DECONSTRUCTING A HIGH STAKES DECEPTION: A CASE STUDY
OF FALSE CLAIMS OF HEROISM

by

MARILYN J. CUDMORE

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of Social and Applied Sciences in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Royal Roads University,
Victoria, British Columbia, Canada

Supervisor: Dr. Judee Burgoon

© Marilyn J. Cudmore, 2017
COMMITTEE APPROVAL

The members of Marilyn J. Cudmore's Dissertation Committee certify that they have read the dissertation titled *Deconstructing a High Stakes Deception: A case study of false claims of heroism*, and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Social Sciences:

Dr. Michael Woodworth [signature on file]

Dr. Leslie King [signature on file]

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate’s submission of the final copy of the dissertation to Royal Roads University. The acting supervisor confirms that he has read this dissertation and recommends that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirements:

dr. matthew heinz, Dean of the College of Interdisciplinary Studies, Royal Roads University, acting on behalf of Dr. Judee Burgoon, Supervisor.
Creative Commons Statement

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-ShareAlike 2.5 Canada License. To view a copy of this license, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.5/ca/.

Some material in this work is not being made available under the terms of this licence:

• Third-Party material that is being used under fair dealing or with permission.

• Any photographs where individuals are easily identifiable.
Author Statement

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at Royal Roads University and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part for commercial use may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED: MARILYN J. CUDMORE
A high stakes deception surpasses other intentional forms of deceit because it is a strategic construction of distorted truths which supplies notable benefits to the Deceiver but purposely delivers deleterious outcomes to targeted Receivers. The level of risk necessary for the Deceiver to accomplish these desired results is tempered by the intense satisfaction of having successfully orchestrated it, of having "won". Specifically, some high stakes deception is unique in that it is well prepared, produced as revenge to a targeted person, and maintained over time using a developed public persona that is exemplary and seemingly credible.

A historical, single case study was selected in order to deconstruct the multiple aspects of this type of high stakes deception, to further understand how contextual elements, personal characteristics and interpersonal communication tactics combined to enable a Deceiver to conceive and implement strategic manoeuvrings efficaciously. The case study exposed a deception by a Dutch Jewish individual who lived through both the Holocaust years in Amsterdam and a short incarceration in a Nazi transit camp at the end of World War II. Forty eight years after the war, he made a startling claim that he was the liberator of almost nine hundred Jewish prisoners from a Dutch transit camp, Kamp Westerbork. His survivor/hero script brought him considerable prestige and financial reward, the capstone being a knighthood conferred onto him by the Royal Dutch House of Orange, although Dutch historians later debunked his claim. The deconstruction of the deception broadens the understanding of how the Deceiver was able to effect a convincing deception to a wide Receiver audience, with minimal accountability. The study supports the Interpersonal Deception Theory.
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Introduction

The Deceiver, who conducts a high stakes deception, recognizes at some point that their goal of winning status, success, or retribution can be achieved through the use of deception. He becomes involved with potential Receivers who will either advance that goal, or be sacrificed for it. A complex construction of deception begins, first by using the Deceiver's keen understanding of the social context from which the narrative can be formed, and in which the deception will be enacted. Secondly, the Deceiver has interpersonal skills which can manipulate the personal values and communication styles of others to attract the targeted Receiver(s). The Deceiver uses considerable savviness and charm to quickly create an intimate and trusting relationship with the Receiver(s), in order to deftly manage an ongoing deception which has truth intermixed with partial truths and falsehoods. The merging of such disparate components into a conversation is not only intended to confuse the targeted individual, but also to concurrently appeal to a wider audience. Over time, the Deceiver and Receiver become estranged, a solid base on which the Deceiver can continue to conduct the deception to his/her advantage, but with harmful outcomes to the Receiver. This type of deception is aptly termed a high stakes deception because it progresses on a high risk benefit/harm level.

The case study in this research identifies one Deceiver who used a simple, repetitive narrative, created to suit what the audience and Receivers hoped to hear, and what activated their caring nature. To the targeted Receiver, however the words and actions of the Deceiver became the source of cruelty and rejection. The Deceiver used increasing demonstrations and evidences of proof, reason, self-ascribed authority, and prestigious association to inflate his own seemingly positive characteristics, and to offset suspicion or challenges. The Deceiver's narrative drew heavily
on emotion, particularly his personal accounts of loss, overcoming of suffering, involvement with children, and an allegedly positive engagement with family, friends and associations. The Deceiver added to his credibility with a public persona of charity work and philanthropy while interacting primarily with persons of status, position or authority. The Deceiver sought opportunities for public audience and accreditation. It was only over an extended period time that questions arose regarding the authenticity of the facts, by those persons who were closer to the deceptive situation. They realized that the Deceiver's narrative was incongruent with facts.

The high stakes deception in this case study contains many contributory, tactical elements that maintained a consistently high level of audience engagement and endorsement. The deconstruction of the deception aims to provide an unusually intense field of exploration to make an esoteric subject more broadly understood.

**Objective of study**

The findings provide a unique window into a real life deception situation by means of the experiential accounts of the participants themselves. The objective is to identify manipulative strategies and interpersonal communication tactics that enabled the Deceiver to reach his goals. The results can also identify the violation of trust and harmful outcomes to the targeted Receiver, while attesting to the innocuous impact on the wider audience.

The application of research findings has both immediate and long term objectives as it supports existing empirical data and current theoretical bases, particularly the Interpersonal Deception Theory (Buller & Burgoon, 1996). Specific findings from this high stakes deception narrative may aid in the clarification and confirmation of historical records and archives at Kamp Westerbork in Holland. It will bring further healing to psychological wounds of former Dutch Jewry inmates and children of
inmates, who also survived this horrific time period. It may appropriately alter testimonials and records in the Holocaust Memorial Centres in the United States, as well as in specific foundations (Stichting) in Holland, as to what is false or misleading in the Deceiver's account. It may affect international decisions regarding awards, recognition, and inappropriately conferred status to the Deceiver. The study will offer a source of solace for the targeted Receiver, the principal Receiver and extended family members who have had negative outcomes due to the deception. Truth will have a broad clarifying effect.

The findings will also acknowledge the man, who in 1945, discovered Kamp Westerbork concentration camp unassumingly in his line of military duty, and liberated it. The study may provide further clarification of military actions during the month of April, 1945. Most importantly, this research offers a unique insight into a validated high stakes deception with its strategical and sophisticated deceptive communication patterns, which may be useful for earlier identification of similar high stakes deception situations.

**Rationale of case study selection**

Initially, the researcher sought to recruit additional cases to augment the findings of the single case study. The primary requirement was to engage both a Receiver and Deceiver so that the researcher could explore a single high stakes deception from both perspectives. This critical criterion became an obstacle during the selection process for supporting cases. As participants were considered, it was deemed that supporting case studies could possibly dilute the impact of deconstructing the chosen single case. Thus the researcher decided to focus on the single case study of the false heroism account as it fit the scope of research best. It was selected because it satisfied the criteria of the definition of high stakes deception and it fulfilled the objective of having both the
Deceiver and Receiver narratives, speaking of the deception from their points of view. The false heroism was captivating in its subject matter in that the deception was monumental; it was heard by thousands of Receiver audiences, it was left unaccountable for decades, it has had a profound impact on Holocaust museums and Jewish history as well as the relationships and communication amongst an entire family. Additionally, this single case study offered a full examination of a successful deception from multiple sources across its lifespan.

**Comparison of empirical and qualitative inquiry regarding deception**

The bulk of deception knowledge and detection cue studies to date seem to be in the category of extensive quantitative studies investigating low level (social) deception, simulated high stakes deception, and social networking deception which can be conducted in controlled laboratory settings. Clearly, empirical studies have the advantage of managed settings, using large samples from randomly selected participants, who can be carefully informed of the procedures and controlled for specific variables. This gives the researcher the ability to examine, to measure and to compare. The explosion of computer and telephone interaction in business, has made it possible that some problems can be circumvented with imaginative real life settings.

Recent investigation conducted in a public corporate setting using earnings conference calls for example, have offered a possible exception to the laboratory limitations, by examining indicators in spoken language markers as real life communication is underway (Burgoon, Mayhew, Giboney, Elkins, Moffitt, Dorn, Byrd, & Spitzley, 2015). With a breakthrough method in quantitative research such as the one referred, both the verbal and non-verbal strategies can be observed, measured and the detection cues explored. Otherwise, the concern remains that "unless [real] high stakes are
employed, the paradigm produces data that does not replicate any typical lying situation" (Gokhman, Hancock, Prabhu, Ott, & Cardie, 2012, p. 2).

High stakes deception, involves features of time, motivation, strategy and interpersonal skill, which collectively are what makes this type of deception complex. Contrasts are also evident, but difficult to measure, such as risk and reward, innuendo and manipulation, or a single episode versus years of repeated deceptions. Most importantly however, non reality settings fail to replicate the reciprocal relationship between the Deceiver and the targeted Receiver, which is essential to the impressively elaborate scheming often evidenced in high stakes deception. Many researchers rue that, "Unfortunately, most studies of deception detection have involved low stakes lies as stimuli, and very few have used truly high-stakes lies (Shaw, Porter & ten Brinke, 2013, p.147). Therefore, detection of high stakes deception is compromised.

It has been noted that professional lie catchers can be duped by highly skilled Deceivers, whether they are researchers conducting experiments, psychologists making assessments or judges making decisions in courts because Deceivers are shrewd enough to perpetuate their gamesmanship skills to control assessment and detection outcomes. In other words, there are some persons able to circumvent deception detection markers, common to lower levels of deception and lying. The rate of detection in assessments commonly used for court proceedings and police investigations is considered equal to chance, which may not align with the professional's self report on detection capability (Hare, 1994; De Paulo, Lindsay, Malone, Muhlenbruck, Charlton & Cooper, 2003; Medina, Cebolla, Banos, & Botella, 2012).

Qualitative research in comparison, offers a shift of focus towards descriptions and perspectives from the participants in the deception, and provides an alternative means of
understanding and detecting high stakes deception. A social scientist uses the narrative inquiry to enhance description of a social phenomena, interpersonal attachments, patterns of behaviours, and observations, all of which will inform and improve on social theory and statistical results (Powers, 2010). The in depth understanding of high stakes deception, which may be more difficult to obtain in quantitative work, becomes more fully exposed in qualitative inquiry. The approach fits the purpose and goal of this research which includes an interdisciplinary focus.

Biographical Outlines of Participants in the Case Study

**Client 200 (Principal, Deceiver's North American grand-nephew).**

The principal participant of this case study research, is designated as Client 200. He is a male member of a large family of Dutch Jewish heritage, now living in Canada. The branch of the family to which he belongs, emigrated from Holland to the Boston area in the United States, prior to World War II. While he is grateful that his immediate family did not experience the years of suffering, his extended family left in Holland during the Nazi Occupation, endured the enforced Ausweis conditions in the Jewish ghetto, starvation conditions, and fear of arrest. Most of the family was arrested at some point during those years and all (but two persons), were transported to Kamp Westerbork then onwards to their deaths at one of the extermination camps. The one aunt and uncle who survived, continued to live in Holland but were estranged.

The aunt was previously not as well known to the American side of the family, partly because she resided in Holland and partly due to the estrangement between she and her brother. In Client 200's adult years, he decided to make a concerted effort to reconnect with his Dutch aunt and cousin. They have enjoyed correspondence and visits frequently and as recently as 2015.
On the other hand, Client 200 was close to his uncle and his family from his early years. He maintained correspondence with them on a continual basis. Client 200 emphasized that Client 230 was his favourite uncle because his uncle made summers fun, he was handy with fixing anything that was broken, and because he could charm he and his brother with his stories of his adventures. Nevertheless, Client 200 felt that his uncle was a conundrum to him (and to other family members), because he sometimes was intimidating and could be brutally forceful on occasion if crossed.

Client 200 is currently a researcher/professor who teaches at a university in a major Canadian city. He is the Director of the city's congregational Jewish cemetery and maintains an active speaking role in the Holocaust Remembrance circuits. He is active in both the broader Jewish community and the university community. He is a father of three grown children and a grandfather. He engages with his extended family on an intimate and regular basis.

Client 200 provided additional information to the researcher from conversations with several family members about events and perspectives. He provided a wide selection of pertinent documents, archival material and books on varying subjects from his personal collection.

Client 210 (2nd Lieutenant, VIII RECCE & 7th Troop, Verified Liberator of Kamp Westerbork).

Client 210, 2nd Lieutenant, was in command of the VIII Reconnaissance Unit (VIII RECCE), 7th Troop, 2nd Div. Canadian Infantry. According to military records and his own personal diaries, Client 210 discovered Kamp Westerbork while on patrol duty, on April 12, 1945. As such, he unintentionally liberated almost nine hundred Jewish inmates. Client 210 has provided extensive proof of the military expedition to Kamp Westerbork. He became aware of the controversy around
conflicting liberation stories in 2000, as Dutch historians were seeking to authenticate liberation accounts.

Client 210 had grown up in Saskatchewan, Canada, with a reputation as a principled man, known for his humour matched with a sharp intelligence. He was sent into officer training in England, once he had turned of age to be able to join the Canadian forces for overseas service. He was initially sent into combat on the European front, as a first officer commanding a highly skilled reconnaissance patrol unit whose purpose was to proceed cautiously in advance of regiments, to locate German forces and to provide tactical information for the advancement of the Canadian 2nd Division under the command of Brigadier General Jean V. Allard. He was promoted to the rank of Second Lieutenant upon the injury of Lieut. M. Young in the vicinity of Spier, Holland following the crossing of the Rhine River and the Twente canal. The change in rank meant that Client 210 was in charge of not only the ground gun carriers in his VIII RECCE patrol, but also the armoured cars and infantry soldiers of the 7th Troop division. Client 210 believes that his discovery of Kamp Westerbork was not heroism, but a single event in his line of duty as a Canadian soldier. Once the regiment reinforcements arrived to relieve him of duty at Kamp Westerbork, he continued to lead his unit north to do further reconnaissance work. He and his patrol unit eventually rejoined the 2nd Division of the Canadian troops at Groningen to complete the final liberation of Holland, ousting the German army. He was in Oldenburg when Churchill announced the end of the European war, on May 8, 1945.

At the completion of the war, Client 210 returned to Canada, and pursued his medical degree. He practised medicine in Saskatchewan until his retirement. He and his wife moved to British Columbia, Canada where they currently reside. A confirming incident occurred when Client
210 was contacted by the daughter of former inmates of Kamp Westerbork to offer gratitude for his unheralded rescue of her parents during the Occupation of Holland. The interview was recently recorded in an Ottawa newspaper (Van der Ven, 2015).

In 2006, Client 210 and his wife were invited by the Dutch government and Kamp Westerbork historians to the 60th anniversary celebrations of the liberation of Holland events, specifically honouring him for his pivotal role in the liberation of Kamp Westerbork.

**Client 220 (Targeted Receiver, sister of Deceiver, great-aunt of Client 200).**

Client 220 is three years older than her brother Client 230 and has lived in Holland all her life. She now resides with her son, Client 240, in Amsterdam. Client 220 was twenty-one years old when the Nazi Occupation overtook the Jewish area in Amsterdam. She was compelled to live with her father's mistress in Den Hague after it became necessary to go into hiding. Prior to that, she worked at the Jewish hospital in the linen room. She was arrested by the Gestapo at the home of the father's mistress in Den Hague, January 12, 1945, along with her brother and her aunt's niece. She believes the mistress sold them out to the Nazis for a price. In an attempt to escape her captors, she was shot in her leg, arrested and transported to Kamp Westerbork. She remained in Kamp Westerbork, in the hospital recovery barrack recuperating from her injuries, for twelve weeks until the liberation of the Kamp on April 12, 1945.

Because of the differing accounts around being arrested, recaptured, and shot, she was blamed for the incident and outcome by her brother. They never spoke again despite her early efforts to reconcile. She became aware of her brother's heroism story in 1993, when reading the Dutch newspaper. She was shocked that he claimed he had no living relatives in Holland. She does not
agree that he was either a hero or a liberator as she was there at Kamp Westerbork. She maintains simply, that her brother's story is untrue.

Client 220 met Client 210, in Amsterdam, Holland at the 60th anniversary celebrations of the the Liberation of Holland. She and her son Client 240, regard Client 210 as the genuine liberator of Kamp Westerbork.

**Client 230 (Deceiver).**

Both Client 230 and his sister observed dysfunctional aspects between their parents, as well as between their father and their uncle and maternal grandfather. Yet he chose to portray his immediate family as exemplary and extremely loving. Client 230 admired his father immensely, particularly in the areas of hard work, strength, sexualized behaviour to women, and tactics on how to achieve personal goals.

Client 230 was active as a youth, in sports clubs in Amsterdam such as boxing, wrestling and swimming. It furthered his position as a tough street youth who self proclaimed that he was the leader who "owned the street" in his neighbourhood. To extended family, he presented as a tough, self aggrandizing but self reliant individual.

During the war, he enjoyed the risk and independence of working with the underground resistance in Holland, whether it was with the official Resistance movement under the displaced Dutch Prince Bernhardt, or unofficially with a resistance sub-group. He did not register with the *Foundation Nineteen Forty Five*, colloquially known as the *Stichting* (English translation, 'foundation'), which had been established immediately after the war to verify genuine Resistance heroes with special pensions. He contacted the *Stichting* in the 1990's, concurrently with his
broadcast of his hero/liberation narrative. From online research search, it appears that he is not listed as a former member of the Stichting.

After the war, Client 230 linked up with the Haganah movement to support Israeli nationhood. He attributed many of his risk taking actions and brute decisions to resistance work experience or training. Client 230 reported several instances of violence, torture, child absconding, illegal activities, forgery and theft, in the post war years, which he believed were justified because of Nazi atrocities.

Client 230 earned a business diploma before emigrating to Montreal, Canada where he enjoyed a successful career in the fabric industry. He had married a non-Jewish woman from Holland who had colluded with him in transporting orphaned Jewish children to Israel in the years 1945 to 1948. He and his wife had a family of two sons and an adopted daughter, while maintaining two homes, one in Montreal and one in Florida. Client 230 was a member of both the Rotary Club and an active member of the Kings of Pythias, in Montreal, a German based group encouraging three tenets of the Jewish faith: prayer, repentance and charity. He was connected to the Jewish community in Montreal but in his Floridian community, he first established contacts at the Holocaust Memorial Centre to begin broadcasts of his survivor/ heroism account in 1991/92. Because of his victim/survivor stories and his alleged heroic deed to liberate Kamp Westerbork, he was knighted on April 14, 2000, by the Queen of the Netherlands and named as a Member of the Order of Orange Nassau. He was subsequently feted and honoured in several American Holocaust Centers.

Client 230 actively recorded his narrative on several interview recordings and in newspaper and magazine articles, chronicling his personal story of victimhood, survival and heroism. Several
recordings are available on social media. He died in January 2012. He was buried in the Kings of Pythias cemetery, in Montreal, Canada with honours as a hero, but unrepentant or charitable to some of his own family.

Client 240 (Receiver, Deceiver's Dutch nephew).

Client 240 is the cousin of the principal participant, and the son of Client 220. He frequently communicates with Client 200. The loss of his family connection impacted Client 240 disproportionately as the child of a Holocaust victim. He carried the Holocaust trauma of both his mother and father as a personal loss, and was devastated that reconciliation never took place between his mother and his uncle.

He is a bachelor businessman in Amsterdam. Although he can converse quite fluently in English, he communicated with the researcher by correspondence via his cousin (Client 200), because of his concerns around translation and confidentiality.

Client 250 (Brigadier-General of Canadian Infantry in Holland, 1945).

By means of an autobiography published in 1985 by Client 250, details of the military campaign in Holland at the end of the European war in 1945, are clearly explained from his personal perspective as Brigadier-General, the commander of the 6th Canadian Infantry Brigade, and the Royal 22nd Regiment. Client 250 was promoted to the full rank of General after the war. His accounts are saturated with specific names, dates and places, however no mention was made of an escaped civilian (Client 230) in the tactical accounts of the battles of Beilen, Hooghalen or Zwiggelte (Holland), or the unexpected discovery of Kamp Westerbork. There is no reference to meeting Client 230 at Armistice day parades or at other venues as a concentration camp survivor or later as a war hero. Client 250 contracted Parkinson's disease and due to his declining health in the
late 1980's, moved to a residential area in the city of Trois Rivieres, Quebec with his wife. He passed away April 23, 1996.

**Client 260 (Curator, Kamp Westerbork).**

Client 260 is the current curator at the museum in Kamp Westerbork, Holland. He provided the researcher with archival documentation, corresponding via email. To Client 200, he gave his professional opinion via letters and face to face, when he, along with Client 220 and Client 240 amongst other family members, visited Kamp Westerbork in 2015. His conclusion was that the account of Client 230 was fabricated and "nonsense".
Literature Review

Differentiation of types of deception

The categorizing of high stakes deception, as distinct from other deception types, is a critical clarification for this research. The researcher suggests three subjectively determined groupings of deception. At the most tolerated end of the deception continuum is unintentional lying, hyperbole, polite lies, or situational lies. Euphemistically called "white lies", these lies might be considered low level type lies. Although they may produce temporary annoyance, inconvenience, or delay to the Receiver, they are unlikely to cause intense or ongoing harm. In recent research, the term "butler lies" has been coined to describe a form of lower-stakes lies that can be either intentional, or spontaneous to suit the moment (Hancock, Birnholtz, Bazarova, Guillery, Perlin & Barrett, 2009). It evokes the image of the dutiful servant employed by the Master of a Victorian household, who can deftly and with deference, state whatever is necessary to protect the Master's interests. The "butler lie" is an immediate deception, intended to manage social interaction, to avoid new conversation, and to exit ongoing conversation in order to perfect a more polished self image.

A category of lies which may not be as well tolerated, is the intentional lie that does have some harmful or self-protective intent. It may be spontaneously concocted or be retributive. Sometimes these purposeful lies aggrandize the Deceiver in order to increase positive responses from others, with no apparent necessity other than to form a more appealing story to gain immediate status with an audience. These arbitrary designations of types of lies attempt to qualify how the deception or lie benefits the liar, however they do not convey the strategic planning which carries a long term, calculated effect on a targeted person and an ongoing management of the relationship with a targeted Receiver.
It is proposed that high stakes deception is a separate category, because it appears that the Deceiver is the author of deceit over a period of time with a clear intent to harm. In fact, "undertaking high stakes deception is itself a choice and may only be undertaken by individuals who believe they can avoid detection, or have mastered strategies to in fact do so" (Burgoon, et al., 2015, p.2). In addition, interpersonal reciprocity between a Deceiver and a targeted Receiver is critical for a high level of mastery and success. Once the deception is successfully underway, the relationship begins its inevitable decline between parties while the Deceiver concurrently increases interactions with other Receivers in the same circle of influence where the deception is taking place (Stout, 2005). The relationships outside of the targeted Receiver, appear to be necessary to the Deceiver, to increase his sense of superiority. If the Receiver self blames for the deterioration of the relationship during this time period, while others embrace the Deceiver more, the Receiver's suspicions may temporarily lessen. However, their levels of anxiety, betrayal and confusion increase. If the Deceiver cleverly demonstrates the appearance of humility or hurt at appropriate moments to others in response to the Receiver, the weight of the deception seems to discredit the Receiver, not the Deceiver (2005). The assumption is that the Receiver, who considers tolerance and loyalty as equal values, will delay being suspicious of the Deceiver, much longer than would non-targeted persons (Schouten & Silver, 2012). Generally, Receivers are less aggressive in verifying content of information, preferring to value the relationship with the Deceiver over confrontation (Levine, Park, & McCormack, 1999; Vrij, 2000; Burgoon, 2005; Hancock, Woodward & Goorha, 2010). When personal betrayal and/or relational pain are insurmountable, the Receiver finally challenges the Deceiver, but at that point, it is likely to be ineffective.
A further feature of high stakes deception is that the Deceiver secures the Receiver's initial trust before the deception begins. In social networking studies, it is noted that to accomplish a trust base, the Deceiver engages the Receiver by telling intimate life details that implies exclusivity and confidentiality (Hancock, Woodworth & Goorha, 2010). Securing the Receiver(s)' confidence is purely tactical, guaranteeing the Deceiver a period of time to conduct the deception, while the Receiver tries to restore a purposefully unreconcilable relationship.

Seemingly, the Deceiver enjoys the construction of the deception as much as its deliverance. To the Receiver, it appears that the Deceiver enjoys observing the detrimental effect of the deception more. In fact, studies of life experiences concur that in high stake deception situations, Deceivers sardonically witness the distress it creates for the targeted Receiver, especially when over an extended time frame (Feldman, 2009).

**Conceptual definitions of high stakes deception**

Having discussed varying features of deception, it can be appreciated that the terms "deception", "lying", "falsification", "duplicit", and "misrepresentation" are often considered interchangeable when describing the complexities of high stakes deception. A generalized definition of deception states it is "a successful or unsuccessful, deliberate attempt without forewarning, to create in another a belief which the communicator believes to be untrue" (Vrij, 2000, in Hart, Filmore & Griffith, 2009, p.135). Some researchers have noted that high stakes deception encompasses three basic components: that the perpetrator knows that the communication is false, that it is planned to be a deception and that the recipients of the deception did not have prior information that they would be deceived (Buller & Burgoon, 1996). These factors can offer a solid
base from which to form a more specific definition of a the type of high stakes deception evidenced in this particular case study.

Intentional deception may be a continuum from low stakes to high stakes, suggesting further internal categorizations may exist of both low level and high level deceptions (Rycyna, Champion & Kelly, 2009). The cleverness of intentional deceit is that it incorporates true information, the truth being useful to conceal what is known to be false (De Paulo, et al, 2003). When truth is manipulated, deception is viewed "as the deliberate attempt, whether successful or not, to conceal, fabricate, and/or manipulate in any other way factual and/or emotional information, by verbal and/or nonverbal means, in order to create or maintain in another or in others a belief that the communicator himself or herself considers false" (Masip, Garrido & Herrero, 2004, p.148). Although the deliberate attempt to purposely distort the truth, or to purposefully omit information may appear common to all deception, benchmarks of high stakes deception are seen in the Deceiver's mastery of interpersonal communication skills and the level of purposed intent to exert maximum harm on a targeted Receiver.

It appears that there are some specific non verbal communication behaviours, such as head shaking, that have apparent consistency in high stakes deception (ten Brinke & Porter, 2012). Yet, variations in situational contexts may affect such behaviours, as when a Deceiver is under scrutiny in a police interrogation as a criminal versus a non-incarcerated Deceiver who is involved in a business fraud. Thus, high stakes deception may not be fully comparable across two situations. Context may enter as a critical consideration when attempting to define its characteristics.

The personal descriptors of the Deceiver and the Receiver appear to play a pivotal role in high stakes deception. The Receiver's characteristics, particularly the ones attracting a Deceiver by
aiding communication, complement to some degree, the Deceiver's characteristics. Some researchers suggest that the latter's positive characteristics are so dominant in the dyad that detection of deception ability, on the part of the Receiver, is compromised or disabled (Ekman & Frank, 1997). The Deceiver has traits that suggest a predilection to risk-taking, especially when overwhelming or harming the Receiver is possible. Some research has tagged this as a game, a "duping delight", or a "recreational thrill", which adds to the challenge to define exactly, the uniqueness of this deception category (Ekman, O'Sullivan & Frank, 1999; Ekman, 2009).

A Receiver, who continues in a Deceiver/Receiver relationship, may be more likely to believe the deception as it is delivered over time (Levine & McCornack, 2001). The Receiver may experience considerable difficulty identifying the deception initially, particularly because of a truth expectation in daily conversations. Generally, people encounter more truthful than deceptive messages and thus have a cognitive bias towards truthful communication (Burgoon, Blair & Strom, 2008). Interpersonal traits and communication factors add further layers of understanding when attempting a clear definition, one which incorporates how intimate and working relationships are critical to capturing the nuances in high stakes deception (Buller & Burgoon, 1996).

In summary, to be able to conceptualize a definition of high stakes deception, such as evidenced in this particular case study, necessitates the inclusion of several conditions: that it is a series of subtly laid falsehoods meshed with truths, orchestrated over time by a Deceiver having specific traits that when activated in a relationship with a targeted Receiver. It purposely extracts retributive harm, while gaining self-focused superiority or reward for the Deceiver, by means of ingeniously using interpersonal communication tactics to create believability in the deception. Thus, this refined definition recognizes there is "serious harm to targets of deceit and adverse
consequences to deceivers if caught, [because they] have high significance for those involved, where substantial economic and reputation loss can occur” (Burgoon, et al., 2015, p. 2).

Detecting high stakes deception

The categorization of high stakes deceit reflects its uniqueness due to its initial invisibility (Akhtar & Parens, 2009). When the Receiver has ongoing suspicions, but subdues anxious thoughts or delays confrontation with the Deceiver, it appears that the deception becomes more entrenched, protected, and untouchable than when doubts first emerged. The invisibility to other Receivers, if not to the targeted Receiver, is augmented by the very fact that the deception is altered, adjusted, and adapted as it proceeds, to foster the appearance of a close relationship, which in turn, deflects unwanted suspicion (Picornell, 2011).

Detection of deception has occupied much attention over the years, as high stakes deception continues to sabotage truth and integrity in political, corporate, and judicial environments. Overall detection ability for both non-professional and professional persons, has been noted at as relatively weak, approximately the same level as chance (Vrij, 2000). Studies continue to explore identification of deception. One such study which examined the videotapes of "authentic high stakes liars", by reviewing video tapes of police interviews, noted that conventional ideas about the reaction of liars as they lied, such as fidgeting and avoidance of eye contact, were not reliable markers of deception. Interestingly and relevant to the current research, is the observation that longer pauses and limited blinking may be more indicative than other physiological indicators. It may also alert observers to the Deceiver's cognitive load during deception (Mann, Vrij & Bull, 2002, p. 365).
More recent meta-analyses suggest that observer accuracy in detecting deception is in the range of 54%, somewhat better than chance (Bond, & DePaulo, 2006). Similar difficulties to define high stakes deception, is found as well when trying to detect it, as cues may not be comparable across all deception situations (Wright-Whelan, 2009; Whelan, 2013). More recent studies of non-verbal indicators implying guilt, such as eye movements, twitching, and anxiety features, used to detect some levels of lying, are also erratic in detecting high stakes deception (Shaw, Porter, & ten Brinke, 2013). Sociologists, psychologists and those in the legal and law enforcement professions agree that detection cues for high stakes deception are critical in their professional capacities. There is wide consensus that high stakes deception requires further exploration for effective detection markers.

Essential to the working of modern legal systems is an assessment of the veracity of the participants in the process: litigants and witnesses, victims and defendants. Falsification or lying by any of these parties can and does occur. Outside the legal system, detection of deception is also of critical importance in the corporate world and in the insurance industry, as illustrated by the practice of hiring private investigators to follow and videotape disability claimants. Because human beings can be very skilled at lying and, in general, are poor at determining when they are being lied to, scientific, objective methods for determining truthfulness have been sought for decades" (Simpson, 2008, p.491).

Professionals understandably believe that they have improved ability in detecting lies based on past experiences and training. Some empirical studies conclude that these abilities may be overrated. For example, a Canadian study indicated that the general opinion of judicial participants reflected their competence in the area of detecting all forms of deception.
Despite the judiciary’s view that detecting lies is a straightforward matter best guided by simple common sense (e.g. Supreme Court of Canada in R. v. Marquard, 1993), empirical research suggests that it is a flawed process with errors occurring in nearly half of all assessments...While one might predict that professionals who need to detect deception on a daily basis (e.g. judges, police officers, etc.) would outperform laypersons, they too typically perform at or below chance in judging the credibility of speakers (Shaw, Porter, & ten Brinke, 2013, p.145).

Some studies are unsettling in that they support the finding that many professionals are unable to detect a high stakes Deceiver, better than a non-professional (Hare, 1994; De Paulo, Lindsay, Malone, Muhlenbruck, Charlton & Cooper, 2003; Vrij, 2000; Hancock, Woodworth & Goorha, 2010; Medina, Cebolla, Barros, & Botella, 2012). Terms such as a "credibility assessment" describe truth testing measures used to evaluate truth telling versus lying. They are widely used as deception detectors in certain spheres of influence such as court proceedings and police investigations, but may not be effective against false positive or false negative conclusions, as might be assumed by either professionals or non-professionals (Meixner, 2012).

Some professionals recognize the difficulty that anyone can initially be misled by clever deception tactics delivered by a Deceiver, who has a carefully constructed demeanour and a convincing dialogue (Hare, 1994). In the day to day interaction, professionals are consistently faced with the difficulty of detecting a fraud. "As high-stakes lies more appropriately reflect real-world conditions faced by psychologists and legal professionals than low-stakes lies, these differences warrant further investigation" (Shaw, Porter, & ten Brinke, 2013, p.147).
It is understood that high stakes deception fulfills certain objectives for the Deceiver, but insight into the manipulative tactics to achieve it and cues to detect it continue to be a source of empirical inquiry (Frank & Ekman, 1997; Ekman, O'Sullivan & Frank, 1999; Hancock, Curry, Goorha, & Woodworth, 2008; Newman, Pennebaker, Berry & Richards, 2003; Porter & ten Brinke, 2010; Vrij, 2008). The forensic relevance and societal consequences of high-stakes deception make the development of detection cues a high priority.

Devices, such as polygraph testing instruments, which operate by calibrating anxiety levels in persons as they lie, can be ineffective with Deceivers who are seasoned experts in fabricating responses, because they rarely, if ever, feel anxious about their deception. The euphoria they feel is an intoxicating emotion often followed by a "smug contempt toward the target" (Ekman, 2009, p. 170). In fact, it requires a full performance strategy.

Lying well is a special talent, not easily acquired. One must be a natural performer, winning and charming in manner. Such people are able, without thought, to manage their expressions, giving off just the impression they seek to convey" (Ekman, 2009, p.347).

Character traits, such as the lack of remorse, can be one of several identifiers in any of three personalities included in the term "the Dark Triad", suggesting a trait exists that belongs to those more inclined to pathological lying (Le, 2016). Despite the awareness that "Dark Triad" personalities (psychopathic, Machiavellian or narcissistic) are observed to engage in manipulation of interpersonal relationships across deception situations, there does not appear to be a clear set of detection cues (2016). Current studies have observed that deceit anxiety may be evident in some criminal interrogations, but appear to be lacking in other high stakes deceptions despite the
presentation of callousness along with "poor interpersonal skills" "malevolent undertones", "blunted affect" and certain "behavioural problems" (Le, 2016, p.8).

Studies on pathological liars, for example, indicate a duality whereby the liar lacks emotion for the consequences to others for their actions, yet has an uncanny ability to mimic emotions and incorporate non-verbal emotives into the dialogue in order to sharpen the engagement effect on the Receiver (Hare, 1994). Researchers exploring the mindset and language of psychopaths note this tactical skill.

This finding leads to the interesting question of how psychopaths can have such manipulative prowess. In addition to their skilled use of body language, recent research indicated that they are skilled at faking emotional expressions, approaching the skill level of emotionally intelligent individuals, despite being largely devoid of emotion. They are capable of adopting various masks, appearing empathetic and remorseful to the extent that they can talk and cry their way out of parole hearings at a higher rate than their less dangerous counterparts" (Woodworth, Hancock, Porter, Hare, Logan, O'Toole, & Smith, 2012, p.3).

Although some earlier studies on detection cues identified guilt, anxiety levels and fear in inadvertent behaviours, more recent inquiry has focused on cognitive load, manipulative actions, and working memory measures, which are associated with constructing lies (Burgoon, et al., 2015, p.3). In other words, specific cognitions and actions, which may be strategic to convince the Receiver of the Deceiver's credibility, may also alert detection. The Information Manipulation Theory (IMT and the revised IMT2), posits that the Deceiver intentionally manipulates their source material, the quantity of information, and ensuing conversations in order to evade detection
The Interpersonal Deception Theory (IDT) takes it one step deeper to suggest that the Deceiver relies on the assumption that the Receiver will be swept up into the deception process as an unwitting co-worker of the deception, and that investigating relationships is the avenue to detecting high stakes deception (Buller & Burgoon, 1996).

In controlled laboratory settings, studies of social deception and high stakes deception continue to broaden knowledge on detection, by examining more closely the reciprocal nature of deceptive conversation. For example, by observing and statistically evaluating the communication interactions between a Deceiver and a Receiver in computer mediated communication (CMC), several linguistic and non-verbal markers have consistently produced identifiable outcomes (Gokham, Hancock, Prabhu, Ott, & Cardie, 2012). It appears that social networking sites (SNS) are an ideal avenue, not only for deceptive communication but also for the identification of deception markers.

A pivotal study of linguistic detection cues in SNS conversations identified eleven variables as potential deception indicators: word counts, words per sentence, use of questions, frequency of first-person singular pronouns, second person pronouns, and third-person pronouns, in addition to negative emotion words, exclusive words, negations, causation words, and words pertaining to the senses (Hancock, Curry, Goorha & Woodworth, 2008). Certain variables were significant. For example, when liars were lying to their partners, they produced approximately 28% more words noting that the former used fewer first-person singular pronouns, but significantly more third-person pronouns when texting. In addition, they used more sensory terms (i.e., “see,” “hear,” “feel”) as the reciprocal conversation progressed, leading to the hypothesis that the Deceiver paced his/her "language production" to the Receiver "more closely" (Hancock, Curry, Goorha, & Woodworth,
2008, p.15). These findings supported earlier research on reciprocal conversations tabling numerical counts in which a Deceiver was noted using more words in deceptive conversation than in truthful conversations (Zhou, Burgoon, Nunamaker & Twitchell, 2004). Speculatively, a plethora of words could alert a Receiver that a Deceiver was protecting falsehoods with verbosity. Such linguistic cues seemed to detect deception well. By extrapolation, evaluating a written transcript of a deceptive conversation may have superior detection outcomes to that of listening to or being involved in a conversation.

In a follow up study of detection cues, a comparison across four conditions suggested that highly motivated Deceivers achieved more success in deceiving their partner (Hancock, Woodworth, & Goorha, 2010). Motivation to deceive is thought to be an influential factor in high stakes deception. The motivational quotient in deception as evidenced in empirical studies supporting interpersonal theories of deception, conclude that motivation is not necessarily a negative factor in deception (Buller & Burgoon 1996; Burgoon & Floyd, 2000; Burgoon, 2005). The premise is that interactive deception efficacy is affected by reciprocal motivation levels, and that both the Deceiver and Receiver benefit from being highly motivated. To rephrase, the former has improved deception success with higher levels of motivation, and the latter, when highly motivated, is better able to discern truth and act upon that awareness. Related studies support that higher levels of motivation improve deception success (Hancock, Woodworth, & Goorha, 2010).

Although some researchers claim that verbal cues are the ones that offer better detection than non-verbal ones in certain modalities, other researchers question whether a single focus on nonverbal cues can be too one sided (Vrij, Edwards, Roberts, & Bull, 2000; Burgoon, Bonito, Ramirez, Dunbar, Kam & Fischer, 2002; Vrij, 2008; Porter & ten Brinke, 2010). Specifically, they
suggest that improved detection requires exploring both the verbal and nonverbal communication markers as they work in tandem. By examining both types of cues simultaneously, the potentiality of detecting deception is found to increase (Burgoon, et al., 2002).

Specific exploratory studies held in a real world context noted that if the Deceiver prepared texts for a high stakes deception, as opposed to being unprepared and spontaneous, the narrative was more lengthy and more detailed. Additionally, more positive emotion based words, increased voice intensity, and "hedging" to infer vagueness supported the presence of fraud (Burgoon, et al., 2015).

**Theoretical support: Interpersonal Deception Theory**

The sociologist/philosopher George Herbert Mead (1863-1931) pragmatically believed, that people's sense of self was a social product, and that "meaning", (one's perception of something), is attributed to different social behaviours, whether they are socially appropriate or non-appropriate. The "meaning" then associated with an interaction or event is given by the individual through interpretation during a reciprocal interchange between persons and is continually modified to fit ongoing, fluid interpretations (Travers, 2001). "Meaning" attribution then, is not neutral, but is an important component of the narrative approach in psychotherapy, the approach used in this case study methodology. By means of the individual's interpretive process, meaning, as such, is translated into roles and language which accomplish his/her goals (Travers, 2001). Thus, a personal narrative can be insightful to a person's formation of reality, irrespective of the fit with social/cultural norms.

The interaction between participants plays an essential role in deception and includes reactions, adaptive responses and meaning attribution. The reciprocal interaction observation is the foundational concept of the Interpersonal Deception Theory (IDT) (Buller & Burgoon, 1996). The pivotal theory of IDT recognizes that the Deceiver communicates what the Receiver expects to hear
in order to accomplish deceptive communication convincingly. At the same time, an additional layer of interpersonal reaction takes place, whereby the Receiver not only becomes the target of the deception, but also the unintentional co-contributor to the deception process. In addition, the Receiver may co-operate in the deception success initially by giving the appearance of unquestioned belief in the Deceiver's deception, which provides unwitting confirmation to others that the deception is true. The Interpersonal Deception Theory thus anchors the current research because it posits that the Deceiver and Receiver are each drawn intrinsically to each other by characteristics which satisfy differing or even diametrically opposed needs, and that the deception is maintained through a management of these reciprocal needs, communication tactics and responses to reactions.

The Interpersonal Deception Theory emerged from the observation that the Deceiver adjusted deceptive tactics throughout each interpersonal interaction with the Receiver, as a progressive activity. IDT identified the feedback loop whereby the Deceiver and the Receiver appeared sensitized to each other, each adapting to the deception in a complex interplay. The theory serves this research well because it departs from the widely held stance that the Receiver serves a passive role in the deception. The Interpersonal Deception Theory presents deceptive conversation formation as an active co-dependency between the Receiver and Deceiver, allowing the latter to be the beneficiary. The Deceiver maintains the deception in a constant state of adjustment, reactive to the targeted Receiver and/or a Receiver audience. Clearly, initially at least, in a successful deception the intuitive capability the Deceiver enjoys in communication cues outstrips that of the Receiver's detection cues.
One important aspect of IDT is recognizing the Receiver's expectation for truthfulness. In contrast, the Deceiver seeks to violate that expectation. In applying this premise to high stakes deception, the assumption is that the Deceiver will deliver as many repeated deceptions and negative consequences onto the Receiver while the Receiver is useful to the Deceiver. It is possible that some personality characteristics of a Receiver are more desirable to the Deceiver, such as those assumed to produce more malleability, more loyalty or more tolerance. In tandem, specific traits of the Deceiver, despite a charming aura, may lead to devaluing truthfulness or concern for others.

Several elements of the theory regarding conversational interplay and time requirements for the deception's success, pertain particularly well to this research. The IDT proposes that the superordinate role of context and relationship can support or reduce success due to pre-interaction features. For example, the primary fears for the Deceiver are detection and challenge, although initial apprehension lessens over time. When the Receiver's suspicions become more frequent, they ignite the Deceiver's self protective responses to adjust engaging strategies and to re-calculate current circumstances to regain the equilibrium of believability (Buller & Burgoon, 1996). In addition, the theory identifies that the element of time plays a definitive role for both the success of the deception and later, the success of detection.
**Historical Literature Relevant to Case Study**

In order to appreciate more fully how the deception in this case study was constructed and managed, it was imperative to include a brief historical outline regarding three pertinent subjects: the meaning and implications of Dutch Jewish citizenship, the restrictions and fear during the Nazi Occupation of the Netherlands in World War II, and an overview history of the original purpose of the transit camp, Kamp Westerbork in north-eastern Holland and how its use was pivotal during the war as was its necessity to be concealed.

**Dutch Jewish citizenship**

The Dutch Jew in the mid twentieth century was a Dutch citizen with all the rights and protection afforded other citizens. That assurance was fostered by four hundred years of compatibility with Dutch neighbours and formed the core belief that they were Dutch first, Jewish by association to their religion and culture and were insulated from Jewish stigmas prevalent in the rest of Europe. There was no reason, prior to 1940, to think otherwise.

Amsterdam became a mecca for Jewish emigres as early as the seventeenth century. It was a relatively progressive city, promoting both free trade, some civil rights and freedom of religion. Freedom as such, was a huge draw to the thousands of Jews that sought opportunity and autonomy, after having been persecuted or restricted in other parts of Eastern Europe and Russia. The Netherlands, Amsterdam particularly, was a safe and desirable destination.

By 1730, with increased immigration from war zones of Eastern Europe, the Jewish population in Amsterdam expanded to approximately 22,280 persons, about one tenth of the entire population of Amsterdam (Bregstein & Bloemgarten, 2004). To a large degree, the emergent Jewish community accepted some authority from Rabbis and other leaders who spearheaded a self
regulating Jewish entity within the Dutch administrative infrastructure. Eventually, this mutual cooperation facilitated considerable access to the Dutch legal system. Major advancements came again in 1796, when the Dutch National Assembly declared that Jews who settled in the Netherlands would enjoy the same civil and political privileges as Nationals and be declared Dutch citizens, an important factor in understanding future events during the Second World War. In other words, the Dutch Jewish community succeeded as a self-reliant group operating well within the wider Dutch community. Increasingly, Dutch Jews considered themselves as Dutch, and less as Jewish.

They were a proud group of merchants, doctors, brokers and intellectuals...by the mid nineteenth century many of them had achieved tremendous success in buying and selling such colonial products as tobacco and sugar from Brazil and the West Indies and diamonds from India. Through their ingenuity and hard work they had contributed to the rise of Amsterdam as the reigning commercial centre of the world. (Levine, 2002, p. 116-117)

It cannot be underestimated the historical importance Dutch citizenry status had on the Jewish population in the pre-war years of 1933 to 1939 regarding its perceived protection. It explains their initial tolerance to Nazi registrations and restrictions early in the Nazi Occupation of Holland under the Ausweis conditions and the disbelief that the Nazis would reject the privileges and protections by citizenship. To some extent, it explains the Dutch Jewry's ambivalence to the anti-Semitic fervour brewing in parts of Western Europe. Even as Jewish refugees arrived from Germany, Austria and Eastern Europe, with accounts of deprivation and persecution, the Dutch Jews regarded themselves unassailable.
The Nazi Occupation of the Netherlands

Like a virus that remains latent until specific conditions reveal its lethal capability, the sudden capitulation of the Dutch Armed Forces to the Nazi Occupation of Holland on May 14, 1940, was a shock to all Dutch citizens. It unleashed the tactics of the Nazi agenda into an otherwise complacent and democratic society. Initially however, the Occupation by the German army hardly disturbed daily routines. A certain type of calm reappeared in the community following the first weeks of the Occupation, when many Dutch Jews, particularly in the eastern provinces, believed personal safety was better served by remaining in their own country. This was their death sentence. According to records in 1940, approximately 140,000 persons were formally registered as Jewish according to the National Socialist standards (Bregstein & Bloemgarten, 2004). Bit by bit restrictions increased after the Ausweis identification papers were issued. Some wealthier Dutch Jewry did flee the country, however most were unaware of the insidious threads of harm infiltrating into their lives via the compromises and complacency of the Jewish Council, the Dutch Constabulary, and the Dutch bureaucracy. Part of the deceit was played out by the Wehrmacht when they arrived as, "the soldiers obeyed orders in adopting a wholly "correct" attitude towards the civilian population" (Moore, 1997, p. 51). It was pure deception. Public reassurances from the General Kommissar stating that no Jew would be molested, perpetuated the Dutch Jewry's hopes of safety until the Nazi leadership decided to implement the "Final Solution".

Within a few months of the Occupation and following the enactment of the October 22, 1940 decree "Article 4", a Jew was defined as a person who had even one grandparent who was full Jew and/or belonged to a Jewish religious community or was registered at the synagogue, whether actively religious or not (Moore, 1997). By year's end, shops and businesses were sporting signs
Jews Not Welcome. Early in 1941, after further intimidation tactics, the first public round ups of Dutch Jewish persons began, first in broad daylight, then in night raids, along with the destruction and confiscation of businesses and homes. It was a simple step to the next horrific move of annihilation. A German raid of the Jewish ghetto area on the afternoon of February 22, 1941, began the systematic, forcible removal of suitable victims, including women and children. They were compelled to run a gauntlet in public view, where German soldiers clubbed them. The entire group was then deported to Mauthausen and killed. The Nazi plan was now clearly visible to all in its intensity and coercive methods (Brasz, 1995). Fear filled the Dutch Jewry aggravated by the awareness that avenues of escape, hiding and hope had all but evaporated. German directives were now in writing for the Wehrmacht to complete the answer to the "Jewish question" with deportation to the east for "Endlosung", translated to mean "Final Solution".

As tragic events began to unfold, the shocking realization emerged that Dutch citizenship offered no protective power to the Dutch Jew. Forcibly removed from their homes, they were herded into trains and taken fifty miles from Amsterdam to the Westerbork detention camp. It was a certainty, that going to Westerbork was only a stop en route to horrors and death in concentration camps. Of the original population of Dutch Jewry in 1940, only 10% survived to see liberation of the Netherlands, April 12, 1945.

