A Thesis

Entitled

The Representation of the Economic Persecution of German Jews in *The New York Times*, 1933-1938

By

Sheila Solhtalab

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty as partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the Master of Arts Degree in History.

_____

Dr. Larry Wilcox, Committee Chair

_____

Dr. Patricia R. Komuniecki,
Dean College of Graduate Studies

The University of Toledo

May 2011

An Abstract of

The Representation of the Economic Persecution of German

Jews in *The New York Times*, 1933-1938

by

Sheila Solhtalab

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty as partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the Master or Arts Degree in History

The University of Toledo

May 2011

From 1933 to the end of 1938, a series of events assisted in the successful elimination of Jews from the German economy. The Jewish boycott of 1933, the Nuremberg Laws, and *Kristallnacht*, all served as examples of the treatment Jews could expect in the years to come. In addition, these events provided the Nazi government a glimpse of reactions from the German public and the Western world, providing essential feedback required in developing Jewish policy. In this process, the press played a pivotal role.

During this period of initial persecution, a great many German Jews were removed from their jobs, banned from business associations, had their shops boycotted to discourage sales, and ultimately excluded from their professions. In addition, with the implementation of the Nuremberg Laws, Jews would be eliminated as citizens of the Reich, resulting above all in the legal elimination of Jews from positions in civil service. By the end of 1936 Jews experienced the process of forced emigration and "voluntary" Aryanizations. As a result, their property was being systematically removed through a series of decrees and regulations. By the end of 1938, in post *Kristallnacht* Germany,

successful emigration rendered Jews penniless – their wealth tied to blocked bank accounts, "penalties," and decrees. The so-called "voluntary" Aryanizations turned "forced," and any hope of economic survival for German Jews in Germany became non-existent.

These, and other, events occurred in plain view of the German public and the international press. They were both privileged to speeches delineating the goals of the Nazis towards the Jews, to the sight of S.A troops blocking the entrances of Jewish businesses, and were even aware of the emergence of "Aryan" businesses from the remains of once prominent Jewish businesses. They both experienced first hand the violence and the financial destitution inflicted on the Jews. Where they differed, however, was in their ability to play a passive role as witnesses; the responsibility to accurately, and truthfully, describe the events in a clear and concise manner abroad fell upon the press. They held the power to inform. Their words could have meant the difference between life and death of German, and ultimately European, Jews. What was reported about the Jewish persecution reached millions of individuals in America and other Western nations daily. *The New York Times* carried this burden above all others, as arguably the most prominent and trusted newspaper of the United States. The questions remain: With their reputation following them, and with first hand knowledge of the unfolding events, how did *The New York Times* represent the ongoing economic persecution of the Jews in Germany? Was the developing persecution reported accurately, as presented by current historical facts?

Table of Contents

Abstract iii

Contents v

Chapter 1

Introduction 1

Chapter 2

The April 1, 1933 Boycott – The Economic Persecution Begins? 20

Chapter 3

The Nuremberg Laws – Legislating Destruction 43

Chapter 4

Kristallnacht – Prelude to Destruction? 62

Chapter 5

Conclusion 81

References 95

"Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities."
-Voltaire

Chapter 1

Introduction

" *We journalists tell the public which way the cat is jumping. The public will take care of the cat*."[1]

Since its acquisition in 1896, until his death in 1935, Adolph Ochs sought to continue to publish *The New York Times* (*TNYT*) under the prescribed direction of its previous owners, Henry J. Raymond and George Jones. By continuing the tradition of printing "unpretentious" news, with "moderation" and "decency," *TNYT* maintained the focus that led to the creation of its reader base and reputation.[2] Under Ochs, *TNYT* continued to provide unsensationalized, unbiased, and undistorted news,[3] focusing on "all the news that's fit to print."[4] A once struggling newspaper, *TNYT* has continuously set the standard for other journals and journalists.[5] Often praised and emulated, it is one of the most

[1] Arthur Hays Sulzberger. BrainyQuote.com, Xplore Inc, 2011.

[2] Elmer Davis, *The History of the New York Times*, (New York: New York Times, 1921), 6. Mr. Davis was part of the editorial staff of *The New York Times*. During this time *TNYT* major competitors, including *The Sun*, which was subsequently swallowed by *The Herald*. *The Herald* and *The Tribune* appealed to completely different readers; focusing primarily on "yellow" journalism and the use of sensationalized biased opinion as fact for the sole purpose of boosting sales. *TNYT* was able to provide its readers, in an almost exclusively basis, fact based news.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] The Truman Library, http://library.truman.edu/microforms/new_york_times.asp (accessed on January 26, 2011)

[5] Davis. At the time of its acquisition by Ochs in 1896, *TNYT* was on the brink of financial decline. Although Raymond and Jones had initially lower the price of the journal to 3 cents, the journal was still unable to recover. It was under Ochs that the journal became financially viable. In a bold move, Ochs

influential newspapers in the United States and abroad.[6] Beyond this, it has influenced a wide spectrum of public and political figures, in addition to being used as a primary source for state agencies.[7] The newspaper reaches nearly a half million readers during weekdays and over three-quarters of a million on Sundays.[8] Through syndication, *TNYT* reaches the readers of an additional 525 newspapers.[9] Despite these accomplishments, it has been plagued by complications and criticisms revolving around its position on Judaism, both personally and professionally.

"A non-Jewish Jew"[10]

Adolph Ochs continuously sought to separate himself from Judaism in his personal and professional life, a goal that he was never fully able to attain. As the son of German-Jewish immigrants, Ochs was continuously criticized by Jewish and non-Jewish organizations and individuals for providing too much or too little coverage of Jewish causes in *TNYT*. Regardless of the criticism received, Ochs was adamant in his refusal to use *TNYT* as an outlet for Jewish causes, fearing that doing so would result in it being viewed solely as a "Jewish" paper, ultimately resulting in loss of credibility.[11] As far as Ochs was concerned, Judaism was a "…religion, like Methodism or Lutheranism, and

---

ignored the recommendation of others and lowered the price from 3 cents to 1 making the journal more accessible, resulting in an increase in advertising revenue.

[6] Laurel Leff, *Buried By The Times: The Holocaust and America's Most Important Newspaper*, (Cambridge: University Press, 2005), 11. See also Susan E. Tifft and Alex S. Jones, *The Trust: The Private Life and Powerful Family Behind The New York Times*, (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1999), 218.

[7] Leff, 10-11. "Files of the Office of War Information, the Office of Strategic Services, the World Jewish Congress, and the Secretary of the Treasure, to name just a few, bulge with the clippings from the New York Times; no other newspaper comes close."

[8] *Ibid.,* 19.

[9] *Ibid.,* 10-11.

[10] Tifft and Jones, 93-94. Description of Ochs given by *TNYT* editorial council member, Garet Garrett. He concluded by stating, "He will have nothing to do with any Jewish movement." (1915)

[11] *Ibid.,* 94-95.

nothing more," a belief that earned him the title of a "non-Jewish Jew."[12] As such, with one exception, *TNYT* refused to be used as an outlet for Jewish causes.[13]

In 1914, Leo Frank, a twenty-nine year-old Jewish man from Brooklyn, was accused of the heinous rape and murder of thirteen year-old Mary Phagan in Atlanta, Georgia. Frank quickly became the only suspect in Phagan's death after she was found dead in the pencil factory that he had managed for five years. After a brief twenty-six days, using less than circumstantial evidence, Frank was found guilty and sentenced to death.[14] The trial was contested by many Jewish organizations, including the American Jewish Committee, who, in 1914, successfully enlisted the help of Ochs and *TNYT* on Frank's behalf.[15]

Frank's case was an anomaly. Ochs had agreed to help, and he did so passionately, not because Frank was Jewish but because of Ochs' "…civic-lesson view of the world, [that] people had only to be apprised of the true facts to enable them to make the 'right' decision."[16] Ochs never viewed anti-Semitism as a factor in Frank's conviction. After all, Ochs had lived in Chattanooga and knew what Georgians were like. Under no circumstance was he willing to believe that, in the south, "being Jewish" would or could be considered a "handicap;"[17] an unfortunate oversight on Ochs' assessment of the factors involved in Frank's case.[18]

---

[12] *Ibid.*, 93. The refusal to use *TNYT* to focus on "Jewish" issues would persist under Ochs' successor and son-in-law, Arthur Hays Sulzberger.
[13] *Ibid*., 92. See also Leff, 20.
[14] The New Georgia Encyclopedia, 'History and Archeology', http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/nge/Article.jsp?id=h-906 (accessed on January 26, 2011)
[15] Tifft and Jones, 92.
[16] *Ibid.*, 93.
[17] *Ibid.* For Ochs, it was impossible to believe that anti-Semitism could be rampant in a in a city where his brother, George, had twice been elected mayor.
[18] *Ibid.*

On the night of August 16, 1915, after having his death sentence commuted to life, Frank was removed from his cell by a lynch mob of prominent members of Phagan's hometown and hung.[19] As a result, Ochs pleaded with Georgian newspapers to reprint a *TNYT* editorial that called "…on justice-minded residents of the state to prove Frank's innocence posthumously," an empty attempt to reconcile his view of "…the Southerners he felt he knew so well."[20] Most papers rejected his plea. One, *The Macon Telegraph*, went so far as to respond via telegraph stating that the "outside interference of… Jews, especially the 'offensive propaganda' printed in *The New York Times*, … had 'made it necessary to lynch Frank'."[21] The response was beyond anything that Ochs could have possibly imagined. The Frank case was of significant importance for Ochs and *TNYT*. Not only did it alter Ochs' beliefs about anti-Semitic sentiments, it singlehandedly discouraged *TNYT* from becoming involved on any subsequent "Jewish" causes. In addition, the case resulted in a shock to Ochs' personal and public identity; he was no longer able to protect himself, or *TNYT*, from being deemed "Jewish."[22] His efforts had failed; "Never again did [Ochs] publicly support a cause, certainly not one involving Jews."[23]

Despite setbacks, Ochs managed to maintain professionalism and dignity within *TNYT*. For example, prior to the United States' involvement in World War I, despite being adamant about his belief that Germany and Austria were single-handedly responsible for the outbreak of war, Ochs insisted that all views be presented in its

---

[19] The New Georgia Encyclopedia. Members of Marietta, Phagan's hometown, lynched Frank after Governor John M. Slaton commuted his death sentence.
[20] Tifft and Jones, 93
[21] *Ibid*.
[22] *Ibid., 96.* Beyond finding himself in a "gloomy state of mind," Ochs had the added enjoyment of dealing with hate mail, most of which was addressed directly to him, both of which left him fearing for his life.
[23] *Ibid., 97.*

editorials.[24] Regardless of position, whether pro-British or German, all views were presented. Still, controversy followed as many, including Ochs' personal friends, believed that *TNYT* placed excessive focus on Germany.[25] This trend continued well into The Second World War (WWII), and under the direction of his son-in-law, Arthur Hays Sulzberger.

"…an unprecedented reign of terror… in the making."[26]

During the 1920s and 30s, as Hitler formally emerged on the political scene in Germany, Ochs found himself taking a more cautious approach on how news from Germany was being reported. In much the same naïve manner that Ochs failed to formally understand the role of anti-Semitic sentiment in the United States, Ochs repeatedly assured readers that there was "no warrant for immediate alarm." Ochs was convinced that Germans could never "…be seduced by Hitler's corrupting charisma."[27] Remarkably, his position persisted into an interview with *The Jewish Journal* in 1931 when he stated that, "The German people are being informed about Hitler." "Gradually," he continued, "those who have supported him are realizing the kind of man he is."[28] Within two years of that interview, however, Hitler had consolidated power, "gained control of the Reichstag," and became the driving force behind the creation of Dachau, in addition to stripping German Jews of jobs and rights.[29] Ochs had no choice but to

[24] *Ibid.,* 105.
[25] *Ibid.*
[26] *Ibid.,* 155. Adolph Ochs on Hitler's consolidation of power.
[27] *Ibid.*
[28] *Ibid.*
[29] *Ibid.*

acquiesce. Hitler, it would seem, marked the emergence of "an unprecedented reign of terror … in the making."[30]

Hitler's consolidation of power changed the editorial face of *TNYT*. In an attempt to maintain uniformity, while distancing itself from the topic of Hitler and the "German situation," any and all editorials for or against Hitler were rejected for publication.[31] In doing so, Ochs broke a tradition that had been in existence since 1896. Since then, *TNYT* had always functioned as an open forum for opposing sides, regardless of how repugnant or morally opposed Ochs may have found the topic.[32] Hitler was, until then, the only exception. Ochs simply could not bear to publish any pro-Hitler editorials and believed that denying all publications on the subject was the only fair and just solution. The solution yielded anger from countless Jewish readers seeking an "…outlet for their condemnation of the Third Reich."[33] The entire situation left Ochs depressed and helpless, unable to function in any capacity within *TNYT*.

In Ochs' absence, his son-in-law, Arthur Sulzberger, took over Ochs' role as editor *TNYT*. Sulzberger and Ochs shared similar traits and beliefs, in particular the steadfast belief that the *TNYT* should not be utilized as an outlet for Jewish causes, which assisted in preserving that tradition at *TNYT*. As anti-Semitism intensified within the United States and throughout the world, Sulzberger intensified the position that *TNYT* not be perceived as a Jewish paper, that it focus instead on unbiased reporting.[34] Sulzberger's drive towards neutrality was economic as well as personal.

---

[30] *Ibid.*
[31] *Ibid.*
[32] *Ibid.*
[33] *Ibid.*
[34] *Ibid., 217.*

> As educated Jewish professionals fled Hitler's oppression, many Americans, still reeling from the Depression, worried that newcomers would claim the best jobs. Such fears coupled with allegations that American Jews weren't doing their full share in the military, nurtured a bigotry that abated only with the end of the war.[35]

Due to the anti-Semitic sentiment within the United States, focusing exclusively on Jewish issues would have been a detriment to the balance and objectivity that *TNYT* had sought to attain, in addition to credibility that its readers demanded.[36] Redirecting its position on "Jewish issues" would have ultimately resulted in an economic loss, as well as loss in credibility. Approaching the plight of German and European Jews cautiously did not mean that "Jewish issues" would not be reported. In one assessment of other American newspapers during the war, *TNYT* "printed more war news than any other paper, averaging 125,000 words an issue and turning away advertisements in the process."[37] Overall, its coverage was "relatively good," "provid[ing] by far the most complete American coverage of Holocaust events."[38]

Despite its achievements, *TNYT* was repeatedly criticized in the United States for paying too much or too little attention to the plight of German Jews. At home, according to Leff, "…readers were suspicious of the Times' Jewish Connection."[39] An unpublished letter to *TNYT* attacked *TNYT* stating that, "In spite of what you and the rest of the 'Jewish Press' think and say Germany will go on, as she has the past year under Hitler, to again become a great Nation … The German people are honest, decent, upright, hard working people and have whatever else it takes to build up a fine nation. Can you say as

---

[35] *Ibid.*
[36] See also Robert H. Abzug, *America Views the Holocaust, 1933-1945: A Brief Documentary History,* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999), 53.
[37] Leff, 9-10.
[38] *Ibid*., See Deborah Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaust, 1933-1945*, (New York: The Free Press, 1986), 220; David Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews: America and the Holocaust, 1941-1945*, (New York: Pantheon Press, 1984), 62.
[39] Leff*.,* 21-22.

much for the Jews?"[40] Responding to such criticisms, Sulzberger consistently and "adamantly opposed to Hitler's persecution of the Jews," while "equally adamant that Jews do nothing special to help other Jews."[41] This position, coupled with the "limited" coverage provided to the plight of German and European Jews from 1933-1945, has contributed to the historical debate about *TNYT* coverage of the Holocaust.

Consistently, historians have criticized Ochs, and later Sulzberger, Jews with prominence, power, and a prestigious outlet, for doing little to help their brethren.[42] After Ochs' death in 1935, Sulzberger was bequeathed the responsibility to speak against the persecution of the Jews. Both declined to fulfill this responsibility, choosing instead to focus on a variety of news topics, rather than focusing solely on the plight of the Jews. Did they act responsibly? As Wyman, Lipstadt, and Leff all agree, *TNYT* presented a more complete assessment of the Holocaust than other newspapers, and in some respect, the growing persecution of the Jews during the 1930s. However, all three have, in some capacity, blamed *TNYT* for insufficient action, in addition to "hiding" the plight of the Jews within the recesses of *TNYT*.

Insofar as the Holocaust in concerned, *TNYT* may have failed to fully and accurately represent the plight of European Jewry. Within the historiography of the Holocaust two books have focused specifically on the role of *TNYT*: Deborah Lipstadt's *Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaus*t, and Laurel Leff's, *Buried By the Times: The Holocaust and America's Most Important Newspaper*. Published in 1986, Lipstadt's work was the first to explore the representation of the Holocaust in the

[40] *Ibid.*
[41] *Ibid*., 30-31.
[42] *Ibid*., 5.

American Press, and she argued that the press failed to accurately and appropriately describe the persecution of the Jews. According to Lipstadt, the press, by virtue of its impact on society, has the responsibility to present events as they were taking place, rather than providing a watered-down assessment of what they deem appropriate for their readers. "The press," she stated, "may not determine what the public thinks, but it does influence what it thinks about."[43] As such, if the media chooses to ignore or enhance the importance of an issue, so will its readers.[44] Insofar as the Holocaust was concerned, the failure of the press could explain, in part, why the American people did not react more strongly to the persecution and plight of the Jews.

The press, Lipstadt argued, failed to emphasize Nazi anti-Semitism or the Holocaust. Repeatedly, reporters "did not always transmit what they saw or heard."[45] Passivity towards reporting the plight of German and European Jews was mimicked by the editors, who decided what to print, where to place it, and what part of the story was going to be printed.[46] The persecution of the Jews, and the ultimate development and implementation of the Holocaust was all too often hidden in the recesses of the various American newspapers, at times totaling little more than just a few lines – blurbs within a sea of stories far more important than the murder of millions – if it was covered at all. *TNYT* fell well within the scope of this critical assessment.

Repeatedly, *TNYT* failed to inform the American public of the significant events taking place in Germany. For example, in 1933, Frederick Birchall, the chief of *TNYT* Berlin bureau, "…assured listeners in a nationwide radio talk broadcast on CBS that

---

[43] Lipstadt, 3.
[44] *Ibid*.
[45] *Ibid.,* 7.
[46] *Ibid.*

Germany was interested only in peace and had no plans to 'slaughter' any of its enemies." Although he acknowledged that the Jews had been persecuted, in his opinion "German violence was 'spent' and predicted that 'prosperity and happiness' would prevail."[47] Even when *TNYT* did accurately describe the plight of German Jews, they often "fell prey" to what Lipstadt described as the "weakness, not strength" interpretation of their crimes.[48] This approach was not unique in the American press.

According to Lipstadt, newspapers throughout the United States appeared to struggle in their attempts to understand who was responsible for, and what the ulterior motives behind, the anti-Semitic violence that they were witnessing.[49] Overall, it appeared that the press was seeking to make sense of the "irrational" and inexplicable.[50] As a result of the various failures of the American press, Lipstadt concluded that American people could not make an educated decision about the persecution of German and European Jews. They could not cry out. Any possibility to provide assistance was diminished, decided for them. Yet, Lipstadt admits that these statements are only speculative. There is simply no way of knowing what the American population would have done had the stories of the Jewish plight have been placed in a more prominent position.[51] The influence of the press, in her view, even exceeded its immediate reader base, influencing history and

---

[47] *Ibid.,* 16-17.

[48] *Ibid.,* 54. In this interpretation, *TNYT* and other newspapers did not deny that atrocities were taking place. Instead, in 1935, they rationalized that the actions of the Nazis proved that things were disintegrating within the party; See also, Frederick Birchall, "Anti-Semites Firmly in the Saddle as Persecution Spreads in the Reich," *New York Times*, June 24, 1935, 1. According to Birchall, Lipstadt stipulates, "all [was] not going well" and Hitler's "power [appeared] to be waning." Unfortunately, however, key factors of the wire to *TNYT* were omitted. For example, Birchall also stated, that "…under her present rulers Germany is no longer a land in which any self-respecting person of Jewish race or ancestry may find comfort, happiness or security. Yet to leave Germany, at the cost of having to begin life anew in some more hospitable country, is as difficult for Jews as is continued existence here."

[49] *Ibid.,* 56.

[50] *Ibid.*

[51] *Ibid.,* 277-278.

understanding. Lipstadt argues that the press' failure is partly to blame for the 'unfathomable" nature of the Holocaust. Because of the press we cannot know "…how creatures, shaped like human beings, can do such things," or how bystanders, "particularly those with access to the news," could have acted so apathetically.

Journalist Laurel Leff followed in the direction suggested by Lipstadt, with one major exception; Leff focused exclusively on the role of *TNYT*, rather than on the American press as a whole. Despite the differences in their arguments, both agree that *TNYT* failed to accurately and appropriately present the events surrounding the Holocaust. According to Leff, *TNYT*, as "America's most important newspaper," had a more important mandate than other newspapers; it had a responsibility to report the events taking place in Germany and Europe in an accurate and more complete fashion. In doing so, their stories might have re-directed the attention of the public, the press, politicians, etc… Unfortunately, *TNYT* did not fulfill their implied role. As a result, Leff claims, they not only misled the American public, but *TNYT's* example enabled other newspapers to mask the plight of the Jews.[52] They were largely to blame for the direction and focus of the news about the developing Holocaust during the 1930s and 1940s.

Of greater significance to Leff, however, was the fact that *TNYT* was owned by Jews of German ancestry.[53] They, above all others, had a responsibility to report the persecution and murder of their brethren, because, as Leff points out, they were aware that their reader base was largely composed of Jews – many of whom were refugees from Germany, who still had family residing in Germany.[54] Instead they chose to ignore, mask,

[52] Leff, 5.
[53] *Ibid.*
[54] *Ibid.,* 10.

hide, or overlook the various policies and the extent of the persecution being inflicted upon German and European Jews. Seldom were stories regarding Jews presented on the front page.[55] Only sporadically did the Times mention the Jews directly, choosing instead to speak of the "German" problem, of "refugees," of the "…problem of mankind," or other euphemisms that could be used to hide the fact that they were referring to Jews, a direct result of Ochs and Sulzberger's influence on the paper.[56]

Leff points to the fact that Sulzberger, despite being adamant that *TNYT* not be perceived as a "Jewish paper," strongly opposed Hitler, the Nazis, and the persecution of the Jews. Yet, in his opposition to Nazism, Sulzberger chose not to speak up publicly against the Jewish plight, instead responding in a "philosophical" manner stating that:

> In doing what I can to help distressed German and Austrian Jews, I must act as an American and not as a Jew, … As a Jew, in my judgment, I have no right to cross national boundary lines in a manner which may involve nationalism.[57]

By "crossing the national boundary" *TNYT* could have been perceived as "Jewish," causing it to lose credibility and its reputation for neutrality. Not speaking up publicly was a calculated and deliberate decision on the part of Sulzberger.

Leff's concluded that *TNYT* failed the public and itself when it chose to deliberately omit information pertaining to the persecution of the Jews. In its relative silence, *TNYT* prevented the American public from knowing more about the Nazi persecution of the Jews. It prevented the American public from knowing more about the mass murders, disenfranchisement, expropriation, and general devastation that was being inflicted upon

---

[55] *Ibid.,* 4. Between 1940 and 1944 *TNYT* printed the following number of front page stories regarding the Jews during the war: six in 1940, seven in 1941, nine in 1942, seven in 1943 and twelve in 1944.
[56] *Ibid.,* 33.
[57] *Ibid., 30-31.*

millions of innocent individuals. In short, they failed European Jewry, the American people, and themselves. [58]

Other texts, such as David S. Wyman's, *The Abandonment of the Jews,*[59] and Theodore S. Hamerow's, *Why We Watched,*[60] have also included some assessment of the role of *TNYT* on the Holocaust. Both criticized the Allied governments for choosing to ignore the plight of the German and European Jewry, even in the face of indisputable evidence of Nazi aggression, up to and including genocide. This included, but was not limited to, the closing off of entry visas to the United States and the refusal of the Allied governments to bomb the train tracks leading into Auschwitz after having had obtained knowledge of their significance. Central to Hamerow's thesis, however, was that the United States chose not to act because of deep-seated anti-Semitic sentiment, from which prominent Jews, such as Arthur Sulzberger, were not exempt. Likewise, despite describing *TNYT* as providing "by far the most complete American press coverage of Holocaust events," Wyman also criticizes it for failing to disclose the plight of German and European Jewry more accurately and more completely.

Criticism of *TNYT* has been inexplicably linked to Ochs and Sulzberger's religious affiliation. The belief that *TNYT* had a greater responsibility to report the plight of the Jews because its owner(s) were Jewish seems without merit, especially since Leff, Lipstadt and Wyman are all in agreement that its representation of the Holocaust was

---

[58] See also Laurel Leff, 'When the Facts Didn't Speak for Themselves: The Holocaust in The New York Times, 1939-1945', in Robert Moses Shapiro, *Why Didn't the Press Shout: American and International Journalism During the Holocaust*, (New Jersey: Yeshiva University Press, 2003), 51-78, and Laurel Leff, 'How the NYT Missed the Story of the Holocaust While It Was Happening,' *History News Network*, April 4, 2005, accessed February 6, 2011, http://hnn.us/articles/10903.html

[59] David Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews: America and the Holocaust*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984).

[60] Theodore S. Hamerow, *Why We Watched: Europe, America and the Holocaust*, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2008). For more on the role of America on the Holocaust, see also Arthur D. Morse, *While Six Million Died: A Chronicle of American Apathy,* (New York: Overlook Press, 1968).

better than that of other American newspapers. It would seem that their argument against *TNYT* is contradicted by their praise. Which interpretation of *TNYT* is appropriate? Did *TNYT* fail to provide accurate and above average representation, or is the historiographical argument flawed?

There are, at a minimum, two flaws in the current arguments – timing and the definition of 'Jewish persecution." Assessing the timing of "Jewish persecution" is central to proving a possible flaw in the historical assessment of *TNYT*. Specifically, Leff and Lipstadt, although both mention the pre-war persecution of German Jews, base the bulk of their argument on the war period.[61] Customarily beginning with *Kristallnacht*, this period is generally identified by the prominent images of the ghettos, extermination and concentration camps, round-ups, "yellow stars," and the murder of Jews. The problem with focusing solely on this period is that key aspects leading up to what we now refer to as the Holocaust are overlooked. This oversight fails to recognize that the systematic Nazi persecution of German Jews began before 1938. Once Hitler was formally placed in the role of Chancellor, the persecution of the Jews only intensified, especially the economic elimination of the Jews from "German" life. *Kristallnacht* was the explosive culmination of years of persecution, not the beginning.

Between 1933-1938 Jews were systematically persecuted under the guise of legality. Among other things, they had their stores boycotted, were fired from their jobs, were excluded from schools and universities, had their bank accounts blocked, were beaten and left morally and financially destitute. Options for survival were lacking. With few options, German Jews resorted to selling their property and businesses in an attempt to

[61] The "war" period generally begins in 1938, post-*Kristallnacht*, and continues until 1945.

make ends meet. Living day to day with little or no income, unable to access their savings, with dwindling liquid assets, their plight seemed desperate. Escape seemed hopeless. Strict regulations on emigration provided Jews with few options for financial survival. If they remained in Germany, they would be forced to endure numerous laws and decrees prohibiting them from any economic existence in Germany. If they were fortunate enough to have a "sponsor" outside of Germany, Jews had the option of leaving Germany penniless or being denied entrance because of the enforcement of financial regulations. Unfortunately, many Jews had to remain in Germany, only to endure the continuation of sadistic Nazi legislation. Each of these methods of persecution was instrumental to the development of "Jewish persecution" during the war. All were exacerbated by the events of *Kristallnacht* on 9/10 November 1938. Yet, until recently, their importance has been largely overlooked.

The historiography of the Holocaust has examined extensively the process of eliminating of Jews from economic life, but only recently has research recognized the importance of economic persecution within the confines of the "Final Solution." Starting in the late 1960s, Raul Hilberg was the first to describe the bureaucratic process of removing the Jews from economic life. In *The Destruction of the European Jews*, Hilberg delineates the chronology of the legislative framework enacted by the Nazi Party and supported by Party members and Party sympathizers .[62]

The process of removing Jews from economic life proved difficult, though not impossible. In its initial phase, the lack of decrees and legislations enabling the outright removal of Jewish employees resulted in creative initiatives. Businesses sought legal

[62] Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967).

rulings to satisfy their desire of being "Jew Free." By using a liberal definition of existing legislation, judges were successful in freeing various companies from their responsibilities of maintaining Jewish employees.[63] The second obstacle revolved around efficiency: "There was a strong conviction that in certain posts (such as sale positions in the export trade) Jews were ideal, or even irreplaceable."[64] All hesitation and concerns were ultimately quieted through the systematic and continuous introduction of laws and decrees that, within a matter of years, had succeeded in the removal of Jews from the majority of public positions. This included the removal of Jews from commerce and retail trades, a topic that has recently gained momentum with studies on the role of big business and "Aryanizations." Insofar as the economic destruction process was concerned, Hilberg described it as continuous, stating that,

> The destruction process had to continue. Whereas, before 1939, anti-Jewish measures were aimed at investments, the wartime destruction dealt with income. From now on the bureaucracy took from the Jews their earnings. The income expropriation yields much less than the property confiscations, but to the Jews the new measures were more serious.[65]

By the late 1970s, Karl A. Schleunes' *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz: Nazi Policy Toward German Jews, 1933-1938* extended Hilberg's monumental study by focusing almost exclusively on the various laws and decrees affecting German Jews. [66] In addition to connecting their influence and importance on the "Final Solution," Schleunes was able

---

[63] *Ibid., 59.* A defendant movie company (German) claimed that it was entitled to fire a Jewish stage manager with whom it had concluded a long-term contract which provided for the termination of employment in the case of "sickness, death, or similar causes rendering the stage manager's work impossible." The Reichgericht held that the clause was "unqualifiedly applicable (*unbedenklich anwendbar*) on the ground that the "racial characteristics" of the plaintiff amounted to sickness and death. In the thinking of Germany's highest judges, the Jews ad already ceased to be living organisms. They were dead matter that could no longer contribute to the growth of a German business.

[64] *Ibid.*

[65] *Ibid., 98-99*

[66] Karl A. Schleunes, *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz: Nazi policy Toward German Jews, 1933-1938*, (Chicago: University Press, 1990).

to show how Nazi legislative policy was inextricably linked with Nazi extermination policy, while simultaneously showing the progress of legislation. The "Final Solution" occurred as a result of legislative policy that was for the most part enacted due to need and demand. Both of these early studies helped validate the importance of the role of economic persecution through a series of legislative decrees and laws, while simultaneously providing a framework for subsequent studies.

The historiography of the Holocaust has always included, to some degree, the economic persecution of German Jews from 1933-1938. Avraham Barkai, for example, focused almost exclusively on the period and its ramification and importance on the Holocaust. In *From Boycott to Annihilation: The Economic Struggle of German Jews, 1933-1943*, Barkai argued that Germans were clearly aware of the persecution being inflicted on German Jews; they were the primary benefactors of the persecution. [67] Gerald D. Feldman and Frank Bajohr have focused their work on the 1933-1938 period but they have, to some extent, deviated. Feldman has focused on the role of big business and Bajohr on the role of "Aryanization."[68] In "*Aryanization" in Hamburg*, Bajohr described the role of German citizens in the economic disenfranchisement of Jews. According to Bajohr, middle-class citizens were the driving force behind the pre-emptive removal of German Jews from civil service, in addition to being largely responsible for the developing "Aryanization" policy in Hamburg. Motivated by greed, the acquisition of

---

[67] Avraham Barkai, *From Boycott to Annihilation: The Economic Struggle of German Jews, 1933-1945*, (Hanover: University of New England, 1989).

[68] Frank Bajohr, '*Aryanization' in Hamburg: The Economic Exclusion of Jews and the Confiscation of their Property in Nazi Germany,* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2002); Gerald D. Feldman and Wolfgang Siebel (eds.), *Networks of Nazi Persecution: Bureaucracy, Business and the Organization of the Holocaust*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005). See also Gerald Feldman, 'Holocaust Assets and German Business History: Beginning or End?,' *German Studies Review*, Vol. 25, No. 1, (February 2002), 24-34.

"Aryanized" property allowed German citizens the ability to purchase Jewish businesses that would have been otherwise out of their reach, in addition to removing the threat of Jewish competitors from the German economy. Significantly, Bajohr showed that there was flexibility in the enforcement and interpretation of Nazi legislation. Due to its international importance, Hamburg officials tried to ignore Nazi laws and decrees directed towards the removal of Jews from German economic life. In comparison to other German cities, Hamburg proved to be an anomaly; Jews, for the most part, were able to successfully work around Nazi policy. With few exceptions, businesses remained largely in Jewish hands until November 1938. In post-*Kristallnacht* Germany, international reactions towards Germany were much less important. Although there are still limitations to the study, *"Aryanization" in Hamburg* was influenced by its predecessors, incorporating the role of the German public and legislation in the initial stages of the persecution of the Jews.

From Hilberg to Bajohr, the meaning of "Jewish persecution" has been redefined. No longer limited to the post-*Kristallnacht* war period, the question remains, if the economic persecution of German Jews from 1933-1938 is examined, would *TNYT* represent the plight of the Jews in a manner contrary to that described by Leff and Lipstadt? Or would their assessment hold true? Is it possible that, Leff's and Lipstadt's arguments are the result of a historical oversight compounded by unreasonable expectations and limited definition and timing of "Jewish persecution"?

What follows is not a political or personal assessment Ochs' or Sulzberger's character. No attempt will be made to link the prowess and prestige of *TNYT* to President Roosevelt, or to any other political agent. Instead, a qualitative assessment of the articles written by

the foreign correspondents of *TNYT* will be made, their content analyzed – when was it written, what did it say, how did it represent the economic persecution of the Jews, and, most importantly, how did it represent the German Jews. In addition, the placement of the articles and their length will be assessed. Were they nothing more than a couple of lines hidden in the recesses of the *TNYT*, as argued by Lipstadt and Leff? Or, was the placement irrelevant, consistent with Sulzberger's view that "…if it was in the Times, it was just as good on page thirty-nine as on page one."[69] In doing so, it is hoped that a better understanding of the position of *TNYT* towards the German Jews will be obtained. Perhaps the historical judgment of failure against it can be altered since the persecution of the Jews was fluid and began in early 1933.

[69] Tifft and Jones, 218. The statement was a criticism of Sulzberger by assistant managing editor, Turner Catledge.

Chapter 2

April 1, 1933 Boycott – The Economic Persecution Begins?

"In the life of an individual, as in the life of the nations, there are certain ideas, feelings and reactions which are cultivated and retained although those who are subjects to them know better. For the individual, as for the nation, they constitute not that which is denied them, but that which they deny themselves. Anti-Semitism is one of those feelings of aloofness, which mankind uses in order to set up a barrier between itself and the ultimate fulfillment of its human obligations" – Josef Kastein.[1]

The early repressive policies of the Nazis almost completely failed to include the Jews directly. At the time Communists, Socialists, and Democrats were viewed as the immediate threat. Although Jews were deemed to be the inspiration for all of the political opposition, as well as the ills of Germany, they were not the primary object of Nazi actions in February and March of 1933. That being said, they were not excluded. Nazi doctrine had always viewed Jews as the embodiment of the enemies of the state, but, due to societal and political restrictions, could not be targeted directly. Eventually, a shift occurred in which Jews could be targeted as political enemies of the State; Communism would be likened to Bolsheviks and Bolsheviks to Jews until being Jewish sufficed for

[1] Josef Kastein, from *History and Destiny of the Jews*, as quoted in *New York Times,* "Anti-Semites' Rise in Germany Traced," April 24, 1933, 13.

persecution. Jews embodied the Nazis' final goal since "to have halted the terror before striking the Jews, would have been to deal with the symptoms and to ignore the disease."[2]

By mid-March the first wave of enemies had been almost completely subdued or placed within the confines of concentration camps, to the point that the Jewish directive could be more directly pursued.[3] Yet, as will be shown, the various tactics implemented during the April 1, 1933 boycott were not unique, as they had been in place and utilized as an instrument of terror by the S.A. and Nazi supporters as early as the 1920s. These tactics included, but were not limited to, boycotting Jewish businesses, confiscating property, and removing Jews from positions in civil service. Over time the Nazi regime perfected and legalized the economic persecution of the Jews. Correspondents of *TNYT* not only witnessed this evolution, they presented the various policies and actions that would collectively represent the economic persecution of German Jewry.

"…The one most unpardonable offense of German Jewry today is the success with which they excel in nearly every walk of life."[4]

When Hitler came to power in 1933 there were approximately half a million Jews residing in Germany, only one for every 124 Germans.[5] Roughly 70 percent resided in

---

[2] Karl A. Schleunes, *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz: Nazi Policy Towards German Jews, 1933-1939*, (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 70.

[3] *Ibid., 69.*

[4] *New York Times*, "Anti-Semitism Held Return to Savagery," April 10, 1933, 13.

[5] Statistics regarding the Jewish population vary. In *Nazi Policy Toward German Jews, 1933-1938*, Karl A. Schleunes estimated the number of Jews at 568,000 (5 per cent of the total Jewish population in Europe), while in *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz: Nazi Policy Toward German Jews, 1933-1939* (Chicago: University Press, 1990), 38, he estimated the population at 503,000. Similarly, Marion A. Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), p 10, estimated the number at 525,000, less than one percent of the total German population

large cities.[6] Most considered themselves Germans. Few practiced Judaism, were involved in Jewish communities, or even considered themselves Jews.[7] Initially limited to specific professions by a historical precedence, by the late 19th century, due to the growing acceptance and assimilation, Jews began to thrive in fields of finance, law, medicine, real estate, industry, textiles, agriculture and commerce.[8] Similar successes were achieved within the social arena. In comparison to other European countries, where Jews were impoverished or members of the lower castes, the majority of German Jews belonged to the middle-class.[9]

The visibility and over-representation of Jews in some of the more prominent fields, particularly within the retail trade, led many non-Jewish German citizens to believe Jews possessed power, influence and prestige, despite the decline in Jewish representation in corporate life that had occurred over 20 years.[10] The economic decline caused by the Depression, compounded by the detrimental conditions resulting from the loss of World War I, rendered most businesses financially unstable. The prominence of some Jewish firms, such as department stores, however, gave the impression of stability, power, and influence – traits the Nazi platform was more than willing to emphasize. Capitalizing on the stereotypical descriptions of Jewish wealth and dominance, the Nazis successfully stirred the emotions of non-Jewish German competitors, the poor, as well as the

---

[6] As with the Jewish population in Germany, discrepancies regarding the number of Jews in Berlin also exist. Marion A. Kaplan estimates this number at 144,000, while Karl A. Schleunes estimates this number at 160,564.

[7] Avraham Barkai, *From Boycott to Annihilation: The Economic Struggle of German Jews, 1933- 1943*, (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1989), 8. See also "Frank S." in Joshua W. Greene and Shiva Kumar, *Witness: Voices from the Holocaust*, (New York: The Free Press, 2000), 6.

[8] See Kaplan, 10-11; Barkai, 8, and 35-36; and Schleunes, 39-42.

[9] Kaplan, 10.

[10] Michael Berembaum and Abraham J. Peck (eds.), *The Holocaust and History: The Known, The Unknown, The Disputed, and the Re-Examined*, (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1998), 197.

unemployed.[11] Initially, however, careful consideration was taken to minimize the use of anti-Semitic rhetoric during the Nazi campaign for power, choosing instead to use euphemisms such as "Marxist," "communist," "capitalist" or even the broad category of "enemies of the State."[12]

Despite the careful cloaking of anti-Semitic sentiment, the Nazis were successful in planting the seeds of anti-Semitic propaganda within the German population as far back as the early 1920s.[13] Skillfully utilizing their campaign platform, the Nazis were successful in redirecting the frustrations of middle-class businessmen, the S.A., the unemployed and middle-class citizens, towards an accessible target – large department stores. Viewed as a plague to the smaller German businesses, department stores were targeted because of their cheap, mass produced inventory, even though they represented a relatively small proportion of retail sales.[14] Utilizing the economic situation to their advantage, the Nazi Party focused on Point 16 of their platform to appeal to small shopkeepers by demanding the "immediate nationalization of the big department stores and their renting out at low prices to small businessmen" as a manner of eradicating

---

[11] See Ian Kershaw, *The Persecution of the Jews and German Popular Opinion in the Third Reich*. (p. 261-289) Downloaded from leobaeck.oxfordjournals.org, December 31, 2010. "…For some, doubtless, insofar as they rationalized their behavior at all, continued patronage of a Jewish store was still compatible with the feeling that Jews exerted undue dominance on the German economy and that there was justification for the broad aim of removing them from that dominance…."

[12] Harold James, *The Deutsche Bank and the Nazi Economic War Against the Jews: The Expropriation of Jewish-Owned Property*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 24. See also *New York Times*, "Excuses that Excuse," March 27, 1933, 14. While Jewish businesses were being looted or closed, Göring attempted to circumvent the attacks claiming that they were not anti-Semitic in nature. Instead, he asserted, "the assaults and robberies and imprisonments had not been of Jews but of Socialists or Communists."

[13] Martin Dean, *Robbing the Jews*, (Cambridge: University Press, 2008), 20. See also James, 24, and Barkai, 35.

[14] Richard Evans, *The Third Reich in Power*, (New York: Penguin Press, 2005), 378. After their initial persecution, department stores were later associated with Jews.

capitalism.[15] Owners of businesses in various "state[s] of collapse" saw it as a method of "breaking the tyranny of investment capital."[16] Eventually, through the combined effort of Point 16 and propaganda, the anti-Capitalistic message shifted after having had "…succeeded in instilling the notion that department stores were all Jewish-owned or Jewish-inspired."[17]

As a result, during the years and months leading up to the April 1 boycott, Jewish shops and businesses, as well as civil servants and private individuals, were targeted in a variety of attacks, some more violent than others. Fearing any unforeseen repercussions of the boycotting tactics, on April 1928 Hitler sought to reassure voters that "…the Nazi Party would not threaten most private property while also insinuating that Jewish property had been acquired illegally and therefore should be confiscated" – justifying the actions of the S.A.[18]

By 1931, the harassment of small Jewish businesses intensified along side the ongoing discrimination of Jewish employees in non-Jewish firms.[19] That same year the Dresdner Bank began the systematic removal of Jewish managing board members, pre-empting any law or decree that would compel them to do so.[20] In 1932 the persecution intensified, as

---

[15] *Ibid.,* 379. This view mimicked Point 16 of the Nazi program. See also Jeremy Noakes and Geoffrey Pridham (eds.), *Nazism 1919-1945, Vol. 2: State, Economy and Society 1933-1939*, (Exeter: The University of Exeter, 1984), 303; and Schleunes, 71-72.

[16] Richard Lawrence Miller, *Nazi Justiz: Law of the Holocaust,* (Connecticut: Westport, 1995), 99. See also Evans, 379, and Schleunes, 71-72.

[17] Schleunes, 71-72. See also Evans, 382.

[18] Dean*,* 19.

[19] Saul Friedlander, *Nazi Germany and the Jews, vol. 1: The Years of Persecution, 1933-1939*, (New York: Harper Perennial, 1997), 19.

[20] Francis R. Nicosia and Jonathan Huener (eds.), *Business and Industry in Nazi Germany*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2004), 23. Though not compelled to do so, it was felt that because of the government takeover of the bank during the crisis of 1931, that the removal of Jews was inevitable. With the development of the 'Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service' the Dresdner Bank could cite the fact that it was a government agency while it purged the remaining Jewish directions between 1933-1934. For similar action within the Deutsche Bank, see James, 24.

specific retailers were targeted for destruction. For example, a pamphlet distributed in Lower Saxony began to urge retailers and small businessmen to join the Party and boycott the "vampire business of Woolworth."[21] Doing so, it stated, would protect them from ruin in the name of "finance capital."[22] The ongoing Nazi-led campaigns to boycott Jewish businesses intensified once Hitler was securely placed in the position of Chancellor, and were magnified by the burning of the Reichstag.

Hiding behind the legality afforded by the Emergency Ordinance, between 27 February and April 1, 1933 the Nazis unleashed a series of actions against individuals and their property. On 10 March, the S.A. emerged re-invigorated, prepared to continue their boycott drive. Signs and placards reading, "Germans, do not buy in Jewish shops" could be seen throughout Germany.[23] Yielding to the wishes of the Party, a series of attacks were launched "on department stores irrespective of their ownership." In addition to these acts of discrimination, middle class individuals placed pressure on the Nazi Party to "close down the department store or tax them out of existence. The campaigns were ferocious.[24] Elated, and in defense of the actions of the S.A., Göring, then Prussian Minister of the Interior, declared:

> When they say that the population is in great excitement because Jewish department stores were temporarily closed, is it not natural that we, Germans, at last declare: 'Do not buy from the Jews but from Germans![25]

---

[21] Evans, 379. See also The American Jewish Committee, *The Jews in Nazi Germany: A Handbook of Facts Regarding their Present Situation,* (New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1935), 42-43. The boycott of the Woolworth would later be expressly prohibited since it fell under the category of American and German owned retailers. The similar named "Wohlwert," however, was Jewish and would therefore fall under the guidelines of the boycott.

[22] *Ibid.* See also, *New York Times* 'Anti-Semitism Held Return to Savagery,' April 10, 1933, 11. "…The one most unpardonable offense of German Jews today is the success with which they excel in nearly every walk of life."

[23] The American Jewish Committee, 40.

[24] James, 24.

[25] *Ibid.* On the 21 March Göring declared to a representative of the Telegraaf of Amsterdam: "It is true that the department stores were attacked. I am certainly opposed to force being used in actions against these

The boycott of Jewish shops and business eventually began to include those owned by foreign Jews. The American owned Woolworth, for example, found it necessary to post a sign on window "stating that it was not a Jewish enterprise and was not operated with Jewish capital" to be rid of S.A. pickets, and be allowed to stay open.[26] This attack came after Vice Chancellor von Papen assured Americans through a cable to the German-American Chamber of Commerce in New York "there was no foundation for reports that American business activities in Germany were being interfered with." In fact, he continued, "aside from sporadic demonstrations against American chain stores, no instance of molestation has come to the notice of American business men here."[27]

Far from simply demonstrating in front of Jewish owned stores, the S.A. adopted a more violent and hands on approach with the "Communist" and Jewish plague within the Germany. Charged with the promises of Point 16, on the morning of 11 March 1933 a unit of the Breslau S.A. staged an invasion of a department store "…hop[ing] to assist the communalization process."[28] Deterred by the local police, the group split into smaller groups and headed towards the local and district courts. There, they proceeded to drag Jewish lawyers and judges into the street, humiliating them in public by forcing them to disrobe – a favorite sport of the period.[29] Later that month, the S.A., along side a civilian, forced their way into a furniture store owned by a Polish Jew "AAC," who was charged with the crime of underselling his competitors. He was beaten and left without any hope

undertakings, but I do not see why it should not be permissible to warn people against buying in Jewish department stores."

[26] Frederick T. Birchall, "Boycott Spreads Through Reich," *New York Times*, March 30, 1933, 1.

[27] *New York Times,* "Germans Aroused by Attacks Abroad; Deny Wide Violence," March 26, 1933, 1.

[28] Schleunes, 71.

[29] *Ibid.*, 71-72.

of assistance.[30] Similarly, the S.A. raided the Communist headquarters Karl Liebknecht Haus in Berlin, claiming it for the personal use of the S.A. and S.S., while simultaneously confiscating property of Masonic temples "cit[ing] the decree against communist property."[31] In an effort to confiscate Jewish property Jews were coerced, under the threat of force, to confess their affiliation to 'communist' activity," thereby subjecting their property to forfeiture."[32] "In many cases," *TNYT* correspondent Edmund Taylor stated, "the victims [of the S.A.] were dragged to police headquarters and put through the third-degree after the regular police officers had withdrawn." After being beaten for the crime of discussing the eccentric nature of Röhm, Dr. Goerlich, a newspaper editor, was taken to jail. As a result his plant was confiscated for use by the S.A.[33] The violent tactics of the S.A. were enough to instill an environment of fear that affected Jews and non-Jews alike.[34]As Azriel Eisenberg concluded, the S.A,

> …took all of [Hitler's] threats and ideals in dead earnest. To them, Hitlerism was a full blown-ideology, a way of life. They were eager to share in the spoils and waited to be appointed to positions which has been vacated by the Jews, communist, and opponents of Nazism. They expected to be able to seize the shops and homes owned by the Jews….[35]

Beyond the brute force utilized by the S.A., Nazi supporters implemented other more subtle tactics that were implemented within public and private spheres. As early as March of 1933, banks had started blocking Jewish bank accounts, refusing to release them until

---

[30] Barkai, 14-15.

[31] Miller, 98. According to the Reichstag Fire decree of 28 February 1933, and decrees that derived from it, "…confiscations and restrictions on property [became] permissible beyond the legal limits otherwise prescribed…" These decrees legalized the confiscation of property "used or destined for the promotion of communistic activities."

[32] *Ibid.*

[33] Edmund Taylor, "German Jailings Spread Terror," *New York Times*, March 27, 1933, 5. There was no consensus as to the severity of the beatings.

[34] Barkai, 14-15.

[35] Azriel Eisenberg, *Witness to the Holocaust*, (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1981), 69.

all debts owed to Aryans had been successfully paid off, restricting the day to day activities and lives of Jews.[36] During that same period, before the existence of any decree demanding the removal of Jews from any profession, various associations took it upon themselves to begin the purging process. On March 21, for example, *TNYT* described the on going "elimination of Jews from responsible positions."[37] That same month, the Hamburg Regional Group of the Reich Federation of German Real Estate Brokers (RDM) "…proceeded with ruthless exclusionary methods against Jewish members…." Members of the Hanseatic Lawyers' Chamber utilized similar tactics after forming the "Working Committee of Nationalist Lawyers of the Hanseatic Cities,' setting upon itself the main task of executing the "necessary preparations for curbing the number of Jewish lawyers."[38] Similar dismissals were attempted by the League of National Socialist Lawyers when they "called for a purge of all courts as well as new elections to the bar associations in order to make sure these were 'free of all Jews and Marxists'."[39]

Each of the above boycott and exclusionary measures played an important role in the removal of Jews from the German economy. The tactics utilized by the S.A., however, were significant because they were singlehandedly responsible for the advent of the April

---

[36] Miller, 109.

[37] *New York Times,* "Nazis Hunt Arms in Einstein Home," March 21, 1933, 10. In Berlin alone, it read, "more Jewish physicians have been dismissed from the hospitals" while "all Jewish judges hitherto sitting on criminal courts have been relieved of office." See also Friedrich Weil, "Aryan 'Justice' Against Jewish Firms" in Margarete Limberg and Hubert Rübsaat (eds), *Germans No More: Accounts of Jewish Everyday Life, 1933-1938*, Translated by Alan Nothnagle, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2006), 17. "… Hospitals and other public health facilities dismissed their Jewish staff, even before the April boycott and the civil service law. In Munich, for instance, the slogan "Jews may treat only Jews" prevailed. On April 24, 1933, Jewish doctors were dropped from the public insurance system, ruining countless careers. The large private insurance companies soon followed suit, and the exclusive companies paid only for non-Jewish patients. In the sum of 1933 professional cooperation with non-Jewish doctors was forbidden..."; 18, "… By the middle of 1933 nearly half of all Jewish doctors had abandoned heir profession. Many emigrated, while others attempted to survive as masseurs, nurses, and midwives."

[38] Frank Bajohr, '*Aryanization' in Hamburg: The Economic Exclusion of Jews and the Confiscation of their Property in Nazi Germany,* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2002), 20- 21.

[39] Barkai, 15.

1, 1933 boycott. On 26 March, after a series of campaigns against businesses and individuals had succeeded in "creat[ing] a climate of fear which affected Jew and non-Jew alike," the decision to develop a formal and organized German-wide boycott, began.[40]

That same day, before any formal announcement had been made regarding the Jewish boycott, *TNYT* openly questioned whether Hitler would try

> …with what good grace he could muster, to throw into the political discard the anti-Semitism he used in climbing to power, or whether he will put into official force those measures against Jews in Germany which Nazi organizations have been calling for. If he does the first thing, the outcry from so many quarters will die down. If he officially continues that which has been officially going on, removed Jews from the bench, puts them out of hospital staffs, takes them away from university teaching bodies and generally denies them legal rights to which they have been entitled, he will have additional proof that in the world today no nation is isolated.[41]

Three days later on March 29, after the decision was made for the Jewish boycott, the announcement, or "manifesto," was published in the *Völkischer Beobachter*. It proclaimed that,

> The guilty ones are among us; they live among us and abuse day after day the right of hospitality the German people have granted them. …Responsible for these lies and slanders are the Jews among us. From them emanates this campaign of hatred and of lying agitation against Germany. In their hands lies the power to set right the liars in the rest of the world. Since they do not wish to do this, we will have to see to it that this campaign of hatred and lies against Germany is not

---

[40] Schleunes, 75. According to Schleunes, after having had "retired to his Bavarian mountain retreat to evaluate the situation [caused by the S.A.]", Hitler summoned Goebbels to "announce his decision." It was then that the decision to implement a "nationwide boycott against Jews in the business and professional world."

[41] Edwin L. James, "Herr Hitler's Nazis Hear an Echo of World Opinion," *New York Times*, March 26, 1933, E1. That same day *The New York Times* ran an article entitled, "Germans Aroused by Attacks Abroad; Deny Wide Violence," an order was passed by the executive political commission of the National Socialist Party, in which the "…unauthorized interference with private business and industrial or commercial organizations' were forbidden. Attacks of any sort against "…business federations, other business and industrial organizations, syndicates an so forth" including personal attacks against "concerns or heads of concerns" were to be prevented.

> directed against the Innocent German people, but against the responsible inciters themselves.[42]

The boycott manifesto was picked up, and covered in its entirety, by *TNYT*.[43] Despite it, and the ever-increasing persecution against German Jews, Hindenburg, according to *TNYT*, seemed to be in denial, believing that the actions of the S.A were in no way associated with the State.[44] The persecution of German Jews continued.[45] Every attempt was made to "raise public participation" in the impending boycott.[46] Banners were hung urging the German people to help liberate Germany from Jewish capital,[47] radio broadcasts were made "in a heated voice,"[48] posters were hung blaming the Jews for "inciting the foreign press to lie about the situation in Germany."[49] Some posters stated that international Jews had been "filled with hatred and fury" at the thought of "German fight for liberty" since, as *TNYT* stated, his power in Germany was coming to an end as he realized that he could not "…make a Soviet-Jewish colony of convicts out of

---

[42] The American Jewish Committee, 40. See page 40-42 for instructions for "carrying the boycott into effect." These include the use of "Committees of Action" in spreading propaganda and enlightenment, in protecting foreigners, regardless of origin or race, in addition to protecting the innocent, while punishing the guilty.

[43] *New York Times,* "Boycott Manifesto Includes 11 Orders," March 29, 1933, 8. Orders number one, five, and seven, involved the economic persecution of German Jews

[44] Birchall, "Boycott Spreads Through Reich," *New York Times*, March 30, 1933, 1. "German Jewry is completely convulsed by the boycott of the National Socialist Party. Because of a misdeeds of a few, for which we are not responsible, it is now proposed to expose to economic ruin those German Jews who with all of their hearts feel themselves bound up with the fatherland." – President von Hindenburg.

[45] *Ibid.,* In Muenster, University professors were prevented from entering the building of the University, while detachments of S.A. entered the courthouse and forced all Jewish attorneys to leave. In addition Westphalia newspapers no longer accepted the advertisements of Jewish concerns. In Frankfurt-on-the-Main Jewish employees were served with dismissals, while various directors and officials of the opera house were "ousted." In Breslau, twenty-eight Jewish physicians of the municipal hospitals were also given notice.

[46] Schleunes, 83.

[47] United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM)

[48] Birchall, "German Business Protests Boycott," *New York Times*, March 31, 1933, 1.

[49] *Ibid.*,77. Some posters stated that the international Jews had been 'filled with hatred and fury' at the thought of 'German fight for liberty' since his power in Germany was coming to an end as he realized that he could not "…make a Soviet-Jewish colony of convicts out of Germany."

Germany."[50] Most, if not all, attempts made by the Nazis, failed to incite public reaction against German Jews.

On the contrary, the impending boycott had the opposite affect on the German population. As *TNYT* reported during the eve of the boycott,

> Industrialist, banks, steamship companies, associated members of commerce, moderates of different shades of political opinion and even the Nationalist allies of the all powerful Nazis are all believed to be opposed to the boycott and are said to be privately protesting it." [51]

In addition, the general population was more than willing to show their indignation towards, and fear of, the impending boycott. As Friedländer indicated, the "repeated announcements concerning the forthcoming boycotts resulted in such brisk business in Jewish owned stores" that the *Völkischer Beobachter* felt it necessary to denounce them for having "lack of sense" for forcing "…its hard earned money into the hands of the enemies…."[52]

Yet, as *TNYT* noted, the attainment of positions held by Jews was the real reason why Nazis were pressing for a Jewish boycott. According to the French journalist Jules Sauerwein, *TNYT* stated,

> … If the Jews in Germany did not have jobs and money, there would be no fanaticism against them. But the present anti-Semitic movement is giving the Hitlerites the opportunity to throw the Jews out of their jobs and give those jobs to Germans, thereby helping them fulfill campaign promises. … When they see the Jews in office they think it would be a fine thing to have their jobs. From their point of view, the anti-Semitic campaign not only is morally wonderful but offers practical benefits.[53]

---

[50] *New York Times,* "Nazis Lay Boycott to 'