave Roubaix for having aided Matton by passing letters to her friend in Brussels. Matton ended by denouncing Jeanne Defrance and Rose Roussier as women of ill repute who had venereal disease. It is not possible to delve further into these complicated, fascinating accounts, but what is important to note is that most of this core group of suspected spies denounced their so-called friends as spies, women of ill repute, or both; in doing so they implicitly or explicitly denied that they themselves were spies, and echoed key judgements of occupied culture. Each seemed to have had detailed knowledge of the others, suggesting that perhaps they had been involved in similar activities and desired to exonerate themselves once repatriated by denouncing former friends.

It is possible not only that these women were indeed spying for the Germans but also that accusations stemmed from a belief in pre-existing relations with the Germans. For instance, Mme Pourez-Conteran from Roubaix was labelled by a rapatrié as being susceptible ‘of engaging in espionage’ because she had ‘intimate relations’ with German officers and had been the mistress of Kommandant Hofmann, for whom she served as an interpreter. Whatever the reality of the above cases, spying
was heavily associated with Lille and its environs. The German police headquarters in Lille was allegedly ‘a refuge for spies’,

in Lambersart, a German-speaking Frenchwoman nicknamed ‘The Spy’ owned a villa where other women ‘engaged in diverse festivities’; one Frenchman was claimed to be ‘head of the Office of the Intelligence Service at 9–10 Rue du Pas’ in Lille and was personally criticised in the clandestine publication Les Vidanges (discussed below).

French intelligence officers believed that the Germans recruited ‘numerous women from special milieux (dressmakers, hat-makers, governesses, teachers, opera singers)’ to be spies and even suspected women of espionage simply because of their profession. Yet other non-occupied French authorities were cautious about reports of espionage, especially the commonplace conflation of sexual misconduct and spying. In a note to interpreters attached to the British army regarding their duties in the event of an advance, interpreter Letore drew on his experience from the spring 1917 advances, warning:

experience has proved to me that public rumour can make too quickly and therefore unjustly spies of all women of ill repute who have had intimate relations with the Germans. These women and girls must be suspects, of course; they are surely not spies […] the people who accuse have suffered greatly from Boche brutality […] and can unwittingly exaggerate the facts. Those whom they have accused have suffered greatly too […] No-one is more horrified than me that these women could descend so low; yet horror does not exclude pity; certainly it must not lead us to injustice.

This not only demonstrates the seriousness with which non-occupied French, especially military, authorities regarded accusations of espionage; but also that these authorities sometimes held more nuanced views than the occupés themselves. The occupied culture had strict norms, a simplistic, Manichean labelling, and quick judgements. It largely ignored the subtleties of occupied life with which many struggled; its standards were idealistic rather than realistic.

Yet there is some, limited evidence beyond repatriation reports of French espionage for the Germans. The Commissaire de Police of Condé, Vieux-Condé, Escautpont and Crespin addressed a summary of the occupation to the Sous-Préfet of Valenciennes in November 1918. He explained that the ‘German civilian police’ searched for hidden Allied soldiers and authorised ‘unscrupulous people, so-called ravitailleurs [suppliers of goods, discussed in Chapter 5]’ to have freedom of movement to carry out commerce, even across the Belgian border, on the
condition that they denounced those who contravened German rules. He continued: 'About 20 spies operated in my area and are very dangerous. There are others. I found on Belgian Maurice Schandewyld, from Fresnes, arrested *in flagrante* for fabrication of false money […], papers naming him an agent of German security services […] The Germans were also informed by loose women and other people'.

In January 1919, three individuals from Wignehies, a village west of Fourmies, were found guilty by a French intelligence investigation of espionage during the occupation: Belgian Marie Werbrouck, her twenty-six-year-old daughter Armide and fifty-five-year-old Georges Duchat. They had, among other things, denounced locals during the occupation and were responsible for German searches. Marie Werbrouck was arrested and imprisoned; an arrest warrant was issued for the other two. According to Marie Werbrouck’s own testimony, her daughter had divorced in July 1914 and, in February 1916, had became involved with German Franz Meyer. In January 1917, she gave birth to a child, but it died hours later. Her daughter was then sent to Valenciennes’ prison and ‘placed in a cupboard to listen to prisoners’ conversations’, which she would repeat to an officer (Naussbaum) who was a friend of her lover. Marie Werbrouck denied knowing that her daughter worked for the German police and claimed that she accidentally caused German searches by simply talking to Naussbaum about hidden goods. Her daughter had left for Sivy in Belgium on 10 November 1918 with the German driver who lodged at their house; Marie had not heard from her since. This case is exceptional because the words ‘espionage’ or ‘spy’ were not used to describe any of those found guilty of *intelligence avec l’ennemi* by the Cour d’Assises du Nord, although there was a legal blurred line between being a denunciator/‘indicator’ and a genuine spy – all these comprised *intelligence avec l’ennemi* and especially *correspondance avec l’ennemi*. However, punishment of those believed to have engaged in misconduct went beyond the purely legal.

**Revenge during the occupation: from insult to assault**

Acts of revenge or expressions of disgust concerning suspect individuals were not limited to the liberation or post-war period. Sources testify to verbal attacks against individuals during the occupation, usually women believed to have been engaging in intimate relations with the Germans or those working voluntarily for the occupiers. Insults such as *Bocharte* and *femme à Boches* were used frequently, plus variations
such as Bochette or Bochesse – and for all those engaging in misconduct, including men, embochés. Unsurprisingly, the Germans forbade such insults, and diarists recorded that people were punished for this.

Redier, writing of women who were German mistresses, stated, ‘We hardly dared to look at these women, as we went to prison for having displeased them.’

Despite or perhaps because of this, some occupés explicitly expressed their desire for post-war revenge, retribution or justice. Some repatriation testimony stated that inhabitants photographed women (especially married or young women) who had relations with Germans, showing them walking arm in arm and entering hotels. The purpose of such photographs was clear: in Valenciennes, an album was deposited at the Mairie; in Roubaix, two sisters were photographed with Germans, and ‘numerous examples of these photos were produced and distributed to numerous people who have the intention of proving the inconduite of these young women after the war.’ Women photographed in compromising positions were also mentioned in reports on Lille and Tourcoing.

I have not discovered actual examples of such photographs.

More verifiable were clandestine tracts, which circulated in Lille-Roubaix-Tourcoing and Brussels throughout the war, three of which used similar, insulting language to criticise those engaging in misconduct. These publications are examined in more detail in Chapter 8. The title of one, Les Vidanges (a pun on ‘life of angels’ and ‘taking out the rubbish’) gives an indication of the attitude its authors held towards embochés.

The only preserved copy dates from January 1917 and comprises a list of suspect individuals, often described in a mocking, insulting way. The explanation of the list highlights a mindset central to the wider occupied culture:

We are publishing a correct and verified list of the filthy females and disgusting characters engaging in commerce and the rest with our enemies.

Whilst the husband, brother, or son finds himself at the front or is sleeping six feet under, these swine party, and prostitute their very beings, their family and their motherland under the German boot! …

The motherland and their families must not suffer this smear. The women whom we denounce for punishment by honest people enrolled in their manner under the flags of the invader, they have chosen the position that suits their insanity; some of them think of profiting from the automobiles of their friends and of making it abroad the day of their next retreat, but whatever happens, we will find them again one day, and their names will have been thrown like rubbish … in the bin!!… EAGLE EYE [ŒIL DE LYNX].
Once again, it is primarily women who were the object of this criticism, although men were also named and shamed in these publications.

Expressions of criticism occasionally went beyond words. Suspected spy Mouton even remarked that there was, in Lille, a ‘secret society’ called ‘Les Vengeurs’ (The Avengers) who had

as their mission to execute all denunciators. It is thus that the denunciator of Miss Cavell and the French teacher was punished by two members of this society. These two members, righters of wrongs [justiciers], were themselves denounced and arrested in January 1916, but yet another new denunciator was executed shortly afterwards.111

No other sources point to similar executions, but there are hints of physical vengeance. Maxence van der Meersch attributes much importance to attacks on suspect individuals in his novel Invasion ’14 – Fanny, the wife of an absent Belgian soldier, is subject of physical abuse in a bread queue because she was pregnant by a German.112 This may seem imbued with a heavy sense of poetic licence, but it appears to have had some basis in actual events, although it is not clear whether the young van der Meersch, only eleven in October 1918, witnessed or knew about them.113 Marc Blanpain, in his 1980 memoir of the occupation, refers to similar incidents:

those who we called ‘les femmes à boches’ were hated and, exposed, lived in danger; we smashed their windows with pebbles; pointed out by fingers, they were shoved and hit slyly in the street or in the long food queues; we sung filthy and threatening laments behind them or under their windows; sick, we let them snuff it at home, saying: ‘They’re only getting what they deserve.’

We sometimes took advantage of the darkness of winter nights to push them into a canal or the freezing waters of a river.114

Archival evidence suggests there is some truth behind van der Meersch and Blanpain’s prose. In Denain, according to rapatriés, there were ‘veritable battles of women’ in 1914 – those who worked freely for the Germans, nicknamed the femmes à sacs (sandbag women) were hit, insulted, threatened with having their hair cut.115 The first example of popular vengeance in Lille occurred on 12 February 1915. As a police report indicates, a group of about 100 ‘demonstrators spontaneously went’ to an estaminet run by a Belgian man suspected of having denounced hidden French soldiers. The crowd threw stones at the window, smashing the glass, causing a few hundred francs’ material damage. No one was injured, and three hours later order was
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re-established, with no arrests made.116 The same day, M. Trollin, a head teacher from Lille, noted in his diary, ‘A crowd sacked a cabaret [in] rue de l’Hop. S’ Roch: the female owner denounced a French soldier who was hiding in a neighbouring house.’117 It is unclear if Trollin is referencing the same event, albeit with different details. Similar events occurred, again in Lille, on 4 March 1915, this time targeting a woman: a crowd of about 500 people ‘booed’ thirty-nine-year-old Mme Devildre, on boulevard Victor Hugo. A French policeman helped to accompany Devildre home, seemingly attempting to ameliorate the disorder which could engender German reprisals for the entire city. During the walk, ‘stones were thrown at Devildre by children, and by women who followed her and called her a “whore”’. Devildre called two passing German soldiers, but their intervention exacerbated the anger of the crowd. Once at her sister’s house, the sister called for more German soldiers, and about ten came to disperse the crowd – shots were fired, but no one was injured. Devildre had also been molested by crowds on 2 and 3 March.118

An interesting case is related in a letter from one Kleeberg, working for the military police at the Kommandantur of Lille, to M. Pollet, head of the civilian police of Lille, on 19 April 1915:

On 18/4/15 a gathering occurred around 1p.m. […] around a French middle-class woman. The unfortunate woman was mistreated by numerous women for reasons that I do not know. They tore her clothes[,] they kicked her and they tore her hair. At the same time, cries of ‘She’s with the dirty boches’ etc were heard.119

Such attacks were likely carried out by working-class individuals, representing an extreme expression of disgust at those breaching the expectations of occupied life and hinting that at least some workers adhered to the norms of occupied culture. It is curious that such similar events took place so close to each other and so relatively early on in the war, with no recorded incidents of such violence after 1915 in the Nord. Such attacks were a precursor to what became known as the affaire des sacs (sandbag affair).

The sandbag affair

The traditional narrative of this affaire is that the Germans had ordered locals to create sandbags, fencing and other material which they claimed would be used for purely defensive or non-military purposes in the occupied area. Once it became clear that such goods were being sent to
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the front, workers and factory owners refused to cooperate – in Becker’s words, they ‘led the combat’ – via a series of strikes from April–July 1915, primarily in the Lille-Roubaix-Tourcoing area. Military material was indeed being fabricated here: in Lille alone, an estimated 220,000–230,000 sandbags a day were produced in spring–summer 1915. Yet although industrialists and local notables did play an important role (see Chapter 6), the strikes actually started with crowds of outraged working-class locals refusing to allow the workers to enter the factories, launching verbal and physical attacks including pulling hair and beatings. Many victims and perpetrators were women. One case study is representative: in late April 1915, female workers of the Selliez clothing factory in Roubaix were insulted for numerous consecutive days by local residents who, a French police report noted, ‘had built themselves up into an angry state’. The women were targeted because the factory was working with the Germans. Some locals believed it was making uniforms, but it was in fact producing around 900 empty sandbags and trellises a day. This ‘conflict’ culminated in a ‘small riot’ on 30 April. At 7.00 a.m., the approximately 450 women employees ‘got to work, but, by a sort of tacit agreement, they did not start work, apart from about fifty who, having a batch of goods to finish, entered to complete this job’. The latter left the factory individually at 8.00–8.30 p.m. once their work was finished, and each woman was assaulted by locals in ‘hostile and violent demonstrations’. One of the perpetrators, a cabaratière (cabaret owner) named Mme Mordacq, ‘acted in a particularly brutal manner’. In his diary, Blin recorded that these disturbances were accompanied by children singing: ‘The [female] workers of Selliez / Have betrayed the French / Who will come and hunt them down / When the peace is signed.’ Two French policemen were at the scene but were unable to restore order. Despite the violence to which they had been subjected, none of the victims complained to the local police commissioner.

In late June, again in Roubaix, a man was arrested for having said, ‘You have to be a coward to work for the Germans and against your brothers.’ He told the arresting German officer that he would repeat these words to his Kommandant. The same day, three women who made sandbags were ‘smacked’. The Commissaire Central concluded, ‘It is certain that a strong movement of discontentment has been occurring for a few days in the working population.’ Days later, in Roubaix, crowds not only physically assaulted a woman believed to be working for the Germans but threw manure at a French commissaire (M. Orlianges) who tried to calm the situation – because he allegedly had a mistress who oversaw the
manufacture of sandbags in her house. Orlianges called on a German gendarme who came to his aid, even firing a shot into the crowd before his revolver was knocked from his hand.130 A French police investigation was launched, during which women freely admitted assaulting other women who they believed were making sandbags. The finer details of this are complex and fascinating, and I have examined them elsewhere.131 They demonstrate the strength and violence of working-class criticisms of those who were thought to have worked for the Germans. These attacks, which in some sense have an element of charivari about them,132 were a means of reinforcing the occupied culture. In particular, they explicitly demonstrated what was acceptable or not according to the moral-patriotic norms: in this case, making sandbags which would aid the German war effort was clearly unacceptable.

Whether in response to threats and attacks from compatriots or a genuine crise de conscience, many in Lille-Roubaix-Tourcoing refused to continue working until late July 1915, when harsh German measures (stricter curfews, fines for municipalities, imprisoning bosses and attackers, punishing absentees) quelled the public disorder.133 (In her memoirs, May Corballis [Sœur Marguerite], an English nun living in Roubaix until November 1916, suggested a different resolution: she had personally convinced the Kommandant that making sandbags was ‘anti-patriotic’ work, and ‘he agreed to not ask the people to make any more’. This seems unlikely, and in any case would not apply beyond Roubaix.134) The harsh German reaction offers a probable explanation for the lack of similar disorders and acts of public retribution for the duration of the war, but the liberation afforded new opportunities for enacting ‘justice’ on those who had engaged in misconduct.

Post-war popular purges?

From October 1918, few ‘purges’ like those seen in the aftermath of the Second World War took place. This was perhaps linked to the rapid Allied reoccupation, which imposed its own strict controls, dissuading mass disorder – perhaps also because of aforementioned military investigations into and removal of suspect individuals. Yet some acts of popular retribution did occur. On the evening of 19 October 1918, ‘a group of young people accompanied by women traversed several roads of the quartier St-Maurice [in Lille], demonstrating in front of the houses where women had engaged in relations with German soldiers’. Five women had their houses targeted, and vandalism and theft were
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carried out: windows were smashed, money and property (which the crowd claimed the women had obtained as favours from the Germans) was stolen.\textsuperscript{135} That same evening, a crowd of 200 men and women (possibly the same people) vandalised and stole from a pâtisserie and an estaminet whose owners were ‘known for having engaged in commerce with the Germans during the occupation’.\textsuperscript{136} A police report from the next day (20–1 October 1918) explained that similar scenes occurred in the eighth arrondissement: at the house of a woman who had lodged a German, all the window panes were smashed with stones, and the crowd broke into the house to steal goods. Window panes were smashed at another woman’s home, and ‘a house known for having engaged in commerce and relations’ with the Germans was pillaged by ‘a crowd of unknown individuals’. The female owner had been warned in advance and had kept her distance.\textsuperscript{137}

On 17 November, crowds sacked a house in Croix believed to belong to a married woman said to have had a German lover during the occupation and to have engaged in commerce with the enemy. The owner of this house was actually her aunt, and the suspect – one Mme Terasse – had already fled the commune.\textsuperscript{138} For Le Naour, such police reports ‘are shockingly silent and hide undoubtedly violent realities behind laconic and discreet phrases’, such as ‘the population hounded her’.\textsuperscript{139} Thus, there were some unofficial, fairly violent ‘purges’, and there were probably further unreported examples of this, or reported examples for which the documents are missing. Here the crowds appear to have wanted to remove the wealth accumulated during the occupation by certain suspects, and to damage their buildings, rather than any more permanent or serious punishment of the suspects. This may make their expression of anger representative of a desire to punish outside the realms of the law, which they saw as inadequate, and a recognition that the suspects had not broken any laws (or had, but that this could not be proved) – yet had still behaved badly, had still in some way betrayed their Patrie. Misconduct was not confined to legal definitions.

Rare sources also mention female head-shaving taking place, one of the most infamous symbols of popular punishment of alleged collaborators during the Liberation of the Second World War.\textsuperscript{140} As Le Naour notes, attempting to study and shed light on similar events during and after the liberation of the First World War leads to ‘a wall of silence considerably more insurmountable than that of the shameful secret of 1944: indeed, if the sources and archives abound regarding the second liberation, the manifestation of odious head-shavings at the end of the
First World War have barely been recorded. But there is some hard
evidence of head-shavings. In his interwar book Occupied, 1918–1930: A
Postscript to the Western Front, British journalist Ferdinand Tuohy noted
of reoccupied northern France: ‘Not a few of the black-listed ones –
women – were found to have been shorn by fellow-citizens as a stigma
of shame’, although he also hints at more serious methods of retribution,
for ‘others were come upon with their throats cut’. Further, Le Naour
cites the testimony of peasant soldier Grenadou, referring to the liber-
ation of 1918: ‘When we arrived in that area, they were settling scores,
old quarrels from the time of the Germans. They cut the hair of good/
beautiful [bonnes] women. Talk about a circus! We didn’t find that to our
taste.’ Similarly, a photographer from Valenciennes testified to head-
shavings in November 1918. Thus, although not as widespread as in
Belgium in 1918, some popular, physical reprisals did occur in the
Nord. Curiously, this phenomenon, even if it was limited in nature due
to the absence of the latent civil war which explained the explosion of
popular justice in 1944–45, is rarely mentioned in later accounts of the
occupation and liberation. However, there was another form of revenge
that took place at the liberation: denunciations of suspect individuals.
This phenomenon and the subsequent investigations shed light on the
specificity of male misconduct during the occupation.
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