History of Kamp Westerbork

Dutch Jews did not associate well with German Jewry. The attitudes of German Jewry, their Yiddish language and their religious piety were noticeably incompatible to Dutch Jewry. To accommodate the immigrating German Jewry into Holland, the Foundation for the Defence of the Social and Cultural Rights of Jews was established in 1939, under the presidency of Dr. de Miranda,
an Amsterdam physician and member of the Portuguese Sephardic Jewish congregation. He called for humanitarian measures, such as the opening of a refugee transit camp near the small village of Westerbork, in a relatively remote area in the province of Drente (Gans, 1977). It was a safe place in the wooded hinterlands, to house the refugees temporarily.

It was simply a convenient opportunity for the Nazis to exploit in 1940. Converting the refugee camp into a transit camp, provided a relatively unfrequented place to detain incoming Jewish inmates, then offload them onto cattle cars to concentration camps further east without suspicions being aroused in neighbouring villages. On July 14, 1942, the Germans began the concerted effort to systematically arrest and transport Dutch Jews from all over the Netherlands to the Westerbork camp. Approximately 1000 Jews left Westerbork camp each Tuesday morning to the gas chambers of Auschwitz. Additional human cargoes left on a weekly basis to other concentration camps in Poland. Over 104,000 Dutch Jews transited through Westerbork to their deaths.

The deception by the Nazis was tactical and clever. The plan was to treat inmates relatively humanely at Westerbork in order to reduce their awareness of the hidden agenda which otherwise could incite a possible revolt. Incoming inmates were given medical assistance in a well run hospital, allowed religious services, allowed personal belongings and clothing and given some freedoms within camp boundaries. The delusion was largely successful outside the camp, but within the barbed wire confines, inmates quickly learned the weekly fear of having one's name placed on the manifest for export on the railcars.

Commandant A.K. Gemmecker, the commanding officer during the time of the case study narrative was also the person who interrogated the Deceiver when he arrived at Kamp Westerbork. He was the perfect Deceiver himself. Gemmeker acted as the proverbial gentleman. He smiled and
spoke good-naturedly to inmates and seemed to care about their welfare and their children. His affable and stately demeanour concealed the sadistic methods and cruelties carried out by his lower ranked officials, Arthur Pisk and Kurt Schlesinger (Kamp Westerbork website). Gemmecker exhibited no remorse for sending nineteen trainloads crammed with 34,313 Jews from Westerbork to Sobibor. He sent nine trainloads with 4,894 Jews to Theriesenstadt. He sent 4,413 to Bergen-Belsen. He sent sixty-five trainloads with 60,330 persons to Auschwitz and Birkenau. Letters discovered after the war indicated that Lieutenant Colonel Adolf Eichmann reported that he was "very satisfied" with the efficient resolution of the "Jewish Question" that Gemmeker had completed in the Netherlands (Kamp Westerbork website).
Method

There are three reasons why this research study benefits from a qualitative case study approach to inquiry. First, detailed description can be included in life stories, explaining in richer terms how people cope and communicate during their life events. Secondly, the case study method integrates multiple perspectives from a naturally occurring deception episode. Thirdly, it allows for interpretation, not only by the researcher, but also by the collateral input from the participants. From this, the researcher collects, compares and analyzes perceptions and facts to present the material in a fashion that aids in understanding a social phenomenon.

The foundational premise of qualitative research fits with this research method because experiences are assumed to be the underpinning of knowledge. Perception is its filter (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Specifically, the case study method offers the premium means to achieve the objective of the study, that being, to capture in the best way, the nuances and fullest meaning of each participant's point of view.

Rationale for Using a Case Study Inquiry

The emphasis on empirically based research in the social sciences has driven a parallel demand for qualitative narrative work, when the intention is to capture an intimate perspective of a social phenomenon. The case study approach fits the nature of this investigative work, which embraces historical, sociological and psychological factors in an interdisciplinary approach (Yin, 2009). In this research, there is an examination of biographical accounts, historical accounts of World War II and military manoeuvres, historical events in Europe, psychological traits, psychopathy/sociopathy and narcissism features, theories pertaining to deception detection and deception communication. This particular case study required such an in-depth method in order to
bring about a deeper investigation of the intricate fabrication and maintenance of a high stakes
deception.

The methodology welcomes multiple sources and multiple perspectives in order to achieve an optimal understanding of the subject. It allows for intensive analysis in order to deconstruct the deception, while attempting to further understand the depth of the role of relationships. Thus a systematic inquiry into interpersonal functioning, particularly those which have been relatively inaccessible or incomplete through other methods.

**Participants**

The researcher interviewed two persons in face to face interviews, used several previously video taped interviews of one person, and corresponded with three persons by email correspondence. Additional information from these participants came in the form of transcripts, documentation, and newspaper/media sources. There were numerous emails, phone calls and non taped conversations with the principal Receiver. There were conversations with two Canadian military personnel to check military protocol. There were conversations with two persons unrelated to the current study, who had similar experiences in Holland during the Nazi Occupation years.

For the purpose of this study, it was mandatory that participants who were to be considered for the study were vetted for suitability, and to determine that the deception they alleged to have occurred fit with the definition of high stakes deception. An consent/information letter and was given to each participant prior to the pre-interview confirming confidentiality and anonymity and the study's limitations (see Appendix "B"). Those who signed consent forms to be part of the study were given a gift card at the conclusion of the doctoral defence.
For the principal Receiver, and ultimately the other participants chosen for the study, complete anonymity was impossible to achieve as the narrative is identifiable from historical facts and current events. The principal Receiver accepted that likely outcome. For two Receivers of the case study who chose to send emails with information, authoring their email was accepted as their consent to participate; one Receiver restricted certain personal information from being included in the data gathering. Some family members were unavailable as participants.

With respect to the ethical treatment of the participants, care was taken to ensure they were fully informed as to the goal of the study, and that tapes and transcripts were secure. Participants were advised that transcripts would be destroyed within one year to the date of the dissertation completion. They were aware that the researcher would confer with the supervisor of this research and that the supervisor may become aware of some confidential information. The principal Receiver was known to all the participants, and was instrumental in introducing individuals who might participate in the study. The principal Receiver accepted that one of the two committee members overseeing the research was aware of his identity.

Each participant was asked to sign consent forms to engage in interviews conducted over a minimum six month period. Throughout the interview process the researcher maintained openness with each participant, seeking a comfortable rapport, which in itself becomes a component of the data collection (Hiller & DiLuzio (2004). Updates were occasionally scheduled. The principal Receiver and the researcher consulted together following his review of the Results chapter to ensure internal validity.
Clarification of Key Terms

The two primary terms used to designate principal persons in the case study are "Deceiver" and "Receiver". The term "Receiver" specifies a person impacted by the deception and the Deceiver, whether familial or non-familial, including persons who were unwittingly named in attests, proof, and used for statistical means. A "Receiver" may be a person involved in foundations which supported the Deceiver, a friend or acquaintance of the Deceiver, or collectively other detainees of Kamp Westerbork, Dutch historians, and military personnel. The general term "Receiver" may apply to officials of the Dutch House of Orange and Nassau.

The designation of principal Receiver, identifies Client 200 as the non-targeted Receiver and informer of the high stakes deception in the principal case study. For clarification in specific events or quotations in the study, he may be referred to as Client 200 or principal Receiver, or non-targeted Receiver. The targeted Receiver, is Client 220. She does not speak English fluently therefore she speaks via her son Client 240, or Client 200 her nephew, so that her voice is represented in this study. Other Receivers are clearly identified by their designated number or by position, such as being an interviewer or a journalist.

Furthermore, referencing to multiple Receivers interacting with the Deceiver, is referred to as Receiver audiences or listeners.

Non Random Selective Sample

Non-random, selective sampling, also known as theoretical sampling and purposeful sampling, adds credibility to the findings of this case study that address a specific phenomenon. This means that findings are not intended to be generalizable across all situations. "Therefore the sample
size is not determined by the need to ensure generalisability [spelling as in quote], but by a desire to investigate fully the chosen topic and provide information" (Higginbotham, 2004, p. 9). The case study method is often associated with small sample sizes, even single cases such as used in this research study, because of the in-depth nature of the interview, investigation and analysis.

**Procedure**

The face to face interviews with Receiver participants, were held most frequently in the private setting of a university seminar room, in the participant's home, or in public venues such as a coffee shop, between the dates of August 2015 and June 2016. Each of these interviews was audio recorded and lasted from one to two hours. Correspondence with three persons in Holland was conducted in several ways: by direct emails to the researcher, three way email responses between researcher and the principal Receiver acting as a liaison to Dutch participants, and direct correspondence to the Receiver. In addition, the principal Receiver visited Holland on the researcher's behalf in 2015, and spoke directly to all three parties. Four key video recordings of personal interviews were conducted by Ellen Klein, dated April 23, 2010, and J. Modi of the USC Shoah Foundation, dated July 19, 2011, September 19, 2011 and December 8, 2013, the latter confirmed as a replica of a previous interview, dated January 29, 2001 in Clearwater, Florida. In addition to these interview video tapes, other online videos were recorded and transcribed for the researcher by a professional transcriber. Two specific newspaper journalism articles were used to expose the liberation rendered in America (Giradi, 1994) and Holland (Wertheim, 1999). Some additional written sources were photographed or scanned to facilitate analysis. Participants were
encouraged to contact the researcher at any time to complete their narrative as they recalled various factors and perceptions.

In essence, the researcher was invited into the participant's private world and private pain. The researcher recognizes and respects what impact the retelling of their experiences has and what further investigation of the deceptive situation could bring. Nonetheless, the participants identified as Receivers may consider the expression of their narrative as a validation, of having endured a loss that fragmented their lives, and of having been a survivor of a grand deception. The participants confirmed that the information given during the interviews and the questions surrounding the deception, are intended to enhance the ongoing dissection of deception because questions about individual pain experiences are important themes in a person's stories, thus the researcher is best served by an in depth interview strategy (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

Framing Questions

Guiding questions had been prepared to assist conversation (see Appendix "C"). However, open-ended questions better supported each participant throughout the interview as they recounted their narrative, providing further opportunities to explain and to give more in-depth responses. Additional probing questions, such as those recommended for a qualitative inquiry, expanded descriptions and clarified certain details (Tracy, 2010). Examples of probing questions are, "What traits did he display?" or "What do you recall your aunt saying?" Sometimes silence was best to encourage further explanation.

Instrument for Descriptive Statistics

The researcher purchased the computer program NVivo for Mac, for additional support in organizing source material and data analysis. It was meant to augment the interpretation process as
thoroughly as possible. The computer program is noted for being able to place selected text into broad categories called "nodes" that can be further branched to subset "nodes". The nodes are given subjectively determined headings similar to manual thematic content coding. Many sources can be coded: transcripts, audio portions, or other sources such as documents or academic journal articles. Coding allows for analysis including word frequency searches, text search and percentage of weight given to specific meaning nodes.

The researcher found the NVivo tool to be relatively time consuming to set up codes and transfer data to nodes. Transcripts of taped interviews with Client 200 were entered but not the casual conversations on the telephone or meetings such as for updates. The transcripts of Client 210 were also entered. The transcripts of four interviews of Client 230 were entered.

The NVivo program did support the manual text sorting and theme allocation. Word frequency indicated statistical strength of Deceiver and Receiver descriptors (See Table 2). For example, the word "victimhood" a key concept of the Deceiver, occurred seventeen times or 1.41% of the Deceiver's narrative in four selected interviews. Although the researcher concluded that the NVivo computer analyses provided limited usefulness to this particular study, one chart was prepared to compare Deceiver traits, his self report as compared to the Receiver's report (See Table 3). The few comparisons between descriptors of the Deceiver and Receiver was basic, but did bring forward the possibility of discussing the similarities and dissimilarities of descriptors and what that interpretation might offer.

Recognizing word count, for example, or comparing times two coded nodes, aimed for numerical data that could not discriminate between truth and deception. The computer program could not assist with interpreting connections between sources. Further statistical analysis would
have taken the study into a different direction of analysis, possibly subduing the "richness" of the data by emphasizing empirical scores. In other words, the analyses with the NVivo program failed to capture the subtleties and nuances of descriptors, personhood, interpersonal interaction and narrative flow that the researcher was anticipating to understand and deconstruct.

**Assigning of Thematic Meaning Units to Text**

The researcher had extensive raw data to examine. Interviews and conversations that were transcribed, required a template model to extract meaning and usefulness from the varied amount of text. The Thematic Content Analysis template directed the process (Anderson, 2007). The method of formulating categorizations and separating distinct meanings from the text, was to ensure that the researcher's perceptions were as close as possible to those of the participant (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Thomas & Harden, 2007).

Transcripts were read in their entirety several times. As the direction of the findings was becoming clearer to the researcher, broad categories were ascribed, identifying groupings of knowledge under headings of historical context, personality contexts of both the Deceiver and the Receiver, strategies used to conduct the deception, and outcomes. The text was repeatedly evaluated to determine and mark each distinct thought or "meaning unit", then labelled according to the speaker's wording (such as the speaker saying one thought "I am tough", led to the meaning unit being entitled, "toughness"). As the material was further re-read and reviewed, some units were collapsed together (such as "partial truths" and "falsehoods"), or expanded (such as "preparededness and scripted narratives"), or re-titled ("authoritative" became "claiming authority"). The meaning units were frequently reassessed for clarity and relabelled when necessary. The theme headings on
the NVivo computer analysis program were adjusted to have matching designations.

**Supporting Documentation**

The transcripts were not the complete source of raw data. For example, the principal Receiver provided the researcher with historical books on Jewry, the Holocaust, as well as two survivor biographies, one being of his own mother. He also provided personal correspondence between himself and the Deceiver, himself and family members, and himself and the curator of the museum at Kamp Westerbork. In addition, tapes, magazine articles and letters from other sources provided a wide source of knowledge to the researcher. Understanding the wider context of this deception, allowed for a better opportunity to deconstruct its strategic elements (Blair, Levine, & Shaw, 2010). Other participants of the principal case study provided personal email correspondence, personal artifacts from the concentration camp, military records, other written narratives, personal artifacts from the war years and diaries. The researcher accessed Canadian military records, inquired directly to military personnel, accessed websites, media articles, Holocaust Memorial and Shoah foundation articles, testimonies and videos in addition to publicly accessible video recordings to compare statements for truth tables (see Table 1).
Interpretation of the Findings

The organization of the findings provided a pathway to deconstruct the three deceptions efficiently, analyzing the elements alongside the personality descriptors of each participant of the reciprocal relationship. The exegesis of the text supported the interpretation of verbal and non-verbal communication. By examining and collating individual instances, in conjunction with the plethora of documentation, the researcher was able to summarize probable conclusions that could be applied to similar high stakes situations.

Semantic Validity

To add further semantic validity to the research analysis, a person known to the researcher to have experienced high stakes deception as a Receiver, consented to do a review of Theme 4,
"Strategic elements of interpersonal communication" of the Results chapter, to assess the researcher's assignment of category headings to text. The participant had no knowledge of the case study or participants. The inter-rater read transcripts of four interviews conducted with the Deceiver (Klein, 2010). The inter-rater then assigned text to ascribed meaning units. The inter-rater offers a review to compare the designation of meaning units between the inter-rater and the researcher (See Appendix "E").

**Construct Validity**

The established theoretical model, the Interpersonal Deception Theory (IDT) (Buller & Burgoon, 1996) is representative of similar constructs that were observed in the deconstruction and analysis of the deception relationship and communication.

Several participants known to the researcher in clinical work, who had been involved in a high stake deception situation, contributed collateral information from the perspective of having been a Receiver experiencing ongoing deception and manipulation over several years. This was useful for comparison to the Receiver's role in the case study.

**Content Validity**

"Although some variation occurs when interpreting qualitative data, there is a reasonable expectation that a certain consistency exists between the subjective analysis of the researcher and an objective outside analysis" to enable a "consistency of interpretation" (Cudmore, 2002, p. 66). Content validity implies a confidence that the basic aspects of this research, the deception details and the context are accurate. The agreement level between an outside rater and the researcher, comparing frequency rate per meaning units were as follows: moderate (60%) with Theme 2, descriptors of the Deceiver, high (80%) with Theme 4, Non-verbal strategic communication
elements, and low (20%) for Theme 4, Verbal strategic communication elements. The historical points such as details of the Nazi Occupation, military manoeuvres, well known personages involved, and post war events have been confirmed through multiple sources and presented as factually correct. Individual experiences, family memories, family events, and opinions as transcribed, have been reviewed by the principal Receiver (Client 200), for accuracy and agreement.

From the data and analysis, themes and relationships are interpreted in a thorough manner, letting the "data speak for itself" (Heppner, Kivlighan & Wampold, 1999, p. 263). "Thick description", is a label which allows the researcher to pursue "an unadulterated and thorough presentation of the data" that "are closer to the phenomenon being studied that are any other means, qualitative or quantitative" (1999, p. 263, 264). In the process of collecting data and subsequently allocating thematic designations, the material is "minimally filtered" (1999, p. 264). In fact, the sifting of material allows for a condensed version, nonetheless the researcher aspires to include the most complete description in order to make sense of the analysis.

Examining and comparing multiple literature sources on high stakes deception increased content validity. The findings of this study corroborated other literature (Akhtar & Parens, 2009; Burgoon, et al., 2002; Burgoon, 2005; Burgoon, 2015; Ekman, 1997; Feldman, 2009; Hancock et al., 2008; Hancock, et al., 2010; Hare, 1994; O'Sullivan & Ekman, 2009; Picornell, 2011; Shaw, Porter, & ten Brinke, 2013; Schouten & Silver, 2012; Stout, 2005; Vrij, 2008; Woodworth et al., 2012; Zhou et al., 2004).
Results

This case study was an ideal case study to explore high stakes deception in depth. The single case study, clearly a compelling high stakes deception, was complete in its construction and impact, having historical verification in addition to availability to key persons involved in the deception. The extensive amount of material provided ample data with which to deconstruct how the deception was accomplished and with what consequences. The large number of sources had the potential to broaden the scope of the investigation and offered material to validate facts.

The single case study selected for this research involved a Deceiver, a targeted Receiver, a non-targeted Receiver (who was also the primary informant), as well as other Receivers who were aware or impacted by the deception.

Assignment of Codes to Participants

The term "participant" and the word "client" are interchangeable but for the purposes of this research the term used is "client". Each client explained their personal experiences and perspectives to the researcher in person or on the telephone, or by writing an email, writing an autobiography, letter, diary or text. Each client was assigned a number to ensure confidentiality. The case study happened to be the second deception account of several of high stake situations considered for the research, and therefore was originally labelled as the 200 series. Thus, each participant of the single case study was identified by a number in the 200 series. To that end, each client is addressed in the dissertation with the following number:

Client 200: Principal Receiver
Client 210: 2nd Lieutenant of the VIII Reconnaissance Unit, (VIII RECCE), Canadian 7th Troop
Client 220: Aunt of Client 200, sister of Client 230, inmate at Kamp
Assignment of Theme Categories

The transcript of each interview for the single case study was bracketed into thematic meaning units following the guidelines of the Thematic Content Analysis previously outlined. Each meaning unit represented one unit of thought as described by the client. This included units identifying historical details and family circumstances as both the Deceiver and the Receivers experienced them, as well as their reactions and reflections. These meaning units were grouped into five theme categories and eighty-four sub-unit headings.

The case study includes six biographical accounts and one compendium of several accounts, to fully describe the hero/liberation deception. By becoming familiar with the historical background material, the reader is better equipped to grasp what facts were manipulated to create the complex deception and to deconstruct the tactical manipulations and subsequent outcomes of the deception.

Theme 1 - Deception situations.

The first theme unit focuses on the situation's essential context: the historical background and setting which prepares the reader for a richer understanding of the Deceiver's contextual framework and the sources he used to create his deception account.

Theme 1 articulates the three deceptions represented in the single case study. The purpose of including the generational deception (family of origin) and the sibling deception is that both units
aid in understanding the persons involved, as they reappear as key participants in the hero/liberation deception.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>The generational deception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>The sibling deception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>The hero/liberation deception - Client 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td>The hero/liberation deception - Client 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5</td>
<td>The hero/liberation deception - Client 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>The hero/liberation deception - Client 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 7</td>
<td>The hero/liberation deception - Client 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 8</td>
<td>The hero/liberation deception - Client 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 9</td>
<td>The hero/liberation deception - Other sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theme 2 - Deceiver descriptors.**

Theme 2 outlines descriptors of the Deceiver. This theme is categorized into four meaning units: descriptors associated with community or work associations, and family relationships. The last two sub-units, Deceiver's descriptors according to self-report and the descriptors of the Deceiver as indicated by the Receiver's report, enrich the study by providing a broader understanding of individuality and attitudes. They offer a psychological overview of the Deceiver.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 2</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Meaning Unit Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 10</td>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>Friendships, community work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extended family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sibling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife, children, grandchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardworking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of paternal name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persuasion skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self as primary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 3 - Receiver descriptors.

Theme 3 tables the descriptors of the principal Receiver, Client 200, using similar main categories as in Theme 2 (Descriptors of the Deceiver). The headings are as follows: community and work associations, family relationships, and finally Receiver's traits by Receiver's self-report. Theme 3 does not include a unit tabling descriptors of the Receiver according to the Deceiver's perspective, because of insufficient referencing about the principal Receiver. What few descriptors the Deceiver used to describe the targeted Receiver however, in regards to the sibling deception, were incorporated into the unit in Theme 1, section 2, titled "Sibling Deception".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 3</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Meaning Unit Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 14</td>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>Friendships, community work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 15</td>
<td>Family Relationships</td>
<td>Extended family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sibling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit 16  Receiver's traits - Self report  
Wife, children, grandchildren  
Analytical  
Anticipatory anxiety  
Caring, concern for others  
Conflicted feelings  
Collaborative  
Intelligent  
Loyal to family/family name  
Non-confrontational  
Rescuer  
Suspicious of Deceiver  
Truth and integrity values  
Word usage  

Theme 4 - Strategic interpersonal communication elements to conduct deception.

Theme 4 explores the verbal and non-verbal elements which enabled the construction and maintenance of the deception by means of interpersonal communication strategies. Twenty-eight strategical elements are grouped into one of two categories, non-verbal strategies exposing eight meaning units or verbal interpersonal strategies identifying twenty sub-units. This category presents the core findings to enable a deconstruction of the deception process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 4</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Meaning Unit Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Unit 17 | Non-verbal Strategic Interpersonal Communication Elements | Aloofness  
Historical parallelisms  
Intuitive skill  
Mouth noises/pauses  
Preparedness and scripts  
Proof/statistics  
Public persona  
Vague/redirected responses |
| Unit 18 | Verbal Strategic Interpersonal Communication Elements | Claiming authority  
Emotional words  
Exaggeration  
Falsehoods  
Illogical arguments  
Intimidation/Ad hominem arguments  
Manipulation of meaning  
Neologism |
Theme 5 - Outcomes from the deception.

Theme 5 describes findings explaining the effects and legacy resulting from the sibling deception and the high stakes deception of false heroism. Three units capture three major outcomes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 5</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 19</td>
<td>Benefits to the Deceiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 20</td>
<td>Deleterious outcomes to the Receiver(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 21</td>
<td>Changing outcomes as truth is exposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expanded Results from Each Theme Category

Theme 1: Deception Situations

The generational deception.

Generational family dysfunction indicates that deception was not unknown to the Deceiver (Client 230). His maternal grandfather swindled his own two sons out of money in a shared business enterprise, causing a severe fracturing in the family. It impacted Client 200's family of origin enough to compel them to emigrate to the United States before the second world war. Not only was the Deceiver exposed to his grandfather's deception tactics regularly, but also his father's, who concealed multiple sexual liaisons despite his mother's presence. Client 200 surmises that his uncle's predilection to deception tactics was nurtured.

But my uncle would have learned early on about deception and because he would have seen his father engaged in these, you know, this kind of deception with his wife, who ended up in a psychiatric hospital, you know whether she was naturally crazy or whether she became crazy with a, you know, duplicitous husband I don't know, but...you know it's completely possible that my uncle learned that behaviour and I, I think he may have exhibited in some ways some of the behaviour himself through his life.

Consequently both the Deceiver and his sister, Client 220, observed the ongoing affairs, leading to opposing opinions of the father, which may have set the groundwork for sibling distrust and subsequent sibling deception. Despite the siblings' resentments for her, the mistress did provide a hiding place in her home, in Den Hague, for the father's adult children. In fact, she housed and fed the sister and an aunt's niece for approximately eighteen months before her brother, the Deceiver, joined them at the hiding place. The overview of the generational deception is useful background for
evaluating the later sibling deception account, which in turn is useful in deconstructing the deception of the heroism account.

**The sibling deception.**

The sibling deception underlies the Deceiver's heroic claims of liberating the Jews from Kamp Westerbork, but imbedded in this deception is the unanswerable question, who deceived whom? The sibling accounts of their capture by the police on January 21, 1945, are in agreement except for pivotal questions establishing who betrayed their hiding place and what exact instructions were given to escape. The Deceiver blames his sister as the deceiver of their hiding place and for not obeying his escape instructions, concluding from this belief that she rightly deserved her injury and family estrangement. In contrast, the sister believes that the mistress no longer wanted the risk of having them in her home, and it was the mistress who reported them in return for payment. The sister believed that the escape instructions were to benefit only her brother in self preservation, by purposefully giving her inaccurate directions. Client 200 states this: "The two stories...they tell congruent stories up to that point, you know. He says I told her to turn right but she turned left, she says he told me to turn left and I turned left and I got shot".

She contends her brother concocted the escape plan with no consensus and believes he intended for her to be the decoy for his escape alone. Client 200 speaks on her behalf.

Client 200, "She feels that he was trying to get away and he sent her in the wrong direction when they were running".

Interviewer, "So deception, a purposeful deception"?

Client, " Yeah, that ended up with her being shot".
The Deceiver remained vocal throughout the years that it was his sister's fault for causing a sibling rift, but the contention was an efficacious means to keep his sister from interacting with extended family, friends and authorities during the same time frame in which he expounded on his heroic experiences at Kamp Westerbork. The nephew emphasizes the estrangement, "I think from the nineteen nineties on, it even pushed her further away from her family and his, his insistence that she had sold out the family in Amsterdam...". Interestingly, Client 200 states that the Deceiver does not admit any error in his escape plan, in which he failed in his part to overcome one Gestapo policeman and run away.

They were running away from the police and [he] told his sister to turn one direction, she turned that direction, he turned the other direction. He got away, she was shot and wounded and ended up in the camp. He was caught later, they both ended up in the camp.

What obfuscates the believability of the Deceiver's perspective, is that he retells the story in different versions to different audiences. For example, in one interview he claims the police brought him back to his sister and aunt's niece, after which he offered his sister first aid for her wounds. In another interview, the Deceiver states he evaded capture for awhile and was later brought to the Hotel Oranje, his sister having been sent to Kamp Westerbork already. In a third account in a Florida newspaper interview with Client 230, he tells the same story but identifies the two women, not as his sister and aunt's niece, but as two schoolgirls he used to know. Allegedly, while he and the school chums were reuniting and having a conversation they were arrested. This latter version eliminates the connection to his sister. This version recorded by a newspaper journalist is as follows. "Once he saw two young women, schoolmates he thought
had been taken away long ago. A passing patrol noticed the three talking animatedly and marched them to Gestapo headquarters". The similarities between stories are apparent as the escape instructions are identical, with one girl being shot. Client 230 is quoted by the journalist as saying,

I walked with a girl on each side. Two soldiers, the soldiers, keep them busy. The girls should run off in opposite directions. So I did it, and it would have worked, but one of the girls wouldn't leave the other, so they ran off together. One soldier held his gun on me, and the other one chased the girls and shot one.

The conflicting accounts of the capture contrast with commonalities the siblings did experience, but which have been lost due to the estrangement: losing a father in the early years of the Nazi occupation, enduring the Nazi Occupation in the Jewish ghetto, working in the Jewish hospital, escaping the hospital round up by the Gestapo, sharing their mother's psychiatric illness, sharing the loss of their mother, sharing eighteen months in close proximity in hiding, being arrested by the soldiers, being detained at the improvised theatre prison in Scheveningen, being transported by railcar to Kamp Westerbork, and being interned at Kamp Westerbork for twelve weeks. Additionally, they shared the event of the liberation of Kamp Westerbork on April 12, 1945. Nonetheless, the Deceiver states each event and loss as his own personal experience and personal loss, using the subjective, first person, point of view.

After the war there was one uncle, one aunt left, cousins, less than fingers of one of my hands. They killed all my relatives, my friends, my neighbours, my school mates, my, everybody I knew. Everybody, including my parents. After the war I was an orphan.

Client 220 expressed considerable shock 48 years after the war ended in 1993, when reading the daily newspaper at her home in Amsterdam, that her brother was enjoying notoriety for
surviving as an orphan and a Holocaust victim, as well as claiming he was the hero who had enabled
the Canadian army to liberate Kamp Westerbork, which culminated in his being knighted by the
Dutch Queen. The Deceiver frequently retold the lie, that he had no living relatives in Holland, in
later interviews.

And a one point in one of the interviews he did after he was honoured as a hero,...there
were four, here [he is] being honoured. And in the interview on the third page of one of
the major newspapers in the Netherlands,...she opens it up and there's a big picture, a
whole page story of her brother who says he has no living relatives in Holland, which
was a bit of a shock to her... the degree of deception.

It was the Deceiver's choice to ignore his sister's existence. However, in an unguarded moment, he
surprised a Floridian journalist during one interview, by mentioning a sister. The interviewer records
that Client 230 contained the reference and refused to make further comments about her: "My sister
was working at the hospital",...his listener looks up. It is the first [he] has mentioned a sister. "I can't
talk about her", he says. "I talk about everything else." The sibling deception remains unresolved,
but contributes to the fuller understanding of the Deceiver and his purpose for a hero/liberation
deception.

**The hero/liberation deception.**

**Client 200 Account.**

Client 200 is the principal Receiver of the case study, and is the grand nephew of the
Deceiver. He recounts two versions of the liberation narrative that he knows from having many
personal conversations with the participants; the first is his uncle's story, the Deceiver, Client 230,
and the second is of the Client 210, the account of the Second Lieutenant, who is now credited for
discovering the Kamp Westerbork in the line of his military duty. Client 200 summarizes his uncle's version.

So he [Client 230] claims that at the very, very end as the Germans were evacuating, as the Canadian army was moving towards it, he claims to have been able to sneak out of the camp, go through a dark forest at night seeing firefights between the Germans and Canadians, swim across the canal, be captured by the Canadians, be taken to the General in charge of the Canadian army...be interrogated by the General, and then be sent back with the Canadian forces, given a gun, and then sent back with the Canadian forces who fought their way, again through the woods, back to the concentration camp and liberated the camp.

After speaking with the former Second Lieutenant [Client 210], Client 200 gives the following summary.

He [Client 210] was only at the camp for a relatively short time like maybe a couple of hours....What he says is that he, they had no idea that there was a camp there. And so they arrived at the gates...one of the gates into this camp. They followed a little rail line from the canal up to the, up to the camp. And there's barbed wire fences and there's barracks and there's guard towers,...and there was no one in the guard towers, which was pretty odd...and so his crew of about twenty men just sat there for awhile, waiting to see what was going to happen, they didn't know if it was a trap or what. And then one of the doors of the barracks opened up and people stuck their heads out and when they saw the carriers and the armoured cars and they had a white star on them and not a
German cross on it, then the prisoners started pouring in from the end of the camp. They radioed...back to Headquarters....after an hour or so he was told to keep, keep heading North, keep doing what his job was, which was reconnaissance. And the Canadian infantry then showed up later and stayed..they occupied the camp and registered all the people.

*Client 210 account.*

Client 210 is currently a retired medical doctor but was the Second Lieutenant, commander of the VIII Reconnaissance Unit, (VIII RECCCE), of the 2nd Div. Canadian Infantry, during the last months of World War II in Europe. He was unknown to the Deceiver, the targeted Receiver or the principal Receiver, until the Deceiver's hero/liberation account became public. Client 210 consented to interviews and offered his military memorabilia as verifiable sources, because the Receiver's family and historians were seeking the authentic account.

In the spring of 1945, Client 210 was stationed with his unit, on the west shore of the Rhine River along with the entire 2nd Division of the Canadian army awaiting orders to advance into Holland to continue the liberation movement there. It is important for understanding the documentation he presents regarding the liberation of Kamp Westerbork, to note that Client 210 had been promoted to the position of Second Lieutenant in charge of a fairly large cohort of troops and armoured vehicles of the scouting unit, the VIII RECCCE as well as the 7th Troop, upon the unfortunate injury to the previous officer in charge, Lieutenant M. Young. These two units were part of the Canadian operation front to liberate the western and northern regions of the Netherlands, under the command of the Canadian Brigadier-General.
The historical relevance of dates, times, names and army positioning, which assists in establishing historical truth, begins with the instructions given to the Second Lieutenant on April 11, 1945, at the crossroads in the town of Spier, Holland. Client 210 was ordered by a Major Woods, to detour east to scout a secondary northern route as the German army contingent was hunkered down north of the Oranjekanaal at the town of Beilen. Client 210, obeying orders, took his patrol unit along with the 7th Troop, on a north route about six kilometres east, parallel to the highway, which was indicated on his aerial map. Meanwhile, the Brigadier General was headquartered south of Beilen, was planning a military manoeuvre to confuse the enemy by feigning an attack preparation south of the canal as a separate unit was being dispatched across a hastily built Bailey bridge across the canal a mile east of Beilen, to attack by surprise from the eastern flank. It is important to identify these positions as the Second Lieutenant understood them at the time, and are supported by the Brigadier-General's records. Using his well worn map kept from 1945, Client 210 explained his reconnaissance route to the researcher and his timing of troop movements on the evening of April 11, 1945, a set of facts critical in discerning the actual liberation.

Fortuitously we were at a crossroads...my Major said, "There's a crossroad right there...[name], explore to the right". So I went across this way to a village and then we found a country road that went north as the main road going north...And we got to just south of the canal.

Upon the determination that the route from Spier to the OranjeKanaal was safe, the young officer was ordered to return to the junction point at Spier again, to lead the South Saskatchewan Regiment (SSR) of 600 infantry back along the same route to the canal, in order to for them to quickly build a Bailey bridge across the canal at this point as a possible alternative route.
Reconnaissance was necessary if armoured cars and tanks were to move across to the north side of the canal, then west again to potentially confront the Germans north of Beilen. Consequently Client 210 states that he traversed the same route three times before midnight before leading his exploratory convoy over the Oranjekanaal.

The regiment settled itself along the Kanal, awaiting the hasty construction of a Bailey bridge over a sluice gate to enable the crossing with armoured vehicles and gun carriers. The sun was coming up...the South Saskatchewan Regiment [worked on] the bridge across the canal, using a sluice gate, so they had that ready by nine o'clock in the morning and then I started the Number 7 troops.

His patrol consisted of five Daimler Armoured Cars plus seven Brengun carriers. They came to a small gauge rail line approximately eight hundred metres west of the crossing point of the canal near Zwiggelte. He led the troops north from the canal on this rail track because it provided an easier means of crossing a swampy area despite its possible exposure to attack. They proceeded cautiously about two or three kilometres.

We were able to take the cars and tanks across [the canal], the gun cars across there, then we turned left, at 800 metres and then the railway tracks going to the right...turned right onto the railway tracks...wasn't very safe, really, because who knows.

According to aerial maps, Client 210 could identify only a military cabin in the area which was indicated at the end of the small gauge rail line, but it was unclear if anything else existed, in this relatively unpopulated wooded area.

So then we went through, and on the maps...eventually it showed something like a military cabin. I didn't know what it was, but when we got there, we could see it was
surrounded by barbed wire with guard dogs...sure of that! We kept on going north. And we came ultimately to the open gate, and you could see it swinging out over there...I was seeing on the map but had no explanation what it was.

Client 210 reports it was eerily quiet and that he was conscious of a possible ambush. He maintained his patrol in an alert position, as he tried to ascertain their situation. Within a short time, several of the barrack doors opened and Jewish inmates came out recognizing the Allied insignia and their own liberation. In his report he reaffirms events.

I recall how quiet and eerily desolate the camp appeared to be, even minutes after we arrived. Then suddenly it looked as if hundreds of people poured out of the buildings toward us. One aged man climbed onto my lead Daimler armoured car and gave me his yellow "Jood"- Jew star, which I still affectionately keep with my other war trophies.

He radioed his discovery of the transit camp to headquarters and was instructed to stay in position until the South Saskatchewan Regiment (SSR) could arrive to handle the inmate situation"...so we had to stay there long enough for that Brigadier-[General] could get his Canadian intelligence corps. I didn't see it but I learned later that he waited in the camp".

He was commanded to continue his reconnaissance mission with the VIII RECCE patrol northwards once the SSR came to oversee the inmates' welfare.

But I'm in my [armoured] car and I'm just sitting there until some General gives [an] order from my chain in the army, then finally when they got...our infantry regiment, to get Canadian soldiers in the camp, to take control of the place, and then they had to get somebody to administer, so...when they had that, following orders, then they just said,
"Okay [name], you can take off". So we went then north to Amen [Holland],...we harboured there for the night.

The entire day's proceedings, despite the impact it would have on 876 Jewish inmates, is only briefly recorded by Client 210 in his own personal military diary.

At 0300 hours. Major Woods on Troop radio sent me back 20 miles to pick up Battalion (about 600 men) of South Saskatchewan Regiment (Infantry Regt.) - conducted them up to canal north of Westerbork [town], at daylight which they crossed at 0900. At 1000 hrs. #7 troop passed through the South Sask. Infantry Regt.- detoured through swamp driving along a railway line - arrived at, and liberated a Political Jewish Concentration camp (Kamp Westerbork) nr. Amen...(#7 tp. - after radioing information back to Squadron H.Q. - moved out of C.camp after approximately 45 mins then harboured at Amen - 2 miles from camp. Contacted A.Sgt. at Galloo or Schoonloo.

It is important to note that Client 210 was sent to do the reconnaissance with troops in gun carriers and armoured vehicles, and not with a few foot soldiers. He did not encounter German troops on either April 11 or 12, 1945, from Spier northwards to Kamp Westerbork or northwards to Amen. The next combat situation while leading the VIII RECCE, was recorded in Kolham fifty kilometres north of Amen on April 13 and further west between Nordbrock and Wagenborgen.

Client 210 was invited by the Dutch historians, specifically by the curator/historian of Kamp Westerbork, Client 260, to attend the 60th year celebrations of the liberation of Holland as their guest, because of his confirmed active role in liberating Kamp Westerbork.
Clients 220 and 240 accounts.

Client 220 is the sister of the Deceiver (Client 230), and is the targeted Receiver of the sibling deception and the hero/liberation deception. Client 240 is her son. Both reside in Amsterdam. Client 200 was the mediator between the researcher and his Dutch relatives often providing the English voice for them.

Client 220 recalls she was given medical treatment after her arrival at Kamp Westerbork then put into a punishment barrack. She continued to be under medical care in an auxiliary barrack during the twelve weeks before the liberation. Client 240 recounts the details.

Because [name], [name] and [name] were hidden, they were put in the punishment barrack. It is difficult which one was that barrack because they were in a few barracks.

Because [she] was shot down while she tried to run away after they were betrayed, she was put in the hospital barrack of which I don't know exact [number] it was.

Further, Client 240 revealed that his mother was in a wheelchair on the day the Kamp was liberated. He states she does not recall seeing the Second Lieutenant, Client 210, entering the Kamp grounds, but does recall the arrival of Canadian troops as a whole unit. She does not think her brother could have liberated the camp. Client 240 holds that Client 210, the Second Lieutenant, liberated the camp and believes this is validated by the historian's invitation of Client 210 to the 60th anniversary celebrations commemorating the liberation of Holland.

Client 230 account.

Client 230 identifies the Deceiver. He is a great uncle to Client 200, the brother of Client 220 and the uncle of Client 240. The Deceiver's initial version of the liberation of Kamp Westerbork,
was told in the early 1990's, about 48 years after the second world war. The hero/liberation account quickly gained attention particularly after it was published.

The Deceiver alleges he conducted the Canadian troops to Kamp Westerbork, playing a pivotal role in the liberation of 876 Jews from the camp, claiming that without his intercession, the inmates would have faced imminent annihilation by the Allied war movement. His heroism account begins with a nighttime escape from camp, where he alleges he was hiding in a garbage pile until dark.

I crawled on my stomach out of the barrack, ducked myself into a garbage dump (Sigh).

I crawled on my stomach out of the barrack, ducked myself into a garbage dump (Sigh).

Put a box over my head and a hole in it to be able to breathe. When it was completely dark and I'd crawled out from the camp, I escaped. Went under the barbed wire because in Westerbork the barbed wire was not on electric power.

He states he walked for hours between two armies in an active fighting zone, then swam across the Oranjekanaal.

I start walking in the dark through the woods for hours in the direction of the noise of the artillery fire. Then I got between the two fighting armies. Bullets were flying all around. I got to a canal and I want to swim across the canal so I undress and I got my clothes, held it above water and I swum across the canal.

He claims he was arrested by Canadian troops as he exited the canal and was taken for interrogation to the Brigadier-General: "They took me into custody...There was a Brigadier-General and he claimed that by an interpreter, he claimed that I was a collaborator with the Nazis". After a discussion that included the whereabouts of the Westerbork transit camp, Client 230 claimed that the Brigadier General was planning to order his artillery and troops to annihilate a supposed military
camp, several kilometres northeast of the northern route the military were headed. The Deceiver recounts the discussion between he and the Brigadier-General.

[The Brigadier-General said], "The camp you are talking about are military barracks, German military barracks. We have seen [them] from reconnaissance planes, yesterday we took the pictures - only military". I said, "Sure, because we were kept in the barracks, we were not allowed to come out".

Client 230 states he had seen the aerial reconnaissance planes over Kamp Westerbork earlier that day, which is not substantiated by other sources. He claims that he used his authority as an escaped inmate to persuade the Brigadier-General to reconsider the planned annihilation plan or be held accountable by him, for the death of a thousand Jews. Client 230 states that the Brigadier General then conceded, provided him with a Sten gun, ammunition and a patrol of six men to walk back to Kamp Westerbork in the middle of the night, allegedly via the same route back through the two fighting armies with "bullets flying all around", to authenticate his story and to liberate the camp. "So he changed his mind, he gave me a Sten gun with several rounds of ammunition and we had to start walking. I was walking between two military men...and four in the back".

En route back to the Kamp Westerbork, the Deceiver specifies that he and the six patrol men encountered the enemy. He is able to discern their identification in the dark hours before dawn, as German Nazis and Dutch collaborators. He states that they killed all of the enemy with no losses to the Canadians.

We run into stiff German, SS and collaborators from the German side and they had to eliminate them, we started to fight these men and they found out very fast on whose side I
was. And we eliminated these guys, we didn't lose any of our own men and we continued to walk and it got just a little bit daylight when we got to the camp.

His account states that upon the return to the camp, the gates were unattended and open, with the people still inside the barracks. "The gate was open, the guards had run away already and everyone was still in the barracks...it just started to get bright light". He does not record in his narrative of events, any interaction with his sister, his aunt's niece, or fellow Jewish inmates upon his arrival at the transit camp. He does not recount interaction with anyone during the hour and a half wait he claims it took for the regiment to arrive. He does mention a military field radio call to the commander.

There was man with us with a field radio, he radioed back to his commander that it's true what I told, it's a camp with prisoners and an hour and a half later the Canadian armed forces rolled into the camp.

Although it is not clear in any of the narratives at what time on April 12th, the Brigadier-General arrived to visit Kamp Westerbork, the Deceiver states that the Brigadier-General acknowledged him on his arrival. "The Brigadier-General was there too, a big man, giant, big man. He came over to see me and all he said in his very heavy voice, "Oh you were right". He validates his hero/liberation account by stating that he met the Brigadier-General years later at an Armistice Day celebration in Montreal, (the Deceiver claims this meeting occurred in 1967 in one interview, and 1989 in a second interview). He states that the commander remembered him many years later, in Canada, from the brief encounter during the war.
Client 250 account.

The Canadian commander of the 2nd Canadian Armed Infantry, the Brigadier-General, is Client 250. Details included in his autobiography assist in understanding his alleged part in the Deceiver's deception strategy (Allard, 1985).

The Brigadier-General spearheaded the Canadian ousting of the German army from Holland during the early months of 1945 to the end of the European war in May 1945. Under his command, troops crossed the Rhine at Essenden and advanced into southwestern Holland, pushing the German army northwards towards the Baltic Sea. By April, 1945, the Canadians were located south of the small city of Beilen, in western Holland, with the German army entrenched north of the town, on the north side of the Oranjekanaal. The operation was coded as "Canada North". On the 11th April, 1945, he records that he decided on a dual attack, one to act as a decoy from the intended position for a full attack.

The operation that I am planning [in] Holland [which] remains a beautiful country of flat landscapes with paved roads systems that promote rapid advances...My task is to go around Holten from the right and get away as fast as possible towards Beilen [distance of 76.7 kms.]...as for Phase III, it will consist of an attack.

The Brigadier-General logs that the primary route along the main provincial highway was controlled by the 12th Manitoba Dragoons and the Cameron Brigade of the 2nd Canadian Infantry Division. Equally as important to his plan was to explore an alternate northward avenue around the the German flank at Beilen. A reconnaissance scouting unit was dispensed at the crossroads in town of Spier, 6.4 kilometres south of Beilen. It was the task of the VIII RECCE to find a viable alternate route. The VIII RECCE unit accomplished this on April 11, arriving safely at the Oranjekanaal.
Later, a patrol unit reported their discovery of a concentration camp. The Brigadier-General records the discovery: "During this sweeping, one of my patrols discovers a concentration camp where thousands of political prisoners have been shoved into it, the majority being Jewish". The Brigadier-General stationed south of Beilen, visited Kamp Westerbork briefly after its liberation. "Not having time to take care of them, I arrange for them to receive rations and I hand them over to the civilian authorities. But what a vision of horror of this day that has stayed with me"!

The Brigadier-General recorded several details of the visit to Kamp Westerbork, such as trucks being loaded with persons, not having much time to remain there, and providing military rations to the Kamp authorities, but no mention is made in the entire autobiography of meeting, conversing, interrogating or later recognizing an escapee who had swum a canal, or any other inmate from the transit camp.

**Client 260 account.**

The Dutch historian, Client 260, currently is the curator of Kamp Westerbork. He is keenly aware of the effort made to authenticate the correct liberation account of Kamp Westerbork. He is also aware that the Deceiver's narrative was not initially checked for factual content. Client 200 met the curator at Westerbork in 2015 on behalf of the researcher, and stated the curator's conclusion.

Essentially what [Client 260] said was that [Client 230]'s story was complete rubbish. And they're not taking it seriously any of it, that they feel he had nothing to do with the liberation of the camp. So historically, his story is not going to be part of the history of the liberation of the camp other than perhaps it'll be there as another example of,...how people deceive, you know, can really mess history up.
Client 260 acknowledged to Client 200 that when he had interviewed former Kamp Westerbork inmates, most who had been barracked near the southeast sector by the camp farm. They could not remember noticing the arrival of the VIII RECCE patrol unit at the opposite southwest gates. Rather, they recall the noise and joy of the Canadian regiment arriving. Client 200 reports his comments. "Now the problem that [Client 260] points out is that you could see there was like a camp farm, and he says none of the people who were involved in the farm had any memory of seeing the group [VIII RECCE] come in". However, the curator noted that a few persons actually did recall the entry of Client 210's reconnaissance patrol, as Client 200 continues to inform: "He [Client 260] said that's the problem...very few people remember, [but] in all the accounts of the people that were at the camp at liberation, very few of them, only a few of them, actually talk about him [Client 210] being there".

Client 260 suggests that people confined under threat to stay in their barracks were terrified to attract any attention from Gestapo officers should they venture outside. Client 260 concludes that Client 230's liberation narrative is a "farce" and that the account of the Second Lieutenant of the Canadian VIII RECCE was accurate. Client 260 stated to Client 200 that the Second Lieutenant's account is straightforward and compares well with other archival material. Client 200 confirms again the historian's conclusion after much evaluation.

He [Client 260] has to be convinced as a historian that he's got the story as it really happened...it was very clear that [the Deceiver's] account was rubbish. And he used a phrase like that, to say no, they're no, their sense is [his] story is a deception.

The curator Client 260, in agreement with other Dutch historians, had determined that Second Lieutenant (Client 210) while leading his scouting patrol, was in fact the first of the Allied
armies to discover Kamp Westerbork and the Jewish inmates, in his line of duty. In 2005, Client 210 was issued a formal invitation to attend the 60th anniversary celebrations of the liberation of Kamp Westerbork, as an honour, at the Dutch government's expense.

