

Hidden Histories and the Appropriation of the Holocaust in the American Narrative

By Rebecca Weston¹

“Human beings are members of a whole,
In creation of one essence and soul.

If one member is afflicted with pain,
Other members uneasy will remain.

If you have no sympathy for human pain,
The name of human you cannot retain.”

—Sa’dī

Introduction

When confirmed stories and photos of liberation reached the West in 1945, the horrors of Nazi atrocities in concentration camps were undoubtedly shocking to an unknowing American public. Subsequent questions of *how* and *why* such barbarity could take place in a civilized world were surely demanded by its empathetic citizens. Yet as Laurel Leff, author of *Buried by the Times: The Holocaust and America’s Most Important Newspaper* writes, this simply was not so and it proved to be an erroneous assumption that nation-wide press reports, including the *New York Times*, delivered direct evidence of Germany’s crimes against European Jews; to believe that their unique tragedy emerged vis-à-vis liberation is simply untrue.²

On the contrary, it appears that the contemporary American narrative of the Holocaust has risen prominently in recent culture, over half a century removed from the culmination of World War II. As Alan Mintz argues in *Popular Culture and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory in America*, a heightened consciousness has materialized in and beyond European and American

¹ The author, being also an editor, recused herself from the editing process regarding this article. It received no special treatment and was required to conform to all standard requirements.

² Laurel Leff, *Buried by the Times: The Holocaust and America’s Most Important Newspaper* (Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Jewry³ to dominate American discourse at large.⁴ Museums, commemoration, cinematic blockbusters, and countless documentaries continue to fill voids of general knowledge for adults and students alike, albeit limited in depth, thus leaving the need for further analysis of events at the periphery of academic inquiry. It is within this dynamic that underlying notions of American altruism and obliviousness converge with tacit reality, producing a romanticized image of United States involvement surrounding the aggressive objectives of Nazi Germany; that American democracy, ethics, and freedom stands in stark contrast to Hitler's persecution of the Jews. After all, it is more appealing to believe that Americans were humanitarians, liberators, and ultimately unaware of the genocide carried out by the Third Reich.

Here, an ethical dilemma thus emerges: is there an undercurrent of American culpability that has, over time, melded with our desire to keep our own "hidden histories" at bay by taking on the benign role of commemorating the Holocaust to the fullest extent? Many arguments can certainly be made that a problematic connection exists between our little-known history surrounding the Holocaust and how the American people have eagerly appropriated the event into cultural consciousness. It is important to note that the research presented is without intention to vilify the American people or the government, but rather to question the historical integrity of America's past and present state, one that challenges both the pedagogy and scholarship of genocide in a broader context of American history.

Questions are raised of what information is *missing* within this context: what fundamental elements of our own dark pasts have been overlooked, buried, or simply forgotten in the scope of this catastrophic history? To answer this question, it is necessary to explore issues relevant to the American historical record, such as pervasive anti-Semitism and immigration policies that influenced reactions to both German aggression and ideology; to consider evidence surrounding the United States government's handling of initial rumors, verified evidence, and press coverage of mass murder in Europe. Likewise, it is necessary to briefly consider the influence of competing political powers that frequently encumbered Jewish rescue efforts of the Roosevelt Administration both before and during the war. In light of these topics, fierce debates among scholars of the Holocaust have emerged, questioning whether or not American efforts could have had a greater effect on the fate of the Jews. Although this question cannot be definitively answered with hindsight alone, it is one that nonetheless demands scrutiny. Indeed, a compelling collection of research has been conducted in the past fifty years. One of the first works to be published was in 1967 by Arthur D. Morse, aptly titled *While Six Million Died: A Chronicle of American Apathy*, concerning the very issues being questioned in this study.

To be sure, a multitude of scholarly research has surfaced, particularly between the 1970s and 1980s, which has since raised unconventional inquiries regarding the Roosevelt Administration and rescue operations. Groundbreaking works by Henry L. Feingold (*The Politics of Rescue*) and David Wyman (*The Abandonment of the Jews: America and the Holocaust, 1941-195* and *Paper Walls: America and the Refugee Crisis, 1938-1941*) stand as leading reproaches to administrative complacency and abject failure of the American government to save the Jews of Europe. Similarly, Richard Breitman and Alan M. Kraut (*American Refugee Policy and European Jewry, 1933-1945*) offer insight into the anti-Semitic influences of policy-making and public opinion towards Jewish refugees, whereas Sharon R. Lowenstein (*Token Refuge: The Story of the Jewish Refugee Shelter at Oswego, 1944-1946*)

³ Viz., Jewish communities.

⁴ Alan L. Mintz, *Popular Culture and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory in America* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001).

explores marginal acts of refuge implemented by the U.S. government.⁵ Further studies stemming from the public perspective have given way to works by Deborah E. Lipstadt (*Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaust, 1933-1945*) and Robert H. Abzug (*Inside the Vicious Heart: Americans and the Liberation of Nazi Concentration Camps and America Views the Holocaust, 1933-1945: A Brief Documentary History*). In these publications, Lipstadt demonstrates the negligence of the American Press while Abzug's former work delivers first-hand accounts of horrific liberation scenes as witnessed by Americans—and subsequently, absorbed by the public—while his latter chronicles “the varied texture of Americans’ reactions as they witnessed what we now call the Holocaust.”⁶ Beginning in the late 1980s through the 2000s, a cadre of topics surfaced surrounding America and the Holocaust that were attempts to re-analyze previous research as well as present innovative arguments concerning the manifestation of Holocaust popular culture. In these respects, the works of Haskel Lookstein (*We Our Brothers' Keepers: The Public Response of American Jews to the Holocaust, 1939-1944*)⁷ and Richard Breitman and Allan J. Lichtman (*FDR and the Jews*) prudently re-examines “the contemporary reality of FDR and other leaders” and how not only personal sentiments of the president and officials factored into crucial decision-making policy, but reconsiders the stance of Jewish leadership as a significant yet equally indolent force during the war years.⁸ Additionally, the work of Laurel Leff revisits the issue of inattention given by the most prestigious national newspaper, *The New York Times*, and its inefficiency to convey not only the urgency of Jewish persecution but overall severity by its [Jewish] publishers.⁹ Today, controversial topics that question the avid engagement of memorialization, discussion, and apparent “Americanization” of the Holocaust are presented by authors Hilene Flanzbaum (*The Americanization of the Holocaust*), Alan Mintz (*Popular Culture and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory in America*), and Judith Miller (*One By One By One*), offering new insights into how and why the Holocaust has become intrinsic to the modern American psyche.¹⁰

Although these works are but a small representation of the extensive interest in subjects related to America and the Holocaust, they nonetheless remain in a relatively limited scope beyond academia—one which rests in either half-truths concerning role of all participants involved or consists of a cherry-picking of specialized themes that sideline other, yet pertinent information. Our individual and collective reluctance—deliberate or not—to acknowledge and broadly include our own history of involvement perpetuates a kind of storybook account; that we were simply unable to react (let alone prevent) what would come to be colloquially known as “the Holocaust.”¹¹ Despite extensive scholarship that has surfaced within the last few decades surrounding the Roosevelt Administration’s alleged negligence of the “Jewish Question” (a

⁵ Deborah E. Lipstadt, “America and The Holocaust,” *Modern Judaism* 10 (October 1990): 285-86. Compare with Lawrence Baron, “Haven from the Holocaust: Oswego, New York, 1944–1946,” *New York History* 64 (January 1983).

⁶ Robert H. Abzug, *America Views the Holocaust, 1933-1945: A Brief Documentary History* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999), vii. See also Deborah E. Lipstadt, “America and The Holocaust,” 293.

⁷ Lipstadt, “America and The Holocaust,” 290.

⁸ Richard Breitman and Allan J. Lichtman, *FDR and the Jews* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), 2, 5.

⁹ Leff, *Buried by the Times*, 28-30.

¹⁰ Lipstadt, “America and The Holocaust,” 294.

¹¹ The term ‘Holocaust’—in specific reference to Nazi genocide of European Jews—did not enter world-wide diction until the 1960s, nearly twenty-five years after the war and entrenched in the heated atmosphere of the Civil Rights movement and Vietnam War, thus emerging “as a reference point for ultimate evil.” See Robert H. Abzug, *America Views the Holocaust*, 207-09.

question intrinsically linked to underlying anti-Semitic, xenophobic, and Social Darwinist sentiments of a nation) upon American soil, it remains detached from the question of *why* these issues have been marginalized in the overall American narrative.

Section II: Anti-Immigration, Anti-Semitism, and the Early Roosevelt Administration (mid-1800s – 1939)

To better appreciate why marginalization has occurred, an examination of the American historical record of the late 19th to early 20th century is required to understand the circumstances of American involvement and the Holocaust—an examination that is not limited to a single factor, nor shies away from providing a foundation of America’s dismal and precarious histories. In this respect, racial ideologies and anti-Semitic sentiments and policies that are often marginalized or absent within contemporary, even commonplace discourse can be considered the foundation on which Americans reluctantly stood when faced with answering the “Jewish Question.” While it is easier to assume, or even logical at times to reason that anti-Jewish sentiments were solely endemic to Nazi Germany, studies of U.S. opinion throughout the 1930s until the end of the war have shed light on why both the American public and government voiced reluctance to provide assistance to those subjected to persecution. Moreover, these studies have revealed that hostilities towards not only Jews, but European immigrants as a whole were not part and parcel to German policy. An investigation of international policy, namely concerning European immigrants, reveals that negative sentiments pervaded American dialog as early as the 18th century: as Americans experienced an influx of more than 400,000 European migrants by the late century, a panic of employment and land competition melded with fears that the American civilization would be subjected to “mongrelization” as towns and cities across the U.S. peaked at capacity. As Wesley Greer argues, these fears were not purely restricted to non-Jewish communities. On the contrary,

Jewish Americans feared this would bring unwanted attention and hostility towards them. American Jewish indifference to their brethren in Europe dated back to the nineteenth century. Americans Jews unwillingness to help European Jews immigrate in the 1930s and 1940s found its prelude in the 1880s.

Despite these attitudes, Americans—viewing themselves as the archetype of a civilized society—nonetheless provided aid to European Jews under the Lincoln Administration in the mid-1800s surrounding persecution of Jews in Tangier, which would continue on by the turn of the century.¹² Yet as the Nazis gained force in Germany during the 1920s, the well of American support would run dry and apathy towards the plight of the Jews would manifest as the status quo throughout the U.S. in a three-pronged approach that advocated immigration restriction, nationalistic nativism, and anti-Jewish diatribe.¹³

As previously noted, the matter surrounding Jewish diaspora and heightened immigration in the late 19th century were issues that, by the time of the Roosevelt Administration, had

¹² Wesley P. Greear, “American Immigration Policies and Public Opinion on European Jews From 1933 to 1945” (thesis, East Tennessee State University, 2002), 7. See also “Revival of the Persecution of Them in Various Sections,” in *The New York Times [1851-2009]* (St. Petersburg: *New York Times*, 1887), 12, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

¹³ Greear, “American Immigration Policies,” 6-8.

“haunted Western civilization for centuries.” However, under the rally-cry of nationalism in the pre-war era, the majority of [Christian] Americans came to view Jewish immigrants as a “unique and troublesome presence” as both international agitators and economic dynasts¹⁴—in short, a veritable threat to the very foundations of native Americanism. By 1924 U.S. immigration policy (specifically, the National Origins Act¹⁵ which established immigration quotas) reflected both official and public reception of Western and Northern Europeans and their contrasting perceptions of Eastern and Southern Europeans. The latter were deemed a degenerate stock that, according to leading politicians and American eugenicists¹⁶ would weaken the American pedigree. Based upon these pejorative views, Eastern and Southern Europeans were virtually barred from entrance as the strains of economic turmoil reverberated across the nation. As Greer states,

The implementation of the strictest provisions of the National Origins Act coincided with collapse of the American economy that plunged the United States into the Great Depression. The strict enforcement of this act worsened the Great Depression because immigrants were not allowed to secure jobs before they entered the country as was allowed by the Alien Contract Law of 1885.

Underlying the Great Depression, however, was the notion that the ‘Jewish banker’, espoused by widely-received radio personality Father Charles E. Coughlin¹⁷ and businessman Henry Ford, was an anti-national and economic opportunist “at the heart of the problems that disturb the world today.” Moreover, the ‘Jewish Idea’—the replacement of American values with deleterious Jewish ideals—remained, according to Ford, at the core of not only immigration problems, but symbolized a destructive influence upon American life as a whole.¹⁸ Within this context, it becomes apparent that dominant corporate, political, and religious voices throughout

¹⁴ Richard Breitman and Allan J. Lichtman, *FDR and the Jews* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), 4-5.

¹⁵ The Immigration Act of 1924 contains a subdivision for natural origins and quotas that is found under the ‘Numerical Limitations’ heading, Sec. 11 (a). It states: “The annual quota of any nationality shall be 2 per centum of the number of foreign-born individuals of such nationality resident in continental United States as determined by the United States census of 1890, but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100.” For a digital copy of the original document, see “U.S. Immigration Legislation: 1924 Immigration Act,” U.S. Immigration Legislation Online, accessed April 23, 2014, http://library.uwb.edu/guides/usimmigration/1924_immigration_act.html.

¹⁶ Although many accept Germany as the precursor to compulsory sterilization, study has proved that the U.S. preceded German policy; moreover, ‘The Law for the Prevention of Hereditarily Diseased Progeny’ passed by the Nazi Party “was based on a draft by the American eugenicist Harry Hamilton Laughlin (1880-1943) and on sterilization laws already enacted in some states in the United States.” For further reading, see Thorsten Noack and Heiner Fangerau, “Eugenics, Euthanasia, and Aftermath,” *International Journal of Mental Health*, 2007, 114-15.

¹⁷ Greer, “American Immigration Policies,” 8-9. As Greer states, Father Charles E. Coughlin was an eminent Roman Catholic priest who would “instigate and antagonize immigration proposals” through his national radio broadcasts and publication of his magazine, *Social Justice*. With these methods, Coughlin succeeded in bringing anti-Semitic issues surrounding immigration to the heart of American homes during the early 1930s. For additional information on Coughlin and his influence on anti-Semitism in America, see *Am I an Anti-Semite?* in Robert H. Abzug, *America Views the Holocaust*, 79-82.

¹⁸ Mark A. Stoler and Melanie S. Gustafson, eds., *Major Problems in the History of World War II: Documents and Essays* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2003), 324-25. In the article *Dearborn Independent*, American automaker Henry Ford revealed his blatant anti-Semitic opinion concerning the negative effect the ‘Jewish Idea’ had not only on labor markets, but world capitalism. Here, Ford draws a division between the Jewish notion of ‘getting’ versus the Anglo-Saxon value of ‘making’—a differentiation that was “a vicious, anti-social and destructive idea” when separated from the integrity of American values.

the 1920s and 1930s channeled a direct line to domestic mentalities surrounding Jewish presence within the U.S. In this heated atmosphere, one must to question the relationship between the American government and its constituents—who was influencing whom when it came to domestic and international policy?

Symptomatic to this native nationalism, the preservation of American resources and employment formed the backbone of restrictionist ideology at both state and public levels. Heightened by a crippling increase of unemployment in the 1930s, problems surrounding foreign immigrants took center-stage as a pressing issue in the Roosevelt Administration in 1932.¹⁹ Augmented by the advent of racial ideology and religious and political persecution of Jews by the Nazi Party, Roosevelt stanchly “agreed with Hoover’s Executive Order of 1930 limiting immigration.”²⁰ It was a widely shared sentiment that would have dire consequences for European Jews attempting to escape Nazi-controlled territory in coming years. Regardless of efforts by American Jewish advocates to call attention to the mounting crisis in Germany and circumvent tightened restriction policies against immigration, the quota limits set under the former Hoover Administration remained relatively firm due to America’s own economic crisis. However, in spite of escalating reports of Nazi violence from Jewish informants, the president charged he “would not intervene in domestic affairs of foreign powers,” particularly at the cost of jeopardizing U.S. domestic reforms outlined in the New Deal.²¹

Jews by and large formed a minority within the U.S., comprising roughly 4 percent of the total population. By 1934, they were nonetheless viewed as the catalyst for political upheaval within the U.S. and subjected to slanderous allegations by American anti-Semitic groups. The largest and most persuasive was Friends of New Germany and the German-American Bund,²² which vehemently accused Jews of inciting governmental subordination to the contentious “Jewish Question.” Notwithstanding, Jewish organizations and newspapers attempted to pacify intensifying anti-Jewish rhetoric within political and public spheres by pointing out that:

no Jews headed any of the twenty-five independent offices of government or the twenty emergency relief administrations. No Jews held high positions in the

¹⁹ Congressional Report No. 1016 was submitted by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to the 72nd Congress, detailing proposed amendments to the Immigration Act of 1924 which would subsequently restrict European immigration by 90 percent. To read the document, see Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, *Restriction of Immigration: April 7, 1932 – Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and Ordered to Be Printed*, by John W. Moore, 72nd Cong., 1st sess., Cong. Rept. 1016, vol. 2 (Washington, DC), 1-5, accessed February 13, 2014, <http://infoweb.newsbank.com>.

²⁰ Greear, “American Immigration Policies,” 14.

²¹ Breitman and Lichtman, *FDR and the Jews*, 67-71, 83, 85. As Breitman and Lichtman state on page 64-65, Roosevelt’s New Deal was an ambitious series of economic reforms geared towards not only social conservatism but a means to placate northern industrial laborers and southern working class citizens. Moreover, many of these supporters of the New Deal harbored deep-seated “suspicions about Jews, foreigners, and racial minorities”—a significant factor that prevented Roosevelt from publicly confronting racial or religious prejudices among American voters.

²² Greear, “American Immigration Policies,” 11-12. According to Greer, the German-American Bund, a pro-Nazi group that claimed approximately 25,000 members “spread their hatred to the masses used the media outlets of radio and newspaper print.” Although this particular group’s influence would dissolve following the outbreak of war, they nonetheless laid the foundation for the formation of other anti-Semitic groups in the United States such as the ‘Silver Shirts’ led by William Dudley Pelley. For additional information on Friends of New Germany, see Richard Breitman and Allan J. Lichtman, *FDR and the Jews*, 76.

departments of justice, war, the navy, and commerce, and few Jews represented America abroad.²³

Attached to scathing accusations that Jews were puppeteers to the Roosevelt Administration, the rising anti-Semitism of the 1930s was later echoed in public opinion polls conducted concerning European Jews, refugees, and immigrants which reveal the prevalence of anti-Jewish rhetoric among Americans; by November of 1938, one year prior to the outbreak of war in Europe, 77 percent of Americans did not believe that more Jewish exiles should be granted admission into the U.S.²⁴ For American and European Jewry alike, it appeared that expectations of any attempts at rescue from Nazi persecution rested on the beleaguered shoulders of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his wayward cabinet.

In light of pervading anti-Jewish sentiments in America and escalating turbulence in Germany, American Jews—ostensibly recognized as economically, politically, and socially loyal to the Roosevelt Administration—found themselves pleading at the feet of an indisposed president for their European brethren, in the hope that “American influence and power might again offer some hope for deliverance, as in the past.” Although Roosevelt personally preferred to handle foreign policy in the style of back-room negotiating as opposed to head-on open debate, the sudden *Anschluss* of 1938²⁵ produced yet another wave of immigration concerns demanding immediate attention, namely facing the prospect of 190,000 Austrian-Jewish emigrants. Nevertheless, the president responded with an ambitious proposal to enable the relocation of German and Austrian “political refugees”—a phrase shrewdly coined to minimize further association with undesirable Jewish exiles—to the U.S. and sympathetic countries of Latin America and Europe. Yet as a steady stream of visa grievances reverted to Washington, stymied by the bureaucratic red tape of obstinate State officials, it “became apparent that the Administration’s good intentions remained largely rhetorical.” Despite Roosevelt’s up-hill battle with his conservative opponents in the Administration, another effort would be made to confront the worsening refugee situation in Europe. Fresh on the heels of the *Anschluss*, recession, and mid-term elections, Roosevelt acted in unprecedented fashion by organizing the Évian Conference in early July of 1938; without partisan motive and little to gain politically, it appeared that the president’s undertaking was based upon humanitarian merit alone. Yet as Breitman and Lichtman conclude, it was apparent the “circus atmosphere” of roughly 200 delegates from countries around the world offered only a façade of empathy and benevolence by assembling on behalf of Roosevelt’s token gesture to address the “Jewish Question.” Although the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees (ICR) was established to consider the plight of the Jews remaining in Germany, beyond German and Austrian borders it was made clear that “no one wanted the Jews.”²⁶ Moreover, Palestine was not only deemed off limits by British delegates but remained a divided issue for Jewish organizations; for many Jews in attendance at Évian, the Conference represented nothing more than “a beleaguered world Jewry surrounded by a murderous world community.” Indeed, mounting tension in Czechoslovakia and Poland would soon elevate the crisis to new heights for “political refugees,” creating a paradoxical impediment

²³ Breitman and Lichtman, *FDR and the Jews*, 75-76, 78.

²⁴ Stoler and Gustafson, eds., *Major Problems*, 327.

²⁵ On March 12, 1938 German troops marched into Austria uncontested, an act that effectively unified Germany and Hitler’s native homeland of Austria which housed over 200,000 Jews. See Richard Breitman and Allan J. Lichtman, *FDR and the Jews*, 100-01.

²⁶ Breitman and Lichtman, *FDR and the Jews*, 83, 100-02, 108-10.

to rescue efforts by serving as political camouflage for news of the 'Final Solution' in the coming years.²⁷

By the end of 1938, it was evident that the Roosevelt Administration was caught between polarized domestic and international powers competing for legislative clout while at once attempting to remain politically adrift of foreign controversy. As Henry L. Feingold writes,

On one hand, there existed strong restrictionist sentiment generated by the Depression, and on the other a particularly loyal Jewish community allied with other liberal elements which was urging that the tradition of asylum for the persecuted of Europe be at least nominally maintained.

As the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization gained anti-alien momentum, coinciding with the violent Nazi pogroms in early November of 1938, Roosevelt's public decree to extend visitors' visas to roughly 15,000 Jewish refugees was again tersely challenged with restrictionist-driven roadblocks implemented by American representatives.²⁸ Although it can be said that Roosevelt's attempts to aid European Jewry were typically genuine, it was clear that the mounting crisis in Nazi Germany had little influence over the dominant objectives of conservative politicians in Congress.

For the Western world, the November pogroms (a three-day episode of Nazi brutality that would come to be commonly known as *Kristallnacht*²⁹) delivered a distressing jolt to the American people as national newspapers³⁰ covered the attacks against German Jews, detailing the violent acts of Jewish humiliation, arrests, and deportations to concentration camps. Despite alarming news dispatched by the American press, the immediate possibility of American response or rescue was stalled by November congressional elections, resulting in the isolationist-ridden House members not only doubling in numbers, but enlarging their resolve to prevent liberalized immigration in the wake of the Nazi pogroms. Answering to the pressures of partisan whims at a press conference on November 16, Roosevelt deftly sidestepped referencing the word 'Jew' when he declared the reports from Germany were "scarcely believable in a twentieth-century civilization." Moreover, the president failed to pose any new measures to relocate the persecuted Jews of Germany. In light of this omission, the austere quota limit inhibiting an increase in German immigration was implicitly upheld.

²⁷ Henry L. Feingold, *The Politics of Rescue: The Roosevelt Administration and the Holocaust, 1938-1945* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1970), 33-35.

²⁸ Feingold, *The Politics of Rescue*, 6, 9, 17-18.

²⁹ The term *Kristallnacht* is colloquially translated from German as 'night of crystal' or 'night of broken glass'—an event defined by the shards of glass lining German streets as a result of the smashing of Jewish store windows, homes, and synagogues by Nazi Party members, the SA, and Hitler Youth. For a more detailed account of the event, see "Kristallnacht: A Nationwide Pogrom, November 9-10, 1938," United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, accessed April 16, 2014, <http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005201>.

³⁰ "Berlin Raids Reply to Death of Envoy: Nazis Loot Jews' Shops, Burn City's Biggest Synagogue to Avenge Paris Embassy Aide," in *The New York Times [1851-2009]* (Berlin: New York Times, 1938), 1, ProQuest Historical Newspapers. In this wireless report from Berlin, detailed accounts from November 9-10 are given of men roaming the streets in the main shopping districts "breaking windows with metal weapons, looting or tossing merchandise into the streets" while both Party members and onlookers observed the "spontaneous demonstrations." Compare with "Mobs Wreck Jewish Stores in Berlin: Raiders Loot Shops; Carry Off Occupants," in *Chicago Daily Tribune [1851-2009]* (Berlin: Chicago Daily Tribune, 1938), 1, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

Although Americans were outraged by the news of the Nazi violence of November, they remained unwilling to increase German immigration for Jewish victims. On the contrary, a Roper/Fortune pole taken in January of 1939, a mere two months after *Kristallnacht*, revealed that:

83 percent of respondents opposed ‘a bill to open the doors of the U.S. to a larger number of European refugees than now admitted under our immigration quotas.’ Only 9 percent supported such a bill, with the remainder undecided.

Two months later, the same poll indicated only 5 percent of Americans were in favor of raising quota limits. Clearly, Roosevelt had good reason for concern surrounding the opinion of both his cabinet and citizens.³¹ In a global context, the president was not alone in his reluctance to address the issue of immigration. To the despair of German Jews, nearly every other country outside of the U.S. maintained restrictions, exposing “a harsh contrast to the unwillingness of the rest of the world to act on their behalf”³² in the face of mounting evidence involving the persecution and murder of European Jews.

Section III: Preface

An assumption is made that ordinary people within the United States have a rudimentary knowledge of World War II; for instance, September 1st of 1939 marks its beginning between the Allied and Axis powers—that is, between Great Britain and the Soviet Union positioned against Nazi Germany, Italy, and Japan. Most Americans can also acknowledge that December 7th of 1941 was the entrance of the United States into the war following the bombing of Pearl Harbor—a day that was etched in infamy.³³ These dates are more or less common, to be sure; however, there are many between 1933 and 1945 that may not be familiar, especially if referencing events occurring in Europe such as the Nazis coming to power in 1933, the November Pogroms of 1938, or Allied liberation of concentration camps in 1945. For these reasons, Section III will briefly explain more ambiguous events by use of footnotes or simply direct the reader to the actual source or document for further clarity. Attempts are made to cover as much territory as possible between 1933 and 1945, yet not every issue can be addressed. Hence, events, such as the Warsaw ghetto uprising, Polish liquidations, and deportations of Jews in Axis territory, will generally be omitted from the overall narrative but presented in the catalog of newspaper headlines (refer to figures 4-6). Specific to the theme of this paper, the following issues

³¹ Breitman and Lichtman, *FDR and the Jews*, 114-16. Compare with Robert H. Abzug, *America Views the Holocaust*, 54.

³² Abzug, *America Views the Holocaust*, 54, 75.

³³ This reference is an allusion to Franklin Roosevelt’s famed ‘Day of Infamy’ speech to Congress following the bombing of Pearl Harbor, delivered on December 8 of 1941. For the full document, see House, Committee on Foreign Affairs, *State of War Between the United States and the Japanese Empire. Address from the President of the United States Before a Joint Session of the Two Houses of Congress Requesting That Congress Declare That There Exists a State of War Between the United States and the Japanese Empire. December 8, 1941.—Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Ordered to Be Printed.*, by Franklin D. Roosevelt, 77th Cong., 1st sess., H. Doc. 453, vol. 22 (Washington, DC, 1941), 1-2, accessed May 11, 2014, www.infoweb.newsbank.com.

presented will center on the American press and the Roosevelt Administration and how these elements often undermined public knowledge of the Holocaust.

Section III: The American Press, the Roosevelt Administration, and the Politics of Knowledge (1933 – 1945)

A more troubling issue surrounding public knowledge of Jewish persecution is the prevalence of American antipathy relative to the amount of information that was transmitted by the international press, and given the sheer amount of coverage that had been documented it raises dubious questions as to why adequate action was not taken to allay the desperation of European Jews. Surely arguments can be made that the greater public—those who were not privy to information circulating in government spheres—was more or less oblivious to Nazi atrocities. Yet as Deborah E. Lipstadt writes:

an astonishing amount of information was available long before the end of the war. There was practically no aspect of the Nazi horrors which was not publicly known in some detail long before the camps were opened in 1945.

As research has revealed, Lipstadt's argument indeed carries significant weight, and while the press is not responsible for deciding the public's opinion, it does help determine what is or is not relevant to the public. In this respect, the "space allocated, the location of the news in the paper, and the editorial opinions" played an integral role in shaping both knowledge and reaction to Nazi anti-Semitism throughout the U.S.³⁴ As Leff argues, the problem was not that national newspapers in the U.S. lacked reporting on the persecution of European Jews, but that it did not receive adequate attention let alone certifiable information,³⁵ at least enough that might have produced a more positive outcome for Jewish victims by the end of the war.

Between the integral years of 1933 and 1945, stories transmitted by American press correspondents within Nazi and Ally territory garnered ample public awareness via national newspapers across America. As Leff points out,

From the start of the war in Europe on September 1, 1939 to its end nearly 6 years later, the *New York Times* and other mass media treated the persecution and ultimately the annihilation of the Jews of Europe as a secondary story. They reported it. In fact, from September 1939 through May 1945, the *Times* published 1,186 stories about what was happening to the Jews of Europe, or an average of 17 stories per month.

However, this does not imply that information regarding Jewish persecution, deportation, or extermination made it to the front page; on the contrary, these subjects appeared on the front page of the *Times* less than thirty times in pre- and wartime years and never ran consecutively nor as the leading editorial. What is more, Jews were later minimized as the primary victims of the Nazis following liberation and referred to simply as "refugees or persecuted minorities."³⁶

³⁴ Deborah E. Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaust, 1933-1945* (New York: Free Press, 1986), 2-3.

³⁵ Leff, *Buried by the Times*, 4.

³⁶ Leff, *Buried by the Times*, 2-3.

My own research relating to the regularity of front-page editorials of Jewish persecution and extermination within specific periods (those marking significant events such as the rise of the Nazi Party, *Kristallnacht*, the outbreak of war, and subsequent war years) produced results that can be deemed as nothing less than shocking when compared to the sheer amount of information coming into the U.S. To illustrate this argument, a combined search on ProQuest Historical Newspapers was conducted using the parameters only between 1933 and 1945 including the keywords ‘Jews’ or ‘Jewish’ and ‘Nazis’ or ‘Germany’ and ‘Poland’. Out of 57,474 results, 120 headlines³⁷ were meticulously pulled from 4 prominent newspapers in major metropolitan cities: *The Los Angeles Times*, *The New York Times*, *Chicago Daily Tribune*, and *The Washington Post*.³⁸ Here, careful selections were made out of thousands of headlines and accompanying articles that chronologically detailed the publication date, newspaper, full headline, and more importantly the page number the article was located on—a noteworthy detail that is indicative of how the location of editorials within newspapers were relative to the response of Americans throughout the nation.

To clarify, the process of my headline selection was based upon the claims of Laurel Leff and Deborah E. Lipstadt: that the *New York Times* and the American Press at large systematically and strategically moderated or downplayed news of Nazi aggression against the Jews (and consequent slaughter between 1938 and 1945), which purportedly formed a direct line to policy makers within the Roosevelt Administration.³⁹ Surely, such claims by the authors had to be an exaggeration, or at best influenced by the desire to make a provocative argument. After all, it is difficult to believe that Americans were deliberately negligent to glaring reports of Nazi atrocities, verified or not. Yet as my research took shape—what began as a modest attempt to disprove Leff and Lipstadt’s work—an unsettling truth manifested in the face of doubt.

Out of 8 selected years, a total of 29 front-page headlines were catalogued, leaving a staggering 91 headlines dispersed on alternate pages. More revealing, however, is the foci of headlines and content of articles (emphasized by the unwillingness of major newspaper publishers to place the stories on the front page), which raises a critical question of *why* this occurred, particularly given the gravity of not only mounting persecution throughout the 1930s but open reporting of Nazi extermination of European Jews between 1941 and 1945. Looking at figures 1 and 2 of the catalog, it is important to note that front-page headlines in 1933 and 1938 coincided with first the rise of the Nazi Party and later the shocking event of *Kristallnacht*; here, it can be argued that 1933 marked a year of uncertainty, in that Hitler’s expanding power was viewed with both anxiety and optimism within the U.S., often delivering contradictory or misleading information surreptitiously placed within the inner pages of the newspapers in question. For instance, on March 3, 1933 *The Los Angeles Times* reported on page A12, “Pogroms Held Plan Of Nazis: Slaughter of Jews Declared Impending in Germany,” whereas on March 27, 1933 *The New York Times* reported on page 1, “Nazis End Attacks on Jews in Reich, Our Embassy Finds.” While the former headline could easily fall under the category of informal information, such being the common problem argued by Leff, the latter headline was 1 of 3 found in 1933 that informed the American public Jewish victimization was subsiding, if not

³⁷ This amounted to 15 headlines apiece for each chosen year (1933, 1938, 1939, and between 1941 and 1945, thus yielding 36,264 total results for these exact dates.

³⁸ For a complete catalog listing, see figures 1-8.

³⁹ Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief*, 4. See also Leff, *Buried by the Times*, 4.

suppressed altogether by Nazi perpetrators themselves.⁴⁰ This, of course, proved to be the opposite, as the winter of 1938 gave way to an unprecedented and horrifying surge in Nazi persecution: *Kristallnacht*. Although Americans' sentiments towards Germany were growing increasingly negative despite press reports of the Nazis' inhumane treatment of Jews,⁴¹ attitudes towards refugees, rescue, and immigration rapidly hardened as the U.S. faced a potentially large number of Jewish evacuees fleeing the Reich. Anticipating a more disastrous situation for native-born Americans,

various papers noted that in light of the increased pressure on Jews to emigrate, now was the time for America to *raise*, not lower, its protective barriers; now was the time for increased vigilance...[t]he press did not permit its disdain for Germany to compromise its conviction that there should be no change of our immigration laws.⁴²

Although the event of *Kristallnacht* gained ample attention throughout the nation, it is evident in this account by Lipstadt that the press exerted considerable influence regarding what the American public knew (even dictating the degree of importance relative to page placement in newspapers) and how Americans both processed and interpreted the information in the context of restrictionist ideals.

Yet for the years 1939, 1941, and 1942 only two notable headlines out of hundreds appeared as front-page news: "Nazis Warn Foreign Jews of Reprisals Over Shootings" (*The Los Angeles Times*, January 12, 1939) and "U.S. Refuses French Plea to Take Refugees; Reich Curb Called Bar to Orderly Emigration" (*The New York Times*, January 9, 1941). Again, one must question why little attention was given to the Jewish plight, particularly when other alarming headlines read "2 Million Jews Face Exodus to Camps in Poland: Germany Completes Plans for Strict Segregation" (*Chicago Daily Tribune*, December 3, 1939, only three months after war was declared) or "Himmler Program Kills Polish Jews: Slaughter of 250,000 in Plan to Wipe Out Half in Country This Year Is Reported" (*The New York Times*, November 25, 1942). What is most disturbing, however, is the 1942 *New York Times* article right away stating:

Old persons, children, infants and cripples among the Jewish population of Poland are being shot, killed by other various methods or forced to undergo hardships that inevitably cause death as a means of carrying out an order by Heinrich Himmler, Nazi Gestapo chief, that half the remaining Polish Jews must be

⁴⁰ "Goering Says Jews Will Be Protected: Asserts Some Excesses in Germany Were Unavoidable and Were Quickly Curbed," in *The New York Times [1851-2009]* (Berlin: New York Times, 1933), 28, ProQuest Historical Newspapers. See also "Jews' Mistreating Abated, U.S. is Told: Embassy and Consulates in Germany Report After Protests Here," in *The Washington Post [1877-1995]* (Berlin: The Washington Post, 1933), 1, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

⁴¹ Between November 9-13 of 1938, stories of vandalism and brutality were printed on the front pages of national newspapers, with many bearing headlines such as "Hitler Seizes 20,000 Jews: Homes Burned; Stores Looted; Terror Reigns: Mobs Run Wild in German Streets—Jews Flee from Terrorists in Germany" and "Arrests Continue: Insurance Settlements to Be Confiscated for Reich's Benefit—Germany issued a new series of decrees yesterday to complete 'the liquidation of the Jews.'" For additional headlines, see figure 2.

⁴² Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief*, 86.

exterminated by the end of this year, according to a report issued today by the Polish Government in London.⁴³

Although headlines of comparable Nazi atrocities preceded this editorial,⁴⁴ it nonetheless serves as viable testament to the muted reaction of both the U.S. government and the American people; by 1942, the Nazis' extermination of European Jews had evolved from an allegation into a world-wide documented fact.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, in what would become a near-standard for the American press and reports of Nazi mass extermination of European Jews, news publishers routinely "placed various stories on inner pages and allotted them but a few lines," leaving "readers free to accept this news as valid or dismiss it as unverified information."⁴⁶ Key to such a dilemma is the perceived difference between substantiated and unsubstantiated reports; in all likelihood, it was a judgment many Americans were either ill-equipped or unwilling to make.

Research conducted for 1942 yielded results similar to Lipstadt's findings: out of hundreds of headlines examined, no front-page editorials could be found detailing the Nazi murders being reported in Poland (see figure 5). Although it is reasonable to want to question such incredulous findings, numerous headlines reading "Million Polish Jews Perish: Mass Executions and Gas Wiping Out All but Able-Bodied" (*Los Angeles Times*, November 26, 1942) and "Poland Called Vast Center for Killing Jews" (*The Washington Post*, December 20, 1942) for example, were instead found on the inner pages of all four newspapers in the catalog. What is more, an editorial in the *Chicago Daily Tribune* proclaimed the slaying of 2,000,000 Jews as part of an "extermination campaign" in Poland, accrediting the information to Rabbi Stephen B. Wise, chairman of the World Jewish Congress, via the State Department.⁴⁷ Although Wise's claims were ran on a handful of front pages of newspapers in the U.S. and certainly telling of Hitler's 'Final Solution' now well underway, "most major papers treated this as a story released by a Jewish source and an interested party," thus rendering Wise's confirmations fairly

⁴³ "2 Million Jews Face Exodus to Camps in Poland: Germany Completes Plans for Strict Segregation," in *Chicago Daily Tribune [1849-1988]* (Berlin: Chicago Daily Tribune, 1939), 4, ProQuest Historical Newspapers. See also "Himmler Program Kills Polish Jews: Slaughter of 250,000 in Plan to Wipe Out Half in Country This Year Is Reported," in *The New York Times [1851-2009]* (London: New York Times, 1942), 10, ProQuest Historical Newspapers. For more information of Jewish extermination reported by the American press, see 'Polish Confirmation and Press Reaction' in Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief*, 162-76.

⁴⁴ See "Nazis Seek to Rid Europe of All Jews: Mass Transportation to Polish Zone Continues Unabated," in *The New York Times [1851-2009]* (Berlin: New York Times, 1941), 10, ProQuest Historical Newspapers. In this article, it is stated that the "Complete elimination of Jews from European life now appears to be fixed German policy." However, it can be argued that the ambiguity of the phrase 'elimination of Jews from European life' is not suggestive of Hitler's 'Final Solution', but rather understood as a measure to isolate Jews in Polish ghettos.

⁴⁵ According to David S. Wyman, the Jewish Labor Bund in Poland released a document in May of 1942 summarizing verified massacres throughout Polish cities, which was then transmitted to London's Polish government. Upon their persistent demands for action, leaders of the party succeeded in forcing American and British government officials to acknowledge the information. As a result, "the Bund report became the decisive factor in the first breakthrough of extermination news." However, as Wyman asserts the "news of the existence of a plan" for the systematic extermination of European Jews did not reach the U.S. until August of 1942—this information was not released to the press until November and only after it had been confirmed by the State Department. For more information on the topic, see David S. Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews: America and the Holocaust, 1941-1945* (New York: New Press, 1984), 21-22, 42 and Deborah E. Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief*, 162.

⁴⁶ Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief*, 164.

⁴⁷ "2 Million Jews Slain by Nazis, Dr. Wise Avers: Extermination of All in 1942 Held Hitler Aim," in *Chicago Daily Tribune [1849-1988]* (Washington, D.C.: Chicago Daily Tribune, 1942), 4, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

unreliable by comparison to non-Jewish accounts.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, by the end of 1942 reports from underground operatives in Poland were transmitted to London via the Polish government that “included graphic descriptions of Jews packed into freight cars and deported to ‘special camps’ at Treblinka, Belzec, and Sobibor,” where many victims “died of suffocation or lack of water en route; the rest were murdered at the camps.” While information of the Nazis’ plan to annihilate European Jewry was more or less authenticated by Allied government in November of 1942, it was only after the war that the world fully understood the scope of Hitler’s ‘Final Solution’.⁴⁹

By November of 1942, Rabbi Wise’s desperate efforts to inform the world of Nazi atrocities marked a decisive turning point in the course of the Holocaust; from that point on, “the news of Hitler’s plan to annihilate the Jews was available to anyone in the democratic world who cared to know.” However, the determination of the media to not only provide adequate coverage of Germany’s extermination plans but stimulate concern and anger among the public remained close to nil despite recent revelations by both Wise and the State Department. As a result of this oversight, the ability of rescue advocates to pressure the American government into providing aid for European Jewry was undercut by the refusal of the press to firmly address the issue. More importantly, neither the media nor Roosevelt himself made any attempts to bring the plight of the Jews to the forefront of public knowledge during press conferences. Regardless, by December of 1942, the president was fully aware of Germany’s extermination program that had already been confirmed by Wise. As American and international Jewish organizations⁵⁰ tried in vain to raise support among other faiths and non-Jews, pleas and demands for U.S. and Allied action against the murder of European Jews fell largely on deaf ears as the world transitioned into 1943.⁵¹

Yet in early March of 1943, a shift in public disapproval of Germany is clearly detected in newspaper captions: of the 15 articles listed in figure 6, there are 7 that contain both beseeching and accusatory messages; Americans were not only demanding action and rescue operations but voicing overt criticism of the Roosevelt Administration’s failure to aid European Jews. Here, headlines such as “20,000 Plead: ‘Act Now to Rescue Jews’ – Tragic Call Heard at Mass Meeting” (*Chicago Daily Tribune*, April 15, 1943), “Buck Passing is Blamed for Plight of Jews: Roosevelt Criticized for Failure to Act” (*Chicago Daily Tribune*, August 7, 1943), and “Step to Save Jews Urged in Congress: Measure in Both Houses Advocates Creating a Presidential Body to Act Now” (*The New York Times*, November 10, 1943) can be found amidst mounting reports of the mass extermination of Jews conducted by the Nazis in Poland.⁵² As research shows, these headlines coincided with the American Jewish Congress’ “Stop Hitler Now” mass demonstration at Madison Square Garden on March 1st—an event that generated a “wave of publicity and activity” surrounding the issue of Jewish rescue.⁵³ Although the State

⁴⁸ Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief*, 180-81.

⁴⁹ Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews*, 52-53.

⁵⁰ For a complete list of the seven Jewish organizations—the Joint Emergency Committee on European Jewish Affairs (also known as the ‘Temporary Committee’ prior to March, 1943)—that worked to raise international awareness of the Holocaust and incite American response, see David S. Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews*, 67-68.

⁵¹ Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews*, 61-63, 72.

⁵² “All-Europe Purge of Jews Reported: Hitler Said to Have Ordered Continent Cleared Before End of the War,” in *The New York Times* [1851-2009] (Stockholm: New York Times, 1943), 5, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

⁵³ Tens of thousands attended the Madison Square Garden rally while thousands more listened to speeches in surrounding areas. The demonstration attracted, according to police estimates, approximately 75,000 people. For

Department made small-talk about rescue operations in the spring of 1943, Roosevelt and conservative legislators consistently rebuffed requests by Jewish leaders to discuss the matter at greater length.⁵⁴ Taking this detail into consideration, the prevalence of headlines calling for rescue can be interpreted not as active responses by the U.S. government to finally give aid to millions of European Jews falling victim to the Nazis, but instead as frantic appeals for rescue by American Jewry and local supporters—a matter that was discreetly exposed to those associated with the Bermuda Conference.

On April 19, under the heading of U.S. and British delegates, the issue of *refugees* in Europe was presented in a series of proposals by international officials and largely to an excluded public: the press was firmly restricted to five correspondents (representing only wire services) in attendance while “no individual newspapers were permitted to send reporters.” Moreover, it was agreed by the delegates that emphasis on the Jewish plight was banned and special steps were not to be taken on their behalf. As Wyman asserts,

The positive objectives [of the Conference] were three. First, to devise steps to encourage neutral European nations to accept more escaped refugees. Second, to seek temporary havens in United Nations territories in Europe and Africa and to locate transportation to them. Third, to call an early meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees to implement the decisions reached at Bermuda.

Regardless of professed aims to solve the issue of refugees, the outcomes of the Bermuda Conference were as insignificant as the press coverage, which remained under the strict control of government officials. Of the few correspondents allowed to attend the Conference, ultimately none were privy to the secret deliberations and final reports of what was deemed the “no news conference.”⁵⁵ The failure to act by U.S. and British governments was further compounded by new immigration restrictions and refugee amendments in 1943; in addition to lengthened forms, background checks, and time required for visa application screening,

State Department officials added the provision that the refugee had to be in acute danger before a rescue attempt was a reasonable option. This virtually allowed the State Department to close its doors at will because it claimed that no one who applied for visas was in danger.⁵⁶

As 1943 came to a dismal close, it was clear that the politics of rescue did little more than bury the urgent requests for congressional response in the inner-pages of news reports and more importantly, it placed the fate of European Jewry in further dire straits. By January of 1944,

more information, see David S. Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews*, 87-88 and “Save Doomed Jews, Huge Rally Pleads: United Nations Must Halt Nazi Murders Now, Leaders Tell 21,000 at the Garden,” in *The New York Times* [1851-2009] (New York: New York Times, 1943), 1, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

⁵⁴ Seven Jewish congressmen, headed by Emmanuel Celler, obtained a meeting with President Roosevelt and staunch restrictionist Senator Breckinridge Long in the spring of 1943. However, the congressmen focused on the issue of loosening immigration restriction and quotas rather than rescue operations. This emphasis on immigration restriction highlights the failure of American Jewish leaders to firmly press the issue of rescue upon the State Department, thus allowing a crucial opportunity for discussing action to escape. For more detail, see Greear, “American Immigration Policies,” 45.

⁵⁵ Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews*, 113, 119-20.

⁵⁶ Greear, “American Immigration Policies,” 48-49.

mounting pressure of cabinet members in the Roosevelt Administration⁵⁷ to take direct action against the continued extermination of European Jewry catapulted the issue of rescue into the political limelight.⁵⁸ By March, newspapers began printing stories of assured rescue; looking at figure 7, *The Washington Post* confidently declared, “Rescuing Refugees – and in Time!: New Board Is Striving to Get Victims Out Europe ‘In Mass’” (*The Washington Post*, March 12, 1944).⁵⁹ But what would surface as a three-way clash between meagre government funding, understaffing, and internal opposition over the next few months, the newly-established War Refugee Board remained an open question to its overall effectiveness for a better part of the year.⁶⁰

On June 12th of 1944, President Roosevelt issued an official message explicitly notifying the 78th Congress that the legislature had:

repeatedly manifested its deep concern for the plight of the persecuted minorities in Europe whose lives are each day being offered in sacrifice on the altar of Nazi tyranny...the unprovoked murder of innocent people simply because of race, religion, or political creed is the blackest of all possible crimes.

Within the pages of the document, Roosevelt not only established the War Refugee Board but professed its efforts had brought “new hope to the oppressed peoples of Europe”—a declaration made of not out of conjecture, but attested fact. Moreover, the president noticeably stressed the continuous appeals and efforts made by Congress to find safe havens for Europe’s “oppressed.” Unfortunately, Roosevelt’s candid efforts would remain indefinitely destabilized by the Nazis’ fervent extermination program, ultimately preventing the persecuted from escaping extinction. Nevertheless, Roosevelt’s message was delivered with a promise to harbor roughly 1,000 refugees within the U.S.⁶¹ It is evident that Roosevelt’s message exhibited his readiness to not only listen to appeals of rescue within his own Administration but to finally lend aid to the “oppressed” of Nazi Germany; the inability to explicitly use the term *Jew*, however, would remain an vital omission in the catastrophic wake of liberation. Ultimately, and not without struggle, the War Refugee Board “[played] a crucial role in saving approximately 200,000 Jews” from the clutches of complete annihilation, made possible not only by evacuation, underground

⁵⁷ Seven Jewish congressmen, headed by Emmanuel Celler, obtained a meeting with President Roosevelt and staunch restrictionist Senator Breckinridge Long in the spring of 1943. However, the congressmen focused on the issue of loosening immigration restriction and quotas rather than rescue operations. This emphasis on immigration restriction highlights the failure of American Jewish leaders to firmly press the issue of rescue upon the State Department, thus allowing a crucial opportunity for discussing action to escape. For more detail, see Greear, “American Immigration Policies,” 45.

⁵⁸ Greear, “American Immigration Policies,” 49-50.

⁵⁹ “Rescuing Refugees – and in Time!: New Board Is Striving to Get Victims Out Europe ‘In Mass’,” in *The Washington Post [1877-1995]* (Berlin: The Washington Post, 1944), B1, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

⁶⁰ Under the urging of Henry Morgenthau Jr., his staff, and members of Congress, Roosevelt created the War Refugee Board as a compulsory response to curtail anti-immigration and rescue barriers set by conservative members of the State Department. See Richard Breitman and Allan J. Lichtman, *FDR and the Jews*, 263 and Greear, “American Immigration Policies,” 49-50.

⁶¹ House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, *Caring for Refugees in the United States. Message from the President of the United States Notifying the Congress that Arrangements Have Been Made to Care for Approximately 1,000 Refugees in the United States: June 12, 1944 – Referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and Ordered to Be Printed*, by Franklin D. Roosevelt, 78th Cong., 2d sess., H. Doc. 656, vol. 15 (Washington, DC, 1944), 1-3, accessed February 13, 2014, <http://infoweb.newsbank.com>. See also Leff, *Buried by the Times*, 265-66.

efforts, and protection within Axis territory, but by publicly issuing warnings to the perpetrators of war-crimes⁶² and shipping foodstuffs to concentration camps during the final months of the war. Although the staff's steadfast achievements in saving the lives of tens of thousands of victims cannot be diminished by hindsight, the Board's greatest downfall was its establishment far too late in the proverbial game.⁶³ However, these revelations are best understood in retrospect, as appeals of rescue made to the Roosevelt Administration were obstructed by an unexpected obstacle a mere two months prior to the establishment of the War Refugee Board: the War Department. Here, the shattering failure of Allied powers to bomb Auschwitz would reverberate into future decades, again calling into question the objectives of the U.S. government to aid the Jews of Europe.

By mid-April of 1944, the Roosevelt Administration was again challenged with the option of taking a pro-active stance to save Europe's Jews: bombing the vital railways of concentration camps. As the month came to a close, a report carried by two Hungarian escapees (a document that detailed the extermination plan for Hungarian Jews, gassing methods and crematoriums, the physical layout of Auschwitz, and statistical records of the Nazis' murder) made its way to Allied hands. Around this time the newly-established War Refugee Board obtained the information, which was immediately corroborated by evidence from external sources received earlier in the year. By June, the Allied governments and press had relayed the contents of the report—"the truth about Auschwitz, along with descriptions of its geographical location and layout"—to the wider world. Nevertheless, appeals for the bombing of Auschwitz and contiguous railways would prove unsuccessful. Over the course of 1944, appeals transmitted to War Department for immediate action were consistently rejected on the basis of impracticability. For the American military, assistance was considered an effort that "would require the 'diversion of considerable air support essential to the success of [their] forces now engaged in decisive operations elsewhere'." Further proposals to bomb Auschwitz and rail lines faded with the closure of 1944. By mid-January of 1945, the remains of Auschwitz was captured by the Russian army.⁶⁴

Section IV: From Auschwitz to Americana and Conclusion*

Upon the discovery of Nazi death camps, America viewed itself as the "shocked and innocent liberator" in the highly-publicized aftermath of Hitler's slaughter of European Jews, adopting an attitude of outrage and heroism that would ultimately persist for nearly twenty-five years after the war's end. Regardless of this obstinate mentality, the horrific reality of the 'Final

⁶² In late March of 1944, the *New York Times* ran a front page article, declaring that "All guilty must pay for atrocities and asks people to assist refugees." Significantly, the piece specifically uses the phrase "Jews and other victims," unlike the Presidential Message issued three months later. For the full article, see "Roosevelt Warns Germans on Jews: Says All Guilty Must Pay for Atrocities and Asks People to Assist Refugees," in *The New York Times* [1851-2009] (Washington: New York Times, 1944), 1, ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

⁶³ Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews*, 285.

⁶⁴ In November of 1944, Himmler had already ordered the gassing chambers and crematoriums to be destroyed. Much debate has centered on the issue of bombing the rail lines and camp itself, ranging from feasibility to moral imperatives of sacrificing additional lives of inmates. However, those who supported the bombing concluded the means would justify the end, and "although those who appealed for the bombing did not know it, many Auschwitz prisoners shared their viewpoint." See Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews*, 289-303.

* The title *From Auschwitz to Americana* is borrowed from Gerald E. Markle et al., "From Auschwitz to Americana," *Sociological Focus* (August 1992).

Solution’—the callous murder of six million men, women, and children on the basis of religious conviction—quickly faded into the annals of history in the immediacy of the Cold War and few questioned the detrimental role of the U.S. within this capacity. Moreover, “no new generations of Americans had yet come along to challenge the image that those who fought the war had created themselves.” But for many, the advent of the Eichmann trial in the 1960s served as a catalyst to the resurrection of America’s ignoble past, and although the horrors of the Holocaust were already known to the public, it challenged American notions of virtue and benevolence with the blinding hypocrisy of a culture in crisis. By the decade’s end, a period of national self-examination, cultural renewal, and re-interpretation thrust the history of Nazis genocide into a new light: it had become the *Holocaust*.⁶⁵

For average Americans today, knowledge of the Holocaust relies heavily on representations, whether it is in books (*The Diary of Anne Frank*), movies (*Schindler’s List*), or documentaries found on television (*The Holocaust*), to name but a few examples. Even those who have not read or viewed these materials, they stand as benchmarks for its reception into the American narrative—to the Americanization of the Holocaust. Yet it is the persistent ordinary and academic discourse, scholarship, and commemoration that prove American perceptions of the Holocaust are far from static, but rather intrinsic elements that have “evolved in concert with larger social, cultural, and political movements.” As Hilene Flanzbaum further argues,

representations of the Holocaust in America takes place on an embattled stage, where a seemingly small gesture seems to take on cataclysmic resonance. With each important touchstone of Americanization—whether it is the radio broadcast of Adolf Eichmann’s trial for war crimes in 1961, commonly recounted as a formative moment of awareness; NBC’s televising of the miniseries *Holocaust* in 1978...the opening of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in 1993; or the huge success of *Schindler’s List* that same year—the discussion gets louder and more heated, rather than more muted and moderate as time passes.⁶⁶

In recent years, even the term *Americanization* spurs debates of “vulgarization” or “selling out” when placed in the framework of memorialization, academia, mainstream publications, and blockbuster releases. The history of the Holocaust has become saturated through these mediums and inadvertently imbedded into the very fabric of Americana, to the point that it is now socially acceptable to make a causal reference to some aspect of its history in mundane conversation, whether expressed as a pun or recycled fact, or to associate other acts of genocide freely.⁶⁷ Based upon contemporary vernacular alone, representations of the Holocaust have entered into an era teetering between hackneyed and obscurity; images of Auschwitz have become either detached in American minds or a symbol of monotony in media depictions, whereas phrases such as “grammar Nazi” surface in modern vocabulary with mild insensitivity. Yet for all, the word *Holocaust* remains an integral part of collective consciousness; a hallowed metaphor bereft of callousness and tantamount to humanity’s malevolence.

In reality, Americans readily venerate this tragic event that is not only more than half a century removed but one that is not technically fundamental to American experience. While

⁶⁵ Abzug, *America Views the Holocaust*, 207-09.

⁶⁶ Hilene Flanzbaum, *The Americanization of the Holocaust* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 1, 4-5.

⁶⁷ Flanzbaum, *The Americanization of the Holocaust*, 5, 7.

anti-Semitism existed within the U.S. it was nowhere near the horrors inflicted upon European Jewry. Although many American lives were lost at the expense of Nazi Germany, U.S. cities and towns remained intact and spared from the unremitting bombing which left much of Europe in ruins. Many Americans remained oblivious or indifferent to Nazi genocide, as U.S. objectives were primarily geared towards defeating Axis powers; the rescue of “refugees” remained a secondary issue until the final years of the war. Holocaust survivors, descendants, and American Jewry remain a small percentage of the population today.⁶⁸ Considering such glaring inconsistencies, the zealous nature of Holocaust remembrance demands the question: why here, and more importantly, why *now*?

In recent years, scholars have asserted that the period of self-examination Americans experienced following the Civil Rights Movement and Vietnam War facilitated our own introspection concerning U.S. actions during the Holocaust; Americans questioned their own moral and ethical imperatives as a reflection of Nazi atrocities, while persecution and genocide became the magnifying glass to scrutinize the faults of society.⁶⁹ But can we even compare the Holocaust to other atrocities, such as that experienced by Native Americans, Rwanda, or Cambodia? After all, persecution and genocide did not begin with the Holocaust, nor was it vanquished following the war. In retrospect, the Holocaust is often considered a unique episode in history not only by modern or “civilized” standards but as the defining moment which separates the subjective and societal notions of “good” from “evil.” From here, valuable lessons imparted on humankind at the expense of innumerable Holocaust victims should be assured, but as Peter Novick suggests, such a connection is unlikely “not because of its alleged uniqueness, but because of its extremity.”⁷⁰ While it is judicious to raise virtuous questions about the deplorable nature of humanity, the Holocaust should *not* be invoked as a comparative study—it remains unparalleled in the sense that genocides apart from Nazi Germany do not equate with extenuating conditions that enabled the culmination of the Holocaust. As Roosevelt stated, it was “scarcely believable in a twentieth-century civilization” such a degree of ruthlessness could exist. Comparisons to Native American genocide (largely caused by disease and perpetrated by a people far removed from a developed society) to that of Germany ultimately fails to accurately translate when placed in the continuum of human advancement. It must be stressed that such a contentious claim is not an effort to decry past, present, or even future genocides but to emphasize that distinct circumstances allowed the Nazis to physically and psychologically destroy an entire people as the western world remained blinded by its own objectives.

Accountability for the Holocaust, more often than not, is consigned primarily to the Axis powers—a partial truth at best. As this study has demonstrated, the inadequate responses of the U.S. government, American press, and public played an integral role in shaping the outcome of the Holocaust. Although scholarly accusations surrounding the deficiency of American refugee and rescue operations did not appear until the 1960s, they have since become the crux of assigning responsibility beyond the margins of German history, primarily in respect to repeated hollow gestures made by Franklin Roosevelt and his wayward administration. As Henry L. Feingold aptly states, “on those occasions during the Holocaust years when mass rescue appeared possible, it required of the nations a passionate commitment to save lives,” and although there were individuals in Congress, Jewish organizations, and public spheres who

⁶⁸ Stoler and Gustafson, eds., *Major Problems*, 462. See also Flanzbaum, *The Americanization of the Holocaust*, 32.

⁶⁹ Abzug, *America Views the Holocaust*, 208-09.

⁷⁰ Stoler and Gustafson, eds., *Major Problems*, 467.

strived to do more, the overall consensus of the Roosevelt Administration and national community was consistently at odds with abetting European Jewry. However, this does not imply that fault rests squarely on the shoulders of the American government, nor the public; on the contrary, disunity among American Jews between 1938 and 1943 often undermined efforts to pressure the president to take a stronger stance for refugees and rescue plans, despite overall favorability of Jews within the Administration itself. As hindsight suggests, failure to act by not only American Jewry but world-wide Jewish leaders proved to be one of many catastrophic missteps for their European brethren.⁷¹

Within this web of dismal circumstances, deep-seated threads of anti-Semitic and restrictionist ideology bound public and political circles as a defiant force against foreign intrusion. Coupled with economic turmoil of the Great Depression, the threat of Eastern European refugees provided ample leverage for the U.S. legislators to bar the doors to immigration—a deed which more or less sealed the fate of Jews throughout the Reich. Adding to these issues, the role of the American press and public response (or lack thereof) was interwoven as binary elements of counter-productivity that was evident in bureaucratic silence in media discussions and burying information within the inner-pages of national newspapers. Here, confounding reports of persecution and extermination fused with general antipathy and reluctance of the State Department to place Nazi operations at the forefront of political agendas, thus rendering reports of Jewish extermination negligible in the broader context of winning the war—an objective that neither Roosevelt nor the War Department was willing to compromise.⁷² With all things considered, it can be argued that each noxious factor formed an integral part to a complex equation, one that ultimately rendered the ‘Final Solution’ a tragic answer to the “Jewish Question.”

To date, the subject of the Holocaust evokes an array of emotions and opinions; when surfacing in conversation or academic circles concerning society, it invariably becomes “the yardstick by which modern examples of mass murder are measured,”⁷³ and we as Americans make sure to do so at a safe distance. But perhaps it is the distance we have placed between U.S. involvement and the Holocaust that has augmented our ability to eagerly embrace it in an almost cult-like fashion, as means of displacing our own accountability. From an ethical standpoint, Americans indubitably share a part of that responsibility and to deny this in the face of fact is an affront to the very memory of the millions who perished at the hands of Nazi Germany. If by re-evaluating the American narrative so that it *correctly* reflects our collective failure to act on behalf of European Jews, it is not only our duty as scholars, educators, and historians to provide the full story of our “hidden,” omitted, or forgotten past, but to ensure the truth does not get lost in the obscurity of the present.

⁷¹ Stoler and Gustafson, eds., *Major Problem*, 341-42.

⁷² Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews*, 293.

⁷³ Abzug, *America Views the Holocaust*, 2.

Catalog of ProQuest Historical Newspapers Combined Search: The Los Angeles Times, The New York Times, Chicago Daily Tribune, and The Washington Post

Fig. 1

	Newspaper	Headline	Page
3/3/1933	Los Angeles Times	Pogroms Held Plan Of Nazis: Slaughter of Jews Declared Impending in Germany	A12
3/20/1933	Los Angeles Times	Reich News Censored: Nazi Terrorism Rules Press, Americans Fleeing Germany Recount Amazing Tales of Oppression	1
3/21/1933	New York Times	Jews Here Demand Washington Action: National Leaders Ask "Proper Representation" to Berlin on Anti-Semitic Activities	1
3/26/1933	New York Times	Half Million Jews Affected By Hitler Furor in Germany	XX4
3/26/1933	New York Times	Goering Says Jews Will Be Protected: Asserts Some Excesses in Germany Were Unavoidable and Were Quickly Curbed.	28
3/27/1933	New York Times	Nazis End Attacks on Jews in Reich, Our Embassy Finds	1
3/27/1933	Washington Post	Jews' Mistreating Abated, U.S. is Told: Embassy and Consulates in Germany Report After Protests Here	1
3/31/1933	Los Angeles Times	Nazis Charge Jews Started World War	2
3/31/1933	Chicago Daily Tribune	Hitler Nazis Declare War on World Jewry: Race Blamed for Starting Last Conflict	1
4/15/1933	New York Times	10,000 Jews Flee Nazi Persecution: German-Born Refugees Settle in Near-By Lands, Hoping Conditions Will Change	6
4/18/1933	New York Times	Nazi Drive on Jews Felt Beyond Reich: Reports Indicate Revival of Anti-Semitism in Lands of Central Europe	10
5/23/1933	New York Times	Roosevelt Asked to Champion Jews: Jewish Congress Calls for Help	23
8/30/1933	New York Times	Nazis Imprison Jews in Concentration Camp After French Paper Charges Abuses There	1
9/5/1933	Chicago Daily Tribune	Germany Seeks to Settle Jews in One Land: Hitler Aid Argues They Are Alien Race	8

Fig. 2

Date	Newspaper	Headline	Page
10/29/1938	New York Times	Germany Deports Jews to Poland; Seizes Thousands: Police Carry Out Nation-Wide Raids on Basis of Warsaw Passport Validizing Law	1
11/1/1938	New York Times	Nazi Guns Forced Jews Into Poland: Deportees Were Shot at From Rear as They Trudged From Reich	18
11/9/1938	Chicago Daily Tribune	Germans Attack Jews To Avenge Paris Shooting: Vicious War of Reprisal Led By Hitler	18
11/9/1938	Los Angeles Times	Hitler Speech Blames Jews: He Says They Caused Germany's Collapse at World War's End	10
11/9/1938	Washington Post	Nazis Burn Synagogue As Rath Dies: French Agency Closed -- Dessau Riots Break Out Jews' Expulsion Seen	7
11/10/1938	New York Times	Berlin Raids Reply to Death of Envoy: Nazis Loot Jews' Shops, Burn City's Biggest Synagogue to Avenge Paris Embassy Aide Nazi Guards Watch Vandalism Jewelry Shop Looted	1
11/10/1938	Chicago Daily Tribune	Mobs Wreck Jewish Stores in Berlin: Raiders Loot Shops; Carry Off Occupants, Synagogue Smashed and Set Afire	1
11/10/1938	Los Angeles Times	Berlin Jews Attacked As Envoy Dies in Paris: Shop Windows Smashed and Munich Synagogues Fired in Revenge for Slaying	1
11/11/1938	New York Times	All Vienna's Synagogues Attacked; Fires and Bombs Wreck 18 of 21: Jews Are Beaten, Furniture and Goods Flung From Homes and Shops -- 15,000 Are Jailed During Day	1
11/11/1938	Chicago Daily Tribune	Hitler Seizes 20,000 Jews: Homes Burned; Stores Looted; Terror Reigns: Mobs Run Wild in German Streets -- Jews Flee from Terrorists in Germany	1
11/11/1938	Los Angeles Times	Nazi Mobs Riot in Wild Orgy: War on Jews Spreads in All Germany Despite Goebbels' Orders Calling Halt to Terrorism and Destruction	1
11/13/1938	New York Times	Arrests Continue: Insurance Settlements to Be Confiscated for Reich's Benefit -- Germany issued a new series of decrees yesterday to complete "the liquidation of the Jews."	1
11/18/1938	Washington Post	Raised Quota Studied -- Senators Hit Nazis -- Attache Called Home: U.S. Studies Relaxing of Quotas on Immigrants from Germany	X1
11/29/1938	New York Times	Arrests of Jews Go on in Germany: Those Who Escaped Seizure After Slaying Are Reported Being Rounded Up Now	18
12/25/1938	New York Times	Fear Bred in Reich by Course of Nazis: Many Hoping for Action From Abroad -- Ruthlessness Linked to Easy Foreign Triumphs	10

Fig. 3

Date	Newspaper	Headline	Page
1/12/1939	Los Angeles Times	Nazis Warn Foreign Jews of Reprisals Over Shootings	1
3/5/1939	Chicago Daily Tribune	Nazis to Force Labor by Jews at Minimum Pay: Emigration Passports Meet with Delay	9
3/19/1939	New York Times	Hitler Drives On: Hitler's Push to the East -- And Five Momentous Questions	63
5/19/1939	New York Times	Roosevelt Urged to Act for Jews: Zionist Leader Presents Plea to Hull for Intercession on British Proposals	6
5/19/1939	New York Times	Reich Orders Ouster of 'Stateless' Jews: 1,000 in Munich Must Leave by July 31 or Go to Dachau	7
3/26/1939	Los Angeles Times	Mein Kampf Displays Ignorant Emotionalism	C6
9/1/1939	Chicago Daily Tribune	A House Painter Rises to Power: Hitler's Career -- Dictator's Progress Told Step by Step	10
9/2/1939	Chicago Daily Tribune	The War the World Feared	10
9/3/1939	Los Angeles Times	Where America Stands	A4
9/3/1939	New York Times	Hails Jewish New Year: Mayor Hopes It Will Mark End of Persecution and Bigotry	15
9/10/1939	Chicago Daily Tribune	What Chicago's Women Think of War and Hitler: Leaders of 5 Races Tell Their Views	11
11/6/1939	Chicago Daily Tribune	1,500,000 Jews in Poland Face Death by Hunger: Fare Worse than Brothers in Reich, Paris Hears	5
11/27/1939	Washington Post	Nazis Herd 500,000 Jews Into Poland	9
12/3/1939	Chicago Daily Tribune	2 Million Jews Face Exodus to Camps in Poland: Germany Completes Plans for Strict Segregation	4
12/10/1939	New York Times	Jews' Plight Held Critical in Poland: Warsaw Community Official Says All Live in Terror of Gestapo and Nazi Chiefs	56

Fig. 4

Date	Newspaper	Headline	Page
1/5/1941	Los Angeles Times	Chile Turns Back Jewish Refugees: Thirty-seven Denied Permission to Land	21
1/8/1941	Washington Post	Jersey Convicts Bund Leader And 8 Others: State Charges Them With Promoting Hatred Against Jews	5
1/9/1941	New York Times	U.S. Refuses French Plea to Take Refugees; Reich Curb Called Bar to Orderly Emigration	1
1/23/1941	Washington Post	Purge Intolerance, President Urges	7
2/20/1941	New York Times	Nazi Deportation of Jews Resumed: 10,000 Rounded Up in Vienna for Transportation to East Poland, Berlin Says	8
2/28/1941	New York Times	Vienna Jews Plead for Help to Escape: Visa Holders Lack Funds to Go to the United States or Other Countries	4
3/14/1941	Chicago Daily Tribune	U.S. Bound Jews Quit Germany in Sealed Trains: Under Nazi Guard on Way to Portugal	6
5/15/1941	Washington Post	Jewish Youth Urged to Dispel Spirit of Defeat	10
5/26/1941	Los Angeles Times	Two Million Jews Starving in Poland, Refugee Asserts: Banquet Told Elders in Nazi-Ruled Country Look to Americans to Rescue Young People	9
6/7/1941	New York Times	One-Third of Jews Found in Nazis Grip: Joint Distribution Official Puts Figure at 5,000,000	5
6/9/1941	Chicago Daily Tribune	Jewish Outlook is More Hopeful, Chicagoans Told: Goldmann and Wise Speak at Benefit	22
9/7/1941	New York Times	Nazis Order Jews Over Six Labeled: All Above That Age Must Wear the Star of David, Secret Police Chief Rules	14
10/22/1941	New York Times	Anti-Jewish Drive Renewed in Reich: Thousands Reported Sent Into Poland From Berlin and Bohemia Protectorate	11
10/28/1941	New York Times	Nazis Seek to Rid Europe of All Jews: Mass Transportation to Polish Zone Continues Unabated	10
11/15/1941	Los Angeles Times	Reich Outlines Stand on Jews: Goebbels Issues 10 Points to Govern Nazi Treatment of Race	6

Fig. 5

Date	Newspaper	Headline	Page
6/30/1942	Chicago Daily Tribune	Estimate 1,000,000 Jews Died Victims of Nazis	6
7/2/1942	New York Times	Allies are Urged to Execute Nazis -- Report on Slaughter of Jews in Poland Asks Like Treatment for Germans	6
7/9/1942	Chicago Daily Tribune	Rescue Poland from the Nazis -- Patriots Ask Strong Action by U. S. and Britain	6
7/10/1942	Chicago Daily Tribune	Claim Germans Kill 5,000 Jews in Polish Town: 700,000 Massacred in Nation, Prelate Says	7
11/25/1942	Chicago Daily Tribune	2 Million Jews Slain by Nazis, Dr. Wise Avers: Extermination of All in 1942 Held Hitler Aim	4
11/25/1942	Los Angeles Times	Nazis Wiping Out Jews in Cold Blood: Ration Cards Issued for 433,000 Last March, but Only 40,000 Handed Out Last Month	2
11/25/1942	Los Angeles Times	Half of Jews in Europe Dead: Rabbi Wise Declares 2,000,000 Killed in Occupied Areas	2
11/25/1942	New York Times	Himmler Program Kills Polish Jews: Slaughter of 250,000 in Plan to Wipe Out Half in Country This Year Is Reported	10
11/26/1942	Los Angeles Times	Million Polish Jews Perish: Mass Executions and Gas Wiping Out All but Able-Bodied	2
11/26/1942	New York Times	Slain Polish Jews Put at a Million: One-third of Number in Whole Country Said to Have Been Put to Death by Nazis	16
11/27/1942	New York Times	1,000 Jews Sent Out of Norway by Nazis: Placed on Freighter Bound for Undisclosed Reich Port	3
12/3/1942	Los Angeles Times	Plight of Jews Under Hitler Truly Terrible	A4
12/9/1942	New York Times	President Renews Pledges to Jews: He Tells Group Every Effort Will Be Made to Fix Guilt in Axis Crimes Against Race	20
12/11/1942	Washington Post	Plight of Jews Horrifying, Polish Government Says	16
12/20/1942	Washington Post	Poland Called Vast Center for Killing Jews	8

Fig. 6

Date	Newspaper	Headline	Page
3/2/1943	New York Times	Save Doomed Jews, Huge Rally Pleads: United Nations Must Halt Nazi Murders Now, Leaders Tell 21,000 at the Garden	1
3/21/1943	New York Times	Jews of Five Towns Killed in Poland: 35,000 Persons Reported Slain in German Liquidation of Cities' Ghettos	10
3/29/1943	Washington Post	All Warsaw Jews Slain by Nazis, Rabbi Declares	10
4/15/1943	Chicago Daily Tribune	20,000 Plead: 'Act Now to Rescue Jews' -- Tragic Call Heard at Mass Meeting	1
5/5/1943	Los Angeles Times	Conference Seen as Second Munich: Bermuda Meeting's Failure to Give Adequate Aid to Jews Decried by Jewish Historian	A12
7/23/1943	New York Times	Wise Asks Roosevelt Aid: Jewish Congress Head Estimates Axis Killings at 3,000,000	11
8/1/1943	New York Times	French Jews Sent to Nazi Oblivion: One Who Escaped Terror Says 'Death Convoys' Take Them to Unknown Fate in East	2
8/7/1943	Chicago Daily Tribune	Buck Passing is Blamed for Plight of Jews: Roosevelt Criticized for Failure to Act	9
10/8/1943	New York Times	All-Europe Purge of Jews Reported: Hitler Said to Have Ordered Continent Cleared Before End of the War	5
11/8/1943	New York Times	Germans Wipe Out Jews of Austria: Almost All the Original 200,000 Have Been Killed or Sent to Eastern Ghettos	6
11/10/1943	New York Times	Step to Save Jews Urged in Congress: Measure in Both Houses Advocates Creating a Presidential Body to Act Now	19
11/18/1943	Washington Post	Nazi's Mass Slaughter of Jews Pictured by Kiev Eyewitness	3
11/29/1943	Los Angeles Times	Slaughter of 125,000 by Nazis in Kiev Told: Thousands More Die From Hunger and Disease and Only Six of 200,000 Jews in City Alive	1
12/14/1943	Washington Post	Program Of Death: Jewish Persecutions	14
12/31/1943	New York Times	Refugee Figures Questioned: Faults Found in Testimony of Under-Secretary of State Long	14

Fig. 7

Date	Newspaper	Headline	Page
2/19/1944	New York Times	Poles Charge Nazis Wipe Out Children: Campaign to Exterminate Jewish Young Is Reported	9
3/12/1944	Washington Post	Rescuing Refugees -- and in Time!: New Board Is Striving to Get Victims Out Europe 'In Mass'	B1
3/25/1944	New York Times	Roosevelt Warns Germans on Jews: Says All Guilty Must Pay for Atrocities and Asks People to Assist Refugees	1
3/29/1944	Los Angeles Times	Polish Jews Describe Nazi 'Forest of Death'	8
3/29/1944	Washington Post	2 Lwow Jews Tell of 'Death Forest': Husband and Wife Who Fled Say Nazis Killed 100,000 There -- One Crucified	2
3/30/1944	New York Times	Elimination of Nazi Practices in Europe Called U.S. Policy	5
4/25/1944	Los Angeles Times	Story of Death in Poland Relayed by Underground	8
5/18/1944	New York Times	Savage Blows Hit Jews in Hungary: 80,000 Reported Sent to Murder Camps in Poland -- Non-Jews Protest in Vain	5
6/18/1944	New York Times	Jews to be Freed, Roosevelt Asserts: Liberation in Poland Stressed in Message to 400 Delegates of Federation Here	14
7/3/1944	New York Times	Inquiry Confirms Nazi Death Camps: 1,715,000 Jews Said to Have Been Put to Death by the Germans Up to April 15	3
7/17/1944	New York Times	Hitler Foretold Slaughter: Revealed Purpose to Exterminate Jews in Private Talk in 1933	14
10/6/1944	New York Times	Nazi Death Camp a Scene of Horror: Story of Massacre of 3,000 in Estonia Evident in Piles of Burned Bodies	6
10/11/1944	Los Angeles Times	U.S. Warns Nazis to End Killings	6
10/27/1944	Washington Post	Rescuing Refugees	6
11/26/1944	New York Times	U.S. Board Bares Atrocity Details Told by Witnesses at Polish Camps	1

Fig. 8

Date	Newspaper	Headline	Page
4/12/1945	Washington Post	Liberated by Yanks: Extermination Camp Gassed 5 Million Jews, Survivor Says	1
5/2/1945	New York Times	All Jews Hounded Under Hitler Rule: More Than 3,000,000 Slain in Germany and the Nazi-Occupied Countries	9
5/14/1945	Los Angeles Times	6,200,000 Jewish Deaths Laid to Nazis: Welfare Group Says One 'Mein Kampf' Plan Carried Out	1
5/27/1945	New York Times	Army Curbs News in Reich as Result of Goering Report: Stricter Censorship Prevents Reporters From Interviewing Captured Enemy Officials	1
6/10/1945	New York Times	80% of Reich Jews Murdered by Nazis: All Those Left in Europe Were Marked for Death by 1946, AMG Investigation Shows	13
8/26/1945	New York Times	Jews in U.S. Zone of Reich Find Conditions Improving: Repatriation, Relief Expedited, Although Some Faults Exist	1
9/30/1945	Chicago Daily Tribune	Truman Tells Ike: Give Jews Better Deal	1
10/2/1945	Washington Post	Jews Ridicule Camp Report By Harrison: Conditions Never Nazi-Like and Even Better Now, They Tell Reporters	1
10/17/1945	Washington Post	Eisenhower Defends Handling Of Jews in Letter to Truman: IKE	1
11/20/1945	New York Times	Displaced Jews in Worse Plight: Conditions in Camps in British and American Zones of Germany Decline	6
11/25/1945	Chicago Daily Tribune	Tell How Naked Women Waited Nazi Gas Death: Nightmarish Horror Scene Depicted in Court	5
11/30/1945	New York Times	President Orders Eisenhower to End New Abuse of Jews: He Acts on Harrison Report, Which Likens Our Treatment to That of the Nazis	1
12/15/1945	Los Angeles Times	Nazi Plan to Kill All Jews Disclosed: Germans Admit Millions Destroyed and Slave Status for Poles Set Up	2
12/15/1945	New York Times	Trial Data Reveal 6,000,000 Jews Died: Evidence at Nuremberg Cites Brutality Used by Germans in Extermination	8
12/15/1945	Washington Post	6 Million Jews Slain by Nazis, Tribunal Told	5

Works Cited

- “2 Million Jews Face Exodus to Camps in Poland: Germany Completes Plans for Strict Segregation.” In *Chicago Daily Tribune (1849-1988)*, 4. Berlin: Chicago Daily Tribune, 1939. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
- Abzug, Robert H. *America Views the Holocaust, 1933-1945: A Brief Documentary History*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999.
- “All-Europe Purge of Jews Reported: Hitler Said to Have Ordered Continent Cleared Before End of the War.” In *The New York Times (1851-2009)*, 5. Stockholm: New York Times, 1943.
- Baron, Lawrence. “Haven from the Holocaust: Oswego, New York, 1944–1946.” *New York History*, 1983, 4-34.
- “Berlin Raids Reply to Death of Envoy: Nazis Loot Jews’ Shops, Burn City’s Biggest Synagogue to Avenge Paris Embassy Aide.” In *The New York Times (1851-2009)*, 1. Berlin: New York Times, 1938. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
- Breitman, Richard, and Allan J. Lichtman. *FDR and the Jews*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Feingold, Henry L. *The Politics of Rescue: The Roosevelt Administration and the Holocaust, 1938-1945*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1970.
- Flanzbaum, Hilene. *The Americanization of the Holocaust*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- “Goering Says Jews Will Be Protected: Asserts Some Excesses in Germany Were Unavoidable and Were Quickly Curbed.” In *The New York Times (1851-2009)*, 28. Berlin: New York Times, 1933. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
- Greear, Wesley P. “American Immigration Policies and Public Opinion on European Jews From 1933 to 1945.” Master’s thesis, East Tennessee State University, 2002.
- “Himmler Program Kills Polish Jews: Slaughter of 250,000 in Plan to Wipe Out Half in Country This Year Is Reported.” In *The New York Times (1851-2009)*, 10. London: New York Times, 1942.
- “Jews in Tangier Alarmed: Indications of a Secret Organization for Their Persecution.” In *The New York Times (1851-2009)*, 1. London: New York Times, 1907.
- “Jews’ Mistreating Abated, U.S. Is Told: Embassy and Consulates in Germany Report After Protests Here.” In *The Washington Post (1877-1995)*, 1. Berlin: Washington Post, 1933. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

- “Kristallnacht: A Nationwide Pogrom, November 9-10, 1938” United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Accessed April 16, 2014.
<http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005201>.
- Leff, Laurel. *Buried by the Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Lipstadt, Deborah E. “America and The Holocaust.” *Modern Judaism* 10 (October 1990): 283-96.
- Lipstadt, Deborah E. *Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaust, 1933-1945*. New York: Free Press, 1986.
- Ludmerer, Kenneth M. “American Geneticists and the Eugenics Movement: 1905-1935.” *Journal of the History of Biology*, Autumn 1969, 337-62.
- Markle, Gerald E., Mary D. Lagerwey-Voorman, Todd A. Clason, Jill A. Green, and Tricia L. Meade. “From Auschwitz to Americana.” *Sociological Focus* 25 (August 1992): 179-202.
- Mintz, Alan L. *Popular Culture and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory in America*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001.
- “Mobs Wreck Jewish Stores in Berlin: Raiders Loot Shops; Carry Off Occupants.” In *Chicago Daily Tribune (1851-2009)*, 1. Berlin: Chicago Daily Tribune, 1938.
- “Nazis Seek to Rid Europe of All Jews: Mass Transportation to Polish Zone Continues Unabated.” In *The New York Times (1851-2009)*, 10. Berlin: New York Times, 1941. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
- Noack, Thorsten, and Heiner Fangerau. “Eugenics, Euthanasia, and Aftermath.” *International Journal of Mental Health*, 2007, 112-24.
- “Rescuing Refugees – and in Time!: New Board Is Striving to Get Victims Out Europe ‘In Mass’.” In *The Washington Post (1877-1995)*, B1. Berlin: Washington Post, 1944. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
- “Roosevelt Warns Germans on Jews: Says All Guilty Must Pay for Atrocities and Asks People to Assist Refugees.” In *The New York Times (1851-2009)*, 1. Washington: New York Times, 1944. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
- “Save Doomed Jews, Huge Rally Pleads: United Nations Must Halt Nazi Murders Now, Leaders Tell 21,000 at the Garden.” In *The New York Times (1851-2009)*, 1. New York: New York Times, 1943. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
- Stoler, Mark A., and Melanie S. Gustafson, eds. *Major Problems in the History of World War II: Documents and Essays*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2003.

U.S. Congress. Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. *Restriction of Immigration: April 7, 1932 – Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and Ordered to Be Printed*. By John W. Moore. 72nd Cong., 1st sess. Cong. Rept. 1016. Vol. 2. Washington, DC. Accessed February 13, 2014. <http://infoweb.newsbank.com>.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. *State of War Between the United States and the Japanese Empire. Address from the President of the United States Before a Joint Session of the Two Houses of Congress Requesting That Congress Declare That There Exists a State of War Between the United States and the Japanese Empire. December 8, 1941 – Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Ordered to Be Printed*. By Franklin D. Roosevelt. 77th Cong., 1st sess. H. Doc. 453. Vol. 22. Washington, DC, 1941. Accessed May 11, 2014. www.infoweb.newsbank.com.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. *Caring for Refugees in the United States. Message from the President of the United States Notifying the Congress That Arrangements Have Been Made to Care for Approximately 1,000 Refugees in the United States: June 12, 1944 – Referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and Ordered to Be Printed*. By Franklin D. Roosevelt. 78th Cong., 2d sess. H. Doc. 656. Vol. 15. Washington, DC, 1944. Accessed February 13, 2014. <http://infoweb.newsbank.com>.

“U.S. Immigration Legislation: 1924 Immigration Act.” U.S. Immigration Legislation Online. Accessed April 23, 2014. http://library.uwb.edu/guides/usimmigration/1924_immigration_act.html.

Wyman, David S. *The Abandonment of the Jews: America and the Holocaust, 1941-1945*. New York: New Press, 1984.