**Other sources.**

a) The Canadian Battlefields Foundation and Wilfred Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, in their joint military guide entitled *The Canadian Battlefields in Northwest Europe 1944-45: A Visitors Guide* (2005), writes details concerning the liberation of the Netherlands. Their sources clearly state that it was the VIII Reconnaissance Unit (VIII RECCE) in the lead, liberating Kamp Westerbork, that the "Second Division with 8 Reece Regiment (14th Canadian Hussars) in the lead, liberated Westerbork, the transit camp from which Anne Frank and so many other victims of the Holocaust were transported". The military guide also substantiates that German troops resisting the Canadian troops were not encountered in the town of Westerbork but west as already detailed on the main routing north, and further northeast in the town of Assen. Referring to a different infantry unit travelling from the German border area, the Allies did encounter the German army, but not in the Westerbork area. "They reached Assen on 13 April, by-passed the town and attacked from the north overcoming the enemy in a two hour battle that yielded 600 prisoners".

b) The website, "The Holocaust-lest-we-forget", (2009), states that the official version of the liberation is consistent with Client 210's account and findings from Cpt. Cecil Law's thorough military log of the Dutch liberation (Law, 2000). Further narrative statements are compared to official radio logs and war records and diaries in the truth tables compiled for examination (see Table 1).
Whereas the official version of the liberation of [K]camp Westerbork is recorded in a number [of] books,...in part his experience is also mentioned in Capt. Cecil Law's book, "Kamp Westerbork, Transit Camp to Eternity: The Liberation Story". Most of the records share the same version of Law and [Client 210] of the events surrounding the liberation of camp Westerbork [and] are in agreement with the official version mentioned earlier.

The Holocaust memorial website includes Client 230's version of the liberation, as well as copies of the alleged letters from the Brigadier General to himself. The letters submitted to this website are not consistent in content, spelling or style to the letters that Client 230 provided as proof of his heroism to his family and to the Holocaust Museum in Florida. This is further analyzed in the Discussion.

The website writer is Nicholas van Pratt, also a reporter to the Montreal Gazette at that time. He printed a story on May 5, 2000 as told to him by Mrs. Olga Rains. At the end of the report, Mr. van Pratt suggests several persons familiar with Kamp Westerbork had expressed their suspicions about Client 230's heroism/liberation account.

A similar story was written on May 14, 1993 in the Dutch newspaper, De Telegraaf. One day later, Hens Schonewille wrote in the same paper, "The news that Canadian soldiers were preparing to bombard concentration camp Westerbork on 12 April 1945 with shell-fire has baffled and shocked a number of former inmates. One of them is the former inmate and male nurse of camp, Abraham Mol. Also Hans Colpa, who was the Acting Director of the Westerbork Remembrance centre in 1993 [and who] questions the validity of [the Deceiver's] story...[stated he] simply did not want to get killed at the very
last moment. He risked fleeing the camp to meet the Allied forces a day before liberation" (van Pratt, 2000).

c) Mr. Adrian Van As, the interim manager of Kamp Westerbork following the exit of the German guard unit, wrote a cryptic letter to Client 210 in July of 2005, after he had viewed a video reporting the Second Lieutenant's involvement in the liberation of Kamp Westerbork. Mr. Van As contradicted Client 210's claims of being the first Allied unit to arrive. Mr. Van As claims that in his capacity as interim commander, he closed the camp gates, manned the watchtowers, armed several inmates and posted new camp rules. Whether or not he took these precautions, his letter indicates that he misunderstood the direction from which the VIII RECCE unit arrived and at what time Client 210 diarized his activities. Mr. Van As concluded that the scouting unit could not have liberated the camp.

At the time you mentioned as having arrived in Kamp Westerbork, there was quite some fighting going on in the direction of Hooghalen. That was on the road from Westerbork via Zwiggelte towards Assen. Hooghalen got the brunt of it.

In his challenge, Mr. Van As also mistakes which route Client 210, as leader of the VIII RECCE, described using to enter the camp. He assumed that they had used the eastern gates via the camp farm, rather than the small gauge rail the VIII RECCE unit used to enter by the south gates by the hospital compound. The confusion is obvious in his rebuttal, as he refers to the camp farm in his rebuttal.

Neither what you found on your way to the camp after you crossed the Oranjekanaal. At least you must have seen, shortly on the dirt track leading to the camp, a killed German soldier! Further up you passed our farm.
Mr. Van As further challenges Client 210's account, but makes an error with the date.

What really happened was that I send the Jewish manager, Zielke, of the farm to Oranjekanaal by 11th April to the Oranjekanaal to bring, if possible the liberators back with him. That was where you, according to your diary, had liberated Camp Westerbork already!!

Despite his contesting which Canadian unit arrived first at Kamp Westerbork, Mr. Van As' account is compatible with other records regarding the presence, location and later arrival of six hundred infantry soldiers of the Canadian South Saskatchewan Regiment (SSR) at Kamp Westerbork, on April 12, 1945.

d) The Padre who travelled alongside the South Saskatchewan Regiment (SSR), provided a reliable source of military movements. He stated in his official report made on Thursday April 12, 1945, that the SSR had encountered some light German resistance from the north side of the Oranjekanaal canal while the engineers were constructing the Bailey bridge northeast of the town of Westerbork. The engineering project in the early hours of April 12th was necessary for the larger tanks and gun carriers to cross over the eight metre wide canal. The Padre explained the advance of the troops in his report.

Following first light on Thursday 12. April the SSRs made a sudden well planned and directed attack over the Oranje Canal and established a firm bridgehead...until the Engineer had built a bridge enabling other units and tanks to come across.

The Padre confirmed the crossing and mentions Kamp Westerbork: "12 Apr. 1945 - 0730 hrs South Sask.Rgmt. Crossed the Oranje canal to Jewish concentration camp - Westerbork Concentration camp" [spellings consistent to quotation].
The Padre made a further statement that the liberation of Kamp Westerbork had already taken place while the SSR had been negotiating the canal crossing. "By then the enemy had been driven quite a distance back and Westerbork Concentration camp for Jews had been liberated". His further statement completed the story and gave a time frame of the SSR's arrival.

The SSR were at first too busy containing the bridgehead to tend to the camp, so when the RHLI [Royal Hamilton Light Infantry unit] were passing through they left a company to guard the camp until the SSR were able to take that duty over...The duty of guarding the camp to protect those within from those without...and to ensure proper, orderly dispersion of the inmates, was taken over by Able Company, SSR, with Capt. Adams as acting commander.

Other pertinent information was given about the food supplies, abundance of radios left behind by the German SS, the luxurious quarters for the German officers and the Padre's personal visit to the camp.

I felt impelled to visit Able Company and to satisfy a great curiosity regarding the concentration camp...I found our soldiers in the highest of good spirits...for they were on excellent terms with the Jewish inmates, especially the lovely fair young damsels.

He noted the conditions of the camp.

It was one of the 'not-quite-so-bad' camps, where they had not been treated near so roughly as at other camps...but it was bad enough...I will not go into that part except to say that those who were still there seemed not to have been too badly fed...For long they had had been under dread fear. They had been mentally and spiritually suffocated.
During a walkabout, the Padre viewed conditions and reported on his observations.

Thus it was that on Friday evening Capt. Adams took me to the camp...I will not take time to tell of the community life of the camp: of its shops and handicrafts; its laundry, bakery and hospital; of its inner government and control by willing inmates appointed by the SS Commandant, but rather give a few personal experiences.

In addition, reference was made to the last few months of camp life, when limitations and controls at the camp were eased, specifically mentioning January 1945, the month before the arrival of Clients 220 and 230 at Kamp Westerbork.

During the last few weeks before our arrival, restrictions had been eased in the camp. The SS Commandant had begun calling it the 'Exchange camp' instead of the Concentration camp. Since January 1945, some English and American subjects had been housed just outside the main camp, but I know little concerning this.

e) Hans Colpa, Acting Director of the Westerbork Remembrance Centre, circa 1993, reported several useful facts about the liberation of Kamp Westerbork, in the Dutch newspaper Die Telegraaf, in September 1993. First he stated that Allied commanding officers were likely well-informed about the existence of Kamp Westerbork, having associations with the Dutch Resistance underground support. Colpa established the date of the last transport of inmates from Kamp Westerbork east to death camps as occurring in September 1944, adding that after that date, the inmates were aware that cattle car transports had ceased. He also confirmed the time frame of the aerial reconnaissance in the area. "When in March 1945, the Royal Air Force made aerial reconnaissance photographs of the camp, only the barracks and the German guards could be identified". Colpa's report further stated that fighting along the north route to Hooghalen, five kilometres west of Kamp Westerbork, was
easily heard by inmates. He stated, "the Canadian artillery did not bombard the camp...instead they directed their fire in the direction of Hooghalen, where German troops had dug in. The exchange of fire was clearly heard in the camp" (Holocaust-lest-we-forget website, 2009).

Colpa explained the possible confusion of timelines and identification of infantry units in regards to the liberation of the camp.

The confusion at the frontline was intensified on the 11th of April when Canadian reconnaissance troops as well as infantry that followed encountered German resistance near the Oranjekanaal - Orange canal. The 8th Reconnaissance Troop and the 2nd Infantry division of which Allard's 6th brigade was a part, could have gotten mixed [up]...that was the reason that some people in the province of Drente were liberated by the scouts while other[s] were liberated by the infantry (2009).

**Summary of Theme 1.**

Theme 1 provides the contextual background that was necessary to for the Deceiver to construct his version of the liberation events, which in turn improves the deconstruction process of the deception. To know the context is to know the Deceiver, as the events of the war in Holland transformed his world and how he chose to react to it. It is useful to "climb into his skin" so to speak, to understand his perspective on what could be used effectively in his created narrative. The Deceiver would eventually capitalize on his personal knowledge of people, history, and circumstances during the 1990's, when curiosity about the war theatres, the Holocaust, the brutalities that took place and the fascination with survivor stories became the Zeitgeist of the times. Theme 1 provides the context which confirms that the Dutch Jewry had relied on their Dutch citizenry to ward off Nazi threats, but who were later blindsided by an annihilation scheme that was secretively
conducted by the Nazis in a relatively unknown camp, literally "under the radar" of both the Dutch population and the Allied forces. The times and dates, specifically of April 11 and 12 of 1945, which are recorded in several sources, are compiled and compared to the Deceiver's personal liberation deception details in the Truth Tables, (Ragin, 2005) (see Table 1).

The biographical outlines included in Theme 1, present seven persons, six of whom were drawn together into the deception circle by the will of the Deceiver: the targeted Receiver (and her son), the principal Receiver, the Brigadier-General, the Second Lieutenant of the scout unit, and the curator/historian. The following Themes 2, 3, and 4 explore elements which enabled the Deceiver to communicate his deception persuasively and to keep his deception process active.

**Theme 2: Deceiver Descriptors**

**Overview.**

The Deceiver displays a competence in engaging people and communicating his viewpoint to others. The findings in Theme 2 offer a window into some of the psychological features of the Deceiver that enabled him to conduct relationships efficaciously. The first two units of Theme 2 examine the relationships he holds in community associations, such as the local chapter of the Knights of Pythias and the local Jewish community, as well as in associations with work and family. Given that that Deceiver seeks notoriety, he derives pleasure from associating with persons of status. The Deceiver lists several persons as "best " friends, seemingly enjoying the perceived effect on the Receiver. His personal characteristics enhance how he engages audiences well, as it appears he holds an intuitive sense of what captivates their attention. The Deceiver engaged in many interviews, where he controlled the conversation and the Receiver. This control is apparent in family relationships. The Deceiver was selective about which members of the extended family with whom
he would interact. Family who enjoyed or tolerated his charm, capabilities and exuberant life style were included, whereas he blatantly ignored his sister and for the most part, her son. The Deceiver maintained close contact with his nephew, Client 200 (the principal, non-targeted Receiver), until such time that he questioned his uncle's hero/ liberation account. The Deceiver's self report, the third sub-unit, although not an exhaustive list, identifies twelve descriptors. The principal Receiver's perspective of the Deceiver reports sixteen descriptors in the fourth sub-unit.

The same descriptors, categorized in the NVivo descriptive statistics, provide a base for a comparative analysis of the similarity and dissimilarity of descriptor findings of the Deceiver and principal Receiver. The descriptors include personality traits and attitudinal descriptions which widens the scope of investigation of the Deceiver as to how he related to others and to how he thought others should interact with him. The understanding of the descriptors will enhance the analysis of the interpersonal communication strategies used to expedite the deception, explored in Theme 4.

**Associations.**

**Affiliations with others.**

For the Deceiver, affiliations with others, both family and acquaintances, are important as they seem to contribute to validating his narrative and supplying a source of admiration. He names at least one person, in each time period in his life as follows: school and sporting club friends in Holland in pre-Occupation times, his fiancée and fellow Resistance workers during the Occupation, a fellow worker in the hay fields at Kamp Westerbork, and a girlfriend in post war years when he claims he was involved with the Haganah and Aliyah ships, who later became his wife.
Famous people are alleged to be in his circle of friends such as the Brigadier-General, a famous Dutch trumpet player as well as the President of the Holocaust museum in south Florida. He claimed other friend relationships when the friendship lends credence to his narrative. Although verification can be problematic (for example, the Brigadier-General is deceased), attending an annual Armistice Day celebration with other military personnel and the general public on an annual basis, seems to imply that he saw the General on a regular basis, implying a mutual, lengthy friendship which cannot be verified. By revisiting the quote, the words "every Armistice Day we were together" implies a close friendship but may also mean that the Deceiver chose to attend each Armistice day parade in order to see the Brigadier-General, hoping perhaps, to engage him in a visit. The Deceiver provided pictures of the two of them at the parade as proof of their friendship.

He alleged knowing and being the "best buddy" of musician, A. Brodbaum from pre-war days. This relationship may have been claimed to gain prestige by association; this musician has yet to be verified as no record of this person has been identified to date.

This is a friend of mine - well, let me tell how we met. I was a kid somewhere around eleven, twelve years old...and all of a sudden I see a black boy coming down the street...and we got into a bloody, bloody fight...and I said to him, what are we fighting for? He said, "I don't know". We became friends, And we became good friends.

This fellow became very famous in Holland, because he became a trumpet player for the biggest band in Holland...This man became so famous, he was such a great guy - he became my best buddy.

The Deceiver states in an interview that a photograph in the Holocaust museum of a youth he knew, is one of his friends from Amsterdam. This assertion is unverifiable. Interestingly, the Deceiver told
his nephew, Client 200, that it was a picture of his cousin who was in a line up at the Dachau concentration camp. Whatever the claim, it was a timely one, in a place where he desired to become a speaker with an audience. "There was a docent just going around with children, to show the Anne Frank exhibition. And as I went around, I see a picture of a friend of mine, Simon, guy from Holland".

Connecting with the larger community and making friends in philanthropic societies implied that the Deceiver, by association, has reputable social values. Both the connection to philanthropy and speaking engagements gave Client 230 an outlet for impersonal charity, but also conferred prestige and acclaim. "And he was noted for the things with service clubs, Rotary, Lion's, or whatever he was involved with you know, involved with the Jewish community in Montreal".

Work relationships.

Working relationships in the Deceiver's life, began with working as a teenager alongside his father before the Occupation in Holland. His work experience with his father set the course for him to value hard work. "I worked in in my father's place, and, well, I tried to work twice as hard as he could so he would have to do less, because that was the respect and love that I had for my father". Subsequently, he reports working with the Dutch Resistance during the war. Resistance work, according to his self report, was fraught with risk and danger, but was attractive to him for the toughness it required. He refers frequently to the Resistance movement in his narrative, but particularly for providing him with skills and /or justification for his actions. "Because, right, we were occupied by the Nazis, by the Germans, I joined the Resistance....as a matter of fact it worked out for me so well...very well, two and half years that I could be in the Resistance".
The survival skills he acquired he credited to his training in the Resistance movement. One example is when he escaped arrest from the Gestapo round up at the hospital. "I had a made a key - I was in, like I told you, in the Resistance, always have to be prepared...and I escaped". In another incident, he justifies a life and death decision based on Resistance training. "The reason for this is, you learn in the Resistance, that if you have to save lives of eight people and one can give you away, you have to get away with the one that can give you away".

After the war, he claims to have dealt in arms and immigrant smuggling from Holland to the exodus ships sailing from Marseilles, France to Israel from 1945 to 1948. This work experience is one of the several occasions when the Deceiver justifies his violence and criminal activities with an apparent lack of remorse for the impact of his choices on others. A pattern of violence and rule breaking is apparent throughout the findings, yet the Deceiver earnestly portrays himself as an exemplary person and hero. Interviews that include details of his guard duties at Kamp Westerbork after the Liberation, and the work with the Haganah paramilitary for Israel, are mentioned with pride. "I used to bring adults to, from Holland to Marseilles, to the exodus ships. And one day I had a double big truck with a big trailer behind, full with arms and ammunition, and that I took to Marseilles".

After emigrating to Canada, the Deceiver worked as a successful salesman in the textile industry, retiring in the mid 1990's. By 1993, Client 230 changed career direction and began volunteer work as a public speaker eventually connecting with the Holocaust Memorial Society.
Family relationships.

Extended family.

Client 230 makes effusive references to a home life with his father, mother, sister and extended family that was harmonious and wonderful. "When I was a child in Amsterdam, was the most amazing time of my life...you were at home Friday night, you were together with family...My family was a good family...the family was wonderful, we had a good family".

He spoke of his grandparents, who observed formal Jewish religiosity, only when he was interviewed by the Holocaust Memorial Society or Shoah Foundation.

Father relationship.

The Deceiver's relationship to his father is critical to the understanding of the sibling deception and hero/liberation deception. Many aspects of this relationship seem to bear on the Deceiver's attitudes and purpose to deceive. Some of his father's characteristics produced long lasting influence. He declared his father was exemplary in his work ethic, which consistently overrode religious observances on all but one day.

Hard working. very hard working man. Kind man. Good man. Charitable man. He was a great guy. It so happened in his business that he had to work seven days a [week]...only one day in his life - Yom Kippur - he didn't work. Otherwise work, work, work. Hard working man. Great man.

The Deceiver stated he shared the entire daytime hours with his father, first working in his father's tobacco business, and later enjoying time together and as family. "He was my best friend. Every day after work we went swimming together. Then after the swim, then we went home and had dinner at home".
Being nineteen years old when his father was taken away by the Nazis suggests that the claims of constant camaraderie may be incongruent with other reports of time spent at school, time in which he exercised or spent time with his sporting friends at the club doing wrestling, boxing and swimming. In addition, they are incongruent with statements referring to times in the streets of Amsterdam with peers as their street leader or the frequent absenteeism of the father, purportedly for his multiple affairs.

The Deceiver hints at his disgust or jealousy for the father's last mistress, whom remains nameless throughout the narrative, being referred to solely as "the woman". Yet he claimed to have supported her and may have had a relationship with her himself. This unnamed, non-Jewish woman, remained close to the father, visiting him after his arrest while he was detained at Kamp Westerbork. The Deceiver was aware of this, concurrent with his mother's time in hospital.

Before the big round up, a friend of my father came to our home, the woman, and she came to our home, my mother was gone, and she was in the hospital, and she had a message from my father because she had visited my father in Westerbork.

*Mother relationship.*

The mother's personal struggles with a psychiatric condition and her absences with hospitalization, compounded by reported discord between the maternal grandparents, uncles and his father, are not explained. Rather, the Deceiver describes his mother with superlatives and as having normalized behaviours. "And this is a picture of my late mother. She was a good woman. She was really a great woman. She just loved her kids a real fine Yiddish mama. Oh yes, a real Yiddish mama".
His nephews, both in Holland and Canada refute that his great aunt was Yiddish or that Yiddish was ever spoken in the home. Yiddish was the colloquial language of the Eastern European Ashkenazi Jewish community. Although the Deceiver's family was solidly Ashkenazi, Client 200 confirms that the family was far from the Yiddish world. Therefore, the reference to his uncle's mother being Yiddish was untrue. Client 200 explains.

Did he say Yiddish? (Interviewer: "Yes.") See again, there's- the Dutch Jews were - they looked down at Yiddish, they looked down at the Eastern Europeans, that - the Jews in Holland weren't, they weren't Yiddish....I'm sure that his family would not have spoken Yiddish. Because that's not - there was more, the Dutch Jews were, they were either like my father's mother's family which were Sephardi, the Spanish Jews, and they definitely didn't speak Yiddish, they had their own language...it's called Ladino...and then the east European Jews, the Ashkenazi, they had Yiddish as a lingua franca...so the Dutch Jews...didn't see themselves really with a lot of connection to the peasants, to the peasants from the East...so it's interesting he recalls, as we would have never considered people in our family to be Yiddish...Yiddish, no.

Additionally, extended family members confirmed that the mother suffered from psychiatric problems and that she was hospitalized.

[His] mother was... and who was taken away by the Nazis when the hospital was taken away, and that, that she was a bit nutty, you know, whether she was naturally crazy or whether she became crazy with a, you know, duplicitous husband.
On the day of the Gestapo round up of the Jewish hospital personnel and patients, in 1943, Client 230 exited the hospital for personal safety and did not express regret in his narrative, for not rescuing his mother who was on the third floor.

**Sibling relationship.**

There are no indicators in the Deceiver's various accounts of relational closeness to his sister, only that he had proximity to her and a level of responsibility to keep his family safe from the Nazis during the Occupation, which included his sister up to their arrest in January, 1945. Client 230 states he personally found his sister employment at the same hospital where he worked.

My sister I had, I got my sister also a job in the hospital in the linen room, where she was making sheets, repairing sheets and this and that, she worked in the linen room sewing, so she had also a stamp on her card so we were in the meantime safe.

During the same hospital round up of patients and staff by the Gestapo police, he does not express concern for his sister's escape. Neither does he mention the mutual suffering with his sister for losing their mother in the deportation, going into hiding, being arrested, or taken to Kamp Westerbork. Client 230 records her being shot in the leg, and him providing her first aid. "So the police shot one of them, my sister, in the leg...and I gave my sister first aid, put a tourniquet on her leg".

He denies he ever saw her in the twelve weeks while incarcerated at Kamp Westerbork, despite her proximity in the hospital, the relative freedoms to move about the camp in the early months of 1945 before the liberation, and that they shared Barrack #83 at one point. Furthermore during the eight weeks of camp life after the Liberation, he made no effort to connect with his sister, who apparently was restricted to a wheelchair.
[Interviewer] "Were [niece] and your sister also there at Westerbork? Were they transported to the same place"?

[Client], " [The niece] was there but I didn't see them I haven't seen them at all".

Client 230 refers to his sister only in regards to times prior to Kamp Westerbork, always in the past tense, except for one excerpt when he admits she resides in Amsterdam.

[Interviewer], "And you had a sister, yes"?

[Client], "I had a sister, that's right".

[Interviewer], "And she's still living"?

[Client], "Still living in Amsterdam, Holland".

Generally Client 230 refuses to acknowledge her existence, claiming he was "an orphan". Interestingly, when Client 230 would visit Holland in the post war years, he would not contact his sister, but would choose to stay at a hotel very close to her apartment in Amsterdam. His nephew stated this behaviour appeared odd.

And [he] would have no connection with her although when he would go to Amsterdam he would stay in the same neighbourhood, which always seemed a bit strange, that he wanted maybe to run across her on the street or something, but he really never connected with her, but he was blocks away in an apartment. It's really strange.

**Wife, children, grandchildren relationships.**

The Deceiver mentions his wife three times in all of the interviews and documentation. As the client recounts his post war years of smuggling work, he refers to the company of his wife, his girlfriend at the time, as he sailed off on one of the exodus ships. "And as a matter of fact my wife
remembers [going to Marseille] because we were just girlfriend and boy going out together...and she came to say good bye to me".

The second reference to his wife is going to a doctor's office and thirdly when he is showing the interviewer a picture of the two of them. In the same interview he mentions he had two sons, a daughter, and named each of the grandchildren.

**Deceiver's descriptors - self report.**

When the Deceiver describes his own attributes, it is apparent that he prioritizes being tough, being hardworking, gaining success and having control over his life. A strong paternal influence is noted in each of the following descriptors.

**Hard working.**

The legacy from his father was set early on to be a hard worker. It brought financial success, control of his life, a sense of power, and independence. "Because of his hard work and so - I ended up 16 hours a day myself. Workaholic. But I enjoyed it, I loved it. Work, work, work".

**Importance of the paternal name.**

The paternal name is spoken of at both the beginning and closure of one of the major interviews, and is additionally referred to in several personal letters to his family. The legacy of the surname carried a higher value than that of family relationships. He states emphatically that every letter of his paternal name should not be altered and ought to be held in high esteem"...it's a long name. Yeah. Don't you ever lose one letter of it...keep that name in good order. Keep that name high. Came from a good source. Came from my father. Came from my daddy".
Yet, it was he himself who altered his paternal family name upon arriving in Canada. He Anglicized the Dutch spelling, by altering more than "just one letter", by choice but not out of necessity.

[Interviewer], So [Client 230], please tell us your name and spell it for us".

[Client], "My name is [name given and spelled]".

[Interviewer], "And it was spelled differently when you were born, yes"?

[Client 230], "When I was born it was spelled [name spelled], that's the Dutch way of spelling it".

As Canada welcomed millions of Dutch immigrants in post war years, it was not unusual for Dutch immigrants to maintain the dual vowel or monophthong spellings in their surnames. Nonetheless, Client 230 instructs his grandchildren to carry the name "high".

I tell my grandchildren sometimes, "You know your name? Yeah it's [name]". I say, " It's not a short name is it? No, no. It's not a short name like Schmidt or this and - it's a long name. Yeah...Keep that name in good order. Keep that name high".

His name was further altered, when he was knighted by the Queen of Holland, with the addition of "Sir" to the family name. However this alteration to his name was a capstone of his life's achievement and was extremely important to him as stated by his nephew.

I mean he was buried as Sir [name] right. There was no...it was very clear that the "Sir" part of it was a very important piece to the family. When the grandson who got up and spoke, you know, talked, it was very much, you know, the hero had died".
As a self-proclaimed leader, the Deceiver declared he believed it was a part of his birthright and identification as a Jew, something he perceived was threatened by the Nazi regime. "Because we are leaders. We are leaders. They cannot take that away from us".

His sporting club friends and his peers on the street seemed to be his first experience in leadership. Control and toughness were synonymous with leadership. "I was - I won't say the bully, but it was my street. The street belonged to me". Giving orders was the Deceiver's trademark, and set him apart as a self-made authoritarian in street style leadership which operated with bravado and impulsivity.

And I look and I see there with the Jewish boys, and the guy handed him over and he turned around and they came for us again and I said to the other boys, "Fast. Let's go in the street"! And we went into my parents' home, we went to the top floor, to the attic and were hiding there.

In the Resistance work, he seemed to work as a sole operator, capable of decision making and risk-taking. He claimed to excel in his work as one of the best for stealing and forging documents for the Resistance work.

I joined the Resistance...as a matter of fact it worked out so well that if I was stopped on the street, all I had to do was show that card...And I had to deliver these [food] coupons. I got them illegally or I went to places where they were given out with false ID cards...and for these people I did the following: I did also forgery on these ID cards...I stole these ID cards...I changed the picture on it, I changed the identity on it...I did that always after 8 o'clock when it was dark.
On several occasions he did link with peers, but he played the directive role. "I went back to where I did my Resistance work and I told the boys that I could do [it] no longer, I was caught, they took my picture, they know what I look like".

Working after the war, he spoke of smuggling arms, ammunition as well as Jewish children to be transported on the exodus ships to Palestine from Holland and Belgium from Marseille, France from the dates, June 1945 to the proclamation of Israel as a state in 1948. This provided another example of a risk-taking, tough style of leadership. Being brutal, daring and self reliant seemed to appeal to him, aided by his own sense of rightness and self assuredness.

I was taking people to Belgium and going through the border they were trained by me.. I was taking loads of arms and ammo from Amsterdam to get to the exodus ships out of Marseille..it was good for [the] state of Israel, my best years...My friend, Hans...says, "One day you'll get caught." I said, "I never get caught".

**Persuasion skills.**

The Deceiver enjoyed two advantages that positioned him to be taken seriously as a self proclaimed leader: persuasion skills and a tough, bullying, physical presence. In his persuasive style, he exuded self confidence. He was able to bring attention to his own needs or way of thinking with verbosity and persistence. On one occasion at least, his mastery of convincing others was useful in protecting himself, his mother and sister. He defined his persuasion skills as "an act".

Well it's an act, it's an act that [I] can perform. I took my mother and my sister to the front where the guard was on the door and I plainly said to him, "These people, let them go".

And he let them go. He thought I was one of the principals there who was working.
In another example of useful persuasion, he spoke how he obtained hospital work for his sister and aunt's niece [as the Deceiver identified her], in addition to persuading his supervisor to place his mother as a patient in the hospital, to prevent detainment or arrest.

I couldn't get a hiding place for my mother so easy, so I went to the director of the hospital where I was working...but you had to be sick to be admitted to a hospital, I finally persuaded him and my mother got a bed on the third floor.

The Deceiver's apparent persuasion skill was modelled by his father, who had similarly convinced medical authorities of a faked illness to avoid being sent to work camps during the Occupation. He remembers the deception.

He was 50 years old and he also to report himself and he had from the Doctor an attest that he was something which wasn't true, something wrong with his stomach or this or that so he didn't have to go to one of these work camps.

He was capable of convincing others to follow his lead, particularly noted in the conversations with one interviewer, subtly directing her to do what he wanted.

[Client], "This picture is the, how do you call it, the attest from General [name]".

[Interviewer], " Do you want me to read it"?

[Client], " Well this is actually a, well, if you want to read it, you can go ahead if you want".

[Interviewer], "OK".

Self-justification.

It is evident that at decision intersections, the Deceiver's self image of being an authority supports a substantial degree of self-justification. He indicates that he frequently makes unilateral
decisions, at the same time expecting immediate acquiescence from the listener. In self justifying, he takes credit for positive outcomes, giving detailed explanations of his rightness, but to negative outcomes he blames others for the ensuing consequences of negative outcomes. For example, he explains how his fiancée and parents were the cause of their own deaths because they did not follow his instructions, whereas her sister and husband were living because of his intervention. For emphasis, he repeats a large portion of this story in various parts of the narrative, to make it abundantly clear to the listener or reader that the non-compliant person is culpable, not he, and further implies that he could save anybody if they put their trust in him.

I was talking about my fiancée, this is the girl...I had made a hiding place for her in her parents' home but her sister with her husband went in there...she did not want to go in there, she wanted to stay with her parents...they all got killed...her sister who did go in the hiding place, who did survive with her husband, because they did go in the hiding place.

In a further example, he self-justifies his arrest and his own incompetency to escape and overcome a Gestapo guard, laying blame on his sister because she and and the aunt's niece did not follow his escape instructions.

These girls ran both in the same direction, they didn't split up what I told them, so he ran after two girls, one got shot, and [name] he took [her] like that, so now they had the three of us together.

Self-justification is most evident in his account of being ready to suffocate a baby while in a hiding place. He insists that murdering a child was a necessary sacrifice for the remaining persons, and further suggests that the parents were resigned to watching and obeying him, although it is noted that he was a nineteen year old youth at the time.
I had a hiding place behind the wall, ....I told the father to keep the five year old on his lap and to keep him quiet and the mother...to give me the baby. She didn't want to but I told her she had to...so I had the baby on my lap and I was having the baby's head in one hand and a pillow in the other. And the moment the baby would have given a sound I would have smothered the baby right in the pillow. That I have to do to save the other seven people.

He recounts his retributive treatment to former German soldiers at Kamp Westerbork, when he was a civilian guard. He claims he was justified for being extremely cruel to them, and for this, gives himself praise in reference to his imagined regard from his parents, specifically his father.

You can never get back what they took from you...I beat Hitler. It's the best feeling. I wish I could show my parents. My father would be proud of me. I am damned proud of myself and I have reasons to be.

**Self as primary focus.**

The Deceiver centred many of his decisions and actions around his primary goal of self preservation. He projected a "lone wolf" self-concept.

I didn't get no help...I help myself. Everybody was on his own. And because of my attitude, because if it comes to a point I have a very bad attitude. If it comes to [my] survival...I go through everything. I go through the wall if I have to.

In contrast, if the risk to himself was possibly self-injurious, the Deceiver chose not to risk his own safety for the sake of others. For example, he does not attempt a rescue of his mother on the third floor of the hospital, during the round up by the Nazis in 1943. Self-preservation has a higher value than a sacrificial effort for his mother, his sister or his aunt's niece, other staff or patients on
his floor. Rather, he exited rapidly through a door with a pre-made key, proud that he is self reliant and can look after himself. His affect and remorse is minimal in recounting the episode which culminated in the death of his mother.

My mother was on the third floor. I couldn't get to the third floor, there was a panic there.

I was in, like I told you, in the Resistance, always have to be prepared. I had a key made of a back door from the hospital and I escaped from the hospital that day through the back door.

From other individual accounts, escapes did occur, even from the third floor. Not only did his sister and his aunt's niece escape, but also a psychiatric nurse who had worked on the third floor where his mother was located. Client 200 mentions the parallel story.

This slightly older woman...who was a nurse at the psychiatric hospital where [the Deceiver's] mother was...[she] was able to escape before as they were deporting, you know, taking people away in trucks. Somehow this woman was able to get away and she ended up being hidden with the [name] family.

The Deceiver's effective self-primary focus involved compelling others to capitulate, when he considered it necessary, as in the previously given example of demanding to hold the baby and poising, ready to smother it. Self-preservation is also evident in his thought processes of an escape plan from Kamp Westerbork while returning from the potato fields. It appears to be a pattern assuming it is superior to take the risk over waiting to further evaluate the situation. The following example of the Deceiver's escape idea demonstrates the extra risk placed on a fellow escapee, where a decoy could be very useful for self-preservation, a similar scenario to the sibling escape attempt. The Deceiver shows disdain for the person who does not comply.
I said to my buddy, "I don't trust that. That I don't trust...what are they going to do with all the people in the barracks before they [the guards] run away?...We're going to escape tonight. I don't want to get shot from the towers". My buddy said, "and I don't want - ba bee, ba, blah"...I said, "Well, if you don't go then I go by myself".

**Toughness.**

Self preservation is interwoven with the self-image of being tough. The Deceiver asserts he is the tough guy more frequently in interview conversation than self referencing to being either a leader or a victim/survivor of Nazi atrocities, both of which are key elements of his heroism account. The street is where he first displays his toughness from the age of twelve, in superior fighting skills and control as the territorial leader.

Well let me tell you how we met. I was a kid of somewhere around eleven, twelve years old, living in Amsterdam. The street was a fairly narrow street. And I have to be honest, I was - I won't say the bully, but it was my street. The street belonged to me. That was that if there was a fight, then I was either there to fight it or to separate it. It was my street.

On another occasion he reports his impulsive assessment of strange men in his neighbourhood and his thrill in ousting them. His sporting club buddies followed his lead: "...with that group of boys from the sporting club, we beat the daylights out of them and they were gone". Being unafraid of confrontation or danger was an element of his toughness. Having a tough disposition was useful in surviving beatings and in escaping.

So they [the jail guards] took my head and smashed it into the wall, broke my nose...and I was lying there and he kicked me in the back to see whether I was unconscious, that would yell and scream, but I didn't give a sound.
Deleterious consequences to others left him with satisfaction about his toughness, but not with shame or regrets. In fact, the winning of certain altercations yielded a malicious, self-vindicating humour about "beating the daylights out of them" a second time.

When they [anti-Jew groups] came from the side streets into Waterloo Square, these streets were closed off by us and they couldn't get out, and we beat the day lights out of them, and one of them got killed...I remember I came home that night with his Nazi cap that he had...a souvenir...it's funny.

Again, if toughness and fighting for his personal territory meant obliterating the other person he proceeded with little compromise or remorse for another's life. "...and so it became a matter of him or me. Anyway, to make story short, I'm still here. So I had to do away with him". Referring to a further confrontation, he states matter of factly that he would have chosen murder if possible". He didn't come right the way around the corner because then I would have had him. I would have finished him off right there".

Toughness necessitated a show of strength in unprovoked situations, but he states it could be instigated by very little provocation, justified according to his terms. In this example he secured his leader position with a display of toughness. "...and we got into a fight...it was a very bad fight...what are we fight for, what about?...He hadn't done anything to me, I did nothing to him". 

While observing several video recordings, a certain cockiness is evident when the Deceiver speaks of being aggressive or tough; smiling with satisfaction and affirming with head nods and raised eyebrows which lends the impression he endorses his self image as having machismo. Frequently the transcript records a non-verbal mouth noise (chuckle), when he describes himself this way.
Unapologetic.

From his self report, Client 230 appears unapologetic for his behaviours or attitudes. In a relatively innocuous incident he is unapologetic. "Well I don't care whether he was embarrassed, I didn't - well, I couldn't hold back, at that time, when he asked - he felt, of course, that I'd made a fool out of him. Well, it's too bad. It's too bad".

He remains unapologetic that his sister suffered, when he did not choose to put himself at risk. In fact, he claims his inability to take down the Gestapo agent was calculating such a personal risk, and not an error in judgment of how to implement his escape plan.

This policeman, he's standing there with his gun, and I said, "There's nothing in there no more....but I didn't want to take a chance, I didn't want to take a chance. So I - if I would have known, of course, but anyway, I didn't take a chance.

The Deceiver is unapologetic about several questionable criminal activities that he states mundanely as necessary, with minimal affect. He admits to several criminal activities with little or no remorse: committing several murders, stealing, stalking Jewish children to take them from foster parents to Israel, illegal smuggling and delivering of persons, arms and ammunition in the post-war years, as well as torturing and harming others. Most interesting of his criminal talents, in reference to further developments in his narrative, was his admission of his ability to do excellent forgery. One verbal exchange with foster parents of a Jewish child, when he wished to remove the child from their care, confirms both his ability to forge authentic government documents and his unapologetic attitude about it. " I said, "Very nice. I'm a forger too. I used to forge ID's and passports and all these things for Jewish people to try to get out of Holland..."

In another reference to forging documents he states his own needs as primary.
For these people I did the following: I also did forgery on these ID cards...I find these ID cards, and I stole these ID cards, and you might say that's not nice...but I couldn't care less, I needed these cards.

*Values status, notoriety, awards.*

The Deceiver uses superlatives to describe the notoriety he receives, enjoying referencing extremely large, but unverifiable numbers.

I have told my story to 28,000 children and thousands of adults, and there will be another 40,000 children coming to see it and to listen to the story I will tell...by what I am doing in the Holocaust Center got the attention of the media, and they came for an interview with me, and it was in the newspaper and television all over the area, and the response from the public was great. By doing w[h]at I am doing gives me a satisfaction.

He repeats frequently what awards he has received, such as being knighted for his alleged heroism.

This is the citation that came with the medal, citation I got from Her Majesty the Queen of Holland. Queen Beatrix. Citation says, Her Majesty, the Queen, the Grand Master of the Order of Orange Nassau, by her decision of April 14, 2000, [name] born in Amsterdam named to the member of the Order of the Orange Nassau.

He enjoyed being feted as a hero in the Holocaust museum circuit, retelling with relish the association to three other well known heroes.

I was honoured in 2007 by the Florida Holocaust museum, they had a money raising,...this was a 'To Life' dinner, to life, to heroes, to courage and with four other men we were honoured there at that dinner.
**Vengeful.**

Becoming a guard at Kamp Westerbork for the eight weeks post-liberation exposes his desire for revenge, satisfied by bullying and torturing former collaborators and Gestapo police. Yet first he claims ignorance why he was despised.

One day the mayor of this city in Holland who had rounded up all Dutchmen to send to Germany to factories was [arrested]...I saw his food ready so offered to take it to the mayor, pea soup and bread. I walk in - the mayor was cocky. I called him a 'dirty pig'. The cook was worried that I would kill him...I got the name "Blackie 52". I was hated the most - don't know why.

The Deceiver speaks at length about specific situations and is clearly proud of his pitiless and malicious cruelty. His sense of meanness was first indicated when he chose little creatures to soothe his boredom. In one account, he names a fly "Peter" and calls it "his buddy".

Was so boring that I opened up the window and I let a fly in, to have some company. And for the fly to not fly away, I pulled the wings off. So it could only walk on the table where I was. And I fed it, I kept it alive.

The Deceiver can recount situations of his own brutality after the war was over while he was still living in Kamp Westerbork. He asked to be a guard, which allowed his hatred and desire for revenge to be unleashed with remorseless cruelty. He purposely requested from the interim camp manager to be the guard of a specific German inmate, in order to "leave him up to me". He initially jarred the prisoner to wakefulness to do some immediate lifting work. His report of causing the former guard severe pain and death is blasé, casually spoken, with no remorse. "I say, "you want help"...I lift up the telephone pole and drop it onto his shoulder. I broke his collarbone. He died from
pneumonia". In a second example Client 230 explains his malevolent treatment of another inmate, a Dutch collaborator.

But I took him to the shower... Turned on the water to be very hot...I would not let him out... I showed him the butt of my rifle. He collapsed. He was as red as ever like a lobster...I asked him if he was hungry, he nodded. I put his soup in his pee pot and spit on his bread".

The Deceiver claimed to have many more such stories of his ruthless actions justified as revenge for the collective Nazi atrocities to him and others by stating he just needed one Nazi to enact vigilante justice stating, "I can never get back what they took". In another reference he desires to obliterate them, ending with, "I wish I could have one of them in my hands. Bastards".

Victim/survivor identity.

In stark contrast to the violent language of retribution and revenge, the Deceiver seeks empathy for violence done to him. He wanted to extract every possible advantage from his victim/survivor persona as undeserved suffering, by speaking publicly about the need for dignity to each person in order to guard against such cruelties as prejudice and discrimination to fellow human beings. His speeches were incongruent with his actions.

After that, I go over into education by telling them how deadly discrimination is, regardless against whatever it may be, like race, colour, or religion, that we are all alike and should live with each other in good harmony, without any prejudice or discrimination...I tell them that these atrocities never will happen again...I make them aware of the murderers of tomorrow.
His identification as a victim and survivor of the Holocaust years, including those of the transit camp experiences, gains respect for him by associating him with well known sufferers of death camps. He refers to Anne Frank, using her name for support of his goals. In a personal letter to his family he writes,

..like Ann[e] Frank I am also from Amsterdam and in hiding and betrayed and transported to Concentration camp Westerbork like her and that me talking to the children [at the Holocaust Museum] give it a connection with Ann[e] Frank. I did it for 5 weeks in January 1992 and seeing the tension and reaction the children gave me, made me realize that holocaust survivors have a legacy to tell about the atrocities we experienced.

Nonetheless, he considered he was forced to speak of his experiences and accuses those relative few who deny the Holocaust ever existed, as the propellant to his noble purpose. "It's not easy to talk about these things. But those who are attempting to deny my suffering and the suffering of millions of others, they have forced me to speak out".

**Deceiver descriptors - Receiver's descriptions.**

Client 200, (the principal Receiver), begins his description of the Deceiver by naming four positive qualities early into the interviews; being both delightful and fun as well as hardworking and capable. He was adamant that the researcher be aware of these better traits at the outset of the interviews. "He was a wonderful uncle, totally wonderful uncle. You know he was my favourite uncle". Specifically, he wanted to extract the positive qualities about the Deceiver before falsehoods were explored. This tendency generalized over the four supporting case studies as several Receivers spoke about their experiences, first in positive terms about the Deceiver. Like them, Client 200 reflects on positive characteristics: "Yeah well so, maybe I'll flip it [the question] around and say
first positively. So my uncle was a good speaker... he might not have had that pulpit to speak from had he not been seen as a hero”.

Client 200’s descriptions of the Deceiver's negative attributes were grouped into sixteen meaning units. Over time, suspicion grew that his uncle, the Deceiver had two predominant traits, betraying trust and blaming others. He also recognized the Deceiver's savvy intuitiveness about people's reactions, leading to further perceptions regarding his being domineering, controlling and insensitive to others' feelings or consensus. Unexpected rage episodes and inappropriate actions were consistent with the Deceiver's self-portrayal as a "tough guy". Several members of Client 200's family observed the Deceiver's insatiable need to rigorously maintain a self-image of unassailability and self justification. They were aware that the Deceiver consistently self praised and referred to his status, associative connections, awards and the success of his high level public persona. In fact, when Client 200 questioned the Deceiver's story on occasion, the Deceiver was provoked. Client 200 was unaware of the Deceiver being remorseful for any of his actions or deceptions.

**Betrayal of trust.**

Betrayal and the accusation of his aunt, was exacerbated by her brother's retelling his version frequently to the extended family. Client 200 was clearly concerned about her relationship with the family.

I think of my aunt in Holland, I, I, you know, I think anger that she has about what happened to her and her family and the fact that, you know, she wasn't able to have a relationship really with the North American side of the family because of his stories about her.
Because the Deceiver rejected and betrayed his sister, it was also perceived to be a betrayal to her son who, according to Client 200, keenly felt the need for reconciliation.

He spent his life hoping to reconcile...his mother and his uncle together, not having a father around because his father died when he was young. I think he would have loved to have [his uncle] as a bit of, more of a male influence in his life. But [his uncle's] relationship to him was I think always very, it was a manipulative type of relationship.

Betrayal of the family seemed obvious to Client 200 believing it must certainly have been recognized by the Deceiver's wife, although she appeared to absorb it into her marriage and personal life. "I think about my aunt, the other aunt, [his] wife...she had to have known, she had to have known that it was a deception...I can't imagine she wouldn't be aware of it".

Betrayal to his own two sons and daughter and grandchildren, who have believed a lie about their own father/grandfather since the mid 1990's, is yet to be fully realized, although Client 200 intuitively knows it is likely to occur.

The pain of the camp dies with the person. The children of the person may know about the pain but they don't have the pain themselves but the pain of deception can go on for generations as family...and then the confrontation with the past, you know, I mean those kind of things rip families apart.

The deceptive story of liberation betrays the trust in other persons' accounts who have suffered much greater cruelties, for longer periods of time in concentration camps. It minimizes authenticity because Client 200 believes it casts a spurious shadow over all stories.
Then the danger is...into other people's stories and now oh well is this story right? Well if this guy lied probably all the Jews are lying right. And it's all those Holocaust stories, they're all phoney...constructed to make German people feel guilty...and so people like [my uncle] make that work, the historical work more difficult.

The false story betrays the public's memory of millions of Jews who died in the Nazi atrocities. I don't think [my uncle] did what he said he did and in that sense he's jerked around with the truth and he's made it harder in the future for people to understand what really happened if his story stands as it is. I think the whole memory of the millions who were murdered through that time: I think they suffer by his...egregious acts of construction.

A false heroic account betrays and undermines true military achievements. Many acts of selflessness were conducted by military personnel in the line of assigned duties without any praise or notoriety. Client 200 noted that in contrast to the Deceiver (Client 230), the Second Lieutenant's (Client 210) account of events exemplified these dutiful characteristics. "He did his job, he never saw himself as a hero, his job was as a young lieutenant, was to find the Germans, he did his job, he found them".

**Blames others.**

Blame, a component of betrayal, was a trademark style of the Deceiver. Frequently, the Receiver acknowledges that the Deceiver made pointed accusations at someone else for any negative part in his narrative. Whereas he credited his escapes, avoidance of other arrests, and successes in subversive underground work to his own abilities, he blames the cause of his arrest and imprisonment at Kamp Westerbork on his sister. "[He] said that he felt that [she] might have given
up...given information so that they would be...[he] feels that [she] was the cause of them being caught, being found out." Blaming his sister as well as the Nazis, the Gestapo, and the Dutch collaborators, for his victimhood, gave the Deceiver justification for his story, even if it appears to be fabricated. Client 200 tried to understand his uncle's need to exonerate himself to his family and his need for attention.

I can completely understand why he might have done it, because...you don't want your child to imagine that you are a victim... His way of dealing with this despair may have been to create this story and to become a hero...He probably spoke to more than ten thousand kids in south Florida and Montreal, and he told them the story of what he did, and about...the dangers of racism and anti-Semitism and he might not have had that pulpit to speak from had he not been seen as a hero... So while he didn't need to be a hero to be a witness, his purported heroism gave him a wider audience to speak.

**Delightful/fun.**

The counterpoint in Client 200's view, to the Deceiver's betrayals and deception, was his sense of fun and active delight in leisure activities. Each summer he anticipated his uncle and his family's arrival. "And when he came it was in summer. It was going to be a fun time: he was a fisherman so we'd go out fishing...he was really a, a great guy in that way". Client 200 believed that his uncle valued the family holidays and sensed that it was reciprocal. "But I think family was also very important and I think he had, he really had that tight feeling with our family".

**Domineering/controlling.**

That the Deceiver was domineering was readily evident to Client 200 and the extended family, but he also understood that for the Deceiver, the feeling of losing control as a Jewish resident
during the Occupation must have tormented his self image. "High strung, tense, emotional you know, [my uncle's] desire to be very much in control of things, and then at some point he really wasn't".

Being dominant over others and being in control of a new life narrative seemed to regain the self image which the Deceiver thought he had before the war.

But that this was more of this kind of scheming to change your life in your seventies and have a different narrative for what, what went on at the time you were really a victim...

Now whether he was deceiving us or whether that was true but it was, you know part of the whole life story of his, of being the macho tough guy, you know, don't mess around with me stuff.

**Hardworking成功的.**

In recognizing his uncle's hard work values, Client 200 also appreciated his multifaceted capabilities which made him a helpful member of the family. "And he was a really great guy like when...he'd come in and he'd fix the plumbing, and he get the outdoor lights working, I mean, you know he was really great like that, he could do all that stuff".

The Deceiver made his own success financially as a fabric salesman, to a large degree because of his inherent work ethic. Having material possessions also demonstrated his wealth and success. "So he was, success was very important to him, having things was very important".

Evidently, his success in sales and what he attained from his heroism pensions and awards, enabled him to have two homes and other assets.

There were two forms of benefits he received one was within the Dutch pension scheme, war heroes get more money. So there was a simple thing, he was able to get, have a better
pension from the Netherlands. Gaining Euros and...he was a salesman, he sold corduroy
and made a good living.

Being seen as successful was important to his uncle, but Client 200 noted that he also needed
approval, acclaim, and recognition as a hero. "With all of the other awards and posters on his wall
with, you know, man of the year for this and accomplishment for that".

**Insensitivity to others.**

Despite the Deceiver's apparent zest for life and his interest in attracting others to himself,
he lacked sensitivity to others, notably to women and specifically the women in his own family. "He
was not a particularly sensitive guy to women, I think that [he] really had women's issues...You
know, "I can handle women, and blah, blah, blah". Client 200 wondered about his uncle's
insensitivity to his own wife.

**Maintains self image/self-aggrandizement.**

Certainly the insensitivity to others was exacerbated by his predisposition to self-
aggrandizing, not only of his successes, but also of his aggressive episodes. However, the
maintenance of his macho self image competed with the reality of having been overcome by the
Germans during the war. Client 200 was aware it presented a continuing, conflictual problem of self
representation.

That's the image he had of himself...you know fifty years after the war when he had to
confront himself and his victimization I think, I think that, that conflict between his
image of himself as the tough guy who doesn't take shit from anybody and the fact that
he did take shit from people. You know he was in a prison camp. He was a victim and he
was liberated by Canadian troops; it was too much and he constructed a story.
Self aggrandizement seemed to satisfy an insatiable need to reframe his self image. Client 200 reflected that most of the family discounted his eventual heroism account in part because they were overly familiar with his constant braggadocio in every other part of his life story. "He was a person that most of the folks in my family would say was not someone who could have kept such a story a secret. He was very, somewhat self-aggrandizing". In fact, the Deceiver's self aggrandizement alerted Client 200 to the possible falsification of the facts around the liberation story he told.

And then he came up with a story that many in the family didn't believe, that I was willing to give him the benefit of the doubt but also began to try to research, see if his story was credible or not. And found really to my surprise, in a way that it wasn't credible, but in the meantime he continued to aggrandize himself around this story...as far as I can tell was just made out of thin air.

The Deceiver seemed indefatigable, as told by Client 200, in perfecting his self-image as a tough, successful, altruistic, prestigious hero, in order to appear as having noble qualities”. And I think that's what [he] needed, he needed at the end of his life to be seen as a hero...he was a big ego, he was a tough guy. That was the image of himself, he was a tough guy".

Makes unverified claims.

The claim by the Deceiver of being the key person facilitating the liberation of Kamp Westerbork, propped by unchecked statistics and attests, clearly irritated the Receiver, Client 200, for lack of factual accuracy. He regrets so few desired the truth to be verified at the time, which gave tacit approval of the hero story.
Then he came up with a story...he continued to aggrandize himself around this story which seemed not to be. No one really checked out the facts. And so he was honoured and feted, and knighted, and gained great psychological rewards and some financial rewards.

Client 200 concluded that verification of facts was waived due to the potential embarrassment if someone was found to have lied about such a serious subject matter. "He accomplished it because...my sense is that Holocaust victims are, they're cut a whole lot of slack around the credibility of their story...and so we don't ask questions, and, and I think that's how, how he, you know, how he made the story".

Though the Deceiver's story was improbable and complex, it flowed effortlessly along based on the high esteem given to survivors of concentration camps. Some details conveyed to Client 200, such as walking unscathed at night, in the forest between two armies who were hurling bullets, then being interrogated by a high ranking Brigadier General, being given arms and ammunition and an army patrol as a Dutch civilian escapee to return to the Kamp to check out his assertion, all seemed more than preposterous to believe.

He made a claim that, you know, he just escaped from a concentration camp. I mean weren't there there any Colonels who could have made some decisions about things or Captains? I mean this isn't a, a General level of interrogation, then in the middle of the war moving northwards. Yeah, so no one, no one questions [his] story.

The incongruence became obvious to Client 200, contrasting the image of his uncle being tough and unyielding and his succumbing to authorities as a helpless victim. He suggested that his uncle's victimhood needed to be reframed, giving his life story a more drama and a more powerful legacy.
"But for the people who made up stories either to make them look more heroic, or maybe even more victimized, and heroic from the perspective from, you know, that I survived even more victimization than you did, than the other guy did". Several unverified portions of the Deceiver's story appeared to the Receiver to be completely false.

I mean I've told them [Dutch historians] this story...and this hypothesis that we uncritically accept anything that a survivor says and that... Some fraction of those stories are [not] just minor constructions but they're complete fabrications that have...done for the purposes of deception...and I think for my uncle, and for some people, that's what happens.

Other unverifiable portions seem extracted from other person's stories. Client 200 believes it is improbable that such similarities to other friends' accounts could co-exist. "Some of the Dutch folks in Montreal, felt it was that [he] created the story based on stories of his friends who had a point, a number of them had passed away, and he sort of crafted something".

Client 200 specifically recalls a conversation with a friend's son, himself a psychologist specializing in cult behaviours, who noted that the Deceiver's claims of being a Resistance hero, were uncannily similar to his own father's verified life experiences.

His parents were friends of [my uncle] and [his] wife in Montreal. And [he] was, he really was a Resistance hero, there was no question about that...you know [the son] felt that [my uncle's] story was actually part of his father's story.

All Resistance workers registered immediately following the Liberation of Holland, with the foundation, called the Stichting 1945. It was a specific foundation established to document and to verify bona fide Resistance members and awarded them with deserved recognition and Dutch
pensions. It struck Client 200 oddly that his uncle only registered with the foundation forty-eight years after the war, and interestingly, never spoke of being connected with the Resistance until that time.

[His] activities didn't, he didn't talk to the Stichting until the 1990's I think, that's when he made these claims. And I think no one, no one did the checking. And in some ways, you know, that's part of what a good deceiver does. Right, they, they understand that in a certain context they can make claims and no one's going to question them and the few people that do question them, can be discounted.

When the Deceiver began telling of his heroic account in the early 1990's, his claims were widely accepted by the public, but to family it appeared false. One who did not believe him from the outset was one of Client 200's aunts, who had been incarcerated at the hellish death camp, Auschwitz, liberated in 1945, and had both the experiential background and the familiarity with the Deceiver's character, to completely discount his story as fraudulent. The aunt found his pomposity and self aggrandizement completely incongruent and inconsistent with his claim of heroism, humility and secrecy for 48 years.

You know she, she was just completely suspicious that a man of [his] character, a guy who had posters and the newspaper clippings of all his accomplishments and his achievements, could have kept such a significant story quiet for so long. You know it was just simply a, it just, it just that release of that story in the early 1990's was, was just, I think to her sense, was just incongruous with his temperament which was to self aggrandize in some ways, to be very proud of his accomplishments.
Client 200 was aware that most of the "Dutchies" living in Montreal and older acquaintances of his uncle expressed their doubts about his story, as facts seemed exaggerated, copied or false.

Some of the Dutch folks in Montreal think it was that [he] created the story based on stories of his friends who had then at that point, a number of them had passed away and he sort of crafted something...his way of dealing with this despair may have been to create this story, and to become a hero...Well that's what the "Dutchies" living in Montreal thought about [him].

In addition he reported that some Dutch historians, after checking facts and anecdotal accounts of other inmates, became increasingly skeptical of the heroism story particularly after the Deceiver was knighted by the Queen of Holland in 2000, for his alleged role in the liberation. That event provided impetus to review the facts. "You know the Dutch historians are now doing that kind of research, you know they're, they're I think they realize that [his] story just went too far without any credible fact checking".

**Psychiatric/psychological issues.**

Family members knew of certain psychiatric and psychological issues in the family. Clearly, psychiatric care was necessary for the Deceiver's mother. Deep divisions in the family of origin pointed to relational issues causing one part of the family to decide to emigrate to North America. As siblings, the Deceiver (Client 230) and his sister (Client 240), lived in a toxic environment of deceptive behaviours and ongoing betrayal.

It was, his father {Deceiver's maternal grandfather} was cheating him in their shared business. So there was an aspect of, kind of dysfunction right from the family, you know, get go, and that's why my grandparents, with my dad, came to America...I think my uncle
probably growing up with that dysfunction on his, on his mother's side and then his father
also...but my uncle's father came from another family that also had some deep
dysfunction.

*Rage/Impulsive reactions.*

Uncontrollable anger, accompanied by inappropriate self protective actions, can be
symptomatic of longstanding dysfunction. Nonetheless, to Client 200, it seemed that the Deceiver,
was proud of impulsive and aggressive reactions even when a sexagenarian, as evidenced in the
retelling of one incident when he reacted to being insulted.

They [the Deceiver and his wife] were in Montreal...they pulled up to a stop light in
Montreal and the guy in the next car next to him made some kind of anti-
Semitic crack at my uncle...my uncle had a very Jewish face you might say...and said [to
me] that he got out of the car, walked up to the guy, asked him to roll down the window
and then just pounded him right in the face, and then walked back to his car and drove
off.

In a second unrelated event, Client 200 reported that while visiting his family on a summer
holiday, his uncle, a middle aged father himself at the time, and in the presence of families, tourists
and his teenage nephews, reacted violently, harming a teenager who had pulled a prank on him by
stealing his bottles of CocaCola that were hanging in the water off the pier, while they were fishing.
The incident required police intervention to stop him. "And he stripped down to his underpants,
dove into the water, caught the ring leader, pulled him out on the pier and started beating up this guy.
And the police were called...he was that kind of guy".
Remorselessness.

There are several references to his uncle's remorselessness when it advanced his agenda. The sibling deception and estrangement, and divisive family issue around his heroism account, are two substantial situations that remained unresolved. The Deceiver had no regrets, even before his death, for receiving unmerited awards.

[Client 200], "And so, yes, it would have been really interesting for [name] near the end of his life to have said, you know, maybe only ten percent of this really happened, you know maybe this is what I really would have wished happened..."

[Interviewer], "So no last [words]"?

[Client], "Not that I'm aware of".

At no time did the Deceiver rescind his story, express remorse for implicating others in his narrative, or have regrets for the brokenness between he and his sister.

Resistance to questioning.

When Client 200 challenged the Deceiver's heroism/liberation story by checking details and questioning him, it strained the relationship, producing a scripted narrative response and avoidance. "I think he knew that I knew that his story was not wholly accurate. And our last meeting which was at one of his grandson's Bar Mitzvah's in Toronto, it was awkward, it was really awkward".

When asked for details, the resistance to questioning was indicated by repeating scripted portions.

I'd ask him detail questions. But all he would ever give me is a narrative. he would give me a fully formed story that was very hard to shake him from. He just would start at the
beginning and run through to the end, an if I would ask him, you know, details that would be the kind of thing you'd have, you'd have to remember, because otherwise the subsequent pieces of the story wouldn't make any sense, he really didn't ever want to go there.

**Sexual issues.**

In addition to the braggadocio about his war activities and later awards, the Receiver recounts that his uncle was not judicious about bragging to his brother and he of his sexual conquests, proudly displaying a dismissive attitude to women in general.

And I think he was very, I think sexually aggressive to women. He would tell you as a teenage boy...about his exploits...And..talking to me as a teenager and to my brother too...he really pitted, pitched himself as, as kind of sexually adventurous.

Sexuality issues and exploits undergirded by the sexualized patterns in the family of origin, had a negative influence on the Deceiver's behaviours. Client 200 believed the role model was the Deceiver's father.

The father had a mistress, a non-Jewish mistress, so [his] kind of looseness, you know, I think these things get taught...But my uncle would have learned early on about deception and because he would have seen his father engaged in these, you know, this kind of deception with his wife.

Client 200 further concluded, "You know it's completely possible that my uncle learned that behaviour and I, I think he may have exhibited in some ways some of that behaviour himself through his life".
**Tough/bully.**

Toughness bordering onto bullying, highlighted in the Deceiver's self report, predominates as well in Client 200's report of the Deceiver's characteristics.

He was a big ego. He was a tough guy. That was the image of himself, he was a tough guy. And I think he WAS a tough guy, he, he was an outdoors guy...but my uncle was very much a very different male model for me as a kid.

The paternal modelling of being a tough man, continued with the Deceiver needing to be tough, to win, to be right and to be self reliant. "Maybe very much a recapitulation of his own father's approach to the world and in as much as he had that tough guy sense of himself".

On occasion, Client 200 remembers how his uncle would challenge his brother and cousins to try to beat him at a game of holding his breath, while being held underwater, well aware of the children's fear of harming an adult, and the likely result of the children being unable to win. The contest seemed to give immense satisfaction to his uncle, reinforcing the self-concept that he was tough and unbeatable.

My uncle would challenge us boys to stand on his back while he was underwater and that we could stay on his back as long as we wanted and he could hold his breath. So he would hold his breath and go down and we would all stand on his back, but we couldn't do it for long. We were always afraid and jump off. It was like he knew that and he would come up smiling at us like he won.

**Values success, notoriety, awards.**

Success, notoriety and awards were a lifelong goal for the Deceiver, a fact noticed by Client 200, family and community. In his career from 1952 to his retirement in 1987, he achieved wealth
and material success working as a salesman. "He was a reasonable successful businessman, bunch of kids, house in Florida and a house in Montreal...and success was very important to him".

Financial benefits from awards and status, benefits from conducting the deception, were part of his success but most important to the Deceiver, was the psychological reward which enhanced his self image.

And so he made money on it. But to me the bigger pay off was he had a psychological pay off that the reward for being a hero was just immense for him. You know, beyond monetary value was the psychological reward he got.

The Deceiver valued prestige, notoriety, and acknowledgement from his family. He wrote letters to them about his successes and displayed them prominently. These letters became a point of entry to suspect that the hero account was fabricated.

With all of the other awards and posters on his wall with you know, man of the year for this, and accomplishment for that, you know,...again that part now whether he was deceiving us or whether that was true but it was you know part of this whole life story.

The suddenness of claiming to be a war time hero also raised suspicion.

...but the step into becoming a rescuer of a concentration camp was so abrupt in a way, so unexpected, that it, it didn't, it wasn't as if we had hints of such a thing...[some of] my family who had real suspicions about [him] in general just, couldn't believe that, you know, that this was a factual story, that this actually happened.
Theme 3: Receiver Descriptors

The focus in Theme 3 shifts from a description of the Deceiver to that of Client 200, the principal Receiver. By understanding the personality descriptors and attitudes as described by one Receiver, the analysis can further seek as to what degree certain traits influenced and attracted the Deceiver. They can also provide insight to the Receiver's emotionality that the Deceiver instinctively assesses in conversation between them as the relationship progresses.

The descriptors, stated or inferred by Client 200, comprise sixteen areas of his attitudes and personality features. He prioritizes the caring trait in his identity. His relationships and associations are genuine, thus he attempts to avoid confrontation and is highly agitated by the impact of confrontation and what deception might inflict on others. Suspicion conflicts with his sense of loyalty because his trust for another has been betrayed. A measure of self blame and self questioning is apparent, although cognitively he is aware he not responsible for the betrayal of trust. The findings suggest that the deception negatively affects ongoing trust levels in the family. His strong rescuing nature is consistent with seeking healing and finding resolution for several family member.

The principal Receiver exhibits both academic and emotional intelligence and has acquired considerable academic achievement, but it does not compromise his loyalty and priority to family. He clearly enjoys the value of words, their effect, and meaning.

Associations.

Friendships/community.

Friendships in Client 200's community include speaking with other Jewish families regarding their Holocaust experiences and enabling senior family members of these families to divest of the horrors that they are unable to relate to their own children. His friendships means he both
empathizes with a neighbour about her aunt's experiences, and provides a validation to their feelings.

I was talking with another friend, a neighbour whose parents were in camps and whose father was at Auschwitz...I met this woman from Paris the next day, she's never talked to her kids about Auschwitz and she tells me about that day that the women were hung in Auschwitz...she sees their bodies hanging and she's never told her children about this. You know she can tell me about this because I wasn't her child...so I provide, for some people in [his city] a vehicle for telling what happened to them.

He volunteers as a director of the local Jewish cemetery, volunteers at speaking engagements and is well known in the close community in which he lives. Community involvement is connected to his cultural background and holds for him, a servant leadership element.

**Work association.**

For Client 200, there is a seriousness about work. It is important to do a careful, thorough job, whether teaching or research or speaking engagements, for the personal satisfaction of completeness. In his workplace, negotiation and self awareness is both critical and diplomatic.

I've been, I unionized with my friend [name]...we unionized the faculty here. I then became on the Board, a member of the Board of Governors...and then I became president of the Confederation of University Faculty Associations and you know I'm, I had this very noble job of teaching at a university but when am I a jerk? Is it today or tomorrow that I become a jerk....how can I be watching myself to try to be sure that I'm not totally deluding myself about the things I do?
Working with others harmoniously and authentically is paramount to Client 200. He works assiduously for example, with some Dutch historians to assist with evidence and records for them to examine the truth of liberation account of Kamp Westerbork.

And so in part, you know initially, it is really a question of, of truth. You know that, if I have a commitment as a scholar to [seek] truth in the work that I do...[my uncle] got out of the camp, went through a forest, saw people fighting, you know swam the across a canal, was picked up by the Canadian army, given to a General, you know that's true or it's not true.

Client 200's chosen profession by self report, gives him great satisfaction because it allows him to investigate small bits of the universe and to transfer his sense of caring to the environment. He becomes enthusiastic about the subject matter of his work as a biologist and links his research work to families dismantled by deception.

You know, in the Eco System Theory or systems theory, you have a model that talks about it [deception] like after a fire...there'll be the mountain pine beetle, it'll show up and take it apart...the damage it [deception] does to the family as the story has to get reorganized can be really significant to people...these kind of deceptive stories present a monologue in the family history that is completely subject to revision.

**Family relationships.**

**Extended family.**

Client 200 places importance on all family connections and regards his role in the extended family to be a mediator, a peer, a friend, a confidante, a rescuer, an advisor and a seeker of truth. He believed that his uncle had a close relationship with the North American family.
"At the same time we had this very close relationship with my uncle and his wife and my cousins."

He struggled with the lack of connectedness with his Dutch family members. "The stories kept them from us, kept her and my cousin from having a relationship with the North American family".

The outcomes of this deception gives him the most anticipatory concerns for certain members of the extended family. "You know as I said, I feel most sorry for my uncle's grandchildren who will at some point have to confront the fact". He maintains contact with all the family specifically Client 240, his cousin in Holland with whom he has reconnected more frequently in the last decade. As Client 240 writes to his Canadian cousin after a recent visit, "We cherish that you were all here in Holland. It was indeed memorable and we talk often about it".

**Father relationship.**

Client 200 had a gentle relationship with his father, respecting his conciliatory leaning. "My father was definitely not a braggart and had no self-aggrandizing...I learned contentment from my father, he, he didn't aspire, he was always amazed that his life turned out as it did".

**Mother relationship.**

Client 200 continues to enjoy a close relationship with his mother and has worked extensively on her familial and wartime history intending it to be solace from historical wounds.

When I discovered all this stuff about my mother and discovered the that the man who hid her...it's clear that my mother was exploited, that word is right in the social worker's report...I'm really happy that in 1994, I was able to find my mother's story and I think it's been great for her and it's been good for our whole family that that was opened up.
Sibling Relationships.

Client 200's brother is mentioned briefly, both of them having to have listened to the braggadocio of his uncle's (the Deceiver's) sexual exploits when they were teenagers. "And even talking to me as a teenager and to my, you know, brother too ...he [the Deceiver] really pitted himself, pitched himself as kind of sexually adventurous". His brother is unsure about the outcomes of investigating the liberation account. His sister believes the truth is necessary.

Wife, children, grandchildren relationships.

Client 200 reports that both he and his wife share suspicion and concern for members of the family, as the truth of the heroism account becomes clearer. His wife joins other female members of the family in having been suspicious of the Deceiver. "So when he first came out with this claim, the women in my family, that's my mother and my aunts and cousins, and my wife for that matter, really didn't feel it was credible at all".

Receiver's descriptors - self-report.

Analytical.

Client 200 has a well developed psychosocial trait of analysis, with the intent of caring, rescuing and anticipating feelings. He is a self described analyzer. "I can't say with a hundred degree, hundred per cent surety that, that my analysis of what happened at that time is correct but you know I think I've done a lot of careful looking at it". Analysis is for the purpose of finding truth and adding authentic accounts to history.

I mean I have to feel as a scholar of some sort that the truth does matter to some degree as you know, or that I can get the truth, it can be contextual, it can be situated and sometimes be hard to completely understand.
Anticipatory anxiety.

Client 200's anticipatory anxiety stems from his analytical tendency as he belabours possible outcomes. He describes his worrying trait as a caring trait for those he loves.

I worry about my nephews and nieces...some of them off to university now, some of them still going to high school, how they are going to deal with this, with this loss of trust when a man they always trusted, you know ,[they] really loved?...And if it comes out that he's really not telling the truth, I worry about that.

With negative anticipation that historians will ever rectify the error, Client 200 expresses extended anxiety. " Now maybe the historians can square the circle...I don't think that's really going to happen but maybe it will happen and then I won't have to worry so much about those kids".

Caring concern for others.

Client 200 makes an ongoing concerted effort to remain in close contact with all family members and acquaintances of the family; there were visits with his uncle and his cousins in Montreal and Florida as well as oversea visits with the aunt and cousin who remained in Holland. For example, he cares for the inevitable feelings, such as grief, when his uncle's grandchildren, in addition to his uncle's two sons and adopted daughter hear of the full historical facts.

For my cousin's children to come to terms with it, you know much closer emotionally to [him] than I was as grandchildren...I think it'll be much more potentially destabilizing influence. Who do you trust then, [if] you can't trust your grandfather; do you trust your parents? You know, maybe you knew this wasn't true and they didn't tell you this...When and if this comes out and they learn that that their uncle, their grandfather was not a hero, he was just ...he was a victim and people were victims...I feel most sorry for my, my
uncle's grandchildren who will have to at some point confront the fact that there's some [thing] exact about whether the hero [the Deceiver's name] was really really a hero.

Extended family will be affected by the revealing of truth and Client 200 cares deeply about their feelings. "And I really feel bad for those kids because they are really, really fine young people, I really like them all and I don't think they deserve to have been inflicted, you know to have this deception inflicted on them".

Conflicted feelings.

Consequently, Client 200 has conflicted feelings between valuing the results of emerging truth and valuing others' feelings.

And the same question is sort of what you're asking, what does it do for me to know whether [name] was really deceiving our family and the world in a sense?...and so in part, you know initially it was a question of truth. You know I have a commitment as a scholar to truth in the work hat I do...There's just something about that, that makes it, you know, I'm just curious about the importance because it's something about your character...So part of maybe what drives me is the sense of rescuing, both rescuing the historical record that it's wrong I think and maybe in part it's also rescuing my cousin[s].

The question that circles for him, is whether to tell each family member more details of the research before its publication? He struggles about whether it is his responsibility, especially for one cousin who may be too fragile from having suffered other situations.
She went through a very very difficult time in Florida. Has seemingly stabilized out really well and...she is so totally devoted to her hero father...it will be really difficult for her and again, I've had this huge moral, you know queries about, you know, do I tell her? He has been conflicted about whom in the family to protect. For some family members the truth brings hope and restoration yet for others in the family, it may be detrimental for them. Client 200 holds that seeking truth is seeking fairness through this process.

Yeah it's unfair for us. It's unfair for my aunt to have lived this hell of, you know, my uncle's, making in a sense, for the seventy years now. Yeah so it does come down to integrity that I don't want to out my uncle because he was a jerk. Because he was a jerk, but he was also a really great uncle.

Client 200 was initially conflicted about whether the uncle's story was true or false. He did not want to believe that his uncle was an imposter.

But in this case, it was the women of my family who were suspicious of [him] I'm the goody two shoes. I say "oh well, maybe it could be true", and it took awhile before I too came to the understanding that you know, it's really hard to understand the past but in this case I can't figure out how it could, his story to be true".

Collaborative.

Client 200 worked with various family members over a period of twenty years to carefully understand the deception. He considered all his actions through the filter of collaboration. For example, he frequently consults his cousin in Holland for his opinion, clarity of issues as a means of fact checking. When the researcher asked for clarification, Client 200 was quick to confirm facts with his cousin. "I have asked [him] if he had the answer to the first two
questions...more to come on that".

Client 200 is aware that it is painful for his Dutch cousin [Client 240] to discuss his uncle's deception with his mother.

And he [Client 240] spent his life trying to reconcile...his mother and his uncle together, not having a father around because his father died when he was young, I think he would have loved to have [the uncle] as a bit more of a male influence in his life...I think he always held out hope that somehow he could, he could save his damaged family.

His Dutch cousin collaborated with him in the search for the true liberation account.

...and my cousin was coming here to go to my sister's oldest daughter's Bar Mitzvah...so we went after the Bar Mitzvah and after our family things...that morning we went to [Client 210].

Client 200 has contacted his uncle's children to be forthright about his queries and to gauge their interest in his research.

It's really difficult. So [his] kids, my cousins...the older one, he's aware that we know, that [we] have been doing this...we had a brief, brief, brief talk with the older son, really brief, just letting him know, he was aware that we were doing this research and that we had stuff, and if he wanted to know he could ask us. The, my younger cousin has had no interest in this at all and the adopted daughter,...she needs to feel that [he] was a hero.

Clients 200 and 240, as cousins, have continued to collaborate with their efforts to discuss the process with Dutch historians.

But we have been in touch with the museum in Holland, at the concentration camp in Westerbork...so my cousin and I have been in contact with, my cousin especially, with the
people in Westerbork. We've done a set of interviews with [name of curator].

*Intelligent.*

Research, studying, mentoring and teaching are all components of Client 200's lifelong career, reflecting academic intelligence and investigative skill. Intensive, empirical research has been and continues to be, integral to his work. While he was working in Ottawa, he used his research skills to investigate the accuracy of his uncle's story.

I was doing a project with Ottawa with the Royal Society of Canada, so the archives at the Royal Society, actually the archive, the Canadian archives, the National archives were open twenty-four hour-seven...so I would finish my work with the Royal Society, have dinner and then go to the archive.

*Loyalty to family/family name.*

There is a deep loyalty to the family and to the paternal name which connects Client 200 to his heritage, his culture and specifically to his murdered grandfather's name.

"The Second World War still looms large in our lives. You know what happened and why, is still very, it's a palpable part of my life. You know, I feel it in the name I carry, in my children's names and the things I do".

Although the deception by the uncle has challenged the family loyalty threads, he maintains relationship with all family members, not giving preferential attention to those in alignment with his point of view. The recent revisit to Kamp Westerbork in 2015, and reconnecting with his family in Holland, indicates the significant meaning of family.
"So we all went up to Westerbork...and that was pretty incredible. Pretty incredible. And I'm still almost not recovered totally from it. It's had a really very interesting and moving impact on me, and I think therapeutic, and helpful and all that".

**Non-confrontational.**

Because of the personal difficulty for Client 200 to be confrontational with his uncle, ignoring the possibility of deception was an early option for him. "It sounds like a reasonable story, why not believe it right? We don't want to be suspicious especially of people we love".

At the onset of suspicion about the heroism account, he preferred to hold out that possibly it was a credible story. He preferred a non-confrontational approach and avoidance". I'm a, you know, my tendency is to just go with what people say and then figure it out later. So I would try to defend his [story], you know, it's not an unreasonable story". In fact, Client 200, along with every other family member, even being aware of the magnitude of the deception, let it drift along for years. "And so we just kept playing along and he just kept on speaking more and more".

Confrontation wounds Client 200's memories of his uncle, so a non-confrontation approach has been preferred". Well I haven't really, I haven't really tried to expose because you know, he was my favourite uncle. You know it's really hard to kind of dis your favourite uncle".

**Rescuer.**

Nevertheless, as the aunt and cousin in Holland were increasingly struggling with the heroism liberation deception and family deception, both traits of rescuing and importance of truth spearheaded restoration of connectedness with the Dutch family. "So part of my story which I I think I mentioned last time and I 'm sure it has to do with this; is that I'm a rescuer".

---
Rescuing his Dutch family members as well as daring to rescue his American family from acute embarrassment presents problems for Client 200.

And I realized then...I've been a rescuer all my life. I rescue people: I get myself into pickles at times through this rescuing compulsion. So part of maybe what drives me is the sense of rescuing, both rescuing the historical record that it's wrong, I think, and in part it's also rescuing my cousin.

**Suspicious of Deceiver.**

Client 200 asked himself the simple question, that being who gained from the making the heroism claim of liberating Kamp Westerbork and who did not, initially provoked suspicion of his uncle's story.

What evidence could allow [Client 210's] story to stand? He has his diaries and his notebooks and his maps and he has nothing to gain from his story. And my uncle...I can't square it. That data which I can physically see, with my uncle's construct, which I don't have any evidence for and he had a great deal of, of potential benefit in creating the story. And I think, so the,., at that level who benefits is really clear.

Client 200 was familiar with his uncle's collection of newspaper articles involving his community work but the sudden appearance of being a liberation hero seemed suspicious and scheming.

I've seen the newspaper clippings, I know that stuff really happened but the step into becoming a rescuer of the concentration camp was so abrupt in a way, so unexpected,
that it, it didn't, it wasn't as if we ever had hints of such a thing...but that it was more of this kind of scheming to change your life in your seventies and have a different narrative for what, what went on at the time when you were really a victim.

One detail given in the uncle's liberation story which made Client 200 particularly suspicious, was the alleged documents. It was highly improbable to him, how the highest ranking commanding officer would interview an escapee civilian in the middle of the night. The additional claims of being armed as an unknown escapee civilian, then leading a Canadian patrol back to Kamp Westerbork to liberate it, notwithstanding fighting and subduing German SS and Dutch collaborators en route without losses or injuries to the Canadian patrol, stretched believability.

You know, [his] story is so complex and so many pieces and so many, you know, probables and things that don't just don't, don't work because I don't, I can't match them up...but as far as I understand the history with the camp liberation, they can't match up.

When he says he escaped and went through the forest and they were fighting and that stuff... You know the Canadian army was there or it wasn't there you know, no one was ahead of them. So the whole thing just is, they [the different stories of the Deceiver and Client 210] tend toward incommensurability.

The document, purportedly from the Brigadier-General, were unverifiable as the officer was deceased when the alleged heroism account became broadly publicized.

But that Victor Allard gave [him] a letter attesting to his claim, written with very palsy or signed in a very jagged kind of, you know obviously it had some kind of, you know whether it was Parkinson's or something...it's just inconceivable to me.
Truth and integrity values.

As Client 200 researched his uncle's heroism account, no facts emerged to confirm the uncle's story.

All through the Second World War there were guys sitting at typewriters in the front lines and all over the place typing reports about what was going on and sending them backwards to headquarters wherever headquarters was. And so I was looking through the [war] diaries trying to see if I could find anything that made sense in terms of my uncles story. And I couldn't. In part because there was no names mentioned in the war diaries so. There was just nothing that sort of confirmed it but neither was there anything really to say it was, it wasn't true.

Client 200 retreated from exploring its veracity until a certain discovery of a website made him face the inevitable facts.

I began to hunt for...hunting to try to see if I could find a way to demonstrate that my uncle was actually telling the truth, that I stumbled upon a website...that there was a controversy about the liberation of the camp at Westerbork. I had never seen this website before...man it was so weird.

When he asked his uncle directly about the questions he had, the uncle's replies still left his nephew curious and unsatisfied with the answers .

I at some point deeply into this whole process when he is now becoming relatively famous and speaking in schools, and getting honours and awards and I'd ask him detailed questions. But all he would give me is a narrative. He would give me a fully formed story that was very hard to shake him from."
The driving desire for truth is the core of all Client 200's self stated motives. "I can't see how the stories between my, my uncle's version and the fellow [Client 210] here, his version, they don't seem commensurate. Like they both can't be right".

Even in his undertaking as a scholar, Client 200 valued truth and integrity over painful consequences. "The truth does matter to some degree as you know, or that I can get [to] the truth". The deception causes an unsettling of the family system which truth will alter again, but ultimately the truth should make clear.

**Word usage.**

Client 200 generally values words to express himself and generally uses extended explanations to reinforce clarity to the listener. He frequently enjoys phraseology or a specific choice of word for its beauty of meaning. "I spoke about this beautiful quote...and she's talking about social activism...having to deal with the "cold heaven of daily reality testing". I love that phrase". Or he enjoys the subtlety of the Hebrew meaning of words. "In the Jewish world we have these two terms, we have *** which is justice, and *** which is mercy...we have another phrase, [Hebrew phrase insert], that is the idea of turning".

Words have value. Words form the reciprocal role between family and him, between truth and untruth. It is the violation of words and word usage that offends him. He is uncomfortable with his uncle using words to twist meanings and to misrepresent, and ultimately not to care about the impact of those words. It seems to severely betray Client 200's sense of rightness.

These kind of deceptive stories present a monologue in the family's history that is completely subject to revision, you know, we have [his] story on tape and everything and
I could say, it couldn't possibly be true because the Canadian army wasn't where [name] said he met the Canadian army, they weren't, they just weren't there.

Theme 4: Strategic Interpersonal Communication Elements to Conduct Deception

The fourth theme explores the interpersonal elements that the Deceiver used to engage individual Receivers and audiences. Because it was critical to the success of the deception, the Deceiver needed to use a variety of tactical communication skills to persuade that his hero/liberation narrative was credible, to circumvent suspicion, and to manage his persona. Twenty-seven communication elements emerged from the narratives. These are sub-divided into two categories, non-verbal interpersonal communication tactics and verbal interpersonal communication tactics. The former considers eight factors and the latter, nineteen. When these communication tactics are analyzed more completely in the Discussion chapter, it will be apparent that some elements could fit both categories.

Non-verbal interpersonal communication strategies.

**Aloofness.**

An effective tool to convey control of the conversation, to end it or to discourage unwanted inquiry, is to silence the Receiver with disdain, dismissal or aloofness. The goal appears to make the Receiver feel too awkward to continue asking questions, in other words, to put the Receiver on the defensive. Client 200 noticed this element particularly when questioning the Deceiver about specific details of the circumstances in the liberation deception story. The Deceiver's response was a sudden switch from familial warmth in conversation to a conspicuously cool response. "I think he knew that I knew that his story was not wholly accurate. And at our last meeting which...it was awkward. It was really awkward".
**Historical parallelisms.**

The Deceiver used verifiable facts of history to add substance and validity to his narrative. For example, several references are well known: the Nazi Occupation restrictions for Dutch Jews, the Jewish ghetto in Amsterdam, the night raids and arrests by the Gestapo, the Hollandse Schouwburg, and the transit camp, Kamp Westerbork. The Canadian military was in the Beilen area and Brigadier-General Allard was in command of the military actions and did visit Kamp Westerbork after its liberation. In the following example, the Deceiver inserts reports about the Occupation restrictions, documented with "Ausweis" identification cards; these are true facts, but he parallels the historical points with what may have been his first experience with violence and murder. The Deceiver explained the Occupation restrictions.

That was the Ausweis. Then it didn't take very long, all kinds of signs went up, signs on the street, stores for Jews forbidden. Jews were not allowed to go to all these places... these streets were closed off by us and then they couldn't get out and we beat also the daylights out of them, and one of them got killed.

By frequently using the familiar term "concentration camp" in reference to Kamp Westerbork and his experiences, the Deceiver inferred sameness. Speculatively, the Receiver becomes more emotionally connected and unwittingly believes that the Deceiver suffered severely.

There was a docent going around with children, to show the Anne Frank exhibition...and then I see another picture of my father's youngest sister, sitting on the railroad station with a star, waiting with other people to be transported to Westerbork concentration camp.
By aligning his story with the more familiar life story of Anne Frank, the latter lends historical credence to his, by association. The Deceiver began one of his speaking engagements with the posthumous identification to the well loved young girl.

But there were children waiting to come in...they were showing a movie about Anne Frank. And so I asked one of the kids when I was outside...”Did you see the movie of Anne Frank already”? I said, "We, like Anne Frank, I myself am from Amsterdam Holland".

He used the historical association to further his goal to have speaking engagements.

*Intuitive skill.*

The Deceiver had an acutely tuned intuition which could sense a Receiver's likely response to determine a likely "win" in the moment. In one example that has been quoted, he was proud of his intuition regarding the cook's reaction at Kamp Westerbork when he demanded extra food. He self praises the moment when he knew he "had" him, and he had "won". When finding Jewish children after the war, he sensed or claimed he "knew" intuitively when he had found a Jewish child to smuggle to Israel for the Aliyah.

Well to find children after the war was of course, was very difficult...so I went to playgrounds and I went to school playgrounds and there is recess, you see those kids play...and I went over to the boy when he came out of school...you are a Jewish boy. And besides that I knew it. I knew it. I felt it. So next time I followed him to his home.

The Deceiver intuitively understood his audience whether it was predominantly a Christian or Ashkenazi Jewish one. He tailored his terminology to appeal to his listeners. In retelling several Nazi atrocities to his audience, he spoke of Christmas, gift giving and holidaying with the children, a
non-Jewish holiday but a specifically warm subject to Christian audiences to articulate the contrast to cruelties. The Deceiver used the loss his parents in his narrative, intuitively sensing it carried a strong emotional appeal. He directed the conversation with the Receiver (interviewer) back to the Deceiver's former subject of loss and suffering.

[Interviewer], "You did some wonderful things after the war. Do you want to tell me about those"?

[Client] "After the war I was alone. My parents didn't come back...I was going to the Red Cross for months... And then after six months I had to give up. I didn't see the names of my parents or any other relatives".

Client 200 stated that his uncle intuitively capitalized on the current Zeitgeist, so that he would benefit from presenting his hero/liberation deception in this specific time frame.

He [The Deceiver] was intellectually smart but not brilliant, but he was shrewd. He likely did not believe all what he said about the legacy and the Holocaust but he had an instinct for what could give him status and prestige but appear humble and ordinary, [and he] identified the Zeitgeist of the 1990's, the re-awareness of the Holocaust horrors and the effect of the victim mentality.

*Mouth noises/pauses.*

Mouth noises and pauses are often noticed in the same paragraphs as deceptive inserts. It is difficult to assess if this tactic was intentional or unintentional. The pauses in this example, suggest that some part of the the cattle car transport story is untrue, which it is. The Deceiver is recounting a story he knows but could not have experienced himself. Cattle cars were not used to arrive at Kamp Westerbork, but to exit further east to concentration camps.
There was a barrel somewhere in the corner but you couldn't get to it. Standing room only. [PAUSE] Babies crying, [mouth noise] all old people moaning, groaning, people dying [PAUSE] And you can't get out of there, you can't, you're locked in, it's bolted on the outside. Here is the sliding door and here the bolt goes and you can't get out. It's bad. Bad, bad, bad, bad, bad, bad [PAUSE].

Sometimes pauses and mouth noises or sighs appear to increase the emotional quotient.

And in three months all of them were killed. There is only one boy who survived. This fellow with the dark head, dark face, that's my cousin, Herman [last name]. ...Also a friend of mine. All of them gone. All these boys got killed in a gruesome, gruesome way. They died in a horrible, horrible, horrible situation. [PAUSE]. [Very quietly] Bastards. [PAUSE]. And that's why I cannot understand, I cannot. [LONG PAUSE]. I cannot digest it, I cannot, I don't want to go into it. I'd go crazy. [PAUSE].

Together pauses and sighs seems to signal a shift in the narrative script. The context of the following example is when the interviewer asked the Deceiver a precise question. He deflects to the script of Nazi atrocities, switching to the cattle car transport and Occupation restrictions. What is noticeable overall in the quote as well as in the preamble, is the frequent punctuation of the script with many pauses and sighs.

Precise in their record keepings. They, they - it's unbelievable...you want them? I'll get [PAUSE] of all the people were in Westerbork, they got the information [PAUSE] the name where they used to live [PAUSE] this is one of the cattle cars. I call it boxcars [SIGH, MOUTH NOISE] the Jewish people indeed like cattle. [PAUSE] ...These are the
various badges that people had to wear either in the concentration camps or the cities or the camps....Juif, Jude, Jode. [LONG PAUSE].

Coughs are a specific mouth noises, sometimes paired with hyperbole. In this example the Deceiver was attempting to be asked to be a circuit speaker.

And I said to myself, that's a good opportunity to go and commemorate my parents and the soldiers who died and who gave their lives so that I will live and so many others. (COUGHS) And I went down there (COUGHS) - sorry, when I came there I felt like an outcast.

**Preparedness and pre-formed scripts.**

Between the time when the Deceiver was in the hospital recovering from a serious health issue in 1989 until the first public exposure of his escape/liberation of Kamp Westerbork story is approximately three years. In that time the Deceiver prepared extremely well for his entry into heroism. He simply accumulated a convincing variety of photos, Ausweis identification cards, personal articles, as well as the valuable attests from the General, ready to complement his narrative and to vouch for a false story.

This is the ID card when all, everybody living in Holland had to come and be registered...I made a picture...these were the signs that went up...that's a picture I took with a very old fashioned box camera...this is the [Jude] star that I was talking about...a [picture] of my fiancée...and here is a picture of my fiancée and myself...a picture of the wedding of my fiancée's brother...this picture was taken in the synagogue...this is very famous professor [name] a very famous man...a picture of General Allard and me...I have
that all in writing, I have that...this is the picture of how do you call it, the attest from General Allard...a certification of what happened...if you want to read it, go ahead.

By using narrative portions that appear to be identical in form and wording, it suggests that portions of the narrative are pre-formed and memorized, comparable to theatrical scripts. The Deceiver was intransigent to shifting to unprepared explanations once the script was underway, as detailed by the principal Receiver.

At some point deeply into this whole process when he now becoming relatively famous and speaking in schools and getting honours and awards and I'd ask him detailed questions. But all he would ever give me is a narrative. He would just start at the beginning and run through to the end.

Seven scripted (or pre-formed) narratives have been identified that complement the hero/liberation script, the principal deception. Two of the seven reflect personal choices the Deceiver made for himself: the forty-eight years of silence and that he had no living relatives. The other five scripts detail historical context and provide substance to his narrative. It is interesting to note that the hero/liberation deception script was bookended by these scripts; the deception script of escape and heroism appear to be purposefully placed as the epicentre. The scripts are: breaking 48 years of silence, the Brigadier General friendship, transport to Westerbork by cattle car, the Dutch Nazi collaborators, speaking against Holocaust deniers as his legacy, the Nazi atrocities, and claiming to have no living relatives. Each script is quoted in Appendix "B".
Proof/Statistics.

The Deceiver collected pictures and statements to substantiate his claims, particularly to augment his liberation deception. Client 200 remembers that his uncle collected proof from several sources.

He had backed up his story sufficiently getting attestations by people who were, at that point in their life, very unlikely to have a memory but I think we're just willing to do my uncle a favour. You know, people who...not even able to have those kinds of memories still.

The most debatable proof which the Deceiver widely utilized was the attests purportedly written by the Canadian Brigadier-General. The General (later military designation) passed away in 1996, prior to the letters being widely circulated as proof. Oddly enough, the letters attributed to the General as compared to transcripts of interviews with the Deceiver, indicate significant similarities in words and phraseology. For example, in one statement the Deceiver claims he encountered Nazi soldiers on his return to Kamp Westerbork with the six man patrol.

We run into stiff German SS and collaborators from the German side and they had to eliminate them; we started to fight these men...and we eliminated these guys, we started to fight these men we didn't lose any of our own men.

The General letter of attestation employs similar wording.

However in this letter I omitted to state the fact that this patrol met with stiff resistance from the German SS and Dutch collaborators when approaching Westerbork concentration camp. My men eliminated the enemy resistance and Mr. [name] who had been armed by us, fully participated in these activities.
The Discussion chapter explores several areas as to what degree the letters could be suspect for their validity. As well, the pictures of the General and the Deceiver together are also suspect as to how they were obtained.

Other pictures were used to prove that details of his deception story were true, such as the picture of his Amsterdam fiancée. The picture aided the engagement story and emphasized Holocaust sufferings.

And here the family that would have been my in-law family unfortunately they all got killed. In the middle on top you see my fiancée, left and right are her two sisters, on the bottom father and mother and in left corner the sister that did go in the hiding place.

Statistics are used heavily in his speaking engagements to give significance to historical details to emphasize the atrocities. Statistics increased believability and importance to his story.

The disadvantage to the Deceiver of frequently listing such large quantity numbers as statistical backdrops was that their value became muted. The reader may note this from the following excerpt when the Deceiver was recounting the number of children appreciating his speaking. The Deceiver's numbers are not in agreement with the statistics listed on the Holocaust Center website for this same time frame.

I have told my story to 28,000 children and thousands of adults in those five weeks...there will be 40,000 children coming to see it and to listen to the story that I will tell ...more than 95% of all visitors Children and adults are of Christian faith...I spoke from Jan. 22 'til March 4th to 34,000 children and 15,000 adults during those 6 weeks.
The statistics the Deceiver lists that are accurate are the numbers of Dutch Jews living in Amsterdam, the number of Jews murdered and the number of Jews remaining after the war in Holland.

I tell them about life under the Nazi oppression and the deportation of 110,000 Dutch Jews out of the 140,000 that were living in Holland...I feel now that I have a legacy to talk about what happened and I have 6,000,000 reasons to do so.

The Deceiver appears to have an accurate memory for dates of birth of family members, and times and dates of several events such as when family and friends were taken to various concentration camps. He liked to substantiate his hero/liberation deception with specific numbers such as numbers of people in a boxcar, number of people in the Waterloo Square, and numbers of people in Kamp Westerbork. It appears to be easy for him to recall specifics, such as the Resistance workplace address, the shop where he took food coupons, the various street names in Amsterdam when he took a streetcar while running from police, the street corner names where he fought a black man, hotel addresses, school addresses, even Gestapo headquarters addresses. Sometimes the numbers seemed overwhelming. "I have tens and tens of thousands of letter over the last twenty years that I have been doing this".

Public persona.

Relationships with well known individuals and with persons in community or charity groups appear purposeful to the Deceiver to further his agenda or to impress listeners. Casual associations seem noticeably aggrandized. In this example, the purpose of referring to this particular person in the narrative is unclear except for the fact that he was famous.
We became friends. And we became good friends. This fellow became very famous in Holland...this man was so famous, he was such a great guy, he became my best buddy...fine guy, great guy. Great individual.

When the Deceiver answered about his involvement with the Holocaust Museum, he included references to knowing the Director. Using a well known name seems unnecessary to the context, but it benefits the Deceiver by lending prestige by association in his discourse with a Receiver. The reference sounded verifiable. The example that follows seems innocuous as a single quote, except for its efficacy to impress listeners.

I look back and I see a big guy standing there. I said, "Yes, what can I do for you?" He said, "I am the Director for the Tampa Bay Holocaust Memorial and Education Centre, which is now the Florida Holocaust Museum". He said, and it was Steve [surname], he said, "I would like you to come there to speak".

On another occasion, the Deceiver informed his family of his accomplishments to date by letter, and included references to the allegedly close relationship with the Centre's founder. Some family members dismissed such statements in his correspondence with them, simply as name dropping or pomposity as in this excerpt. "John [surname] is a good friend of mine. The man who started the Center, Walter [surname] who became a great friend of...me. He spend a fortune to started it all" (spelling consistent with quote).

Although the Deceiver does not record any friendship or ongoing relationship from his work, he claims an alleged association with the Dutch Resistance. The many references to it, such as in this short example, seemed off track with the preceding conversation, yet purposed to awe his audiences by claiming to have been associated with the popular notion of resistance to the Nazis.
But after the big raid, these stamps were of no value no more, because all of a sudden, everybody had to go, so that woman came to our house to save the children but I told the woman that I could not go...I have to stay here. I'm in the Resistance, because I have to keep working, for whatever I have to do.

Feigned friendships can be difficult to ascertain when listening to the conversation for the first time but their reference increases the public image. For example, it is unclear if the friendship that the Deceiver alleged he had with the Brigadier-General is a bona fide one when the Deceiver gave varying dates in various interviews, when the friendship began. It was one of the years 1967, 1974 and 1989, if it was at all.

The public image of the Deceiver was diligently maintained to achieve a high level of believability whenever he engaged in interpersonal communication with any Receiver or audience. Prestige add to the Deceiver's public image. The Deceiver frequently refers to his awards, such as his knighthood, as the pinnacle of his achievement.

Well this is when I was knighted by the Queen and it was done by the Consul-General of the Netherlands, by the name Andre Brown. He knighted me on behalf of the Queen of Holland for which I received a medal that I showed you before. This is the citation that came with the medal, citation that I got from her Majesty the Queen of Holland, Queen Beatrix.

During the mid 1990's, the Deceiver invited his North American family members to functions where he was to be feted. He offered to send copies of his various interviews, articles written about him and information about his notoriety and success in speaking engagements. A personal letter to family is highly indicative of his prestige awareness.
To my family and friends and their children...I did it for 5 weeks in January 1992 and seeing the attention and reaction the children gave me made me realize that Holocaust survivors have a legacy to tell about the atrocities...By what I am doing got the attention of the media and they came for an interview with me and it was in the newspaper and television all over the area and the response from the public was great. By doing what I am doing gives me a satisfaction.

It was because of the Deceiver's consistent behaviour to seek recognition about his awards and to promote awareness of his achievements, that seemed so utterly incongruent with his claim that he had kept his heroism silent for almost half a century. Several family members and friends recognized his achievements but remained highly skeptical of his heroism as Client 200 states.

A man of [his] character, a guy who had the posters and the newspaper clippings of all his accomplishments and his achievements could have kept such a significant story quiet for so long...was incongruous...the creme de la creme of accomplishments and that he kept it hidden for fifty years...just didn't make sense.

Despite that his knighthood was his "creme de la creme" of accomplishments, the Deceiver stated that he and his wife kept it a secret from the family until after the award ceremony. His more usual style reappeared in 2007, when retelling the account of his being honoured at a fundraising dinner at the Florida Holocaust Museum. From Client 200's perspective, his uncle enjoyed accumulating and publicizing such awards and notoriety to add to his public image of being a hero. Client 200 however, struggled with the apparent inequity, when awards were offered for true courage and heroism.
There was a big event in Miami honouring heroes, it was a fundraiser for the Holocaust Museum in south Florida. And they had these guys who were real heroes like the guy from the café Rwanda, the Hutu camp hotel owner, you know they made a movie about him, a Marine, a hispanic Marine who ran into the World Trade Center as it was collapsing to pull people out, the first U.S.G.I. to go into battle with two prosthetic legs, and my uncle.

**Vague/redirected responses.**

By strategically answering an unwanted question with a vague, incomplete or sudden redirected response, the Deceiver derailed a Receiver or audience's focus. In the following example. The interviewer (a Receiver) asked the question of the whereabouts of his sister and niece at the Kamp. The answer inexplicably appears to switch back to his script of noble purpose.

[Interviewer] "Were [the niece's name] and your sister also there at Westerbork? Were they transported to the same place"?

[Client 230], "[Name] was there but I didn't see them. I haven't seen them at all. 'Til after the war. I haven't seen them. But the reason that I am going out to schools and to colleges, universities and high schools to speak to young people because young people have to know what happened for their own protection. So I do that because..."

The interviewer approaches the same topic later after a lengthy digression and is delayed a second time with statistics of Nazi atrocities.

[Interviewer] "And how did you escape..."
[Client] "We could hear the sounds - well first I'd like to tell you something else...I'd like to tell you that in Westerbork, to Westerbork came one hundred and ten thousand Jews. There were in Holland before the war, one hundred and forty thousand Jews...sent to death camps..."

Redirecting the conversation is especially noted after the Deceiver makes statements that appear to be false or misleading. In this example, the Deceiver is asked about surviving family. Although he did have living relatives in Holland: a surviving sister, her husband, her son, a cousin who had been fostered, an aunt's niece, an unnamed aunt and uncle, as well as a North American branch of the family, he emphasized that all his relatives were murdered, he was orphaned, and then immediately shifts to a Holocaust script. Seemingly the interviewer follows his lead in the conversation, because no further effort to establish a fact about surviving family, is attempted again.

They killed all my relatives, my friends, my neighbours, my schoolmates, my everybody I knew. Everybody including my parents. After the war I was an orphan, without parents...when I go to schools I ask, so very often I ask the kids, what is the worst disease?...You know when I give lectures...

**Verbal interpersonal communication strategies.**

*Claiming authority.*

The Deceiver believed that leadership was his Jewish birthright and therefore he could claim he had the authority to decide for others."We are leaders. They cannot take that away from us. We are leaders and we are order-givers". It follows that the Deceiver's sense of entitlement to being a leader justified why he frequently gave orders, instructions and delivered non-consensual decisions expecting unfettered obedience. The Deceiver demonstrated his verbal authoritarianism with his
peers in the Amsterdam street gangs, with the expected compliance from the parents in the hiding place or with his fiancée to go into hiding and ultimately in the escape plan he contrived for his sister and aunt's niece before their arrest. He asserted his assumed authority even as a nineteen year old. "I told the father to keep the five year old on his lap...the mother to give me the baby. She didn't want to but I told her she had to".

Clearly, the Deceiver alludes that he could challenge the Brigadier-General successfully as a civilian escapee. The ensuing conversation between the Deceiver and the Brigadier-General as narrated, is presented below in order to allow the reader to re-evaluate the logical possibility that a soaking wet, twenty-two year old civilian male, captured on a dark night, after "swimming" ten feet of a local canal, in the midst of a military battle, was believed by infantry and the commanding officer, to be an escapee from an unknown German controlled, Jewish transit camp. They were convinced to give him weapons, and a foot patrol and the freedom to retrace his steps back to the camp, under the same battle conditions without injury, based on his threat alone, that the Brigadier-General would be held accountable for murdering Jews, at some date after the war. What seems cocky to tell of his convincing abilities and authoritative style, is what created suspicion that the narrative was plausible.

So I said to the Brigadier-General, "If you do so, I told you right now, that there is being kept about, close to a thousand Jewish people there. If you're going to do that, then I'm going to hold you responsible after the war for killing a thousand innocent people". He looked a little different at me...I said, "I'm not going back in German territory without being armed". "No, we don't arm civilians". I said, "Well that's too bad, then I'm not going back, but I 'm still holding you responsible". So then he changed his mind.
Emotionality.

Emotional elements in the narrative especially regarding family losses and suffering, are strategically used when the Deceiver seemingly wishes to deepen a Receiver's emotional involvement and trust. In his narrative, the Deceiver recounts several losses: loss of his father and mother to the death camps, loss of family and relatives, loss of a fiancee' and some of her family members, loss of a cousin and his wife after their wedding, loss of acquaintances, and loss of freedom both during the Occupation restrictions in Amsterdam and in Kamp Westerbork. In this example, the Deceiver uses a highly emotional script about loss and death.

That was my fiancee...I had made a hiding place for her in her parents' home... But her, her father, mother and five brothers and sisters did not survive the war, and here is the family that would have been my in-law family but unfortunately they all got killed...all gone. Gone, gone, gone...this is a picture of my cousin Solomon and his wife...one year after they were married, they got slaughtered in a concentration camp, were gone. And her sister...killed in a concentration camp they rounded up people, 426 or 429 Jewish young men and they took them to Buchenwald and then to the stone quarries in Mauthausen...and in three months all of them got killed...this fellow with the dark hair, that's my cousin, [name], he got killed. There is another fellow here by the name of [name], also a friend of mine, all of them are gone, all of them, all these boys got killed in a very gruesome way. They died in a horrible, horrible, horrible situation.

Eliciting emotion and empathy is evident in the preamble to the Deceiver's heroic liberation claims, when describing his escape from Kamp Westerbork. The focus seems to be on the senses: the smells of garbage, the noise of artillery, the dark woods and a wet canal swim, as well as the
feelings of aloneness, fear, and danger. Given that the Deceiver needed to obstruct suspicion, he likely used these sensory components to enhance the sense of risk and drama as a diversionary tactic. The quote has been used previously however repeated so that the reader may note the various sensory appeals.

I crawled out on my stomach out of the barrack, ducked myself into a garbage dump (Sigh), put a box over my head and a hole in it to be able to breathe. And I escaped. I start walking in the dark, through the woods for hours in the direction of the noise of the artillery fire. Bullets were flying all around.

Perhaps the heightened emotions generated by suffering, death and losses created a starker and more believable base for his purported heroism.

**Exaggeration.**

The Deceiver appears to have used exaggeration and hyperbole extensively. It seems that the exaggeration leads the Receiver to perceive the Deceiver in the most positive terms, which better positions the Deceiver for a relationship and to have a Receiver engaged into the story. In the generational deception, for example, the Deceiver claimed that the family of origin was outstanding and closely knit, although this was not supported by family assertions, but the claim seemed to impress individual Receivers and audiences. Given that the Deceiver wished to have a superior public persona, it is probable that exaggerated presentations of family bonds not only alluded to the Deceiver being exemplary, but may also draw in a Receiver, who themselves desire family connectedness. The hyperbole appears to resonate with an interviewer.
[Client 230] "My family was a good family...not rich but well-to-do, well taken care of, good education, loving parents, the family was wonderful, we had a good family, yes...it was him [father], with him in mind, that I succeeded".

[Interviewer] "Yeah, that was his gift to you".

[Client 230] "Oh yes, absolutely".

Indeed, the exaggeration about the benefits of living in Amsterdam continue the impression that the Deceiver seemed to want endorsed. He claimed, "Amsterdam, beautiful city. Holland, wonderful country. The life there for Jewish people was unbelievable, great".

Sometimes exaggeration becomes more apparent when a similar account is repeated. For example, when he wanted to emphasize the stress of travelling in a crowded train from Amsterdam to Kamp Westerbork, the Deceiver stated it was a cattle car train, took three days and three nights for the Nazis to transport them one hundred and eighty kilometres from Amsterdam Muiderpoort station northeast to Hooghalen. "And it took three days and three nights that we travelled and we came to Westerbork concentration camp". Yet, in later interviews, the exaggeration seems to be exposed when the Deceiver is emphasizing how relatively easy it was for the Dutch to travel especially by rail. "And Holland is so small - you can cross through it in an hour, you're out of the country".

Exaggeration appears to contribute to the construction of the liberation deception because it is relatively mundane or socially accepted in conversations and conveniently conceals blatant lies in a high stakes deception.
Falsehoods.

Fabrication, falsehoods and lies exist in the narrative, but it would require a deep understanding of the contextual background as well as a close examination of facts to list each one. It is beyond the scope of this study to present and explain every factual misrepresentation. Nonetheless the core of this study is to deconstruct the primary falsehood of large proportion, therefore the hero/liberation narrative, as described by the Deceiver in one of his more concise versions, is fully quoted.

We had to stop April 11, 1945. Everybody in the barracks, don't come out. If you come out of the barracks, from the towers you get shot. I said to my buddy, "I don't trust that. That I don't trust. If the Allied forces are coming closer and closer, the guards are going to run away. What are they going to do with all the people in the barracks before they run away. They can come in with a machine gun and mow us all down." I said. "We're going to escape tonight. "I don't want to get shot from the towers", my buddy said, "And I don't want - ba, bee, ba, blah." I said, "Well if you don't go then I go by myself. I'm not going to be a sitting duck." When it got a little dark, I crawled on my stomach out of the barrack, ducked myself into a garbage dump. (Sigh) Put a box over my head and a hole in it to be able to breathe. When it was completely dark, and I'd crawled out from the camp, I escaped. Went under the barbed wire, because in Westerbork the barbed wire was not on the electric power. And I escaped. I start walking, in the dark, through the woods, for hours. In the direction of the noise of the artillery fire. Then I got between two fighting armies. Bullets were flying all around. I got to a canal and I want to swim across the canal so I undress and I got my clothes, held it above water and I swum across the
canal. When I came out on the other side, I had a rifle butt on my head. "Oh my god, those Germans, they got me again." But I did hear a foreign language being spoken, I think, Ah! That's it. I'm free!. No. They took me into custody. There was a Brigadier-General - that name I found out later of course, at that time I didn't know it - there was a Brigadier-General, and he claimed that, by an interpreter, he claimed that I was a collaborator with the Nazis. I said, I'm an escapee from Westerbork concentration camp. That is, I don't know, I walked through the night four miles, five miles, I don't know, away from. The camp you're talking about" ,they're going with the interpreter, back and forth, "The camp you're talking about are military barracks. German military barracks. We have seen them from reconnaissance planes, yesterday we took the pictures - only military". I said, "Sure, because we were kept in the barracks, we were not allowed to come out". "No, you're lying, it's not true, they're military barracks and we're going to bombard it and flatten it with artillery fire". So I said to the Brigadier-General, "If you do so, I told you right now, that there is being kept about close to a thousand Jewish people there. If you're going to do that, then I'm going to hold you responsible after the war for killing a thousand innocent people. I told you so". He looked a little different at me. He said, " Are you willing to go back with a six man patrol"? I said, "Sure. Give me some firing power". I said "I'm not going back in German territory without being armed". "No we don't arm civilians".I said, "Well that's too bad then I'm not going back but I'm holding you responsible." So he changed his mind, he gave me a Sten gun with several rounds of ammunition, and we had to start walking. I was walking between two military
men who were half a step or a step behind me and four in the back. And the interpreter, and they had the order I was told, that the moment I make a wrong move to kill me. We run into stiff German, SS and collaborators from the German side and they had to eliminate them, we started to fight these men and they found out very fast on whose side I was. And we eliminated these guys, we didn't lose any of our own men and we continued to walk. And it got a little bit daylight when we got to the camp. The gate was open, the guards had run away already and everybody was still in the barracks because it was still, it just started to get twilight. Or no, what do you call it early in the morning, it started to get bright light. And there was one man with us with a field radio, he radioed back to his commander that it's true what I told, it's a camp with prisoners and an hour and a half later the Canadian armed forces rolled into the camp. The Brigadier-General was there too, a big man, giant big man. He came over to me and all he said in his very heavy voice, "Oh, you were right".

Truth tables list comparisons of facts around the dates of April 11 and 12, 1945, to elucidate what is likely false versus what is true (see Table 1). Given that the deception now has been established by Dutch historians, it remains to be understood how the falsehoods were inserted effectively, how they might have been perceived as factual and what made them believable to the Receiver(s).

*Illogical argumentation.*

The Deceiver seemed to occasionally use illogical argument to digress from the dialogue as a derailing strategy. It is probable that the meandering in the dialogue is structured to confuse and overwhelm the Receiver. It seems evident that the Deceiver maintained his lead in the following
disjointed conversation and overwhelmed the listener. The illogical piece may also indicate his language when not using a prepared script.

The Holocaust is unbelievable. I - people who are not anti-Semitic, don't get me wrong.

Listen, a Holocaust denier, I met 'em, I met 'em. When I was speaking at the museums or here or there, Holocaust deniers, I met 'em and then for instance I got to talk with - either they're dumb, stupid, uneducated or plain anti-Semitic. But if you take that away somebody who's none of these things could be a Holocaust denier. I may have been one of those. Because it's so gruesome, it's so unbelievable that I don't blame an honest Holocaust denier, who is not anti-Semitic or stupid or uneducated or God knows what.

Interestingly, the interviewer paused courteously in the previous passage, as if she needed to distract the Deceiver from his diatribe, which in turn prompts the following shift in the his conversation topic and offering proof. "This picture is the, how do you call it, the attest from General [name]. This is when he was already a full fledged General, Chief of Staff giving a certification of what has happened".

*Intimidation/ad hominem arguments.*

Intimidation by pairing critical words with aggressive demeanour is efficacious. Sometimes in the interviews there was a sharp shift from being congenial to confrontational. In the following excerpt, the interviewer veered from an empathetic listening role to ask a probing, investigative question. The Deceiver was quick to put the interviewer on the defensive. Client 200 recalls similar displays of intimidation when his uncle was challenged.

[Interviewer] And why do you think you got caught"?
[Client] "I don't know...[LOUDER]. You want me to tell the story the way I told it before, then I will do that".

[Interviewer] "Well, I was looking for what you felt like the change was and what was happening there where you were hiding".

[Client, LOUD and LEANING FORWARD] " Do you want me to tell the story"?

While observing that the Deceiver's tone of voice, agitation or direct eye contact varied considerably in the interviews, on occasion the blend of non-verbal markers with a verbal retort generated a visible surprise reaction and acquiescence from the interviewer. In the following excerpt, it appeared that the interviewer eventually restored the narrative tone by retreating from her direct question and assuming a bland response. It appears that the Deceiver was soothed, after which the reciprocal interaction seemingly regained its previous equilibrium.

[Client] " [PAUSE] [QUIETER] Bastards. [PAUSE]. And that 's why I can't understand. I, I, I, I cannot [long pause]. I cannot digest it...The nerve the guts they had [LOUDER] Where do they get the nerve to go across the border...where do they get the nerve?...What kind of people are they"?

[Interviewer] "I don't know".

[Client] " It's - I, I, I - I have no words for it".

Given that the Deceiver intends to avoid suspicion, it is likely that intimidating a Receiver is an effective means of shutting down the inquiries. In this short excerpt, the Deceiver denounces other unnamed Receivers as disreputable deniers, implying that any dissenter of him could share that label, while he proceeded on his noble course. "But those who are attempting to deny my suffering and the suffering of millions of others, they have forced me to speak out".
It is probable that an individual Receiver re-evaluated voicing suspicions with a concern for the impact on their relational status with the Deceiver, and if the connectedness with the Deceiver appeared jeopardized. It is apparent that this Receiver chose a relationship over confrontation. Client 200, the principal Receiver did as well. "I was not capable while [he] was alive of outing him like that as a, a liar. You know in that sense maybe the [sense of] mercy outweighed the my sense of justice".

When the Deceiver was questioned by friends about his heroism, Client 200, his nephew, observed that he completely invalidated them by distancing himself. "As soon as friends questioned [him] then they were really gone".

When a Receiver did not comply with the first appearance of intimidation, the Deceiver did not appear hesitant to use rough language with physical force. The Deceiver reported on his handling of a frightened adult as they negotiated a border crossing.

I was taking people to Belgium, going through the border, they were trained by me watching red light/green light. One guy panicked. I punch him and [I] poured chloroform on him. While I go across French border, I knocked him out again.

**Manipulation of meaning.**

By taking the spoken narrative at face value, a Receiver or audience in general, might not detect the manipulative components easily, or at all. It is in the repetition of the account over time, or in reviewing the writings, that manipulative elements become more apparent. For example, when the Deceiver wrote a letter that invited his family members and friends to read the articles about him and his hero/liberation story, he also provided the articles. This lends the appearance of openness. Yet, it appeared that the purpose of the invitation was to offset suspicion that he knows was likely to
emerge, and thus he addressed suspicion as a possibility. This may have appealed to some Receivers, who might regard comments such as this as being forthright, not a shrewd tactical manipulation.

Your letter has triggered me of to do what I am doing now by sending the contents of this envelope to all of the family and friends, so that they get the word from me, and not second hand, and then it could come out differently.

It is strategic to be the first person to mention whatever challenge might be contemplated by a listener. For example, the postscript of the same letter as above, used a covert message. Here the Deceiver addressed the possibility that his letter could look like a solicitation of funds, but denied it, although the letter actually appeared to have an overall purpose of solicitation. "P.S. I have enclosed some of the literature and the reaction of some of the children who visited the Center. By no means is the intention to ask for any donations".

The proactive move to identify a potential point of suspicion in a deception, is astute. It seems to dilute suspicion, should someone raise an issue.

The prime example of manipulating a Receiver in this case study, to erase a suspicious possibility by suggesting it had already been dealt with, is contained in the alleged supporting document from the Brigadier-General, where he stated that he, as an officer, had had suspicions about the Deceiver's heroism story in April 1945. Not only the letter itself, but the wording was meant to affirm that what the Deceiver told was true.

As I was suspicious of [name]'s story, I sent a six man patrol accompanied by him to verify. Upon arrival at the camp, they found that everything that [name] said was true...indeed, due to the intervention and the action of [name], the total annihilation of the Westerbork camp and its approximate one thousand inmates was prevented.
Manipulation of specific words and phrases, were used to imply exactly what the Deceiver wished a Receiver to think without stating it specifically. For example, with a cursory reading of the following text, it appeared that the friendship with the Brigadier-General Allard is mutual and planned as an annual lunch visit together. On closer inspection of the wording, it is possible that the alleged friendship is actually a yearly scheduled Armistice Day parade where the two men both happened to be.

On Armistice day we used to get together to celebrate the day and to commemorate the lives of fallen soldiers...Every Armistice day we were together...And we got together every Armistice Day and had lunch with the wife and he became a good friend of mine.

The additional inference that the Deceiver and his wife had lunch, may or may not be as suggested, with the Brigadier-General himself. However the positioning of words in the sentence implied as much. It led an individual Receiver or audience to understand the meaning as the two men arranging to see each other yearly, and further implied the important factor, that the two men were friends. A Receiver would have no way of checking such details. In addition, if a Receiver expected to be told the truth, the friendship implication likely set a solid stage of believability on which the balance of the hero/liberation deception rested.

Given that manipulation of wording and word placement in a sentence could lead to a faulty interpretation, the Deceiver had given himself one of two conversational directions if he was challenged. He could allow a Receiver to believe the falsehood, or the Deceiver could retract the statement claiming ignorance, miscommunication or as an unintentional slip, then re-form a response. In the following excerpt, it is possible that the Deceiver designed his wording to appear that he was destitute and completely alone in Holland after the war. However, he qualified his
statement with the words "pretty well", which allowed the Deceiver some interpretable space to alter his meaning to say that almost all of his relatives were dead. He states, "The previous one I showed you [the picture] there was from my father's side, all the relatives, and these are the relatives who got killed in either Sobibor or Auschwitz from my mother's side. So you notice pretty well, all my relatives are gone". Many Receivers and audiences likely took the former meaning as intended. If they did, then his narrative could move along more smoothly without having to justify the presence of a sister. It increased the emotional appeal to regard the Deceiver as a lone survivor. Reading the above more closely, it is possible to miss the detail that although maternal relatives had died, he had in fact, several paternal relatives of whom he failed to mention.

A more serious manipulated meaning is contained in the Deceiver's translation of the historical terms, "Haganah" and "Aliyah". The Deceiver disguised the meaning of "Haganah", telling his audience that it meant "the help to the children". In actuality, "Haganah" translates as "defence", and was the name for the Jewish paramilitary group that operated between 1921 and 1948. It was created as an insurgent force against the British rule in Palestine operating illegal exodus boats to Israel (Levine, 2002). The Hebrew term "Aliyah", meaning "ascent", is the term given to describe when Diaspora Jews moved to Israel. Speculatively, the Deceiver manipulated the translation so that Receivers "would believe that children were the focus of the paramilitary effort and his post-war activities. The Deceiver manipulated a Receiver's limited understanding of the Haganah underground work to imply it was a children's aid programme, to make himself sound more noble as he described it.

So, finally, these kids [from Holland, France, Belgium and Romania] we got 500 of them to Holland. And they went in that big building...where they mend people in Apeldoorn,
Holland. And they were there and they were educated and prepared for Haganah and Aliyah, for the Aliyah and all the shaliachs there, teaching them and everything and ...these kids, all of them, went to Israel.

Neologism.

The Deceiver coined a word to express how he interpreted the collective experience of enduring evil and suffering during the Holocaust years. The word "unbeclumacable" seems to add layers of emotion to his script of Nazi horrors and discrimination, despite the fact that he did not experience a concentration camp.

As a matter of fact when it gets to talk about it, and you find the words, it was very bad, it was - you cannot find the words. I made a word myself, I made a word because there is [no word]. You said, it was atrocious, it was this - no no - it was unbeclumacable..

There has to be a new word for what the Holocaust was because there isn't a word in the whole dictionary.

Given that the Deceiver needed to emphasize his own pain and suffering, it is probable that the term he introduced, placed a Receiver in uncharted territory of what the Deceiver meant when he spoke of historical factors. In other words, the use of a new term may have convinced a Receiver that the Deceiver had exclusive knowledge about the Holocaust is exclusive. Thus the Deceiver concocted a word. "Unbeclumacable. And I know the the word, what it means. That it is the worst that there has ever been in the world. Unbeclumacable".

By constructing his own word, with a self ascribed meaning, the Deceiver strategically attempted to change the focus of attention so that a Receiver is unable to comprehend its meaning. The Deceiver has the ever present option to alter the meaning slightly. It appears that the Deceiver
used the word in the hero portion of the narrative, to adjust the tone of the conversation, or to possibly solicit a more intense response from a Receiver. In one interview, the following phrase using the term were repeated several times. "I will never find peace...you cannot find the words. I made a word myself. I made a word...it was "unbeclumacable".

Despite the similarity in sound to an English word, it is not. However the commonly used English prefix "un" and suffix "able", do infer a negative resonance. The word does not appear to have a Dutch root word but does link linguistically to the Hebrew script (אָנַבכַּלָּם). Client 200 translated the Hebrew symbol for the researcher, before being aware of its source. He translated it as meaning, "It's actually two words, meaning "I am nothing". It is a translation which could invite in depth psychological inquiry regarding the Deceiver, his deception and his choice of a concocted word. The Deceiver never uttered "unbeclumacable" in the presence of Client 200.

**Overwhelming with verbosity.**

Despite his denials that he was not a speaker, the Deceiver seemed to demonstrate in his interviews and letters, that the opposite was true. In several instances the Deceiver referred to his propensity to chat at length. "And when we got to the doctors' office, the receptionist, talking with her, was a middle aged woman and I talk, more talk and anyway". In personal correspondence, the Deceiver suggested that he could say much about his experiences. "I can write a book about all I have experienced although I do not feel like doing it, although the people at the Holocaust Center tell me that I should do so".

He had a natural interest to engage with people around him, although it appears he favoured being central in the activity or conversation. In fact, according to his family, specifically Client 200, he was very charming, friendly, verbal, to the point of being overwhelming on occasion. From the
interviews, it is noticeable that an overabundance of words are used to state one fact or one event. This tendency is particularly evident in the portions of the Deceiver's narrative that seem pre-scripted and/or memorized in a delivery form. Client 200 found this to be very frustrating when he asked his uncle questions and could not get past a wordy script.

In [the Deceiver's] case, but in a lot of these cases, when you ask an off question not something in their mainstream, you want to see them stop and ponder. And when they can slip right into a new explanation, then you wonder....I think [my uncle] and maybe other folks like him, they've got a lot of these paragraphs and they're not willing...to give me a different slant on this thing.

**Reframing collective experiences as personal.**

The Deceiver constructed his hero/liberation account by transferring stories which belonged to another family member, a friend or collectively the Dutch Jewish population, into his narrative. Although the Deceiver's narrative is a phenomenological perspective of the sufferings during that time, and thus does have a personal perspective of collective experiences, many of his statements became inaccurate, in that he was the "lone wolf" as he claimed, in the experience. By purposefully converting "we" accounts to an "I" account placed a stronger emphasis on his own victimhood or his own successes. The Deceiver used a plethora of first person pronouns. A synopsis of some "I" conversations (including minimal context), which were collective experiences but he attributed to being individual experiences, are listed below:

As a matter of fact, when I got caught..

I was fingerprinted, I was only 19 years old at the time...

But the hiding time, I knew I was safe...
I couldn't be out on the street, and I didn't go out...so I haven't been outside for practically 18 months....

I was hiding there for 18 months and food was getting scarce...

When I came to the camp Westerbork...

And he radioed back to his commander that it's true, what I told...

when I emigrated to Canada...

I haven't got a day to commemorate my parents...

After the war when I came out of it, after the war, I was alone...

I am a Holocaust survivor...

I was liberated by the Allied forces.

Repetition.

The Deceiver appeared to value repetition. It is possible that he repeated certain ideas which he wanted entrenched as fact. In the following example, the fact to establish was that he escaped from Kamp Westerbork. Thus he stated that he escaped from several situations, which reinforced the critical idea of escape from Kamp Westerbork. He left it as an unfinished portion of the story so that the interviewer picked up the thread of thought. After stalling to answer the interviewer so that she felt she was unheard, she pursued her question, implying that escape was now a fact. The communication exchange between the Deceiver and the interviewer identified a savvy use of repetition with an unrelated script of the conditions of Polish concentration camps. It appeared to embed the notion of escape even further, the interviewer subsequently using the exact word necessary for the Deceiver to continue with his deceptive narrative.

[Interviewer], "And how did you escape from Westerbork?"
Because I know you escaped". (Italics mine)

[Client], "We could hear the sound, well first I'd like to tell you something else". [long section of script not included]

[Interviewer], "So what happened? Go back again for me though to Westerbork. How did you get out"? (Italics mine)

Sometimes the repetition appears as a memorized or disingenuous script. The following three excerpts demonstrate one subject, that of being a silent survivor. The Deceiver consistently used exact or similar words and phrases across a wide variety of sources: interviews, speeches, personal letters and media. In the following excerpts, the key word/notion was "survivor".

In a family letter: Survivors can be silent, lecture, publish their story, all of these contribute to future memory, but memory is more than words, I know that the Holocaust happened even though years of study have convinced me I will never arrive at a level of real understanding. How do I know you may ask? I know because I was there, I experienced it...Today I want to transfer my memory to you.

In a newspaper article: Survivors tend to be silent. For 48 years I did not talk about it".

In an interview: Survivors can be silent. Like me I was silent like I told you for 48 years...they contribute to memory. But memory is more than information and more than words. I know the Holocaust happened. I know, because even though years of study have convinced me that I will never arrive at the level of real understanding ...How do we know I may ask? I know because I was there, I experienced it...that's why today I want to transfer my memory to you.
Righteous indignation.

Sounding upset or angry could be useful to bring the Deceiver the focused attention he desired. The Deceiver appeared to employ a gamesmanship style, to portray being unfairly offended. It fit with the personality descriptors of the Deceiver, such as of self-focus and self-justification, as well as with the descriptors of being remorseless and authoritative. The Deceiver played the wounded role effectively when his deception construction required being taken seriously. The venting of anger could be contrasted with extremely quiet words, which seemed to lend further dramatic effect. It was noticed in the following exchange.

[Interviewer], "And why do you think you got caught"?

[Client] [LOUDLY] "I don't know I don't know...You want me to tell the story the way I told it before then I will do that"!

Initially at least, the interviewer seemed to downplay any confrontational possibilities in order to maintain the relationship status as indicated in the following response. She demurred, "If you want."

Raising the voice in a conversation could be a warning to the listener of impending confrontation or anger. Several times the Deceiver lowered his voice to talk before suddenly raising it to make moral statements, such as against dignity for all humans, or indignant statements, such as when calling the Nazis "Bastards", or that he would go "crazy"; the angry tone was an excellent tool to control the interpersonal communication. It was observed that the indignant tone frequently occurred when a falsehood was inserted. In this example, the indignant strategy is used before the Deceiver calmly inserted the invitation to view his pictorial proof of his deception, the "proof" itself suspected as being fraudulent. "[LOUDER] I wish I could have them, one of them in my hands."
[QUIETLY]. Bastards. [PAUSE] This picture is the, how do you call it, the attest from General Allard". The suddenness of the change between indignation and normal conversation seemed to unsettle the communication between the Deceiver and the individual Receiver as the interviewer, or when Client 200 and the Deceiver communicated.

**Specific word emphasis.**

When the Deceiver wished to increase believability on his key points, he used specific words often enough to normalize them, aiming, perhaps, to have the Receiver unintentionally mimic the Deceiver's word choice. Thus, the Receiver validates what the Deceiver has spoken, allowing for the Deceiver to build his deceptive story, one step at a time.

Key words included those such as: attest, alone, atrocities, children, saved, and won. Several key words were also the most frequently used words (see Table 2).

**Superlatives.**

The Deceiver was exceptionally adept in the usage of superlatives or superlative adjectives for constructing his conversations with individual Receivers, audiences, or interviewers. Superlatives, alliterating words and subsequently the repetition of the same superlatives punctuate the story creating a sense of urgency and superiority. A small sample of chosen superlatives appears to affect the positive reception of the Receiver.

It was just amazing, it was amazing for Dutch people to live in Holland was just wonderful, wonderful.

It was so wonderful - so beautiful...we were so integrated...we were so Dutch.

That day I saw the most gruesome thing I've ever seen in my whole life. The most gruesome, gruesome thing.
They died in a horrible, horrible, horrible situation.

The Brigadier General was there too - a big man, giant, big man...he said in his very heavy voice...

I could never, never understand what a mentality and I've seen pictures, I've seen so many, many, many things.

Discrimination has killed more people than anything else in the whole world.

Discrimination is deadly. Discrimination is the worst thing there is.

I have tens and tens of thousands of letters...from the children...I get the most amazing letters from children...I wish I could speak to all the kids in the whole world.

**Tactical humility.**

The Deceiver's savviness occasionally found that a reversed psychological approach would be useful to his goal, when sensing that a Receiver would engage better if he feigned humility and self-deprecation into his conversation. He baited the Receiver by appearances of humility as he did with this individual. Self deprecatory remarks inserted into the conversation initially seemed to attract and engage the Receiver. In this example, self deprecation began the relationship between the Deceiver and the Director of the Holocaust Memorial and Education Center.

There was a man with a white collar, was a nice guy, happened to be a black man, he came over to me, he was a priest of some kind...and I said to him, I said, "I look like an outcast, I'm not a soldier, I'm here for the reason to commemorate my parents. I'm a Holocaust survivor myself. "You're a Holocaust survivor! Maybe you'd like to talk to the
boys"? I said, "No, no, no, no, I'm sorry I cannot talk", and he said, "Well". I said, "No, are you kidding, I'm not a speaker. No no no no". Anyway he came back to me later...and finally I said, "Oh my god, I give in already". And then I said, "okay".

The Deceiver aspired to be in the speaker circuit. The following speech begins with humility and humanness, identifying as a victim, a Holocaust survivor and having lost family to concentration camps. The irony is that he is speaking and thanking American war veterans for liberating him in Holland, those who were least likely to be familiar with the Canadian liberation events of World War II in Holland. However the tactical humility seems an efficacious way to engage the audience he was addressing.

And I went down there...there was a man there, he was a priest of some kind...and I said to him, I said, "I look like an outcast, I'm not a soldier, I'm here to commemorate my parents. I'm a Holocaust survivor myself...I'm not a speaker"...I said to them, "I'm a Holocaust survivor. I was liberated by the Allied forces and I'd like to thank you guys very much for what you have done and if it wasn't for you guys then I wouldn't be here".

An introductory exchange with Steve [surname] used a similar humility tactic successfully. "He said, "Well come and just see what doing there". So it was so busy there and ever since I've been talking up 'til today".

Tangential details/explanations.

Details added interest to the Deceiver's narrative. Details appeared to substantiate the account. However, details and long explanations detoured a Receiver or audience listeners from the main point, especially if the point was a question. Expounding on a series of details may obfuscate parts of the deception, bewildering the Receiver with unnecessary trivia. When an interviewer asked,
for example, about switching roles from being an inmate to being a guard, his reply appeared to deflect her (quote is first section from a lengthy reply).

What was it like? [PAUSE] It's very difficult even to, to express myself about it...but you can never, never, never get back what they did to you and what they have done to you, bodily, mentally, in every respect. ...all these people, they never, and all those Dutch collaborators, Holland had per capita, compared to other countries who were occupied by Germany, Holland had the most collaborators of all the other occupied countries.

If the details included verifiable facts that a Receiver could latch onto, they could help to diminish suspicion. In the following example, the interviewer questioned the client about the whereabouts of his sister and mother, a topic he avoided; the Deceiver deflected with tangential details of the Nazi Occupation restrictions forced upon the Dutch Jewry.

All of a sudden I became the man of the family at a young age. Proclamation came. Jews not allowed on the street after 8 o'clock. Reason for this was they were going to round up the Jewish people now (sigh) 8 o'clock in the evening curfew. Not allowed on the street, you had to be home, Every night, Every night they came into the streets. They had a list. Because of those ID cards.

The unrequested explanation continued, detailing lists, ID cards, sitting at home in fear, public speaking, right words to say, anxiety, neighbours, playing ball on the street, suitcases, and into the story of the first arrest and eventual escape. The original question of the status of his sister and mother was deflected and thus nullified.
Tropes.

The term "trope" means the use of representational words to explain a recurrent theme in a narrative. Client 200, the principal Receiver, was aware of the Deceiver's predilection to using tropes, believing it was a short-cut for him to attract audiences with familiar motifs from the war years. Tropes can conceal deception because they have truthful elements. He stated that the Deceiver incorporated several stereotypical comments about both the Nazis and the Jewish population into his narrative, one trope apparently being a common one. It related the loss of many Dutch Jewish children, and how they could have lived their lives.

From the million and a half children who died, today there could have been geniuses like Einstein, there have been so many geniuses among Jewish people, Dr. Jonas Salk...there have been so many Jewish geniuses in literature, in music, in every aspect.

This trope appeared to be useful as a counterpoint to his self proclaimed rescue of a thousand people, including such young children, in the camp. It may have supported his self acclaimed purpose of speaking to child audiences.

In another example, the trope reflected a general representation of war conditions in the country. "And I escaped...in the direction of the artillery fire...then I got between two fighting armies. Bullets were flying everywhere".

Verbalizing concerns for children.

The Deceiver claimed to have instigated his hero/liberation story in order to combat Holocaust deniers and to impart anti-discriminatory messages to child and youth audiences.
But the reason that I going out to schools and to colleges, universities and high schools to speak to young people because young people have to know for their own protection. So I do that because I have a legacy to do that.

Children being killed in concentration camps became an excellent theme to compare to Nazis enjoying their own children, a hypocrisy. Identifying such truths served to gain emotional value for the Deceiver's hero/liberation narrative.

How could they go on Christmas home to their wife and their children and bring them toys for the kids, or a doll for their own kids and play with them while they were killing millions of children themselves, Jewish kids?

The Deceiver's speeches which included the genuinely difficult hardships children encountered were not congruent with apparent attitudes he seemed to demonstrate. It appeared from his monologues, that children were dispensable or at least were of lesser importance than adults to the Deceiver. Although the potential smothering of an infant has been mentioned as a questionable action, it is a prime example that his survival had a greater value, and outweighed other concerns. He demonstrated the same self-assessed value of children when claiming that his quest to send orphaned children from parts of Europe to Israel for the sake of Israel, was the best for the child.

But an awful lot did not give the children back. Which I understand. They had these kids for say, two or three years, they got to love the child....but hey hey hey, we lost so many after the war, we were left with over from the 140,000 to 25,000 Jewish people in Holland, we'd like to get back as many as possible in the community to build it up again.

In fact, Client 200 countered his uncle's purported smuggling of children out of Holland as true, in that he stated that there was a huge concern in Holland to keep as many Dutch children in
Holland after the war, because the Jewish community had shrunk so precipitously from 120,000 to about 12,000 persons.

It is interesting that the Deceiver appeared to have preferred child and youth audiences. It seemed to be an audience that could not discern deception, if it existed or challenge his narrative.

I did it for five weeks in January 1992 and seeing the attention and the reaction the children gave me, made me realize the Holocaust survivors have a legacy...I have told my story to 28,000 children...for the second time there will more than 40,000 children coming to see it and listen to the story. I will tell...and I tell the children when I speak to them that this is very unique opportunity that they have.

*Verbalizing loss/suffering.*

Loss and suffering, grief and pain are universal experiences that engaged listeners well. The Deceiver seemed to use the theme of loss to disseminate many details so that all Receivers focused on their feelings rather than the truthfulness or accuracy of the story. For example, in one interview, the question was about the Deceiver's abusive actions he did as a guard, to inmates after the Liberation. His lengthy reply, a diversionary explanation about having a painful bowel problem he suffered through which required hospitalization to correct, focused listeners on his own suffering as more important than the sufferings of someone he treated despicably. In a further example, after the interviewer had listened at length to the Deceiver, about the preliminary interrogation at Kamp Westerbork, the Deceiver shifted to his grievances over his personal suffering of the loss of feeling and flesh in his thumb from doing battery work. It was an effective diversionary tactic.

[Interviewer], "So he was embarrassed"?

[Client], "Well I don't care if he was embarrassed... And then I was put in a work
commando to do batteries...My fingers, my thumbs were bleeding, all the flesh was out of my thumb, because I can do do something here with my finger that normal people cannot do, look, you get a whole bend in it. All that flesh on both thumbs is gone. I pushed it in - look here. There's nothing there".

*Verbalizing importance of winning*

Early on in the Deceiver's narrative, the Deceiver appeared to absolve himself from any responsibility about the estrangement with his sister, the inability to rescue his mother from the hospital round up, or situations when self preservation was to him, paramount. To a newspaper reporter he stated with equanimity, his actions were reasonable or acceptable considering the times. "I did other things with them that are maybe hard to understand [torture and murder] in this time and place".

When retelling his post-war security guard behaviours, he gave the impression that he could justify his revenge and despicable actions, as retribution for his suffering caused by the Nazis. "I asked him if he was hungry. I put his soup into the pee pot. I spit on his bread. I had revenge. My mother used to spit on bread. I have more stories, I can never get back what they took from me".

He appeared to justify his heroism account as if he had been keeping a scorecard. Although he made it sound like a competition to win over Hitler, his self-justification could lend the impression that he knew his narrative was a deception but that to him, one wrong equalized the other wrong. "I won over Hitler. I won. I won. And I tell you how. Zero, the score is 17 to 0, like a football match. Zero. He didn't kill me...with all my losses and with anything and everything, I still won".
Theme 5: Outcomes from Deception

Theme 5 findings are categorized into three units, reflecting the effects of the deception. The first unit explores beneficial outcomes to the Deceiver while the deception is in place, such as prestige, awards, legacy, financial gain, and a sense of self winning over others. The second unit includes harmful consequences to the Receivers of the case study with references to experiences from the supporting case studies. Harmful outcomes encompass avoidance of the Deceiver, betrayal, lack of accountability and fact checking, and family estrangement. It also lists issues around loss, such as loss of reputation, loss of trust in the Deceiver as well as loss of trust in relationships. A compelling overarching loss collectively to the public, is the loss of trust towards similar narratives and specifically the Holocaust narratives. The final unit indicates current effects as truth and facts have emerged over time and the false heroism account is challenged and discarded.

Benefits to the Deceiver.

The Deceiver benefitted from his deception in three ways: psychologically, public acknowledgment of hero status, and financially. Client 200 reported that the Deceiver benefitted from a sense of having won over his perceived losses, having improved memories of his life's choices, and a sense of purpose for his sufferings.

But he gained a tremendous amount from it. And in the latter part of his life I think it gave him solace in some ways and meaning for an otherwise meaningless experience...his way of dealing with this despair may have been to create this story and to become a hero...And I think that's what [he] needed at the end of his life to be seen as a hero...so I think it's the psychological benefit of being a hero as opposed to simply being a victim. Client 200 continues to suggest that the psychological impact may have been the primary one.
But to me the bigger pay off was he had a psychological pay off that the reward for being a hero was just immense for him. You know beyond the monetary value was the psychological reward he got, it validated his life to some degree...yes that could be another part of the psychological benefits that he gained was that his story was the one that's in the books. His story is the one that's on the Internet, [his sister's] isn't.

Secondly, the Deceiver received acknowledgement as a hero, through his speaking engagements and interviews, receiving multiple awards and attention, and a knighthood from the Dutch royalty.

And for some people it is simply to have survived is their form of heroism and heroes can dine out, and other people will buy them dinner and I think for my uncle and for some people, that's what happens...so while he didn't need to be a hero to be a witness, his purported heroism gave him a wider audience to speak. And so there are recordings of his on the Internet and the archives and the University of South Florida, so he's gained a piece of what could call symbolic immortality by speaking his story as constructed...when he was buried, he was buried as Sir [name], you know he was knighted by the Queen of Holland.

Thirdly, Client 200 knows that the Deceiver benefited from extra income, extra pensions as a resistance fighter and financial rewards as a Dutch war hero.

There were two forms of benefits he received: one was the within the Dutch pension scheme war heroes get more money. So there was a simple thing he was able to get, have a better pension from the Netherlands. Gaining Euros...and so he made money on it.
Harmful consequences to the Receiver(s).

Client 200, the principal Receiver, Client 220, the Deceiver's sister, Client 240, the Deceiver's Dutch nephew as well as the Receiver's family, shoulder the largest proportion of negative effects of both the sibling and liberation deceptions. Five areas of negative effects are noted: family tensions and estrangement, sense of betrayal, loss of trust, loss of reputation, and ongoing psychological trauma. Estrangement, when a family has been decimated by war, was most difficult to accept.

But he, you know, cast her in such a way that the [North American] family,...the stories kept us from them, kept her and my cousin from having a relationship with the family...

So it put my cousin at a very difficult position vis-a-vis his mom and this desire for a reconciliation between his mom and...her younger brother, which never happened.

Client 200 states that estrangement was purposefully perpetuated by the Deceiver, her brother, although the sister made effort to reconnect with him.

You see the question I guess is, did she not want to see him or did he not want to see her. Because my sense was that she was always willing to - she was willing to make that connection, and he wasn't willing to make that connection.

A very real sense of betrayal existed for Client 200, as it challenged his long held admiration for and enjoyment of his uncle.

When you lose faith in the stories that you've been given to you, it shakes, I mean it really does shake you up...when I, in a sense [his]story, you know, I discovered this in my mid to late forties...who do you trust then, you can't trust your grandfather, your [uncle], do you trust your parents?
The Receiver commiserates with his aunt in Holland about the betrayal. "It's unfair for my aunt to have lived this hell of, you know my uncle's making, in a sense, for seventy years now". In fact, the deception betrays the extended family as they deal with concern and loss of trust in the family as a whole. "And, and so in this story, in this family story, once this becomes clear that, you know, that delusion of my uncle's will create hell around, you know, [to] the family in a way".

The Receiver maintains concern for his uncle's wife's welfare and her family's connectedness, feeling she had to have been aware of her husband's multiple deceptions for the last twenty-five years at least.

I think about my other aunt, [his] wife....she had to have known, she had to have known that it was a deception...But you know we all make out own bargains...that's the way she deals with it. And I really feel bad for those kids [grandkids] because they are really, really fine young people...and I don't think they deserve to have been inflicted, you know to have this deception inflicted on them.

Not only family members would be negatively impacted by the hero/liberation story being discounted, it would also confirm suspicions that acquaintances in Montreal had. Client 200 speaks for a community that may be affected by a Holocaust survivor, one of their own, conspired to have a fraudulent story, to add to his fame and fortunes. " When [he] died,...it was that the Dutch, there were aspects of the Dutch community that didn't believe [his] story at all...that [he] had constructed a story".

More widely, the societal effect from the liberation deception is threefold: lack of clarity and accuracy of historical facts, concern for loss of reputation of Holocaust narratives as a whole, and worse, substantiation that the Holocaust was fabricated for Jewish financial and collective benefit.
And so in that sense, [he] and other people who create these constructs, they make it hard to understand that past...and that at a large level, I think it diminishes all the stories of survivors because you don't know if the next person is also giving you a constructed story to make themselves potentially look better or look more heroic.

**Effects of truth emergence.**

The high stake deception will lose its stronghold as the liberation story hoax is held accountable to the verification of facts. Client 200 who values knowing the truth, holds that it is a necessary task. "I mean I have to feel as a scholar of some sort that the truth does matter to some degree or that I can get to the truth." Other family members, such as grandchildren, could be traumatized to know the truth as it would challenge their trust and belief in the goodness of their grandfather. "They [the Deceiver's children] don't want to know about this story and that's for them really I guess to decide but the people I feel bad about are my cousins' children, because they worshipped their grandfather". The truth is that their grandfather was a victim of the Nazi attempt at a Final Solution, as were all Jews in Europe, but he was not a hero. The truth may challenge their trust in the world at large.

I think most of the grandchildren, you know and the loss of trust in the world when, when and if this comes out and they learn that their uncle, their grandfather, was not a hero. He was just, you know, he was a victim.

Not only is the Receiver interested in uncovering actual facts, but Dutch historians continue to work toward the completion of their investigation of the truth as well.

You know the Dutch historians are now doing that kind of research, you know they're, they're I think they realize that [his] story just went way too far without any credible fact
checking...But we have been in touch with the museum in Holland at the concentration camp in Westerbork. And they are trying to get to their professional level of confidence as to what actually happened at the end of the story.

A severe lack of checking facts, as they appeared in the heroism account, allowed for the story to become implanted, accepted and assumed as correct. The Deceiver's story was able to advance unchallenged because he used his victim/survivor suffering position.

I think he counted on the fact that people who went through these experiences of concentration camps and oppression...are rarely questioned because we're way too sensitive to ask them are you really telling us the truth or not, or what degree of truth?

Most egregious, is the evidence that was purported to substantiate the heroism account. The letters allegedly from the Canadian General, have made him complicit in the deception, and liable for loss of reputation posthumously. The attest seem supportive, however checking them for authenticity may indicate they were tampered after a signature was applied, or worse, forged.

He had the letter from the General in Quebec to attest to the story, but even there, someone should have said, you know, those troops up in the front find a kid, right and they bring him to a General? I mean how crazy is that, right? Generals don't interrogate twenty year olds...no matter what's going on....Yeah so no one, no one questions [his] story.

The Dutch foundation for Resistance fighters, the Stichting 1940-1945, has not checked the liberation account to verify the Deceiver's claim of membership in the official Dutch Resistance.
I had his documentation from the Stichting, from the Foundation 1940-1945,...It's a long
document about his activities through the war years...he didn't talk to the Stichting until
the 1990's, I think that's when he made these claims. And I think no one, no one
did the checking.

The truth that the liberation of Kamp Westerbork was conducted by the VIII RECCE and the
Second Lieutenant, Client 210, as documented by Dutch historians, will cause family members as
they realize belatedly, that their husband/father/grandfather was deceptive and an imposter.

I think they're going to learn, when the historians of Westerbork finally get their act
together and get the story out, they're going to learn that their grandfather was, was a
deceiver, was deceptive, was not telling the truth about something very, very important in
the lives of our families.

As stated, by 2005 Dutch historians had confirmed for themselves that the first liberator of
Kamp Westerbork was the VIII RECCE patrol headed by the Second Lieutenant of the Canadian
Infantry and not the Deceiver as he claimed. The Dutch historians from Kamp Westerbork
demonstrated their factual conclusion by inviting the former Second Lieutenant and his wife to the
60th anniversary of the Liberation of Holland events as their guests, expenses covered by the Dutch
government.

I can find all the exact dates but they invited him to speak at the, and to be at the 60th
anniversary of the liberation of the camp. They didn't invite [the Deceiver] And again, to
me that's an indication that the historians of Westerbork were aware that they had been
deceived...but they invited and they flew at their cost, at the museum's cost at Westerbork,
[Client 210] and his wife to Amsterdam and then up to Westerbork to be there.
The weight resting on the historians remains that they alter the records, publicize their findings, possibly supported by this research, in effect preparing the possibility for a retraction of any awards or prestige accorded the Deceiver.
Discussion

"Oh! What a tangled web we weave, when first we practise to deceive".

(Scott, 1808)

Summary of the Purpose of the Study

The oft quoted verse from Sir Walter Scott's ballad *Marmion*, compares the complications and compromises when people lie, to being entangled in a spider's web. What is unidentified is what sits surreptitiously at the centre of the web. Quite patient, yet quite lethal, a multi-legged arachnid waits, until some precise moment arrives to strike and disable an unsuspecting passerby that underestimates the danger inherent in the silky, undulating threads it constructed. The apt metaphor elucidates that it is the web that does the devious capturing of its prey, then the predator devours.

As this specific case study unfolded and was deconstructed, it has been useful to appreciate the web analogy. The network of tactical manoeuvring, which included the scripting of a deception narrative, the creating of a desirable persona, and the managing a relationship with strategies which directed and supported the central lie, has been examined. It was the timely convergence of historical dimensions and context that formed the base to which were attached partial truths and deceit. The sum of the parts became increasingly difficult to untangle as to what was deception versus what was true. Metaphorically then, the complex structure of the deception process resembles the hundreds of web strands, the believability of the deception is the "stickiness" of the web, and the Deceiver is the predator, satisfied with overcoming his "catch", the targeted Receiver.

The false heroism/liberation narrative, the deceptive web, was constructed almost a half century after World War 2. It was a story interwoven with fact and fiction, that once delivered, confused and impacted a wide spectrum of family, associates, former Kamp Westerbork survivors,
and historians. The deception was dismantled by the year 2005, by several Dutch historians who believed that the true facts clearly pointed to the account of Client 210, (2nd Lieutenant [name], of VIII RECCE unit, 7th Troop, 2nd Div. Canadian Infantry) as the accurate liberation narrative of Kamp Westerbork inmates. Client 210 was invited by historians to attend the 60th year celebration ceremonies of the liberation in Holland. They honoured him for his part in the liberation of Kamp Westerbork in the line of his military service, whereas Client 230, the Deceiver, was neither invited nor recognized. In fact, in 2015, the curator of Kamp Westerbork declared that, in his opinion, Client 230's liberation account was utterly false and an unprecedented deception.

The purpose of this study is not to authenticate all the historical facts. Rather, selected historical aspects are presented because they are critical to the understanding of the deconstruction of the deception, demonstrating how context interacted with the elements of manipulation. The findings have been organized and deconstructed into five categories which parallel the themed units in the Results chapter. They are: 1) understanding the historical context as the base material for creating the deception narrative, 2) understanding the descriptive characteristics and the constructed persona of the Deceiver, 3) understanding the descriptive characteristics of the Receiver including comparisons with those of the Deceiver, 4) understanding the communication elements as it affected the interrelationship observed between the Deceiver and the Receiver(s). The final theme attempts to understand both positive and negative outcomes from the deception. The analysis and findings are examined against the Interpersonal Deception Theory. As part of the conclusion, limitations of the study are considered as well as future opportunities in research work which may expand the current findings from this example of high stakes deception.
Understanding Theme 1: The Context of the Hero/Liberation Deception

Context suggests what material the Deceiver used to construct his deception narrative. By outlining historical, familial or association factors, the background of the deception is incorporated into the understanding of both the construction and deconstruction of the overall high stakes deception.

Understanding the impact of generational deception on the Deceiver.

Certain people enjoy the game of domination. Both the Deceiver's grandfather and father deceived in their business and/or sexual relationships, without apparent remorse. This generational deception marks a critical turning point for the family, and in the researcher's opinion, specifically for the Deceiver. Client 200, the principal Receiver, explained that his extended Dutch family experienced a severe fracturing because of a business deception by the Deceiver's maternal grandfather. Apparently, the grandfather valued success over family relationships, as he cheated both the Deceiver's father and the Receiver's grandfather out of a considerable amount of money. Interestingly, the Deceiver's father did not choose to react by emigrating to the United States as the other branch of the family did, but decided to stay in Amsterdam. By staying on the family turf in Europe, the question remained unanswered whether the father may have condoned the deception along with his father-in-law.

Nonetheless, it is certain that his young son, the Deceiver in this case study, witnessed the inter-familial conniving, the benefits of achieving and winning by duplicitous means, and learned the skill of manipulation apparently without restraints of a conscience. It is also likely that by living in this environment, the Deceiver refined his observational skills of people. His savviness in making a sale in his father's tobacco business likely guaranteed a fatherly reinforcement of winning over
others. Although he strove to please his father, and later spoke in effusive terms about him, it does not appear they had the close bond, affection or approval from father to son, as the Deceiver tried to suggest. Yet, there are more references to the father than to any other family member. In a telling statement, the Deceiver hinted at the ongoing preoccupation with acquiring *paternal* not *parental* approval by telling the interviewer about his awards and successes that, "My father would have been damn proud of me. I am proud of me and I have a right to be".

The Deceiver's father had a tough, successful and cavalier image, a powerfully attractive combination of maleness to a young man who seemed to seek his father's attention fervently. He watched his father's covert liaisons with mistresses, those fortunate few, in his estimation, who could garner his father's time and attention. He watched a mother who seemed unstable and relatively helpless to change events. Together, these components of his upbringing, the intermittent approval from his father, the mother's ill health and likely anger about her husband's rejection, disparate grandparent attachments and sibling strife, all allowed for an assumption that a dark undercurrent of anger was brewing in the young man's thoughts. What is evident in the narrative however, is unadulterated rage when provoked, which appeared regularly in his life choices and circumstances. The rage seemed disproportionate to situations and was contrary to his groomed persona.

When recounting his narrative as a septuagenarian, the Deceiver referred to his having "won" over Hitler, and imagined himself receiving a belated paternal accolade. He states his father would be proudest of him for "winning" as "his Daddy". It was an oddly childlike term for an adult to use in conversation. As much as his father's arrest in October 1942 and later death in a concentration camp would have been difficult for any twenty year old man, the loss seems to have crippled his
emotional and interpersonal development, leaving him with a deepening sense of anger coupled with a desire for revenge and to win at every turn.

There is a pronounced uneven, unemotional reaction when considering the loss of his mother. The Deceiver made relatively benign references to her capture and ultimate death. It was apparent that the mother's death carried less traumatic weight than the father's. In fact, the unfulfilled attachment issues to his father and mother, along with the loss and trauma he experienced during the war, seemed to provide the fertile base from which he ruminated about unfairness, giving him a voice for vengeful thoughts and a sense of entitlement.

It is assumed that historical conditions culminating in Europe at that time, exacerbated his deep angst. Consequently, the most important legacy the Deceiver received from his father, his surname, had a disproportionate meaning to him. The heritage value associated with a name may not have been the primary appeal for the young man. Rather he may have believed it was his responsibility to perpetuate the indefensible reputation of his father, the tough, unbeatable, savvy and charming man who could sway opinions and swoon a woman. Although the Deceiver knew that generational discord and deceit had tarnished the family name in the Amsterdam, the Deceiver may have surmised that it was his legacy to repair it.

When he decided to reframe himself as a hero, he likely self justified that he was honouring his family name in the most expedient way. Perhaps the Deceiver's pursuit of an improved reputation blended with his need to keep seeking his father's approval, even if posthumously. As he deified his absentee father in conversation, he continued to pair the importance of his surname with his father's memory. For example, he expounded to audiences that his father's name, which had been "given to him", needed to be "lifted high", to be "exalted" and "not to change one letter of it". Yet the
first action he undertook after emigrating to Canada, was to anglicize his name by changing two letters, despite the usual practice of Dutch immigrants retaining their Dutch names in the new country. To uplift the name "higher" as he wished to see it, was eventually accomplished through an extraordinary plan of deception. It gained a knighthood, with the coveted addition of "Sir" to his family name. Metaphorically, the word "Sir" succinctly encapsulated what the Deceiver had achieved from his deception, all in "the name of the father".

Understanding the impact of the sibling deception on the hero/liberation deception.

The researcher concluded from reviewing the findings that the Deceiver desired revenge upon both his sister and the Nazis equally. To him, they both represented the cause of his perceived "woundedness", a term coined to describe the perception of being victimized by specific persons when authority is misused or misappropriated (Farnsworth,1998). The Deceiver perceived he had "woundedness" from the day his father was deported by the hated Nazis; the researcher proposes that his emotional world collapsed that day. The blend of anger, confusion, hatred and helplessness was not suitably assuaged thereafter, by his pattern of blaming others. He blamed the father's mistress, blamed his sister and his aunt's niece, never admitting that he likely blamed himself. Instead his anger festered and focused on his sister.

Yet, for interviews and public displays, it was necessary to keep up the appearances of a strong family relationship. What the Deceiver did not include, was his current relationship with his sister. The narrative does not indicate any remorse for this lapse. Family references became increasingly useful to the Deceiver because it implied an emotional sameness with his listeners. Generally, family connectedness provided the smokescreen of normalcy, and clearly promoted his own self-image at the expense of his sister's.
The catalyst of the sibling deception, which likely had its roots of discord within the overall familial dysfunction, centred around what directions were given and followed after their arrest from the hiding place in Den Hague. The Deceiver's casual acceptance of the failed plan, his sister being shot and the two girls been arrested inferred that he, as her brother, was neither distraught nor concerned for her ongoing welfare. From the reaction that he had, it is likely that he did have intent to confuse his sister, using her to be a decoy for his own escape and self preservation. All his successes in his adopted country of Canada did not erase the gnawing subconscious rage towards her, nor did it reverse the sense of failure which caused him to exact revenge on her for his perceived victimhood.

**Understanding the impact of the historical context and timing on the hero/ liberation deception.**

When the Deceiver's serious health issues erupted in 1989, he encountered an unplanned threat to reaching his goal of refurbishing his family name and exacting revenge on his sister, the personification perhaps, of the outcomes of the Nazi occupation. The Deceiver likely had subsumed much of his generalized anger and blame of his sister for many years, in the commonly used skills of coping and avoidance. However, the unresolved sentiments of revenge likely resurfaced with the prospect of declining health. The urgency to "get back what they stole from him", was reignited after his hospitalization and propelled him to action to avenge himself in whatever manner it required to achieve redemption and recognition.

The researcher, in agreement with the principal Receiver, believed that the germ of deceit to form a redemptive narrative claiming a heroic escape and liberation of inmates at Kamp Westerbork, took root at this juncture in 1989. The Deceiver himself stated in an interview that during his serious
health issue that year, he contemplated his life and legacy while in hospital, and from then decided to speak of his experiences. It is interesting to note that the year 1989, was the centenary of his mother's birth.

Not surprisingly, the Deceiver rapidly explored the prevailing sentiments about victimhood and survivorship during the early nineties. The principal Receiver stated in his narrative that his uncle had "identified the Zeitgeist of the 1990's, the re-awareness of the Holocaust horrors and the newness, effect, [and the] attraction of the victim mentality". Clearly, the Receiver is correct given that the Deceiver presciently timed his sudden public narrative of heroism to coincide with other emergent events and increased public appearances of other survivors of the Nazi atrocities. From examining many elements of the 1980/1990's, the researcher concluded that the wider American audience was marketable for such a deception at that time, as well.

The Deceiver, in other words, recognized the historical context which was capturing interest and imagination during these years: the magnitude of suffering of Jews at the hands of the Nazi regime, the broad support of the nation of Israel, heroism in adversity, and collective apologetic efforts to disadvantaged or marginalized peoples. In return, the general public accepted with open hearts, the plethora of survival stories that became available. The trend of the 1990's, evident in literature and media, provided a timely paradigm around which victimhood and survivorship could potentially be exploited. The Deceiver constructed his narrative easily, based on familiar Holocaust themes of orphaned children, food scarcity, Jewish ghettos, loss of friends and family, and exodus boats filled with immigrants to Israel. He added bravado in overcoming adversity, boasted of his accomplishments, and enthusiastically claimed he was refuting Holocaust deniers.
It is likely then, that his desire to create a heroism/liberation story led him to resources to familiarize himself with Canadian military war operations in addition to knowing which commanders of the 2nd Division, the Royal Hamilton Light Infantry, and the 7th Troop or the South Saskatchewan Regiment might be available or alive, in order to acquire the supporting documentation he needed.

When the world's balance of power notably shifted in 1989, the ramifications of these cataclysmic events, such as the dismantling of the Berlin Wall, the changes to apartheid in South Africa and the East/West Germany unification, made spectacular headlines. A sociological shift took place in the western world, as interest in and condemnation of suffering and victimhood re-ignited in response to atrocities in regions such as Rwanda, Yugoslavia, and Bangladesh for example, raising generalized political, racial and cultural consciousness and activism. The Jewish population was not exempt from the increased consciousness around their survival identity that the Holocaust had produced.

By 1989, the American Jewish Committee survey reflected that, "There is little question that in the 1970's and 1980's, the Holocaust assumed a critical role in [the] self-definition as Jewish" (Cole, 1999, p.12). In tandem with this awareness, several Holocaust memorials emerged during the decade of 1985 to 1995. The Holocaust Memorial Centre in Montreal was founded in 1979. It produced its first exhibit titled, "Children of the Holocaust" in 1985, followed by their first permanent exhibition, "Splendor and Destruction" in 1989, the same year as the horrific massacre of students at the city's Polytechnique University. Across the border, the New York Holocaust Museum of Jewish Heritage opened in 1986, the Holocaust Museum in Florida in 1992, and on April 22,1993, the Holocaust museum in Washington D.C. opened. Because public acknowledgement of
survivors was increasing in almost every state, funding for and volunteerism at Holocaust museums, accelerated.

Media awareness of the Holocaust was not far behind. Hollywood graphically exposed the Holocaust horrors in 1978, in the movie *Holocaust*, a saga of a Jewish family and their struggle to survive Nazi marginalization of the Jewish community.

One of the 120 million Americans who watched *Holocaust* was President Jimmy Carter. It is said that he was so deeply moved by the show that on May 1, 1978 he announced the creation of the President’s Commission on the Holocaust whose final report suggested the building of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM). The museum was planned and constructed during the 1980s and opened in 1993. It is situated in close proximity to the National Mall in the capital, next to the Washington Monument, the Jefferson Memorial and the Lincoln Memorial, and has become one of the major research facilities of the Holocaust. Its exhibitions, memorial events and research achievements have a decisive impact on the remembrance of the Holocaust (35 Years after the miniseries *Holocaust* website).

Years later the pivotal Spielberg movie, *Schindler's List*, in 1993, which was based on Thomas Keneally's book, *Schindler's Ark* (1982). It was critiqued by some as "the capstone of American commercializing of a European event" (Cole, 1999, p. 14). Nonetheless, for many audiences, it unleashed profound sympathies for the survivors of the Holocaust. Organized memorialization of the victims seemed the suitable antidote to disturbing evidences of societal dysfunction.

Survivor status became a new paradigm. It lent an identity that had never existed previously, one which assumed a moral authority (McLaughlin, 2012). There was a thirst to hear survivors tell
their life story through interview invitations from such authentic providers such as national newspapers, the Holocaust museum speaking circuit, Jewish Shoah foundations, and publishers. But by the beginning of the 1990's it was also evident that fraudsters had been attracted to the financial and prestigious benefits that were becoming part of the survivor identity.

By the mid nineteen nineties, for example, Carl Willner had already claimed he was a Holocaust survivor. He declared he was moved to speak out in response to Holocaust deniers, similar to the purported reason of the Deceiver in the case study. Similarly again, Willner chose audiences of children more frequently than adult audiences, allegedly for their edification on discrimination. Willner was an outright fraud.

A well known imposter, was the author of a book entitled *Fragments: Memories of a Wartime Childhood* (Wilkomirski website). Binjamin Wilkomirski, also known as Bruno Grosjean. He was first exposed as a fraud in 1988 by a journalist/writer exploring Grosjean's family genealogies (Lear, 2002). Another twelve years passed before the Swiss historian Stefan Maechler, confirmed the fraud in the year 2000. Despite clear proof and the substantiation of falsehoods, Wilkomirski continued to enjoy an elevated status, circuit media attention and speaking invitations as a Holocaust survivor until legal enforcement to quit, from a Swiss court. Maechler deplored Wilkomirski's case, fearing it was an example of the contemporary treatment of the Holocaust for self gratification purposes. Such fraudulent survivor stories were undergoing investigation in the decade that many genuine survivors were asked to tell their stories, most volunteering their time and energy altruistically rather than for personal gain.

The survivor identity enabled each victim to transform their memories into a "survivor mission" (Fermanglich, 2006, p.126) The purpose, according to Dr. Robert Jay Lifton, a psychiatrist
and authority on trauma effects of victims/survivors specific to the Holocaust, is that the "mission" can genuinely fulfill a sense of purpose. However, Lifton also revealed that some individuals who survived the Holocaust "felt compelled to create a new identity to "transform" themselves, to reshape and change their identities after having survived" (Fermanglich, 2006, p.127). He proposed that a survivor of war endured many losses and repeated terrors, and thus created a sense of powerlessness and extreme vulnerability. For some, they needed to regain a form of balance, thus they re-wrote their own narrative. These survivor/writers self-justified their new narrative, rather than let other people record or interpret for them. In other words, falsifying a narrative offered a self-redemption strategy. For an unethical few, a false narrative was profitable.

The Deceiver gathered the information and condensed it into a narrative draft sometime in the two year period following his health crisis. The Deceiver knew Kamp Westerbork well and knew the auxiliary historical facts. From these sources, he created a plausible account of escape and liberation, adding his own losses and exaggerating times of deprivation, to make it credible and moving.

Another source facilitated forming his convincing deceptive narrative. The Deceiver "borrowed" parts of other credible survivor stories. Remarkable similarities existed between several stories and his narrative. For example, the Deceiver claimed several parallels between he and Anne Frank, such as living in Amsterdam, being in a hiding place, being transported by train, and living at Kamp Westerbork. Despite the glaring differences in the degree of her suffering and death in the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp versus his twelve weeks at a transit camp, this connection effectively introduced him to the Holocaust Memorial Centre directors and child audiences beginning in 1992 (United States Holocaust Museum website, 2015). Given that the Deceiver could
be easily enraged over perceived sleights, the public's fascination with the Anne Frank diaries must have galled him for what notoriety she received not only as a girl, but also posthumously (Wolf, 2007). His successful linkage to her life account enabled his survivor story to have more impact, more notoriety and more financial gain than it merited.

A comparison with other escape accounts from Kamp Westerbork, noted otherwise inexplicable similarities, particularly the account of an escape from Kamp Westerbork by a fellow Dutch inmate, Philip Mechanius. The escapee, writing his account decades before the current Deceiver, does not claim any heroism. However, similarities are comparable to the Deceiver's escape account, notably crawling under barbed wire and swimming a canal (see Appendix "A").

"I crawled through the hole in the barbed wire and spent hours walking around until I came to a paved road. I knew there had to be somewhere a bridge to get to the other side of the canal, but I could not find a bridge. I then decided to swim across the icy canal" (Kamp Westerbork website, 2016).

Apparently the canal was a common destination for escapees from Kamp Westerbork, as it was south of the camp in the general direction of the advancing Allied liberators. Two hundred and seventy-six persons are said to have escaped via the Oranjekanaal (Kamp Westerbork website, 2016).

Other similarities are disconcerting. The Receiver pointed to the friendly exchange he had while attending the funeral of a friend's father, a bona fide Resistance worker. The son, an acquaintance of both the Receiver and the Deceiver, was a practising psychologist in Montreal, Canada specializing in cult behaviours. He expressed his concerns to the Receiver, that his own
father's story of Resistance operations, seemed "borrowed" to create the Deceiver's Resistance work story. Apparently the stories matched point to point.

The reproduction of a story and claiming it as his own, subsequently brought questions from Client 200, his nephew as well as others in the community, whether the Deceiver's alleged underground work was true. Did the Deceiver work with the resistance movement of the "Interior Forces", or with one of the three armed resistance teams, the LKP, the OD, or the RVV, the groups under the command of Prince Bernhard of the Dutch Royal family (Dutch Resistance website, 2016)? Or was the Deceiver a rogue resistance worker? Or was the resistance work he allegedly aligned, actually with the Haganah, an illegal paramilitary group aiming to derail the British forces in Palestine? He did admit to being involved with the Haganah, both in Europe and in Palestine between 1945 and 1948, and to smuggling operations during that period, but was he associated with them earlier? Any underground resistance actions had usefulness to the war cause but the Dutch Resistance claim specifically had post war financial benefits. With unresolved queries such as this, his later claims that he escaped and guided a liberation attempt were suspect.

**Summary of Theme 1.**

In summary, two factors of the context contribute to the construction of the deception. The historical context is the factual foundation of the Deceiver's deception narrative, the familial context is the motivation to conduct it. In order to conduct an analysis of the strategic elements of the hero/liberation deception, it is essential to know what history gave the Deceiver his material to prepare a scripted narrative in advance, and to know what context advanced the deception success.
Understanding Theme 2: The Deceiver's Descriptors

The Deceiver employed remarkable energy to uphold appearances of being a well grounded family man, deserving wholehearted respect as a socially moral, acceptable, trustworthy, altruistic, charitable, and heroic individual. He developed a secure base for his grand deception by constructing a social-cultural bedrock of family and friend connectivity. His narrative provided several self reported descriptors.

Understanding descriptors of family, friends and useful associations.

To the Deceiver, the American branch of the family provided opportunities of conviviality which honoured a long established tenet of Jewish heritage. The fractured family connectedness plagued members of the American/Canadian families as well as the Dutch family in Amsterdam with increasing consternation, because the latter had been completely estranged from the family by the Deceiver. Unwittingly, the American family became useful to the Deceiver as his familial supporters, and provided him an audience with whom he could practise his newly formed heroism story and his skills of persuasion. In addition he could assess their receptivity of his "proof" and "attests" of his liberation story.

Friends were a second level of involvement in his deception effort. The claim that someone was his "best friend" peppered the Deceiver's narrative frequently. Most best friends were deemed famous as well. It is speculated that his friendships were valued for usefulness not for sincerity. As such, he encircled himself with well known people, people in leadership or influential positions in charity work and philanthropic organizations. Collectively, such friendships offered two critical validations to the Deceiver, prestige by association and the appearance of social responsibility. In
this way, the Deceiver and his narrative were assumed to be authentic, because trust was imparted by association.

The Deceiver knew it was in his best interests to closely associate with local Jewish community groups, the Shoah Foundation and the Holocaust Memorial Centre in Florida, as well as the Jewish community, the synagogue, Rotary Club and Kings of Pythias group in Montreal. Any one of these societal groups provided a sense of belonging for the Deceiver, which in turn offered uncontested support to him. Given that the Deceiver needed to shield his deception from suspicion, the shared reputation with these acclaimed organizations provided him with a vicarious accreditation to his story. In other words, the associations and alleged friendships effortlessly, albeit unknowingly, condoned the Deceiver's constructed narrative.

Eventually, there were individuals in Holland and friends in the Jewish community in Montreal who confronted the principal Receiver with their suspicions of false or plagiarized facts in his uncle's hero/liberation narrative. In the United States however, the American associations generally remained unaware of factual discrepancies which sustained the Deceiver's image, prestige, and his constructed heroism/liberation account.

**Understanding descriptors constructing a public persona.**

Several factors such as charm, courageous adventuring and associations with other well known persons developed an appealing personal image. One key trait that could be faked was the appearance of humility through self deprecation. Humility is a characteristic which generally denotes noble character and was therefore useful to the Deceiver. The associated self-deprecation skill expedited Receiver relationships, because it encouraged social affinity, particularly when it implied intimacy or commonalities between a Receiver and the Deceiver. Shared personal
shortcomings and personal victories over suffering drew empathy. Listeners identified with the Deceiver vicariously through his tales which implied resiliency and heroism. It lent an important aura of genuineness, a "pretence to shore up the constructed persona", which became firmly rooted in empathy seeking disclosures (Peck, 1983, p.124). The Deceiver depended on his perceived authenticity of character, to advance the receptivity of his deception.

Understanding descriptors constructing a saviour paradigm.

The Deceiver delivered a forceful monologue denouncing the global ills of discrimination and demagogues, including that of Hitler and the Nazi regime. It provided him with the platform to construct a "saviour/redemption of the Jews" theme. The Deceiver likely delivered the speech to appear altruistic and morally superior, however his messages could appear cultish, in that his public proclamations of moral uprightness seemed incongruent with his own cruelties to people he hated. Additionally, the multitude of words he used to explain his humility, seemed to obscure self aggrandizement and self justification. Thus his saviour message was constructed as a decoy, an alternate message for the Receiver to absorb while they concurrently were exposed to the deception story.

The saviour theme had moral and religious overtones which apparently fit with the Deceiver's flexible position on religion. The researcher noted that he could alter his Jewishness to fit Christian audiences, could profess he was a faithful worshiper in the synagogue to Jewish audiences, yet could declare he was an agnostic to an interviewer. Some of his saviour references paralleled Christian imagery. In one example, the Deceiver stated that the transport to Westerbork in a train took three days and nights, subtly imparting the Christlike sense of suffering and entombment. The Deceiver's time in solitary punishment at Kamp Westerbork had a similar motif of suffering and
confinement. It is possible that he inserted religious overtones into his narrative to connect better with those listeners familiar with the concept of a saviour.

Nonetheless, the saviour theme appeared to link several descriptors of the Deceiver with specific incidents which were spoken as prologues to his heroism/liberation deception. Descriptors such as power over others through intuition, and his self acclaimed authority and leadership using his tough, bullish style and persuasion skills, connected several incidences to redemption opportunities, which he self-praised. The list of whom he "saved" prior to his incarceration at Kamp Westerbork, is long. For instance, he claimed he "saved" his peers in the Waterloo Square Gestapo round up, his sister and niece from work camps, his sister and mother from the first arrest in Amsterdam, his mother from being taken to a work camp, his sister in the second arrest, the family of four in the cupboard hiding place, his first fiancee's family to a hiding place, as well as saving several Jews by forging multiple documents.

The list continued that he saved Jewish children from foster parents, saved Israeli hopes of nationhood with smuggled goods and people, and saved the Romanian children from Iron Curtain regimes. Given his claims as hero/liberator of Kamp Westerbork, his ultimate redemption claim was saving 876 Jewish inmates from annihilation and bombardment.

The Deceiver's subsequent work within the speaking circuits about surviving the Holocaust added to his list of those he purported to "save". Most evident were the extraordinary numbers of people he influenced, which to the researcher gave the impression of self aggrandizement fed by considerable hyperbole. The numerical data that he used when referring to his audiences at the Holocaust Memorial were approximately four times that of the official statistics posted by the
website, for the same period of time (United States Holocaust Museum, 2015). There was no subtlety in his assertions that he was the saviour to any who would follow.

In stark contrast, those whom he chose not to save, or those who refused to obey his message, faced his rejection or their death. As such, the motif of the sacrificial lamb is added to the saviour theme. For example, he does not save his mother from the hospital round up. She died because he saved himself instead. His first fiancée chose to decline his instructions to go into hiding. She died, but he hid. He did not save his sister or niece at the arrest and escape effort but chose to save himself. His sister was injured, he was not. Each situation the Deceiver recorded which had a non-saving theme involved a woman, leading to speculation that his survival was paramount to theirs. The impression continued in the narrative that the Deceiver's self preservation had the highest value and that each woman's injury or death was their own fault. In other words, it "sets a stage to victimize someone else and in the process it is purposed to protect [the] fragile self image" (Akhtar & Parens, 2012, p. 97).

The Deceiver consistently claimed he could save others, but three months before the end of the European war, he could not save himself. A fellow worker had warned him that he might get caught doing Resistance work. "I never get caught", he said. But he did. In this he failed himself, necessitating years of calculation as to how he would construct his own redemption.

**Understanding descriptors constructing a victim/survivor paradigm.**

The Deceiver's descriptors of self as being primary, hardworking, determined and vengeful, integrated personal loss with a victim/survivor perception of himself. One impetus to adopt the victim/survivor role may have been the successful promotion of the diaries of Anne Frank by her father, first published in Dutch in 1947. The broad success in America of the book, titled *Her*...
Achter-huis, arose from being published in English (Frank, 1952). It was then transformed into a play in 1955, a movie in 1959 and a tourism destination in Amsterdam. Then the Frank family opened their home to the public in the early 1970's, so tourists could view the secret cupboard hiding place. The movie, The Attic, was released in 1988. Interestingly, the English version of her diaries was retitled as The Diaries of Anne Frank in 1989, the same year that the Deceiver had his pivotal health concerns and decided to enter his story into a survivor marketing opportunity.

Public appetite for information about the Holocaust fed a new genre in literature and entertainment. The Nobel prize winner, Elie Weisel, wrote about his unspeakable losses and deprivations in his book, Night (1960) which was widely read as a Holocaust memoir and became a symbol of remembrance (Fallace, 2008). The book, The Hiding Place, an autobiography of Corrie ten Boom, a Dutch woman who hid hundreds of Jews, and who was arrested and incarcerated at Ravensbruck, was published in the United States in 1971 to wide acclaim. It soon was followed by the movie of the same title in 1975. By 1972, several children's books had been published about the Holocaust. In April 1978, NBC television produced the mini-series, Holocaust (35 Years after the miniseries Holocaust website, 2013). In 1983, the diaries of another woman, Etty Hillesum, whose life was terminated in the concentration camp, was published (Hillesum, 1983). The preponderance of interest in the Holocaust outrage caused Weisel to state that "the theme of the Holocaust was no longer taboo" (Fallace, 2008, p.26). Global recognition of genocidal issues was increasing, but with that, came public recognition and a marketable commodity.

The Deceiver had verifiable survivor experiences. What distinguished him from many survivors was that he desired the notoriety of being a survivor. His hard working nature and determination provided the endurance and tenacity to make it happen. The Deceiver capitalized on
his own survivor/victimhood once he saw its power to expand his prestige. Specifically, his authoritarian traits, evidenced in being bullish and successful, confirmed to himself that he was a unique leader. His view of others as subordinate to him supported his paranoia, perceiving others as a threat to his purposes. This, in turn, seemingly nurtured his self-serving behaviours which indicated a strong sense of entitlement.

**Summary of Theme 2.**

Each of the descriptors attributed to the Deceiver connect to the deception construction by enabling the construction of a likeable and admirable persona. It followed then that his strategy to construct a deception fit his self organizing characteristics to reinforce his superior position. Given the variety of traits which satisfied his self centred goals, it is probable that the Deceiver was a narcissistic personality with features, that "may seek glory, wealth, position, power, and prestige as a way of continually reinforcing their superior image...and will resort to manipulative strategies to gain their ends" (Beck, Freeman, Davis & Assoc., 2007, p. 44). Clearly, the Deceiver's anger and retributive cruelties to people who disagreed or questioned his authority, exposed his fear of being diminished or discovered. Despite that his genuine identity as a survivor of the Nazi Occupation in Holland as a Dutch Jew would have sufficed to bring him a certain degree of notoriety, he viewed his survivor experiences only as an entry point. The core belief that he was superior, seemed to overcompensate for issues within his family of origin but carried him forward to his latter years. Thus he could justify reframing himself with the annexation of an incredible escape story that included a heroism and liberation deception which was to complete his self ascendancy schema.
Understanding Theme 3 - Receiver Descriptors

It became clear to the researcher that the Receiver spent an enormous amount of time attempting to rescue and care for others, including the Deceiver, his family and the targeted Receivers. As time consuming as it was, the Receiver believed that a positive outcome was reward enough. The principal Receiver for example, worked endless hours to reunite his aunt and cousin to the larger family in Canada. He was acutely aware of the family dysfunction and estrangement, yet pursued his mission in the context of caring and loyalty to all members of his family. This effort was well received by the aunt and cousin in Holland and has resulted in improved interpersonal relationships overall.

Understanding the Receiver's rescuing role in relationships.

The fundamental descriptor of the Receiver, by self report, is the desire to rescue others. It permeates through his parallel traits of anxiety, concern, and loyalty. Together, these traits, apparent to many who interact with the Receiver, are an attempt to make life easier for someone and to facilitate learning or life experiences. Rescuing is a form of his caring, planned in advance so that pain, hurt, disconnectedness and suffering are minimized. In the effort to reduce trauma and stress in others, he accelerates his own anticipatory anxiety of possible difficulties and confrontations he wishes to sidestep by keeping communication flowing between parties.

However, the Receiver was unable to rescue his uncle. He deeply desired that outcome. All his inquiries and research of his uncle's claim to heroism, were originally purposed to exonerate his uncle's liberation account. His research only deepened the awareness that his uncle had made up a false story. His anxiety stems from the concern about misrepresentation as dishonourable to the
extended family. It has been difficult for him to accept that he may not be able to rescue his uncle's children and grandchildren from the painful outcomes of the truth.

The Receiver described himself as valuing humanness, courtesy, and deference to others when needed. Such descriptors might suggest an introverted leaning with a person centred focus. As such, these traits were susceptible to the Deceiver's persuasive and ingratiating personality. The Deceiver, who could critique concern for others as a weakness, also considered it malleable to his causes. The Receiver's rescuer and loyalty traits appeared to be the first traits disrespected and mishandled by the Deceiver, because of the Deceiver's need for self-aggrandizement and need for recognition.

In the initial phase of the Deceiver/Receiver relationship the researcher noticed that the Receiver sensed there was an exclusivity to the Deceiver's adoration. But once the Receiver attempted to equalize the relationship, the Deceiver understood that effort as devaluing his worth of being superior or tougher than the Receiver. Moreover, the Deceiver seemed to embark on a relentless cycle of criticism of the targeted Receiver once their relationship was disengaged. It seemed that the Deceiver's evaluation was that she was mentally or even emotionally inferior to him. The non-targeted Receiver, who had invested caring, loyalty into the relationship, continued to seek to restoration of the former unity for some length of time. Other Receivers in the relationship circle of the Deceiver and Receiver, were likewise subdued, metaphorically in a domino effect, as they too, became fearful to engage in confrontations with the Deceiver. Unintentionally, the Receiver's rescuing and caring traits out of respect for family members, delayed the movement from suspicion of the deception to it being investigated earlier by themselves or by others.
Understanding the Receiver's analytical role.

The Receiver's analytical skill was highly honed, not for personal gain but for the pleasure it brought him to sense emotions and nuances in word meanings and to sense the needs and feelings of others. The Receiver tended to measure levels of intimacy and authenticity through relational, interactive communication exchanges. The Receiver was skilled in assessing such communication for congruency between verbal and non-verbal markers. However when incongruence was spotted, the Receiver tended to inflict self blame for relational problems. For example, it appeared that the principal Receiver's analysis of the Deceiver accurately detected deception relatively early in the relationship, but the Receiver's analysis of the potential impact on others, created enormous anticipatory anxiety levels. That anxiety initially prevented him from confronting his uncle and the deception. Yet, it was the ability of the Receiver to analyze over time, and to overcome his anxiety, that has brought a degree of restoration to family connectedness.

Comparing descriptive statistics of the Deceiver and Receiver.

The computerized NVivo query and analysis were minimally useful to this research because it could not satisfy a complete analysis of all available sources nor could it provide a comparative analysis across traits as they contribute to elements of strategy, accountability and detection. Frequency of words in text, analyzed from the 2010 Klein interview, only reflect specific words and phrases at one time in one set of interviews. The analysis of frequencies can suggest commonalities in a small slice of conversational material. A brief comparison of traits between the Deceiver and Receiver is insightful for a discussion of their similarities and dissimilarities.

The word frequency table is separated into sections sorting similarly themed words. The weight or proportion of the text given to that word most often reinforced the frequency rate. Sections
divide references to Receiver audiences, family and friend associations, survivor related words, work related words, phrases starting with the pronoun "I", words referring to conversation and finally words relating to proof of the liberation heroism.

The first section supports the premise that the Deceiver made considerably more references to children as compared to adults, as a means to make the deception more palatable. The second section indicates substantive references to the family name, consistent with the analysis that the family name issue was a strong factor in the assumed motivation to deceive. Interestingly, the number of times that the Deceiver referred to his father is fewer than both that of his mother and sister. The percentage weight reflects this as well. However, in the researcher's assessment the references to the father include more aggrandization. The lesser frequency rate may be attributed to the small portion of the narrative in which the father was alive, as compared to the mother. The most interesting piece to note in this section is the frequency of claiming there were, "no living relatives".

The third section centres on the wording around "survival". It has considerably less frequency than some other non-issue words, although it is a key theme of the Deceiver's narrative. The fourth section clearly indicates that work themes factored largely into the Deceiver's life.

An analysis of the Deceiver's traits suggested that he had narcissistic tendencies, which appears to have some confirmation by the number of phrases beginning with the pronoun "I" followed by verbs that describe his self-centredness. Words such as "telling", "knowing" and "wanting" have high frequencies whereas "helping" was low. There was zero occasion of "I listen" or "I listened" and only one occasion of "I heard". The specific non-word, the non-verbal [PAUSE] recorded by the transcriber, scored in the high range.
Interestingly, words referring to the proof of his deception as a composite frequency for Brigadier, General and Commander (39 references) were noted as were those concerning pictures as proof of his relationships (27 times). The total number of references he made to the knighthood citation by the Queen of Holland was 19 times. The relatively low number of times he used the words "liberated" and "liberate" could be the result of wanting to focus on the heroism acts he stated about himself rather than highlighting the liberation moment for others.

In short, the NVivo programme provided a tool to list individual traits as nodes so that text could be highlighted and placed into the node sections. Comparisons that could be possible for a quantitative study, had no purpose to what was being studied and evaluated in this research. Simply, the comparison chart of Deceiver and Receiver self-descriptors set up by the researcher was used to alert what similarities and dissimilarities existed between the participants as follows (see Table 3).

Dissimilar descriptors are not unexpected between the Deceiver and Receiver when the relationship is separated by a deception experience. The identifiable descriptors which are listed as contrasts are: blaming others, being vengeful (Deceiver), to self blaming, non-confrontational tendencies (Receiver); rescuer and anticipatory anxiety traits (Receiver) to self promotion, self justification and insensitivity to others (Deceiver). What emerged unexpectedly from the findings were similar descriptors.

Ten descriptors of the non-targeted, principal Receiver and the Deceiver were evaluated as similar. For example, work was a shared value. They both enjoyed their chosen work, had excellent skill levels to do their work, and achieved success in their chosen career field. It was evident that both Receiver and Deceiver valued a good reputation and worked conscientiously toward that goal. Both valued family connections and legacy through respecting the family name. Each enjoyed how
words could be used in conversation, separating out single words and phrases, to define or to elaborate meaning. Both enjoyed persuasion in their respective fields of influence, one with deceptive leanings and one without. Each had intelligence, whether academic or experiential. Both involved themselves altruistically in charitable work, fundraising and engaging in community philanthropy, although their motivations appear different. The similarities are suspected as playing a contributory role in drawing the Deceiver and Receiver together. Initially, the Deceiver and Receiver are intensely attracted to each other. It is supposed that the Deceiver values similarity to his own beliefs and style, therefore the Receiver may look highly appealing as a potentially constant source of association and acclamation. The Deceiver may consider similarities as non-threatening. The surmise is that the relationship cannot be sustained when underlying motivations become apparent.

**Summary of Theme 3.**

The role that similarities between the Deceiver and the Receiver play in social attraction, is supported by research that proposes a correlation does exist between perceived attitudinal similarities and social attraction, and influence on social and intellectual first impressions (Bryne, 1971; Singh & Ho, 2000). Additionally, similar attitudes in a reciprocal relationship may increase the attraction particularly when self serving interests are at stake (Morry, 2007). The latter research may also explain the relentless bond of understanding which continues to resonate between the Deceiver and Receiver, despite the deception breaking the bonds of the relationship. In other words, the antecedent high similarities/high attraction level which fuelled the close interpersonal relationship in the first place, also improves the intuition about the other person in later confrontations. For the Deceiver, it seems to give predictive ability on how to harm the Receiver's feelings best once the relationship is severed. For the Receiver, the intimate understanding of the
Deceiver leads to a better detection of the manipulation tactics, but also seems to sustain the raw feelings whenever they are re-exposed to the Deceiver's words.

**Understanding Theme 4 - Deconstructing Strategic Elements of Interpersonal Deceptive Communication**

Inevitably, in the attempt to comprehend the full force of the high stakes deception, the simple question arises, how did he do it, how did he accomplish the deception so efficaciously, and why did everyone believe his deception? To analyze these queries, there are three fundamental assumptions: the intricate construction of the deception narrative is based on context and timing, the construction of the public persona of the Deceiver conceals his lesser traits and highlights prestigious ones, and the ongoing relationship and communication between the Receiver to the Deceiver is contingent on attractant traits appearing in the initial interpersonal stages. These three pillars prepare for the strategic elements which maintain the deception.

The strategic communication elements have been grouped into two sections because of the volume of material: non-verbal elements and verbal elements. Certain sub-units identified in one category, may cross category distinctions.

**Understanding non-verbal interpersonal communication strategies.**

Congruence between non-verbal and verbal elements, is a key factor when assessing spoken communication. It is important because it helps a Receiver gauge levels of believability and authenticity. For most conversations, this works. The exceptional difficulty with listening to conversations, speeches, or stories told by a Deceiver, is that a person skilled in high stakes deception tactics, is likely adept in managing these signals, which interferes with common detection cue instincts. Receivers initially seem to be swept up into the Deceiver's rhetoric. They miss the
deceptive qualities and identifiers while they are communicating or are interacting with the Deceiver. Yet, it was the non-verbal signals which alerted the principal Receiver to the possible deception in his uncle's narrative. Strategic non-verbal elements are listed in alphabetical order.

*Allofness.*

Allofness emanating from the Deceiver towards the Receiver when he tried to engage in meaningful conversation, was one of the first identifiable non-verbal indicators confirming suspicions about the relationship with the Deceiver. Allofness created confusion and a sense of pending trouble. From the first episode when the Receiver noted allofness, he sensed the Deceiver's increasing retreat from what seemed a "close" relationship and bond between them. From that point it seemed that positive interactions with the Deceiver declined.

Allofness or distancing initiated by the Deceiver in the case study was pragmatic, for it protected his self image and the deception. Client 200 noted allofness from his uncle as a sudden change, once he had decided to challenge his stories with questions. Because the questions probed, the Deceiver withdrew as his only recourse against a perceived threat to himself and the deceptive heroism account. As appearing to lose or fail could not be tolerated, it is assumed that the Deceiver may have decided that he had few options but to avoid questions and the questioner, in order to reassert his hero persona and presentation of his narrative.

*Historical parallelisms.*

The Deceiver presented verifiable historical facts in his narrative, to lend a level of overall credibility to his liberation deception. The researcher posits that when Receivers collectively are familiar with global and historical events to the point of identifying and nodding affirmation while the Deceiver speaks, the well known facts effectively conceal the deception within the speech.
Given that the Deceiver needed to control the receptivity of the Receiver(s), the historical parallels lent an air of knowledge, wide experience or powerful connections, which may enchant the Receiver to listen without suspicion. The Receiver could not distinguish between the historical parallelisms and the deception portions of the story, therefore the narrative does not fit the Receiver's concept of a deceptive narrative. The critical factor then is that the Receiver seemed to agree with the entirety of the Deceiver's story when there was a preponderance of true historical facts. The researcher proposed that a ratio likely exists, its exactness unknown, when comparing the quantity of true facts to false ones; the ratio may determine whether the Receiver believes the entire narrative is true or not. Ironically, it is a deceptive strategy in which the Receiver becomes unknowingly blinded by facts.

Despite that historical context was the source of the deception material, and diligently incorporated into the Deceiver's account, he appeared to overstate some of his experiences, a detection cue to those who knew actual truths. If Receivers could tolerate exaggeration as a harmless feature of his storytelling for a time, it was in the repeated hyperbole that the Receiver suspected something very important was not true.

The Deceiver appeared to place historical facts alongside exaggerations. For example, his twelve week detainment at Kamp Westerbork, itself understood as a reasonably humane transit camp, was never on the same level of suffering as those who were incarcerated at concentration camps such as Auschwitz, Ravensbruck, Sobibor and other death camps. Europeans, particularly those who had been inmates of such camps, reacted intensely to his exaggerated notion of Kamp Westerbork and choice of words of sufferings. It drew suspicion from the start. Client 200's aunt was one person who quickly recognized the fiction, which alerted her to suspect the Deceiver. She had
experienced Auschwitz and knew immediately that her nephew's uncle, from the "other" side of the family, was an imposter.

The Deceiver appeared to incorporate prepared scripts of historical details, beside secondary prepared scripts recounting horrific deeds he had committed. The first seemed to dilute the impact of the second. If historical parallelisms had not been inserted, it is likely that Receivers or audiences in general would have been offended, shocked or would have rejected the Deceiver's message altogether. In other words, history validated the messenger.

Finally, the attempt to be equal to well known people who had situations in Europe during those years, was an obvious reach by the Deceiver for prestige in the community. For example, he fervently reinforced he had historical connections with Anne Frank. To many listeners, it was egregious to use the name and reputation of someone who had died and could not defend their supposed shared legacy. But it was effective.

*Intuitive skill.*

Client 200 surmised that his uncle was more shrewd than academically intelligent. But shrewdness meshed with a keen intuitive ability offered a potentially devious combination of skill sets to woo Receivers into the deception with little concern for risk. Being intuitive is a form of analytical ability, and may be a learned skill as well as genetically endowed. It appears to be a skill that can be honed and reinforced over time. Intuition requires a refined observational skill which can anticipate feelings, emotions and reactions in others.

The Deceiver was conscious he had this ability and used it extensively. Several times in his narrative he claimed a sense of expectancy in the form of premonitions. He stated that his wife could attest to this. For example, he claimed he knew the morning of January 21, 1945 that his sister and
he would be arrested at the mistress' home, which later came to pass at 9:00 that evening. He also claimed he knew which child he could reclaim post-war from foster care just by watching them at playgrounds. It is evident, that the Deceiver was capable of inflicting considerable emotional hurt on his sister after the war, as he intuitively knew her emotional state, vulnerable weaknesses and social circle well. The Deceiver claimed he used his instinctive sense to strategize on a continual basis. Without intuitive skill, the Deceiver would have failed in his attempt to conduct the deception because he could not have controlled any Receiver's reaction or further gauge their reactions.

To be able to utilize intuition, it was important that the Deceiver know his subject matter, his targeted Receiver, the immediate circle influencing the targeted Receiver, and the appeal of his public persona within that relational sphere. He would have observed intensely, like a psychology academic, the moods, preferences, and beliefs of each listener whom he must attract to his constructed deception circle. The Deceiver then relied on his instincts to be flexible and instantly responsive to the Receiver's responses or reactions. The researcher posits that the intuitive ability was most pronounced when the Deceiver targeted a Receiver who embodied the right mix of caring/rescuer/non-confrontational traits which to him were easy to identify.

The targeted Receiver, the Deceiver's sister, Client 220, likely became frightened by the Deceiver's intuitive skill because it became invasive into her life, and brought threats to her self-assurance, specifically when the positive relationship has collapsed. His intuitive skill was being applied negatively in order to affect her on an ongoing basis.

In considering the Deceiver's skill of choosing specific words or subjects for his hero/liberation narrative so that it would appeal to audiences, yet conceal deceptive components, it is suggested that he intuitively "knew" what they expected to hear and then delivered that message.
The message did not have to be true, only believable. To construct the deceptive narrative of escape, heroism and liberation, the Deceiver intuitively recognized the Zeitgeist of the times, the emotional appeal of survivor-hood and victimhood, and rapport building tactics using charm or tough bullying, whichever strategy achieved his immediate goal.

By preparing well in advance for his high stakes, high risk deception, he intuitively knew that proof was essential to offset suspicion. But the cleverest strategy was to put together occasions to meet the Canadian General, to read his autobiography and to have an appointment with him to sign his autobiographical book, in order to produce the pictures and notes instinctively knowing how this "proof" would substantiate his liberation narrative in the best possible way, before he launched one word of his deception narrative.

*Mouth noises/pauses.*

When the interviews were transcribed, many pronounced pauses and sighs became evident in the written text. When reviewing the original videotapes, the researcher noted considerably more pauses and sighs in the conversations than were recorded.

The Deceiver added intensity to his prepared scripts by raising the pitch of his voice, pausing to brandish an irritated look at the Receiver (interviewer) or to shake his head as if all was hopeless, or to sigh several times in sequence. The placements of sighs and pauses in the script appeared to be significant. It is beyond the scope of this study to assess the placement of non verbal markers empirically, but the impression was that they appeared to be strategically used in the scripts when bookending the hero/liberation deception piece of the narrative.

Mouth noises and pauses audible in the interview tapes, had a visibly emotional effect on the interviewer. It directed the interviewer's attention from the script and onto the speaker, the Deceiver.
It was an effective detour away from the interviewer's questions. It is possible that the pauses and delays were a necessary stall for the Deceiver as well, to gauge how the script and emotive value was being received, giving the Deceiver a brief interlude to adjust his presentation.

Occasionally it seemed that the pauses emphasized specific themes. When the Deceiver used the theme of speaking about children, about loss of family and friends, or about the Nazi atrocities which he overcame, there were several pauses included in the communication. In other words, the facial expressions and non-verbals added complexity to the deception story. The presence of mouth noises, sighs and pauses at specific points in the narrative may alert a Receiver that the Deceiver intends a trajectory away from some inquiring element of the story that is not to be suspected for deceit.

**Preparedness and pre-formed scripts.**

For the Deceiver in this case study, the preparatory work to have accreditation was remarkable. In fact, it is assumed that from the time he conceived the deceptive plan to its inauguration, the Deceiver accrued a convincing set of validation and proof, ready to launch alongside the narrative. Thus, the targeted or non-targeted Receiver who had believed in the relationship, experienced a secondary trauma upon recognizing the pre-planning that already existed as a means of intimidation. Non verbal strategizing such as this was difficult to foresee.

Preparation of historical information, that would support an escape/heroism/liberation story, in addition to the gathering of proof and pictures, was clearly the focus of work for the Deceiver in the principal case study. From 1989 to 1992, he researched and put into place the detailed scripts he needed to make a successful launch of his deception. He accumulated historical and military material to create a broader base for his escape and liberation story. Clearly, he seemed to have
engaged opportunistically with the General on Armistice day or at book signings to achieve the necessary documentation to support his claims. It was part gamesmanship and part savviness, to select a top ranking official to acquire necessary documentation. He may even have prepared simple forgery equipment to complete his task of having "proof". It is assumed that his thoroughness in preparatory work made it possible to counter all original suspicions, stalling any accountability.

The Deceiver used well formed scripts to deliver such declarations concerning the evils of discrimination, racism and hatred. He claimed to have begun his speaking career to rebuke Holocaust deniers, however the Receiver noted that it was extremely difficult to halt the Deceiver while delivering the prepared script. The Deceiver seemed intent to state the exact words repeatedly and use non-verbals such as sighs and pauses for emotional effect. The scripts which appear to be pre-formed and memorized, succinctly delivered fiction, facts and emotion at critical junctures of the narrative.

**Proof/statistics.**

The Deceiver had a supply of memorized numbers, as an addendum to prepared scripts to lend statistical clout. For example, he could rattle off the number of Dutch Jews murdered, the number of Jewish children murdered, cattle car transport numbers, and numbers killed in various concentration camps due to Nazi atrocities. He had population facts about Amsterdam, adherent numbers attending the Jewish Sephardic synagogue, as well as an excellent recall of people's names, addresses, even house numbers in Holland.

The Deceiver exhibited unusual behaviour in that he consistently told his personal narrative to a Receiver, then offered to prove it. It is unusual to prove one's account of past events and then claim it requires statistics or pictures. The Receiver noted that some people who gave an attest to the
Deceiver, did so out of a desire to appease his interests in being a survivor of the Holocaust, and may not have been aware of its future usage and intent. Most peers had died by the time his story was publicized and therefore the attests are unverifiable. Even the Canadian General who was in advanced stages of Parkinson's disease by 1992, passed away in 1996; it was the same time frame in which the letters purportedly from him were being widely circulated as proof. Two pictures in particular of the Deceiver and the General side by side, one taken in 1994 outside of the Montreal City Hall at a Remembrance Day parade, and the other a casual picture of both sitting on a couch, were the Deceiver's most utilized proofs. The first picture is contested because it could be had by anyone at an Armistice parade prior to 2001 events and security issues. The odd feature of the second picture, which is allegedly is of their friendship, is that the Deceiver is holding up a copy of the General's book as verification. Other pictures of family and acquaintances which he obtained and mixed with those of unknown persons, enabled the Deceiver to claim famous friends, departed relatives, or persons whom he lost during the Holocaust as close associations. Client 200 noted that one particular picture which was used as proof and verification, received two different identifications from his uncle: first as his father's cousin, and subsequently a friend named Solomon. The pictures that the Deceiver used have not been verified according to the names he provided.

By self report that he was an accomplished forger, the Deceiver certainly raises the question of reliability as to his attests. It is prudent to speculate whether the proof which he provided was real or forged. The letters allegedly from the Brigadier-General deserve to be deconstructed as they were the Deceiver's most significant source of "proof".

With the Deceiver's alleged past experiences in the Resistance movement as well as forgery capabilities, it is conceivable that one or both attests, allegedly from the Canadian officer, were
forged by the Deceiver. To explore this possibility, it is necessary to examine several points: the Deceiver's capability, access to the materials and forgery equipment, and access to the General.

To begin, the Deceiver prided himself on his skill as a forger of passports, identity cards and letters during the war. Forgery of identity documents during the Nazi occupation, involved replacing photos, lifting stamps and seals from the paper then reapplying with accuracy, typing revised birthdates, and so on. He had expertise in aging documents appropriately (Dutch Resistance website, 2016).

Closer observation of the General's alleged letters, the researcher considered the letterhead used, the word usage in the body of the letter, the General's nomenclature and signature, and the easily observed fact that the attest letters were altered in reproductions given to different media, to provide evidence suggesting forgery.

The letterhead which denotes the General's address, would have been relatively straightforward to acquire, with pre-9/11 security concerns, by corresponding directly with the General's military office or his home for requests regarding his career or schedule. Even Legions readily provided that information in the past. Alternatively, if he did directly correspond with the General regarding his autobiography, he could have had a reply letter with letterhead, salutation, valediction and signature. The General's former address in Trois Rivieres, is still simply available online. Using that reply letterhead by any of the above methods, a competent forger could lay the letter on top of a separate sheet with a typed message, the dual sheeting could be photocopied to look like one letter. In examining the copy of the first attest, there is evidence this technique may have been used. One can notice a fine line cutting through the bottom of the letters of the postal
code in the upper left corner. This could indicate that the letter from the General is an adjusted, photocopied letter.

Conceding that the General may have written the letter, the elderly man may have wished to do a simple favour to someone who was interested in his career and autobiographical book. The Deceiver's plan would only have required his self deprecating charm, informing the General that he had a shared personal experience at Kamp Westerbork, to gain access for a book signing opportunity. But it would have gained a valid, but ultimately valuable signature.

The authorship of the two letters is also suspect. The two letters have two separate type scripts from two separate typewriters. This would be somewhat surprising if a secretary, his wife or the General himself typed the letter on his home typewriter. However, it is the irregular spelling, grammar and word usage of English that does not reflect either a secretary's English nor a General's long military career history of writing formal letters as well as poetry in both French and English languages. It could reflect a person on the other hand, who wrote English as a learned second language. Several examples of incorrect spelling are listed in non-sequential priority: the name of the Deceiver spelt in a Dutch manner, not Anglicized, "Bufore" instead of "before", "Inded" instead of "indeed", "Ha" instead of "had", "Westerbok" instead of "Westerbork", "retrat" instead of "retreat", "advised" instead of "advised", "Wiich" instead of "which", "Retied" instead of "retired", "Chef" instead of "Chief", "refering" instead of "referring", "Me" instead of "Mr.", "thr" instead of "the". Grammatical errors are as follows: "on the morning of 12th 1944", "Mr. [name] who ha just swam across a canal", and "German soldiers had recently been housed in the during the German retrat" (Spellings consistent with letter). Commas, apostrophes and periods occasionally are absent
and spaces between typed words are often doubled or tripled, similar in the Deceiver's personal letters to his family members (i.e., August 4, 1994).

The copies of the letters given to the journalist to be printed in the Montreal Gazette, in 1993 (van Pratt, 2000), differ from the copies given to his family, the interviewer, Ellen Klein and the copies held by the researcher. Several corrections to spelling and punctuation in the text were made, without Editor notation, and were seemingly presented as originals. Some changes made are as follows: "Gentleman" to "Gentlemen", "patrol" capitalized to "Patrol", spelling of his name is Anglicized not spelt in Dutch, deleting first name to write "Mr. [name]", "Me. [name] corrected to "Mr. [name]", correcting a comma to a period at the end of the sentence "by us," to "by us.", again correcting a comma to a period, "submitted," to "submitted." Spelling is also corrected on singular words: "before", "periods", "retreat", "advised" and "Westerbork". The sole Editor's note follows the word "troops" in the text. It is curious as well that the General would spell his own rank incorrectly as "Chef" (French version) rather than "Chief" when writing a letter in English. In regards to spelling, even with a person such as the General who had Parkinson's disease, it is curious is that a he would spell his own name incorrectly. The General's pre-name was not hyphenated in the first attest, but is in the second. In addition, he did not state his qualifications as a General would include in a correspondence for the purpose of validating military facts, as General [name], C.C., G.O.Q., C.B.E., D.S.O., E.D., C.D.

It is irregular that the General would identify himself as the ranking officer of the 6th Brigade, 2nd division of the Canadian "Army". Canadian military do not refer to Infantry units as "Army", as American troops do. With due respect to Allard's wartime title, he was correctly referred to as Brigadier-General, 6th Canadian Infantry Brigade, 2nd Canadian Infantry Division. To pursue
accuracy of nomenclature further, post 1967, the time frame when the attests were allegedly written, the correct terminology was not the above, but rather the Canadian Armed Forces. What makes this nomenclature critical to clarify, is that the General was the key proponent for amalgamating all military units, whether English, French, airforce, navy or infantry, under one distinctive, historically significant military identification in Canada. It is unclear why a letter purportedly from him, would not include this important terminology.

The errors in the letters parallel some spelling, grammatical ones and specific words which the Deceiver used to explain his own deception narrative of heroism and liberation. It is quite odd that the General would use exact replications of terms used by the Deceiver unless he was advised on what to write, unaware of what he signed, or the letters were forged. Six examples listed below compare wording between interviews transcripts (Klein, 2010 and Modi, 2011) and the alleged attests:

1. Deceiver: "I got to a canal...and I swum across the canal".
   Attest: "...our patrols took into custody [name] who ha[d] just swum across a canal".

2. Deceiver: "The camp you are talking about are military barracks."
   Attest: "To the best of our knowledge, Westerbok was a German military barracks"

3. Deceiver: "I'm going to hold you responsible after the war for killing a thousand innocent people".
   Attest: "...the camp was nearby and housed about a thousand Jewish inmates".
   (Note: in the General's autobiography he states not a clear number such as "thousand" but the plural form stating that, "...a concentration camp where thousands of political prisoners have been shoved into it...") (Allard, 1985, p. 174).
4. Deceiver: "He said, "Are you willing to go back with a six man patrol?"
Attest: "...I sent a six man patrol, accompanied by him..."

5. Deceiver: "We run into stiff German, SS and collaborators from the German side..."
Attest: "I omitted to state the fact that this patrol met with stiff resistance from the German, SS and Dutch collaborators..."

6. Deceiver: "And we eliminated these guys, we didn't lose any of our own men..."
Attest: "My men eliminated the enemy resistance...

Finally, the signature of the second attest may not have as rounded a form as in the first attest. The personal letters written in long form by the Deceiver to his family indicate that the letters "A", "N", "S", and "M" are markedly rounded. Because linguistic analysis and further evaluation is lacking to fully address the inconsistencies of the attests, it remains unclear if the primary "proof" that the Deceiver provided for his heroism narrative, is valid.

Clearly the attests stretch logical possibilities that they are real attests from the General. The researcher proposes that the attests, like the Deceiver, are fraudulent.

**Public persona.**

Associations can be orchestrated, which may not be evident at first to the non-targeted Receivers but assuredly are to the targeted Receiver, as further indication of the lack of authenticity in the Deceiver. In the case study, a person of higher authority or position than the Deceiver received high accolades, respect for their opinion and idealization, (irrespective of their specific training). Recognition from persons in position seemed necessary for the Deceiver. Supporting research suggests that notoriety "from others [is] primarily to document their own grandiosity and preserve
their superior status” (Beck, Freeman, Davis & Assoc., 2007, p.42). Such associations are collected and stacked so to speak, even if it is a loose or transient association.

It is probable that the persons added to the Deceiver's repertoire, alleging their close association, were completely unaware of the supposed links to them and quite possibly were unattached in any conceivable way to the deception account of heroism and liberation which their association and name seemed to condone. Although business and political persons are known to thrive on liaisons with well heeled or well known people, a story of survival and heroism is suspect with the frequent allegations of close ties with prominent people. Tagging names seemed to be a cue that the Deceiver was intent on impressing the listener with his own status.

The Deceiver intuitively seemed to realize that to avoid suspicion, he had to maintain his public persona assiduously. When his heroism account was challenged, he used vicarious associations for two purposes: proof by association that he was an upright citizen with meritorious credentials, and secondly to commiserate that complaints from Client 220, Client 200 or others who were adverse to his story, were unwarranted outcomes, often collectively endured by leaders in prestigious positions.

Maintaining the public image was a constant enterprise, but one that the Deceiver seemed to enjoy. Several factors had to be protected for the deception to continue. Associations had to be in place so that his reputation matched with an altruistic theme that could be verified. Proof and statistics which supported his story, were accumulated and seemingly memorized. The relationship with the targeted Receiver, his sister, had to stay at a high level of resentment and hatred to justify his ongoing desire for revenge, and to blacklist her to others to discourage engagement with her. Client 200 stated that there was a disconnect with his Dutch aunt and her family, because of the
Deceiver's constant belittling of her. Nonetheless, the Deceiver projects himself in his public persona as the eminently better person.

The public persona of the Deceiver created an impenetrable wall so to speak, to prevent the Receiver's questioning affecting outcomes, and to thwart incongruent discrepancies which might infiltrate to outsiders. As time passed, the targeted Receiver became marginalized, much to the satisfaction of the Deceiver.

Vague/indirect responses.

The Deceiver's reaction to a Receiver's inquiry or challenge was to withdraw interpersonal reciprocity. It was one of the Deceiver's most obvious means of dominating the relationship or distancing himself from someone who would not support his deception story. Supposing that the Deceiver had to manage his narcissistic reaction to perceived insults in public, being vague or responding with minimal conversation, may have been useful to him as self control. In other words, distancing physically or being indirect in answering, may have been a necessary strategy.

Client 200, noted vague responses to his challenges around credibility and explanatory details. It is likely that the Deceiver did not wish to veer from his scripts and prepared format in his effort to keep uniformity and control of the deception framework. For the most part, he achieved this goal as one interview is uncannily similar in narrative and in non-verbal sighs, pauses and affect to another. The escape/heroism/liberation piece remained a constant construct, and it was difficult to have the Deceiver add or subtract details. Interestingly, the Receivers in the supporting case studies indicated that the vague replies and distancing they felt emanating from the Deceiver, caused them to retreat from confronting the Deceiver, despite knowing they were being deceived.
Understanding verbal interpersonal communication strategies.

Although the next section deconstructs several verbal markers individually, they are rarely used singly in the deception conversation. The cleverness of the Deceiver was in how he tactically blended one or more verbal strategy into his interpersonal communication. Part of the difficulty for Receivers to detect deception in the infancy of its construction, was that the non-verbal markers seemed to pave the path for the verbalized narrative and the deception within it.

Claiming authority.

The Deceiver believed he was exceptional, and that he ought to be regarded as exceptional by others. Therefore, it is consistent form that he delivered an exceptional deception. As an entitled leader, his sense of authoritarianism pervaded the narrative. A bravado existed in his speech that could not tolerate challenge or disobedience. On several occasions, the Deceiver's instant reaction to resist the interviewer seemed to indicate that he was reasserting his self assigned authority on the subjects of the Holocaust, the plights of relatives and acquaintances, and the assumptions of what people needed. He expressed himself in tough, bullish talk to emphasize his self made status. In addition, the notion that he alone could save others from the perils of the times was the platform to enhance his authority on eradicating global issues such as discrimination. The authoritarianism in his speech appeared to substantiate the constructed heroism by demonstrating how he exercised his leadership skills.

Emotive words softened his authoritarian message. They created an intermittent diet of assertiveness and humility. He was adept at balancing his natural tendency towards overwhelming a Receiver with a bully approach, by also showing his humanness, so as not to distance the Receiver.
**Emotionality.**

The use of emotional words and appeals may appear to be diametrically opposed to the claims of authoritarianism and toughness; however, given that the Deceiver's ultimate goal was to convince the Receiver, it is apparent that using opposite modes of conversation produced excellent persuasive results. Emotionality increased the co-sufferer connection with the Receivers. It quickly aggrandized his purported suffering levels as if validating membership into a survivor/victim fellowship.

Emotional themes gave a strategical advantage to the overall deceptive script. The following negative emotive inducing themes were effective: family deaths, persons suffering in concentration camps, inhumane conditions of "cattle car "transport, and other injustices. Positive emotive themes included: amazing pre-war living conditions, superlative family cohesiveness, enjoyable work in the Haganah, and thousands of children receptive to his messages. Creating emotional strong points selectively throughout the interpersonal communication, provided a screen between the disingenuous character of the Deceiver and his public persona, between the truth of facts and the deception. They effectively focused the Receiver's attention from evaluating content accuracy. In the researcher's opinion, the emotionality element is the "stickiness" of the deception that prevents the Receivers from extricating themselves from the web of deceit while they are in the process of being entangled by it.

**Exaggeration.**

Although there hardly is a tale that does not have the addition of some conspicuous exaggeration, it is possible that in a high stakes deception, exaggeration is so very extreme that the Receiver accepts and excuses it all the more. Why? In a reverse strategizing which may at first
glance seem counterproductive or curious, the exaggerated numbers and details were so absurd or unlikely, that they might have impacted the Receiver more forcefully and thus persuaded more convincingly. Several contrasting elements that the Deceiver used which effectively obfuscated the deceptive components have already been discussed, therefore in tandem it is possible that exaggerating what was not important, veiled what was. The use of exaggeration fit with and reinforced the Deceiver's public persona, that he ranked as exceptionally superior. Exaggeration or hyperbole appear efficacious for inserting partial truths and falsehoods into the deceptive script.

**Falsehoods.**

The deception was constructed block by block, evidenced in the series of falsehoods which permeated the Deceiver's narrative. Some falsehoods, such as the timing details of the military movements on the night of April 11/12, 1945, required considerable reflection on the part of the researcher, to better understand how deceptive details were conceived or twisted from bits of truth. For the Receiver, the entanglement of truth and deception became indistinguishable, and thus falsehoods were believed alongside truths. By identifying certain falsehoods, the researcher was aided in deconstructing the deception in addition to how the Deceiver was able to avoid detection. When a scripted deception had contextual and historical truths to use as concealers, the Deceiver used his intuitive skills to effectively implant unverifiable, questionable or false elements into his story. Partial truths were a particularly savvy tactic, because they could be tilted expeditiously to imply any meaning he desired at the moment, if challenged.

Three selected examples are deconstructed to expose inserted falsehoods. Each falsehood contributed towards the ultimate purpose, to accept the hero/liberation deception unchallenged. The
chosen examples are: the "no living relatives" statement, the final arrest/cattle car train transport, and the escape details from Kamp Westerbork.

The Deceiver claimed that he had no living relatives, likely referring to relatives in Holland. This was not accurate. He slipped up in one interview. When he was questioned by an interviewer that indeed he had a sister, he quickly retorted that he, "could not talk about her but could talk about everything else". It was a quick admittance and regrouping after a falsehood was exposed. Despite having his secret uncovered, his quick reply offered two interpretations: one of of a sad, caring brother, who, still in grief, could not talk about a sister, or as the Deceiver likely hoped, it was regarded as a rebuff and warning that the subject was off limits and would not be answered. He did not admit to telling a lie. The Receiver in this instance and seemingly characteristic of non-confrontational Receivers, chose not to upset the Deceiver, and backed away from the inquiry.

In the second example, the Deceiver is quoted as saying that "three Gestapo agents" arrested them from their hiding in an upstairs room, (sister, and aunt's niece and himself) on "January the 21st, 1945, 9 o'clock in the evening". They were taken "to the jail in the Hague", stayed overnight, and "the next morning" they were forced "on the control of the Dutch police" to "walk to that very infamous jail in the Hague", in Scheveningen, they called the "Orange Hotel", because orange was the colour of Holland" (OranjeHotel website, 2016). After an unsuccessful escape effort, they were "brought into a place there, some kind of cellar", followed by another walk to the "jail in Scheveningen" where he was held prisoner "for fourteen days". He stated he did not see the two girls again as he was " in one cell with three other men" and "interrogated in Scheveningen". After that he was put in a "cattle car", to travel to Kamp Westerbork. The transport he described as being
"one of those cattle cars that they used to use for transport [of] the Jewish people to the concentration camps" and that it took "three days and three nights" to arrive at Kamp Westerbork.

To understand the effects of this falsehood, a few points must be made clear because Receivers who heard these details for the first time would be unaware which ones were spurious. To deconstruct the parts, the distance from the city of Den Hague, their hiding place, to the coastal beach area of Scheveningen, where the jail is 5.0 km (3.11 miles). Under normal conditions it would be a fifty-six minute walk according to Google estimates (2016). Because the sister was shot in the leg, was bleeding and required a tourniquet as well as later hospitalization, it is unlikely she walked that distance as her brother claims. This detail cannot be fully known, but from this point in the narrative he was able to distance himself from her, create a trajectory of his own sufferings and survivor status, shifting the focus towards his own actions and later heroism.

Some transport facts are verifiable yet it demonstrates the Deceiver's savvy ability to insert falsified facts without accountability. For example, entry cards to Kamp Westerbork, still in possession by the targeted Receiver, indicate that the siblings arrived at Kamp Westerbork on February 5th, 1945, exactly fourteen days after the arrest date. However, since the Deceiver further claimed that he was not only in the jail for fourteen days, but was in transit in a "cattle car" for "three days and nights", seventeen days is incompatible with facts. Neither the Deceiver's own statements nor documentation supported either the means of travel nor the time it took to travel from Den Hague through Amsterdam to Kamp Westerbork.

Interestingly, the Dutch rail system was considered an exemplary infrastructure for its time and was used efficiently by German Nazis/Dutch collaborators for troop transport. The reputed commuting service to cover the distance of 66 kilometres (41 miles) from Scheveningen to
Amsterdam, took about an hour. In pursuing this line of substantiation, it was found that all transports of Jewish persons to Kamp Westerbork were conducted through Amsterdam's Muiderpoort Station on regular trains, not cattle cars, after September 3, 1944 (Westerbork trail website). The Deceiver confirmed in one interview, that he did indeed travel through Amsterdam's Muiderpoort Station, when telling how he tried to interest fellow young men to make an escape when the men were ordered off the train to load barrels of foodstuffs. To travel the last 179 kilometres (111 miles) between Amsterdam and Kamp Westerbork was possibly a seven or eight hour journey but not likely a three day journey. The Deceiver offered a conflicting statement of journey times on a different occasion, stating that to go from one side of Holland by train to the other took about an hour, as the country was so small. Although he could create tremendous emotion and sympathy from claims of suffering in a cattle car transport, it is untrue. It is likely that the Deceiver inserted the falsehood to activate high levels of Receiver empathy.

In the third example of falsifying facts, the Deceiver alleged he escaped Kamp Westerbork on the night of April 11, 1945, because he believed the Germans would shoot them before the Allies liberated the camp. All eight hundred and seventy-five people in the camp disagreed with his conclusion and remained sequestered in their barracks that day and night because the advance news of an impending Allied rescue had circulated through the camp from underground radio transmissions (Law, 2000). Altogether, it is reasonable to assume that all inmates would have heard the commotion of trucks and the voices of the Gestapo's hurried departure from the camp that afternoon. To state that he needed to crawl out of the barrack at dusk, hide in a garbage pile under a box until dark, then climb over the barbed wire to avoid capture (or under the barbed wire, depending on which interview), becomes suspect. Additionally, reports of nearby residents regarding
the watchtower searchlights, stated they came in rounds with intervals too short to escape, were likely turned off after the guards left (Westerbork trail website, 2016).

Receivers, non-targeted individuals and audiences, would not be able to detect the startling falsehoods linked together to create the hero/liberation piece. But as the escape story was repeated, Client 200, the Deceiver's nephew, had his analytical sense sharpened, causing him to recognize inconsistencies which eventually led to checking facts and thus to suspicion of the entire liberation as a falsehood. For example, as he heard the story repeated, specific points seemed increasingly bizarre and unbelievable. Facts from documentation were available for comparison. For example, the direction of artillery fire could be verified as directly west and southwest of the Kamp, according to military records and the biographical account of Brigadier-General Allard who detailed his artillery engagement with the German strongholds south of the town of Beilen, and near Hooghalen, five miles west of Kamp Westerbork. This suggests that the Deceiver had to have walked in either a west/southwest direction to fit his description of walking between German and Allied armies who were engaged in battle. The infantry that he later claimed captured him was south/southeast of the camp near Zwiggelte and the town of Westerbork. Either the direction of his walk is suspect or his escape account is false. But these details were not as incredulous for Client 200 to believe as that there was an interrogation of an escapee, of unknown alliance, conducted by a high ranking Canadian officer whose location can be pinpointed, or that the Deceiver, a soaking wet twenty-two year old young man (because he claimed to have swum the canal), could be entrusted by a commander with a Sten gun, ammunition, a patrol unit and the freedom to exonerate himself by walking back through the alleged battleground on foot with no artillery back up. Finally, if his escape account was true, the Receiver questioned what purpose the Deceiver had in claiming full
responsibility for the liberation of the Kamp instead of giving the appropriate adulation to the Canadian patrol unit who walked there with him? Client 220, the Deceiver's sister, who remained in Kamp Westerbork when the guards left, always maintained that her brother's entire hero/ liberation story was an unadulterated lie.

Various claims that the Deceiver made in his story, are exceedingly difficult to evaluate for truthfulness while they occur in conversation. Because some facts can be trounced by superfluous details and historical parallelisms, a listener can become exhausted from trying to sort, understand or distinguish which parts are true (Akhtar & Parens, 2009). Seemingly, the Deceiver directed his Receivers further from the truth with a continuous series of falsehoods, the sheer volume of them making it impossible to discern the true story on first hearing. Small scale falsehoods that individually could appear as harmless hyperboles, might be compared to having a vaccination. They inoculated Receivers against recognizing the serious flaws and claims that had the most importance to the Deceiver.

The military war diary entries, radio communication excerpts from each unit in the 2nd Division, the autobiographical accounts of the Brigadier-General, and the military diarized report of the Second Lieutenant of the VIII RECCE scouting patrol, are tabled with the escape/liberation account, for the dates of April 11 and 12, 1945, and are useful for further comparisons and a scrutiny of truth versus untruth.

*Illogical Argumentation.*

The illogical diatribe as recorded in the Results chapter, a relentless and aggressive diversion from script, is sensible to no one but its author. While the Deceiver spoke against discrimination and atrocities, he actually dehumanized certain demographics, and in doing this may have appealed to
those who already believed it. It was graceless, authoritarian, overly negative argument, distorted by a mishmash of facts and opinions.

Illogical arguments seemed to overwhelm the listener. Referring to the above argument which was a response to a question about Holocaust deniers, the Deceiver delivered a confusingly disconnected retort, unusual in that it was unprepared and non-standardized. The Deceiver's potential volatility was clearly exposed. The critical point is that it happened so few times but it was fortuitous to be recorded, in that it was insightful to the Deceiver's self perception. The researcher considered the digressions valuable to observe what cognitive processes the Deceiver used when unaware he had drifted into unscripted conversation.

*Intimidation/ad hominem arguments.*

Blame was the primary tool which the Deceiver used to cripple the targeted Receiver. It was not just to allege fault, rather it was opportune to cast doubts on character in ad hominem arguments to others. This approach was calculated to discredit his sister and her position as much as was possible. Blaming her was a one-sided fallacy that she was the sole cause of his arrest and victimhood. According to his rants, she was deceptive, had motive to betray their hiding place, and was the unstable, disjointed member of the family to which his contrived deceptive plan enabled him to reappear as the vindicated person. The Deceiver used such arguments to convince others but speculatively, the arguments actually highlight the Deceiver's inconsistencies. For instance, he defaulted on his own alleged familial connectedness by verbally assaulting and intimidating his sister. The Deceiver used blame of others as a springboard for self acclaimed moral authority to conduct his public speaking.
Manipulation of meaning.

Manipulation is a commonly used term when referring to deception and is a means to advantaging the Deceiver. To manipulate effectively, the Deceiver in this case study, misappropriated both the targeted and the non-targeted Receivers' vulnerable characteristics such as compassion, care, respect, tolerance and service to others. The Deceiver disdained these traits as weaknesses using them to create emotionality, insecurity and fear. It is probable that the Deceiver learned to detect traits in those who could easily be manipulated, a learned skill from his family of origin. He likely learned as well how to create an imbalance of power with those around him to perpetuate the manipulation.

One part of the manipulation strategy was to encourage a two pronged meaning for every communication. The Deceiver purposefully framed wording so that the Receiver understood one meaning, but the Deceiver could retreat to an alternate one if needed. For example, because the Deceiver needed to maintain that his sister was the cause of his troubles, it is probable that the alleged instructions during the escape attempt had a double meaning or enough vagueness, to render her at fault whichever interpretation of the directions she took. Manipulation of meaning partially satisfied the revenge he needed to act out and fulfilled the sense of enjoyment he had in witnessing her distress.

The Deceiver was coercive. He used rage, threats, criticism and forcefulness to manipulate other people who blocked his agenda. He managed all interactions with any of his Receivers, selecting any one of several verbal tactics to rebuke: making excuses, lying, exaggerating, bullying or blaming. He could overwhelm and manipulate Receiver audience feelings and comprehension with historical parallelisms, statistics and verbosity.
Neologism.

The neologism "unbeclumacable" was a word coined by the Deceiver, to speak of Holocaust and Nazi atrocities. It was similar to another word variant he used, "proclamated". "Unbeclumacable" had no true meaning except for the one the Deceiver attributed to it. The word reflects English phonetics, but is not an English word. The English prefix "un" and the suffix "able", common in other English words, means "not" and "capable of" respectively. The word imitates English words such as "unbelievable" or "unbearable", to reinforce a negative connotation. After exploring if there were Dutch or German root words or phonetically similar words, the researcher discovered that the Hebrew phonetic of "unbeclumacable" interpreted as, "I am nothing". The author of the word "unbeclumacable" was fluent in the Hebrew language and thus it can be speculated that the Deceiver's fragile self identity emerged through the subconscious meaning of the word he created, which starkly contrasted with the public persona he also created.

Overwhelming with verbosity.

The Deceiver's verbosity numbed reciprocal communication. Verbosity could be used to overwhelm, intimidate or in contrast, to suggest a private familiarity to the Receiver. Ironically, both the Deceiver and Receiver enjoyed the usage of words. Words were an attractant to each other and appeared to initially draw the Deceiver and Receiver together. For Client 200, the principal Receiver, words were the means to further relational opportunities and to share ideas. He valued words because they carried a precise meaning and weight; words expressed his identity. It was bewildering and painful to him, when words became swords. For example, he spoke of the deception as "egregious" ensuring "it will be hell for the family" recognizing that deceptive words had the potential to irreparably shatter familial relationships. When the targeted Receiver was
confronted by the Deceiver's devaluing words, utilized to humiliate or blame, she suffered excruciatingly, feeling betrayed.

To the Deceiver, the primary usefulness of words was their influential power over people. Interpersonal conversations granted an opportunistic connection with any Receiver such as influential persons he needed to advance his project or friends and family members who might enable his goal of "winning". Words were simply tools to use and to adjust in order to persuade and mobilize his ambitions forward. Like a recruiter or proselytizer, the Deceiver used volumes of words to draw audience Receivers into his deception network and to him. Specifically, pre-formed uninterruptible scripts, emotionalized discourses, or lengthy tangential details effectively shut down reciprocity. Over-verbalization significantly contributed to obfuscating falsehoods.

*Reframing collective experiences as personal.*

The Deceiver reframed historical and familial experiences as solely personal ones in which his sufferings were unique. It was an alternative truth effectively spotlighting him as exceptional. Several situations were obviously shared experiences but reframing himself as the single sufferer was tactical as false humility, implying he was a martyr or victim. Ideally it provided an increased narrative focus on himself.

*Repetition.*

Repetition was a simple endorsement of past words and phrases. It made simple phrases sound dramatic to give emphasis to the facts that the Deceiver wanted the Receiver to grasp. For example, the Deceiver wanted to entrench the notion "I escaped". Repetition reinforced the word "escape", even if the notion was false. The Receiver responded with parroted words "so I know you escaped". Repetition was a successful form of persuasion.
Righteous indignation.

Acting with righteous indignation against generalized wrongs was a means for the Deceiver to connect with non-targeted Receivers and audiences. The Deceiver changed the tone of the conversation by expressing a moral authority about discrimination or atrocities accompanied by non-verbal sighs or hand and head motions to emphasize exasperation which fit with indignant pronouncements. He emphasized his disgust with injustices with a raised pitch of his voice to match rhetorical questions such as "How can they be such monsters"? Appearing indignant about Nazi collaborators, the hapless state of inmates in concentrations camps, large scale murders of children, or even when recounting the damage to his thumbs doing battery work, his speech dynamics were intended to incite fear and horror in his audience. In total, it is probable the implication is that atrocities would likely be duplicated in the future, without his intervention or input.

He tapped into global injustices with significant indignation, adding a "them versus us" argument, to place the Deceiver on side with his Receivers. His indignation, which matched well with the Receivers' values and ethics, offered persuasive confirmation that he, a person who had already rescued hundreds of Jews as he claimed, could be trusted to be their hero. For those who wanted to believe the facade, it was convincing and alluring. For the targeted Receiver and those speculating that the Deceiver was a fraud, the speeches were alarming.

A second way of using righteous indignation effectively was against the targeted Receiver. Generalized accusations were directed to implicate his sister as a potential threat as well. It appeared that early in the breakdown of the relationship, the targeted Receiver was the only person aware of the two-sidedness of the Deceiver. At that juncture, the Deceiver utterly rejected the Receiver and set the course for revenge. The righteous indignation and subsequent rejection, seemed to parallel
one of several points of departure in the relationship: the Deceiver's perception that the Receiver was not co-operative, was challenging his actions, or had a desire for an equalized relationship.

Indignation for the perceived insult, was delivered in erratic, non-sensical rages, intimidation, and accusations.

*Specific word emphasis.*

Important words to the Deceiver were "escape" "survive", "victim" and "orphan". Each word delivered shades of intimate meaning to extract the most empathy from Receivers and create the most harm to Client 220, the targeted Receiver. For example, the four words, "I am an orphan", were meant to have devastating implications to her specifically. They did. They impacted her on several relational levels. The implications of the word "orphan" was not appreciated by other Receivers or audiences. Because the Deceiver needed an empathetic base for his deception, the word "orphan" implied a childhood loss not an adult loss of parents as was the case. In addition, it implied he was the sole sufferer. To his sister, who understood the subtle message between them, it repeatedly reminded her that she was estranged, disconnected from the family and blamed as the cause, as well as she was the condition of his subsequent losses in life. It demoted her by not acknowledging her as family or in sharing in the loss of their parents. The specific choice of words severely wounded her each time that phrase was repeated. The specific words were the means to reopen the sibling wound and keep it festering.

The words "victim" and "survivor" had great power to engage Receivers. The words were used frequently to establish their significance in the Deceiver's story.
The word "escape" was frequently used and was confirmed when the interviewer repeated it. Specific word use, when repeated enough, was likely to be remembered, be affirmed and be believed, even when it was a lie.

**Superlatives.**

A narrative, inundated with superlatives, is a form of engaging rhetoric purposely used to have an impressive effect on listeners (Schouten, 2012). Although it is an effective strategy to engage a Receiver's admiration, it can suggest insincerity. For example, the people in the Deceiver's sphere of influence, who complied with him, received overstated praise. Such words as "wonderful", "amazing", "unbelievable", "so beautiful", "so famous", "so great", or "so good", were frequently used in the Deceiver's narrative to overrate friendships, family association, achievements or appreciation from his audiences. In contrast, references to Germans, Dutch collaborators, his sister, or camp inmates were addressed with the negative superlatives such as "so horrible", "the worst there ever has been", "unbelievable", "unimaginable" and "unbeclumacable", or in a repeated series of this example, "bad, bad, bad, bad, bad, bad".

The superlative descriptions are a manipulative tactic to contrast the Deceiver's "goodness" as compared to his victimhood and other people's "badness". To extrapolate, superlatives supported the appearance of the Deceiver being a "good" person and thus incapable of being a "bad" person who could deceive. For Receivers, the superlatives in his narrative, emphasized what they wanted to hear from a hero.

**Tactical humility.**

Describing his own performances and moments of humility worked well for the Deceiver. He ingratiated himself to a Receiver or an audience with tactical humility, because it aligned his
public persona with the societal expectations of goodness including helpfulness, generosity and self
deprecation. What appeared to be humility, incited a camaraderie with Receivers around similar
experiences of loss and suffering, altruism and self effacement. Allowing that the Deceiver
continually strove for believability of his hero/liberation deception, it was critical to its success to
have the appearance of humble qualities, whether they were genuine or not. For this reason, self
deprecation about several small, relatively unobtrusive disclosures, offered tidbits of authenticity to
his constructed persona.

When the researcher had suspicions that the Deceiver's self deprecating comments and
humility may be disingenuous and orchestrated, five observations were noted. First, a humble
statement appeared to introduce emotionality before a deceptive script. Secondly, humility improved
the Receiver's reception of the Deceiver and his story. Thirdly, the circumstances that invited
humility could not be verified. Fourthly, it conveyed that the Deceiver's humility had influence or
power over his listeners. Lastly, the supposed humility contributed to the reputation of the Deceiver
as a person.

The researcher then noted that the Deceiver was never hesitant to broadcast his losses,
sufferings and self report his own tenacity or self sacrifice. To an unconvinced listener it seemed to
serve as a confirmation of his self-centredness. The question is raised whether pain and suffering
was exploited for self serving purposes? Except for those who crave publicity, notoriety and
sympathy, who else would desire to publicize their loss and grief? While it is difficult to make
distinctions on such unmeasurable qualities as humility versus false humility, the Deceiver appeared
to demonstrate self-aggrandization in this covert way.
**Tangential details.**

Details and explanations in all conversation, carried the underlying implication that the relationship between Deceiver and a Receiver was personal and carried lasting momentum. Explaining and describing reassured the Receiver of the stage and level of intimacy. Conversely, the withdrawal or reduction of words and explanations conveyed that the relationship had altered or ended. The Deceiver knew that the giving and taking away of words carried inherent meaning to the Receiver. They constituted power and control.

Being explanatory at times in interpersonal communication, allowed the Deceiver to give a false impression of familiarity and closeness. It substituted as a filler in the conversation but appeared to have no relevant substance. Details lent the Deceiver the appearance that he was knowledgeable in many subjects. Given that the Deceiver required many fillers for his narrative to appear to have substance, it is probable that the tangential details reflected the Deceiver's advanced preparation of his fraudulent subject matter.

**Tropes.**

Historical tropes engaged audiences with familiar language. Contextual material became an unauthorized verification of the narrative, making it exceedingly difficult for the Receiver to discern what was historical truth and what was an assumed truth. For example, in examining the narrative as it moved toward the heroism portion, it was interesting to observe that the Deceiver used more historical tropes and offers of "proof" around the main deceptive insert. A trope for example, which captured immediate attention was that orphaned Jewish children were unhappy when fostered in Holland, but happy when living in Israel. For select American audiences, the trope worked well
because it sounded familiar and fit their belief that the Jewish world desired American intervention to aid Israelis in their Biblical homeland. Tropes were unlikely to be held up to accountability.

*Verbalizing concerns for children.*

Appearing to value or protect children consistently contributed to a veneer of respectability. Given that the Deceiver was keen to have his public persona reflect selfless concern and familial values, he inserted prepared scripts regarding little children into his hero/liberation story. He exploited the universal abhorrence of cruelty to children. His audiences became moved and engaged with him as he spoke, assuming that his experiences were valid and that his knowledge of events was accurate. Notwithstanding his claims and stories, the Deceiver's previous and dubious actions to infants, children and youth contrasted sharply with his speeches on the protection of children.

Because the Deceiver wished to gild the heroism of his liberation, it is possible that additional heroic acts he claimed may be specious but were intended to impress listeners with self-aggrandizement about saving or helping children. When he spoke of finding children in Europe, particularly those in Romania and smuggling them to Israel, several of his actions seemed questionable and callous disguised as beneficial and magnanimous.

The theme around children begins with a false translation of Hebrew terms he used in his speeches to audiences and in interviews. The Deceiver states to the interviewer, "I think those three years [with] Haganah and Aliyah..., that means for the help of the children - I think those three years were the most wonderful three years of my life". Specifically, he translated "Haganah" and "Aliyah" to mean "help of the children". This was inaccurate. The correct translation is important to understand how he manipulated the understanding of his resistance work in a paramilitary group to give the impression to Receivers, that he was magnanimous and altruistic. The term "Haganah"
meant "defence" and was the title of a Jewish paramilitary organization. The term "Aliyah" meant "going to Israel". The Haganah, the core of the Israeli Defence Force (IDF) supported illegal immigration, organizing demonstrations against the British and anti-Zionist policies during the British mandate in Palestine (Levine, 2002). Accordingly, clandestine units to smuggle orphaned children (and adults) were set up in Belgium, France and Italy after the war to bring the Jewish diaspora to the nascent country of Israel. The exodus of immigrants was piggybacked onto the illegal shipments of arms and ammunition in the holds of ships; they were used as decoys to offset British interference with the IDF and to stop the capture of goods. The operations were frequently deadly for passengers, particularly for children. The ships that were intercepted in their journey were rerouted, where they either languished at sea in the Mediterranean or lived in sub-human conditions in Cypriot camps (Hadari, 1991). Ariel Sharon, a former Prime Minister of Israel, reported in his autobiography that immigrants who had been Holocaust survivors endured "a double or triple tragedy" not only suffering in their homeland, but they also "had rotted" in Cypriot detention camps under British detention. If they arrived at Haifa at all, they were immediately immersed in "a war zone", then "thrown into battle" (Sharon & Chanoff, 2001, p.52). The Deceiver never produced such true facts of the Haganah, but used unfamiliar terms to aggrandize his reputation, his persona and to engage his Receiver into his heroism construct. The audience was likely captivated by the referral to young children and sympathetic to their collective plight. The strategy had two benefits to his deception narrative: first to weaken recognition of inserted falsehoods, and secondly to strengthen the inference that his motives were meritorious.
Verbalizing loss and suffering.

The theme of loss and personal suffering has a similar purpose to that of child issues, in that the theme impacts the Receiver's feelings and increases his believability in the Deceiver. The frequency with which this theme was used in the narrative was significant. The emotional value inherent in the topics of loss and suffering were purposed to engage the Receivers more deeply and for them to identify more closely with the humanity of the Deceiver.

To the first time listener, the accounts of personal loss and personal suffering caused by the Holocaust, are poignant. In a heroism context, Receivers and audiences would likely expect to hear the negative circumstances of war such as being wounded, grieved, or vulnerable but to hear how the Deceiver overcame these obstacles with positiveness, resiliency, self reliance and a strong character was commendable. Therefore, the assumption is that the Deceiver used this theme as a solid base to convince the Receiver of the likelihood of his heroism to also conduct a liberation. For a Deceiver it was an act. In his narrative, he proudly declared that some actions demonstrated his ability to "perform acts", to manipulate situations, perhaps not recognizing he concurrently was alerting some to suspicion in connection with his purported heroism actions.

Verbalizing the importance of winning.

Winning was clearly the Deceiver's life goal. He exulted in stating many times, that "I won". He can be lauded for surviving his circumstances, but his dedication to winning was deleterious to others if they blocked his path to his goal of heroism. Sometimes it seemed as if winning was the sole message to his sister in Holland. Frequently the attitude of winning underwrote phrases in preformed scripts of atrocities, discrimination, Dutch collaborator issues and loss and suffering incidences. It is probable that any Receiver would emotionally colaborate with his desire to win,
particularly to win over Hitler, so much so, that generally audiences seemed content to accept his liberation heroism readily.

**Summary of Theme 4.**

The grouping of thematic elements in this unit presents a composite of deceptive strategies used in this case study. Although the groupings attempted to categorize non-verbal and verbal elements, several had linkages to each other. Overall, they offer insights into various communication tactics the Deceiver employed to gain access to multiple Receiver support, to persuade a non-targeted Receiver that the deception was true, and to inflict as much damage onto the targeted Receiver as possible.

The elements assist in deconstructing how the Deceiver was able to construct the deception and have it believed. Through aloofness and distancing himself from the Receiver, the Deceiver created a challenge to suspicion and increased his sense of superiority. He used history as an ally to validate his account. He was conscious of his abilities to be intuitive which allowed him to assume he could capitalize on Receiver traits which he considered weak and malleable to his persuasive tactics. His intuition led him to understand what the Receiver wanted to hear from him and thus he delivered the message and emotions that conveyed his concern and leadership convincingly. It did not matter if his proof, statistics or experiences were fabricated, as his overall public persona was glorified further with the heroism he related from various situations. In fact, Receiver upon Receiver could confer their approval of him because of his philanthropic and community associations which attributed several verifications of his reputation, despite the fact that he lived a lie. His sister, the targeted Receiver, who was the first to know that the Deceiver was an imposter, was effectively rejected and unable to contribute to the interpersonal communication circle. Nevertheless, the
Deceiver continued to triangulate Receiver relationships, being sure to engage many non-targeted Receivers into his sphere of influence to offset disbelief or suspicion that may present a challenge from others. He used well worn themes of loss, suffering, victimization, survivor ability, global issues, and children suffering to buttress his own deceptive narrative that he was capable of saving them previously as well as from future horrors. The Deceiver's overall preparedness in conducting his deception was exceptional and fitting for the times. It was a well conceived plan and a well conducted play of times and persons, from which he was to reap immense benefits.

**Understanding Theme 5 - Outcomes of the Deception**

By the definition of this particular high stakes deception, such as evidenced in this case study, the Deceiver benefitted and the Receiver(s) were harmed. This theme unit exposes several of the outcomes to the Deceiver and Receiver, as well as those outcomes as the truth exposes the deception.

**Understanding the benefits to the Deceiver.**

There were three areas that the deception success benefitted the Deceiver: public acknowledgement, familial name enhancement, and the defeating of his sister's legacy. Given that the Deceiver seemed to care more about his own reputation, it is likely that he thought the benefits of deception were satisfying. His public persona offered him the approval for which he had craved from his youth and gave the Deceiver additional status, an authoritative morality and a podium from which to speak. His purported heroism was rewarded financially, another success to add to his repertoire. Whatever public recognition he received, he relished displaying on shelves and walls for all to admire the collection of newspaper articles, certificates, letters and awards. He could reminisce
with enjoyment, that his success in deluding so many had brought him approval and fame; ultimately it had returned status to his paternal name.

It is possible that the person from whom he wished to prove his worth the most, was of course unattainable in the way that he wanted. His father was dead. The person to whom all his resistance was directed, Hitler, was also dead. But the person to whom he desired revenge, his sister, had been wounded but had remained resilient under pressure and was undefeated by the deception game. She had retained the familial home of origin. His country of birth, Holland, which he had betrayed for self fulfilling reasons, would be the first to hold him and his story accountable. That alone must have irked him as an unfinished challenge.

The relationships that the Deceiver had in Canada and particularly the United States, continued to endorse his self identification as the victim. It removed or assuaged any regrets for cruelties or pain he had imposed on others. He became indifferent to the consequences of the truth and lies in his narrative. Moreover, he was proud of his ability to aggressively take and do what he intended to do. Clearly, the Deceiver viewed himself as deserving reimbursement for his victimhood, substantiating studies that indicate certain personalities "see themselves as the victims... [saying] "why doesn't anybody understand what I've been going through"? (Hare, 1993, p.43). The reactionary response to criticism, discipline and authority occasionally is exposed. Yet to many he portrayed himself as a socially acceptable man of decency. The contrast co-existed in that some would continue to admire him even as some knew him to be cruel or dangerous, as if he had, as some remorseless persons do, "an animal inside him" (Hare, 1993, p. 56).

Despite his various financial rewards and other outward manifestations of his deception success and gamesmanship, they were presumably insufficient in satisfying his intrinsic needs. He
had been unable to dismantle his Dutch nephew's attachment to his mother and was unable to achieve unchallenged acceptance from his extended family. By the time of his death in 2012, it is possible that he intuitively foresaw the dismantling of his name and legacy as truth chipped away at his constructed falsehoods.

**Understanding the harm to the Receiver(s).**

The betrayal of the Deceiver's sister, and the estrangement of her following the war, cost the Deceiver a relationship with his only surviving family of origin member. The need he had for revenge, caused him to forfeit all that could have been possible in connectivity with her in the seventy years after the liberation. However the bulk of the detrimental effect of the estrangement squarely fell to his sister and her son. With so many family having been murdered in Europe, the sister bore tremendous grief not to be connected more with the extended family in America. They too dealt with the confusion, awkwardness, and then suspicion.

The non-targeted Receiver, Client 200, acted as an intercessory, non-judgmental liaison with both "sides" of the deception, unintentionally being an accessory to the disengagement of the targeted Receiver while he tried to reconcile all members of the family. He thoroughly had enjoyed a relationship with his uncle and found it difficult to reconcile that the family, including himself, had been betrayed (as did other members of the extended family). The Deceiver meanwhile, demonstrated his preferential connections with the American family which emphasized the sister's disengagement and losses. The Deceiver exploited his relationship with the non-targeted family members in order to achieve the maximum misery for his sister.

As a pattern, the Deceiver seemed to utilize someone to be his decoy or his sacrifice, whether a sister, friend, wife, mother, nephew or others. It worked very well for his self
preservation. While the Deceiver's audiences were focussed on the meritorious heroism accounts, he continued to be detached from his sister and nephew in Holland, to inflict continual accusations on his sister, and to keep revenge very much an active effort.

**Understanding findings that support the Interpersonal Deception Theory (IDT).**

A quantitative snapshot of this story would not have offered such completeness of investigative findings, a more holistic view of a real high stakes deception case. The richness of the study is reflected in the variety of perspectives, examined against historically relevant discrepant evidence. The qualitative inquiry uniquely provides a means to examine all components evidenced in the high stakes deception over its entire life span. The patterns that have been exposed are critical to a better understanding of how a deception is constructed.

Because of the complex layers of the case study, the researcher chose the Interpersonal Deception Theory (IDT) because it theorized a progressive path of the deception dependent on the influence of the reciprocal relationship between the Deceiver and Receiver including pre-existing relational conditions, expectations of trust, the contextual environment of the deception (source credibility), as well as considering conversational effects over the duration of the deception. The theory is highly relevant to this case study, "to describe an iterative process of mutual influence in which the enactment of deception by one conversational participant provokes a cascade of moves and countermoves by both parties to the conversation. These moves are aimed on the one hand at adapting the deceptive message in order to maintain its apparent truthfulness (i.e. achieving deception success)" (Buller & Burgoon, 1996, p.6).

Recognizing that a vital relationship must first exist for the deception to be constructed, it is assumed from the findings that the principal Receiver, as well as audience Receivers, became
impressed and drawn towards the Deceiver by certain traits. Being fun and demonstrating strong leadership were two of the personality attractants. The Deceiver then, was attracted to those who admired him for those traits with their caring nature and sense of acquiescence to his leadership. What becomes evident early in the relationship is a sense of "knowing" each other well, which sustains the Receiver/Deceiver relationship, even as it diminishes. It is the Receiver's resolve to prioritize relational closeness over suspicions that dampen the desire to confront the Deceiver which in turn, raises his anxiety. The relationship, stable and trusting initially, begins to fragment as the deception awareness consolidates and the Receiver realizes that he or others, may suffer harmful outcomes by exposing the Deceiver.

In line with the Interpersonal Deception Theory, the situational context and pre-deception interaction factors of this specific case study have been explored as widely as possible, because the researcher, in agreement with the theoretical premise, considers the historical context, the Zeitgeist of the 1990 decade, as well as individual characteristics, non-verbal communication and intuitive knowing between the Deceiver and Receiver, as collectively impacting the receptivity and endurance of the deception. The researcher would add that without appreciating the contribution of such precursors, the deconstruction of this deception would be impaired or skewed.

The pre-deception relationship, as has been explained in the previous chapters, is instrumental in understanding the efficacy of the strategic elements with which the Deceiver used to manage the deception. Eventually, both the mutual knowing of each other's responses, behaviours and script repetitions contributed to the Deceiver's ability to sense ways to enjoy success in self-presentation, and implement ways to circumvent suspicion. "Leakage behaviours" erupted occasionally. The term, used to describe small narrative, non-verbal or logical inconsistencies,
concerned the non-targeted Receiver particularly. In other words, the very elements that constructed
and concealed the deception, were transforming into indicators signalling to the Receiver that
something was amiss on a grand scale.

From examining the theory further, its eighteen assumptions assisted in identifying
connections between the cognitions of each participant and later behaviours. For example, the
Receiver's apprehension which he experienced when earlier specific events seemed to be
inappropriate, changed to anxiety which increased proportionately to the deception's success, as he
felt relatively disabled and incapacitated to effectively halt or alter its progress. Certainly it is
evident that chronic anxiety and negative affect have been evident in the demeanour and restrictions
in some life activities of the targeted Receiver. The anxiety is apparent in the principal Receiver as
deception counters his value of honesty, which carried forward as an expectant trust that the
Deceiver would be equally and reciprocally truthful, involved and conversational. Noted in other
research as a "truth bias", Receivers tend to be hesitant to attribute deception to others, particularly
difficult if the person is familiar to the Receiver, highly influential or well regarded by others with
whom the Receiver knows (Levine et al. 1999; Vrij, 2000). When this expectation of trust is
violated, the Receiver is thrust into a cognitive and emotional confusion; first to 'fix" the problem
and then to tolerate incongruence. Ultimately, the Receiver feels betrayed. The pattern to achieve a
betrayal of trust is likely a component of the sibling deception.

The theory suggests that as a skilled Deceiver, he intuitively knew how he must actively seek
trust and compliance and so must monitor a continual evolution of the deceptive narrative in all
communication. As a result, the Deceiver, constantly was aware of what was true, partially true and
altogether false, continuously adjusting the deceptive narrative with emotive inserts or details that
solicited the desired responses in order to safely place his deceptive story with higher believability quotients by means of correct timing and sufficient emotion. As the Receiver responded, the Deceiver could alter, correct, substantiate with proof, use the influence of others, draw on his constructed reputation to further persuade or to humiliate.

The theory supports further observations in the principal case study that, over time, the Deceiver became increasingly sensitive to challenge, and more strategic in managing and maintaining his public persona more rigorously. He was less likely to be aware of illogical or incongruent statements. By contrast, the Deceiver could convey authenticity more convincingly as the deception progressed. In the case study, the repeated scripts and presentation modality produced such a convincing, polished version by the year 2000, that even authorities and many historians had been duped. To a lesser degree, this case study supported the assumption that the Deceiver altered details of his deception narrative over time. The deceptive portion of the narrative was largely consistent although there was evidence of changes made to his primary artifacts he used for proof of his story.

In fact, the Deceiver appeared to control his narrative well and to intuitively know how to convey it as normalized interpersonal communication. The researcher observed that the Deceiver communicated the deception portion in small doses, so to speak, delivering non-important details in a high intensity style and with prolixity, but injected the deception in low intensity style, subtly and simply. At the time of delivery, it seemed undetectable.

Empirical evidence supporting IDT states that detached observers can detect deceit more readily than participant Receivers. The present case study did not fully concur, observing that some Receivers more familiar with the contextual information were the ones who recognized the
deception more quickly than casual listeners to whom the deception incurs little or unknown impact. However it was also observed that the principal Receiver, who adored his uncle, required considerable time to assess the deceptive narrative. An aunt of the Receiver astutely recognized that the only persons who questioned or were suspicious were those who had experienced similar historical elements of the Deceiver's story. For example, the stated aunt who had endured Auschwitz concentration camp, as well as the overall Ausweis restrictions of the Occupation of Holland, was an early contender that the Deceiver was lying for self aggrandizement.

Nonetheless, the Deceiver enacted a variety of communication tactics simultaneously to ensure his deception sounded like truth to his audiences and specific Receivers. According to IDT, the Deceiver must begin the interpersonal exchange with the Receiver using accurate, validated statements that guide the Receiver to accept the balance of the narrative as true. The Deceiver must rely on relevant knowledge and familiarity to be believable. If the deception is delivered as a brief insert between a plethora of words and facts, in context with measured emotion, the deception can appear significantly less toxic than it is. Once the Receiver suspects the Deceiver, the latter retracts intimacy. The Receiver finds it extremely difficult to understand at this point, why others still remain deluded by the Deceiver's falsehoods and disingenuous persona.

The Interpersonal Deception Theory explores how emotion prompted by the Deceiver in the script, plays a central role in the deception success. The non verbal emotive actions of the Deceiver, inclusive of facial cues, ascertained as genuine by non-targeted Receivers, elicits a visceral reaction from the targeted Receiver(s), signalling to the Deceiver that his deception is affecting his intended target whereas elsewhere it is gaining support. In the Deceiver's self-evaluation, this constitutes a "win".
The Deceiver and Receiver quickly aligned in conversational roles that contributed to the deception relationship gaining momentum. Despite that the Receiver attempted to challenge, understand and rectify incongruent facts with the Deceiver, the latter declined engagement. Yet the Receiver held fast to the continuity of the relationship. However the fact that he exposed his queries, activated the Deceiver's change in relational direction. In the Deceiver's words, the targeted Receiver deserved consequences which included disdain and avoidance. The Interpersonal Deception Theory explains this phenomenon as a non-static deception communication, an ongoing platform for the individuals to deal with actual or perceived deception and suspicion on the conscious and subconscious levels. In other words, both the Deceiver and Receiver are promoting their own sense of the interaction and relationship, which at this point veers apart according to their vastly different perceptions, values and goals. Thus, word usage becomes central as a meaning laden tool, powered by disparate motivations.

According to IDT, analytical knowing is valued by both Deceiver and Receiver. For example, the Deceiver "knows" that the Receiver's value of caring will emerge as emotional explanations. The Receiver unwittingly provides the Deceiver with a valuable source of information that the latter will effectively use against the Receiver to defer challenges. In addition, he "knows" that the Receiver's caring conversations will absorb fault, tolerate miscreant behaviours and provide avenues of relational restoration which the Deceiver has no intention of using but provides little in the way of obstruction. As the IDT states, "because senders are monitoring receivers for feedback...detection ability is likely to decline over time in conversation" (Buller & Burgoon, 1996, p. 30). By means of conversation and well intentioned effort, the Receiver has provided an extended
time frame for the Deceiver to perfect the public persona and to prepare further information management.

Interestingly, across the findings the Deceiver, as evaluated by the Receiver, made a tremendous effort to have relationships, not to connect with his sister the targeted Receiver, but to engage with charitable organizations, public forums, religious and community leadership. He valued any award, diploma, media attention, that seemingly bolstered his prestige and notoriety. It was a opportunistic buttressing strategy to deflect challenges or accountability.

The Deceiver, according to the IDT, becomes comfortable in the deceiving role, and with more time, in strategically modifying deliberate deception (Buller & Burgoon, 1996, p.15). In short, deception success is conditional to whom the Deceiver targets as a Receiver, the strength and acuity of the deception, how effective the reciprocal communication between both participants is, in addition to what degree of suspicion is sustained in the relationship.

The longitudinal perspective embraced by the Interpersonal Deception Theory purports that when the Receiver is finally able to rise above the despondency of having been duped, the network that the Deceiver has already established is strong enough to resist suspicions, accusations, legal action or rebuff. The Receiver becomes increasingly alarmed that his own valid concerns appear false, petty and disrespectful to a person who appears to be well established, who is financially strong and has the public appearance of being morally upright or even a bona fide philanthropist/leader. Non-targeted Receivers add considerable emotional stress to the targeted Receiver because they cannot fathom that the Deceiver, wearing his constructed persona, could conceivably be of any character other than what they themselves have witnessed or experienced. The targeted Receiver becomes further isolated for reasons not of their making.
Summary of Theme 5.

It was important for the Deceiver to maintain a sense of superiority while maintaining an appearance of vulnerability throughout the high stakes deception. Therefore he required a social dominance to rectify his perceived "status injuries" with "social recognition" (McLaughlin, 2012, p. 41). The Deceiver visualized his social connections with enjoyment giving him a highly anticipated means of notoriety. In comparison, the Receiver viewed the social scene as further humiliation once the Deceiver had laid blame. Publicity seemed invasive.

In the study, it was observed that the Deceiver made deliberate attempts to become known. Hyperbolized details which were intentionally subjective and self perceived as attractive, were part of his social status strategy to entrench himself with people as if they too, were part of his game. Hence, deception advancement depended on "seeking visibility for narcissistic purposes" reflecting a "celebrity culture" (2012, p. 321, 335). Added to this concept is the notion, evident in the case study, that claiming widespread contacts and friends for self validation, numbers and names presented as proof of credibility, lost influence over time and eventually incurred suspicion.

By the time that the deception was recognized as a grossly incapacitating one, the detection of truth was hampered by apparent supporting material, assumed veracity from the years of broadcasting the story, as well as it contradicted the established public persona that the Deceiver had created. However, as facts continued to displace the falsehoods and become more solid, time is being recognized as the defender of the truth.

Conclusions

A word search in various dictionaries uncovered one hundred and twelve synonyms of the word "deception", formally identifying the difficulty of pinpointing the shades of meaning to
understand its many facets. To extrapolate this difficulty is to define the variants of a high stakes deception. A similar difficulty exists for the Receivers on a personal level, to understand how they were betrayed, deceived, duped, manipulated and hated. The reciprocal and intimate communication which instigated the deceptive relationship is then confounded by the revenge communication that follows rejection. It is divisive, toxic and potentially overwhelming because there are multiple layers of innuendo, betrayal, alleged facts and elements of proof to continue a betrayal for a very long time.

In a sense this study was a complex microsociological project attempting to deconstruct the creation and maintenance of a verifiable deception. The findings are not statistical, but influential. From the findings, an immense amount of information and knowledge suggested deceptive patterns. It proposes that the early identification of the deception may lie in observing and understanding the traits and patterns of regressive behaviour of the targeted Receiver and the subsequent rejection by the Deceiver. It needs attention to the inherent difficulties as the Receiver (targeted and non-targeted) attempt to interact with a formerly intimate person who disparages the Receiver but otherwise maintains a polished public persona. In addition, the strategies that are exposed in this study and used in multiple combinations to exact the deceptive purpose, may provide insightful knowledge to challenge the Deceiver while the deception is in progress. To a great degree in the handling of a high stakes deception, in conjunction with refusing to engage with the Deceiver as is possible, the study strongly encourages the earliest accountability of facts, allegations, blame and even the proof and documentation provided by the person in question. As such, discrepant evidence was used in this study to test the potency of some statements and evidences of "proof" made by the Deceiver.
The entrance of the 1990's Zeitgeist advocated a social conformity shift, in that, war atrocities violated moral codes. The Deceiver is assumed to have very shiftable moral codes throughout his years, but could identify with what the populace wanted. He arrived as a vindicator and a saviour. Perhaps he believed that his high stakes deception was justified as a cleansing effort. Nonetheless, with the advent of imposters scheming to benefit from the victim/survivor/hero labels, a countermovement arose in the late 1990's and early millennium years which have debunked several Holocaust frauds, of which this story is now categorized in Dutch history. "There is great societal interest in identifying liars who would otherwise reap the benefit of undetected deception" (Akhtar & Parens, 2012, p.103). The principal Receiver's aunt once told him that the only people who would discover the falsehoods were the people who had experienced the same thing. She knew that the story of liberating Kamp Westerbork did not include the lies he told and she could identify a fraud.

The historical pieces seemed valuable to the researcher in that it took a considerable amount of time to explore and to confirm aspects of context. Without certain falsehoods being identified, it would have been an incomplete study as it attempted to explore further manipulative elements which in combination, provided the tactical means to conduct a believable deception. Historical records, military records and personal accounts from a variety of persons pointed to the truth and by knowing the truth, the counterfeit was clear.

The descriptors identifying the Deceiver and the Receiver are not exhaustive, but are what was evident from the descriptions in the case study. The descriptors suggested that similarities between the Deceiver and Receiver attracted them to each other and then facilitated interpersonal communication until an equalized relationship was desired by the targeted or non-targeted Receiver.
From that crossroads, the Deceiver seemingly had no interest in anything but a hierarchal relationship and as such, attempted to sabotage all efforts to compromise, tolerate, accommodate, forgive, or understand the Receiver. In fact it is proposed that the Deceiver was incapable of these interrelational skills because he viewed others' opinions as insults. His self perception was that he was a tough, self reliant model of leadership with intuitive and personable skills. He believed that his aggressiveness and superiority ought to be apparent and respected. To the researcher, it suggested that his psychological deficiencies of attachment and approval, to which he likely owed his unrelenting drive to overcome, were unsatisfied by his successes. The threatened egotism evident in the Deceiver's need for approval and self-aggrandizement, has empirically established links to narcissism and aggression factors (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). There is ample subject matter to further place the Deceiver's characteristics under the Dark Triad Theory lens, as it appears to satisfy the criteria of the three "dark" personality types of narcissism, Machiavellianism and sub-clinical psychopathy as a three sided unit (Le, 2016). Egotism, a contributive feature, where the person remains emotionally invested in self all through the developmental years, then emerges in a constant cycle of re-evaluating, re-establishing and readjusting his self image, his sense of superiority and status to minimize any perceived threat to self. The motivation to be superior to others and to invalidate those closest to him suggests a source. The question is whether the experiences that the Deceiver experienced in his youth, that being self focus and self preservation as primary, may have been encouraged in a negative direction that could only be assuaged by disabling anyone who challenged or competed with their agenda of self promotion.

The Receiver's personality traits seemed to fit with socially accepted norms, but also seemed to fit with what the Deceiver considered malleable and vulnerable. These were the traits that the
Deceiver was able to betray and contort into problems, which in turn overwhelmed the Receiver and convulsed the relationship. Yet it became apparent that the Deceiver might have benefitted from utilizing another Receiver to liaison with him. It was explored what a triangulated relationship might accomplish for the Deceiver, despite that it created an imbalance of power. It was thought that the non-targeted Receiver unwittingly exacerbated the estrangement of the targeted Receiver as he tried to mediate since the targeted Receiver recognized more deeply her rejection and the Deceiver's preference and availability to the non-targeted Receiver's family.

Elements of the deception were not used singly, but in groupings according to the Deceiver's discretion at the moment. Non verbal elements may have alerted the Receiver to suspicion whereas verbal elements were likely to be the primary source of hurt and confusion. The variety of ways that words could be employed to establish the deception or to control the Receiver confirmed the savviness of the Deceiver and his lack of remorse for the consequences. He was able to extract increased empathy from using themes that included child welfare, personal losses, death and horrors, as well as pleasant thoughts of familial connectedness. Three elements emerged as essential to the furtherance of the deception and deconstructed at length how the Deceiver used them efficaciously: maintaining his public persona, providing proof to support his deception and preparedness in constructing his narrative ensconced in historical facts.

The deconstruction process in this research advances the Interpersonal Deception Theory that pre-deceptive familiarity, specific descriptor traits, and interpersonal communication involvement along with contextual elements, gives a prepared high stakes deception potential life and momentum. Once an equalizing or challenging stance is taken by the Receiver, providing impetus to the Deceiver's perception of having been unfairly dealt a status injury, the revenge
mentality prepares to orchestrate whatever strategic means is gauged to be most useful to exploit the Receiver. The patterns that are exposed in this study are a "thin slice of behaviour" captured from a historical narrative that may invoke further study to isolate reciprocally invitational attractants between a Deceiver and Receiver and subsequent deceptive communication (Burgoon, 2015).

The findings supported that the Deceiver believed he had "won". That is, his goal was attained, which mattered considerably to him, whereas the unscrupulous means to achieve it, mattered very little. Winning was essential to his sense of self, his sense of public worthiness and his sense of legacy. From his need to win, the sanctimonious self image increased with every card of thanks, every article or interview, media attention and every award. The Deceiver likely believed he had advanced his familial name, felt morally upright, righteous in his voiced sentiments and invincible, simply because his deception worked. His moral compass may have been absent or self regulated, but remorse most certainly was not part of it.

Limitations of this Study

The study was limited by the very nature of its subject. It is a broad topic with many tangents that could be explored. It is a sensitive subject and for the family involved, it is a topic that may incur further outcomes and defensiveness.

Although the investigation of facts required extensive research on military and historical evidence, there were topics of personality disorders and traits that could not be explored adequately as to how they contributed to the Deceiver/Receiver relationship and the Deceiver/Receiver communication. Although the Deceiver engaged with many Receivers, the findings are limited to investigating the targeted and the non-targeted Receiver. It was alluded how Receiver audiences did not hold the speaker accountable to fact checking, but this avenue was not fully examined in this
study. As well, it was beyond the scope of this study to determine which deception strategies had the strongest effect on Receivers.

The study relied on multiple sources including many testaments given by persons who are still alive to tell their story. However with two key participants being deceased, the researcher was limited to their narratives in recorded modalities or in written form in addition to accounts given by those who had known and interacted with them.

The study was an attempt to understand historical and military evidence as it pertained to a family disclosure of deception that had international outcomes. The non statistical basis of this study, although richly informing, has the limits of applicability to other high stake deception situations.

**Opportunities for Future Research**

The hypothesis offered by the researcher that the Deceiver uses a decoy Receiver to assist in his harm of the targeted Receiver, suggests a triangulated bond exists in this particular type of high stakes deception as a component of a prepared deceptive plan. The researcher is inclined towards pursuing future study that could examine whether the Deceiver intuitively senses that to exact the most harm to one Receiver, he/she requires another Receiver to be useful as a liaison and source of information. Despite that the Deceiver offers no co-operative intent to restore the relationship with the targeted Receiver whom he perceives as vexatious, further study may expose the usefulness of a "decoy" Receiver who does desire reconciliation. The case study findings suggest further exploration is warranted to examine if a "decoy" Receiver exists as a necessary component of the deception to placate the targeted Receiver, to provide information, to support the Deceiver (even
temporarily), and unintentionally prolong the wounding of the targeted Receiver while suspicion and
detection of the deception is stalled.

The Deceiver required his targeted Receiver to lose, which in his estimation deserved
humiliation and disgrace. Further studies might correlate the level of desired revenge in this type of
high stakes deception to the degree and length of time in which the Deceiver employs tactics to
achieve it.

**Summation**

The purpose of the research has been accomplished in that the factors which contributed to
the deception have been exposed. It allows for the discrepant evidence to shine through the partial
truths and falsehoods so that the true heroism account of the VIII RECCE patrol of the Canadian
2nd Division Infantry, under the command of Client 210 can stand firm for the generations of
inquirers seeking to respect the legacy of the Dutch Jews and their Canadian liberators. In addition,
many who encountered the same sufferings as the Deceiver chose to move on, perhaps even to
forgive their perpetrators of discrimination, but never to consider using their own deplorable
situation to manipulate others or to gain from it disreputably. This research honours them.

The ramifications from the deception and false heroism wounded a family with undeserved
blame, the loss of connectivity, and the loss of reputation. The family needs healing from the
outcomes of the deception. It is clear that the bulk of the initial work to move forward from
suspicion to confronting deception, has required of the principal Receiver an incredible courage and
devotion to family truth. The very strength of his words has accomplished what authentic and
truthful words ought to achieve, that being they are the pillars of justice and mercy working
together. In doing so, the web of deceit is shattered and the truth released.
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Scripted Narratives Used by the Deceiver

Samples of eight scripted portions, which were repeatedly used in the Deceiver's narrative, are direct quotes from the same interview, and are listed alphabetically (Klein interview, April 23, 2010).

The cattle car transport script.

The cattle car transport of Jews from Kamp Westerbork to concentration camps further east in Europe, is a factual piece of Holocaust history. The cattle car transport script is raw. It was used to substantiate the claim of being a victim and provide drama. It is not true that Client 230 was transported to Kamp Westerbork via a cattle car.

And after fourteen days they put us all in a boxcar. A boxcar is one of those cattle cars that they used to transport the Jewish people to the concentration camps...no windows, no seats, no nothing. I was in there with about, I would say eighty people, no water, no food, no bathroom facilities. There was a barrel in the corner. Three days and three nights, people had to let go, the smells, the stench, the old people moaning, groaning, heart attack, kids, babies, crying.

The discrimination of Jews script.

The discrimination script was used by the Deceiver, to give validation of his desire to speak to various groups about his Holocaust experiences, and his alleged heroism.

Discrimination has killed more people than anything else in the world. Discrimination is deadly. Discrimination is the worst thing there is...Don't you ever discriminate because if you discriminate you start a next Holocaust. Because that's how it all started, with
discrimination. Hate. bigotry. That's the worst thing in the world. Don't ever ever discriminate or hate. Scrub hate out, completely...you will say that you were present when a survivor of the Holocaust, a witness, made you a witness for the other witnesses.

The Dutch/Nazi collaborators script.

The Dutch/Nazi collaborators script highlights benefits the collaborators received, if they became collaborators with the Germans.

Because of - some did it for they could get jobs, they could get extra rations and coupons and all that stuff...and some were very happy to join...they are joiners in this world who would just join for the sake of joining and they don't even know what they join for. But when they were in the Dutch Nazi organization, they felt they became somebody. They felt they were Ubermensch, they felt above and stronger than anybody else... there were so many collaborators in Holland, it's known for it, it's statistics.

The escape script.

The primary deception lies in the escape script which alleges heroism by virtue of an unlikely escape from Kamp Westerbork, then returning to save 876 fellow Jewish inmates. This script is the precursor script to a further script, alleging a close friendship with the Brigadier-General.

There was a Brigadier-General - that name I found out later...and he claimed that by an interpreter that I was a collaborator with the Nazis. I said I was an escapee from Westerbork concentration camp!..I walked through the night, four miles, five miles, don't know, away from the camp...the camp you are talking about are military barracks. We have seen from reconnaissance planes yesterday we took the pictures, only military. I
said, sure because we were kept in the barracks we were not allowed to go out. No you're lying, it's not true, they're military barracks and we're going to bombard it and flatten it with artillery fire. So I said to the Brigadier-General "If you do so I told you right now that there is being kept about close to a thousand Jewish people there. If you are going to do that then I'm going to hold you responsible after the war for killing a thousand innocent people. I told you so. He looked a little different at me. He said are you willing to go back with a six man patrol? I said I'm not going back in German territory without being armed. No we don't arm civilians I said Well that's too bad... so he changed his mind, he gave me a Sten gun with several rounds of ammunition and we had to start walking. ... we run into stiff German resistance. And they had to eliminate them... It got a bit daylight when we got to the camp... he came over to me and said, "Oh you were right".

The Deceiver depended heavily on an alleged attest, purportedly written by the Brigadier-General. "This picture is the, how do you call it, the attest from General Allard. This when he was already now a full fledged General, Chief of Staff, giving a certification of what happened".

**The 48 years of silence script.**

The catch phrase, "48 years", is the time period that the Deceiver claimed he kept a secret. The Deceiver addresses a potential suspicion from listeners as to why he held a secret about heroism from family and friends, by offering an explanatory script.

But what I want to tell you also is that for forty-eight years I had my experience during the war locked inside myself, I couldn't speak about it, it's hard, was kind of emotional to talk about these things. But I've never talked about this here. How did I get to talk about
it after 48 years...Because for 48 years I didn't talk about anything, you know. Only I
start to talk to combat the Holocaust deniers.

**The Holocaust legacy/six million reasons script.**

The personal legacy of the Deceiver, is built around the noble purpose of countering deniers
of the Holocaust. The legacy claim for "six million reasons" offered the Deceiver a change of
identity, from victim to a victor.

But those who are attempting to deny my suffering and the suffering of millions of
others, they have forced me to speak out...And that's why I'm doing what I'm doing.
These days I'm going to schools, universities, colleges and organizations and I talk about
the Holocaust to combat the Holocaust deniers. That's actually the main idea of the whole
thing.

This script occasionally included the details of the deaths of six million Jews.

So I do that because I have a legacy to do that. A legacy, and I have six million reasons.
The six million reasons are the six million Jews who dies in the concentration camps. Six
million Jews who died. Among the six million Jews, a million and a half children. A
million and a half.

**The Nazi atrocities script.**

The atrocities committed under the Nazi regime are inserted into the Deceiver's narrative at
various points for historical parallelism, and emotional effect on the audience. The script
occasionally included references to the harm children suffered.

While they were killing millions of Jewish kids, I never understood that mentality how
they could just [go about their business?] on the concentration camps, they're getting, get
together with their own people having their parties and singing and dancing, and all this -
they were beasts. They were beasts.

The Deceiver associates the atrocities instigated by Hitler as an aberration of German intelligence
and ability, to gain emotional momentum in his narrative.

One crazy man - Hitler. There were millions who followed him. Those highly, highly,
highly, highly highly, highly intelligent Germans - because these Germans...they were the
best in anything and everything, scientists, physicists, in literature, in arts, in tool
making, in furniture making, in you name it...and that these highly highly intelligent
[people] ...to follow a madman and kill eleven million people, not for what they had done
but for what they were.

The no living relatives script.

The Deceiver increased the emotional level in his speeches when he stated he was an orphan,
despite that he was an adult when his parents were killed. This script declared there were no living
relatives, which was a blatant falsehood.

After the war, when I came out of the war, I was alone. My parents didn't come back. I
didn't know what to do. And I was going there every day to the Red Cross for months to
see relatives come back or put a name on that, a name and after a month and two months
and three months and then after six months I had to give up. I didn't see the names of my
parents or any other relatives.
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Guiding Questions for Semi Structured Interview

1. How did you experience the deception situation from your perspective?
2. How did deception take shape?
3. How do you think the situation impacted yourself and others?
4. How did you communicate with the Deceiver in this deceptive situation?
5. How would you describe the Deceiver?
6. How do you describe yourself?
7. How did the Deceiver manage to deceive others effectively?
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Sample of Initial Designation of Meaning Units

Excerpt from taped interview of Deceiver, Client 230. (Klein, April 23, 2010)

Strategy - REC uses DEC language
- "Go back again for me though to Westerbork. How did you get out?"

Strategy - deflect direct question, shift to historical context/truth insert
- "Artillery fire heard"
- "We knew any day we would be liberated" and "I said to my buddy, You know pretty soon we're going to be free"
- "In the middle of the day we had to stop working. Twelve o'clock...It was April the 11th."

Self Description
- "I don't trust that. That I don't trust.

Strategy - use of fear/saviour theme
- "If the Allied forces are coming closer and closer, the guards are going to run away. What are they going to do with all the people in the barracks before they run away? They can come in with a machine gun and mow us all down", I said, "We're going to escape tonight".

Self as primary/tough partial truth
- "Well if you don't go, then I go by myself."
- "I crawled on my stomach out of the barrack, ducked myself into a garbage dump."

Strategy - non verbals
- Sigh
unverified/illogic - "Put a box over my head, and a hole in it to be able to breathe. When it was completely dark and I'd crawled out from the camp, I escaped. Then I went under the barbed wire.

Strategy - truth insert
- "Because in Westerbork the barbed wire was not on the electric power"

Strategy - escape script
- "I start walking in the dark through the woods for hours"
- "In the direction of the noise of the artillery fire"
- "Then I got between two fighting armies."
- "Bullets were flying all around"
- "I got to a canal...I undress and I got my clothes, held it above water and I swum across the canal" 
- "When I came out on the other side, I had a rifle butt on my head... They took me into custody"

Script - illogical/false
- "Yesterday we took the pictures from reconnaissance planes"

Strategy - blame/emotion
- "I'm going to hold you responsible after the war for killing a thousand innocent people"

Script - illogical/false
- "Are you willing to go back with a six man patrol? I said "Sure". Give me some firing power. I'm not going back in German territory without being armed."
- "So he changed his mind, he gave me a Sten gun with several rounds of ammunition "
- "We run into stiff German, SS and collaborators from the German side...we started to fight these men, ...we eliminated these guys, we didn't lose any of our own men and we continued to walk"

Strategy - partial truth
- "..it got a little bit daylight when we go to the camp and everybody was still in the barracks"
- "..there was one man with us with a field radio, he radioed
back to his commander that it's true what I told, it's a camp with prisoners"

"and an hour and a half later the Canadian armed forces rolled into camp.

"The Brig/Gen. was there too...he came over to me and all he said in his very heavy voice, "Oh, you were right".

"And twenty two years later...I go , I said, 'Don't you recognize me? Who? Holland, Westerbork! And he looked at me, he said, You're the boy who swam across the canal..."

"We became good friends."

"As a matter of fact I have pictures that I can show you on that."

-48 years not talking script/Holocaust deniers script

"Kids ask me questions. And they say, [S] you were talking about that you were at Westerbork but you didn't say how you were liberated, how you came out of it and that is how the story came out with the Brigadier General."

"That was the story with the Brig.General there. I will show a picture later on of the Brig. General."

- Dutch collaborators in Holland script

"I became a guard in Westerbork"

"I will never be able to find peace"

"beasts, I will never be able to find peace"

"I don't want to go very deep in my mind about what happened and what I have lost

"I don't want to take stock, go really deep, deep into it"

"I don't want to because ...I would smash everything around me to pieces".

" I don't want to go deep into it because it has really been Unbeclumacable".

"after the war... My parent didn't come back. I didn't know what to do".

"I didn't see the names of my parents or any other relatives. There was one aunt and I had to give up"

"I am looking at the guy in the mirror...I took care of myself"

"There were were also children who were given during the war by Jewish people into hiding ' take my child' and after the war [we want] to get it back"
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Inter-rater Summary

Upon reading the transcripts of Client 230, dated May 5th, June 26th, July 7th, and July 10th, 2010, the following review is my initial impression of Client 230 and some common themes I saw throughout the four interviews. The consent form I signed, recognizes my agreement to confidentiality of the information and persons mentioned in the transcripts, as well as establishes my own request for confidentiality as a participant in this research study.

Client 230 was a Holocaust survivor who overcame all odds to survive. On multiple occasions in this interview, it seemed clear that the interviewer and Client 230 had already talked off record and that the interviewer had seen or pre-selected personal items or documents. The interviewer mentioned topics, leading the interviewee in his story by bringing up key elements. She mentioned situations that Client 230 had not addressed, or he stated he had already told her about what he wanted to talk about.

Client 230 was clever, using whatever means he could to protect himself, even if this meant taking other people's lives into his own hands if he saw a possible threat to himself. He challenged authority as he saw fit and justified it to himself, always reflecting on the negative situation as if he had a choice, but was always in control of the situation. He clearly knew the rules and restrictions, yet justified that he could determine if they should be obeyed. He seemed unapologetic about stealing, making fraudulent ID, convincing others to do things that were wrong, harming others, and pushing back at authority figures. He does feel unease however, when he thinks he is being watched, fingerprinted or controlled by others. He believes that he knows best and knows how others think and how they will react. He speaks of his family in high regard especially of his father, yet he makes little effort to rescue them or help them if his own wellbeing comes first.

Client 230 was resourceful, savvy and a braggart. He often praised his own brilliance in plans or what advice he provided for others (secret rooms, escaping police, escaping camps). When things did not work out for him, he blamed others who did not listen to his orders. Their problems, he emphasized, were because they didn’t listen to him. He saw himself as not needing any help from anyone, that he was a survivor solely because of himself.

More pride arose when Client 230 detailed how he had harmed others. Even for someone he killed, he remembered names and dates as if it was a personal victory. He thought murdering a collaborator was funny, and making a fly wretched was funny, as if both existed for his own entertainment. He mentioned the famous two jails he stayed at as it was known for the good Dutch people, only the good ones would be there, identifying himself as a good Dutch person, better than the collaborators.

Client 230's story seems rehearsed, as if he had to control the interviews. Often when questioned by the interviewer, he stated he will tell that point later, or switches topics, or is seen as rude, controlling or dictating. He focused on linking himself with individuals of high regard, promoting himself and his good deeds. He focused on stories of himself on the front page with pictures in the newspaper, speaking on radio, or television. He links himself to people of greater importance; royalty, consul-general, chief of staff, the Queen of Holland, a very well know famous professor, a famous trumpet player in the biggest band, a
Westerbork guard, all adding to his name. He thinks it is honouring his parents if his name goes on a big monument.

It sounds like Client 230 had some psychological instability and insecurity, as he stated several times he could not ever will find peace. He admitted that he could not go deep into his mind as he would go bananas, go berserk, smash everything around him to pieces, implying he knew he had rage issues that were uncontrollable. In his final interview he demonstrated this rage towards the Germans, explaining the gruesome killing and suicides at the Quarry, heightened anger causes stuttering in words and using incomplete sentences to show disdain for the deniers. The use of the single word ‘unbeclumacable’, that he created to describe his experiences during the Holocaust, seemed to be repeated several times, to cement the word and its meaning.

In the later interviews Client 230 placed great emphasis on children, stating that he shared his story to protect them, (possibly fear conditioning), to making him appear as their rescuer. He seemed to have no regulatory holdback, to know what behaviour was appropriate for an adult male around children. He stated that he watched them at school, followed them home, sometimes came into their homes and talked to parents, but lured them to exit to Jewish communities in Israel. He personalized his connection to children by claiming that he saved hundreds of kids, that they loved him when he visited them, and had thousands upon thousands of letters from children to tell him how thankful they were to him, gratifying his role and his importance/legacy. His best day was marching with 500 children for Israel's proclamation day as he drove a car holding the Jewish flag at the front of the march, putting himself in a place of authority and leadership among the children.

Client 230 demonstrated that he believed he was entitled to his leadership, claiming the street belonged to him, he was entitled to more food, coupons, or freedoms to which other Jewish people were not. His claims about the family name seemed fickle, as he played with the letters of the name, then stated it came from a good source, and that others must keep it in high regard, as if it was royalty or had unusual importance.

Initially, when I read the transcripts I found myself seeing several red flags indicating a person that found it easy to say anything at all, as it often did not match with his actions that he would tell about later. I noticed my reaction when he would describe things. His long descriptions and his proof, made me think at first that what he said must be right because he had proof and details because they cemented his story and made it more legitimate in ways. However, when I re-read the content again, questions came up because then I recalled how somewhere in his story he had said the opposite or he told of things that contradicted. I found that the documents for proof raised more questions why he presented that specific document. The document did not justify his illegal activities, or killings but did he think so? There were two letters dated August 15th, 1990 and October 29th, 1990, written by the Chief of Defence Staff, concerned me to ask why would there be a follow up letter sent just over two months later, to clarify that they "eliminated the enemy resistance", and emphasize that Client 230 "who was armed by us, fully participated in these activities". Why this adjustment? It made the escape story sound untrue and ridiculous.

In conclusion, Client 230, pronounced he has won, repeating this several times, he won over Hitler. He had victory over the war, over Hitler, over the German politicians and leaders of the Nazi Party. That was a good legacy for his family, children and wife, and with the Jewish community. He did not have to add anything more.
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Bracketing

One of the key goals as a researcher that I had for this study, was to make high stakes deception, and those who perpetrate it, more transparent to the rest of us. The participants boldly exposed their stories in the hope that in the telling, it would be cathartic for them and knowledge gathering for me. As the researcher, I have prioritized journeying with the participants over these past two years, as they have divulged their life stories and their life's pain to me. It means that because of their transparency, they deserve an authentic presentation of the findings.

A case study such as this, benefits from the researcher's background of clinical work in disseminating facts from narrative, in order to handle and organize the vast and varied data that comprised this research. Past experience enabled the researcher to hold the material to a disciplined inductive analysis to extract meaningful interpretation, in order to describe "how true meaning within the social world of themes, ideas and happenings might be identified by a researcher and a respondent in a combined interpretative response to data. Such an interpretation would reflect some component of a researcher's own experiences" (Bednall, 2006, p.2). I recognize that as a researcher, I cannot present as completely neutral, and therefore in keeping with the intent of the methodology, I have become connected with several of the participants in a mutually, respectful friendship while exploring the case studies with them.

My current work experience is in clinical counselling, specifically the Urgent Short Term Assessment and Treatment (USTAT) work in a major Canadian city. I have worked as a Mental Health Clinician in the government's Ministry of Children and Families, as well as in counselling/mediation work in a private clinic. My thesis for my Master of Arts (Psychology) degree was in the
area of leadership abuse and perceptions of victimhood, from which a deep interest in malevolent personalities that conducted self centred deception with remorseless cruelty to others, emerged.

I have been involved with many persons who struggled with the effects of stress, trauma, betrayal and loss when maliciously deceived. This background will both influence my analysis and contribute to the understanding and its potential for applicability (Yin, 2009). Finally, it is my responsibility to approach this study with empathetic listening but most importantly with systematic due diligence, to ensure the credibility of the research process.
Table 1: Truth Table Comparisons of Timelines for April 11/12, 1945

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIENT 230 INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>CLIENT 210 INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>BRIG/GEN (CO) AUTOBIO</th>
<th>2nd DIV CDN INF (WAR DIARIES)*</th>
<th>SO.SASK REGT (OPERATIONS LOG)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APRIL 11, 1945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working in camp farm</strong></td>
<td>At Spier, ordered to explore to the right&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Have crossed Twente Canal at night &quot;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks worker to join his escape plan as Allies liberating soon</td>
<td>VIII RECCE east to parallel road then North to town of Westerbork</td>
<td>&quot;Push north to Beilen&quot;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1830: Hoogeveen Comd.post at 15207215 in Woods SW Beilen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does not trust Germans Guards leave K.W. 879 Jews remain in barracks</strong></td>
<td>Reports that &quot;Bill&quot; Van der Veen calls Cm. Gemmecher at K.W to surrender</td>
<td>&quot;We reach Beilen. D COY op in Beilen with Toronto Scots Sent SSR 1.5 mi. E instruct to build Bailey bridge over canal &amp; to rescue Scots if necess.&quot;</td>
<td>1830: Hoogeveen Comd.post at 15207215 in Woods SW Beilen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dusk</strong></td>
<td>crawls out on stomach Into garbage pile Box with hole</td>
<td>Position at town of Westerbork</td>
<td>No enemy en route to canal position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dark</strong></td>
<td>crawl under (2011) over (2010) the barbed wire</td>
<td>Escapes KW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk miles thru woods in direction of artillery</td>
<td>Walks btwn armies heavy fighting,</td>
<td>No enemy in recon. area</td>
<td>&quot;Beilen front fighting&quot;</td>
<td>aerial photos taken yesterday [Apr 11/45] [earlier photos, March 5/45]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bullets flying</td>
<td>Wu canal, clothes off swims across</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Heavy fighting Beilen to Hooghalen&quot; [5 km north]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At canal, clothes off swims across</td>
<td>Arrest by Cdn army interrogation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW is military base Will hold BG accountable for 1000 deaths</td>
<td>BG gives Sten gun, ammo &amp; sends him with 6 man infantry patrol to KW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dark, midnight approx.
Return to K.W. with Cdn. patrol - enroute meet stiff resistance
Identifies as GermSS & Dutch collaborators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIENT 230 INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>CLIENT 210 INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>BRIG/GEN (CO) (AUTOBIOG)</th>
<th>2nd DIV CDN INF (WAR DIARIES)</th>
<th>SO.SASK REGT (OPERATION LOGS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+/- 2300 to 0230 Visit with Dutch/Amer couple at farm home at Westerbork town orders VIII RECCE</td>
<td>Maneuuvre decoy op two prong attack at Beilen a success +/ 0300 Maj. Good</td>
<td>0115: Outflank Beilen cross canal at MR225774 Assault crossing in 3 places A and B first then C and D Carriers to remain in 22772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return to Spier to escort SSR safely to canal

He & patrol eliminate enemy - No losses to Cdn patrol
At Spier meets Cpt G. Lane Brings SSR to canal, same route thru town Westerbork

### Dawn - see empty gates open - no inmates out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIENT 230 INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>CLIENT 210 INTERVIEWS</th>
<th>BRIG/GEN (CO) (AUTOBIOG)</th>
<th>2nd DIV CDN INF (WAR DIARIES)</th>
<th>SO.SASK REGT (OPERATION LOGS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+/ 0900: No. 7 troops and VIII RECCE begin crossing canal</td>
<td>0900: A COY to bridgehead</td>
<td>0840: SSR: 3 units across Orange</td>
<td>0912: FUS: MR situ. under control</td>
<td>0915: SSR: our loc 226760 [N. of Zwiggelte]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+/1000: pass thru SSR Turn left 500 metres, rail tracks on right
Following tracks north thru swamp See military cabin & barbed wire guard dogs, continue north to swinging open gate, closest to guard tower & staff houses.
Occpts. coming out of barracks

### Field radio call to HQ 1635: 8th RECCE: All true what I said
Field radio call to HQ "Send help"
Field radio: Conc camp clear of enemy Relieving you shortly

Ordered to stay in position till Brig. Gen sends reinforcements 45 to 60 min. wait til orders arrive
Move north out to Amen. Cdn Intelligence corps to monitor K.W. A COY of RHLI took over for night

During sweep one of my patrols discovers a concentration camp thousands of political prisoners...majority are Jewish

1530: Maj. Doering to take over guarding of Jewish concentration camp few miles from Westerbork
1650: D COY on obj. [Halerburg]

### Cdn army arrives 1.5 hr after arrival [0800?]
Guards posted
He becomes a guard

1700: 8th RECCE: Have over run conc. camp 2480 RHLI presently relieving and will in turn be relieved by COY of 6 Inf Bde with some tanks. Answer: Camp to be guarded. Everyone to be kept in. Int & Mil gov. staffs being dispatched from div to cope with situ. A/Q looking into admin aspects

---

**APRIL 12, 1945**
Truth Comparisons across War Diary Excerpts:
***"Because the battalion war diaries were usually made up after the event many details were forgotten and their times may not be accurate. The Brigade and divisional ops were entered on the spot and therefore are reliable as to time but the messages themselves may have been delayed due to other radio traffic or the operational situation".***

**War Diary: 4th Canadian Infantry/Brigade

"12 Apr,45, 0830: 4 Bde. was ordered (by Gen. Matthews) to concentrate in the WESTERBORG [sp. as in document] area preparing to pass through S Sask R bridgehead back to the Main Axis and on North. Rapid move of whole div in a simple thrust line was to be continued.
12 Apr45, 1600: Soon after 1500 hrs Essex Scots battle GP. Essex soon ran into opposition on the heels of the RECCE near and in the town of Hoogveen [sp. In document for Hooghalen].
12APR45, 1800: At 1800 hrs. R Regt C crossed the canal and headed north-East vis the concentration camp captured during the afternoon by the 8th RECCE with 1000 inmates, to the town of Assen...By 2200 hrs RHLI together with main Bge HQ were firm in Hooghalen..."

**War Diary: 2nd Canadian Infantry Division

12Apr45, MR 12/226. Sheet M1 1/100,000.
"Cloudy but warm. Another move today for this HQ in an attempt to maintain contact with our fast moving forward troops. This time to 108485 (Sheet M1, 1/100,000 Intelligence officer (2) visited the Prisoner of War cage in the afternoon. In the evening Intelligence officer (1) went to the concentration camp not far from Beilen in area 2480. Some 2000 Dutch and German civilians, 80% of who were said to be Jews, were liberated by a squadron of 8th Canadian Reconnaissance Regt. (14th Cdn Hussars), General Officer Commanding visited 6th Cdn Inf Bde in square 1470 in the morning and in afternoon proceeded to 4th Canadian infantry Brigade Headquarters to discuss next day's activities."

**War Diary: H/Captain H. Gordon Walker - Protestant Chaplain of the South Saskatchewan Regiment

"Following first light on Thursday 12 April, the SSRs made a sudden and well planned and directed attack over the Oranje Canal and established a firm bridgehead...The SSRs held the bridgehead until the engineers had built a bridge enabling other units and tanks to come across. By then the enemy had been driven quite a distance back, and Westerbork Concentration camp for Jews had been liberated...The duty of guarding the camp to protect those within from those without, ...was taken over by Able company, SSR with Capt. Adams as Acting Commander. The officers and men were billeted in the fully modern and sumptuous luxurious residences of the former German SS guards just outside the main gate to the camp....At that time it was estimated there was sufficient food in the camp for ten days..."


Punctuation and spelling as per documents. Quotes as per war diaries.
Table 2.
Descriptive Statistics - NVivo
Selected Word Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deceiver Descriptor</th>
<th># of times</th>
<th>Receiver Descriptor</th>
<th># of times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Analytical, methodical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family name importance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Loyal to family &amp; family name</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Word usage/Intelligent</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vengeful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Non-confrontational</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self depreciation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caring concern for others</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self justification</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Truth &amp; integrity values</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self as primary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rescuer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Anticipatory anxiety</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unapologetic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Suspicious of Deceiver</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values notoriety, awards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim/survivor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Deceiver self report, Klein interview, Apr.23, 2010)
(Receiver self report, Interview, March 1, 2015)
Table 3. Comparison of Descriptors of Deceiver and Receiver by Self Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deceiver Descriptor</th>
<th># of times</th>
<th>Receiver Descriptor</th>
<th># of times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Analytical, methodical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family name importance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Loyal to family &amp; family name</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Word usage/Intelligent</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vengeful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Non-confrontational</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self deprecation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caring concern for others</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; tactical humility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self justification</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Truth &amp; integrity values</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self as primary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rescuer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Anticipatory anxiety</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unapologetic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Suspicious of Deceiver</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values notoriety, awards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim/survivor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Deceiver self report, Klein interview, Apr.23, 2010)
(Receiver self report, Interview, March 1, 2015)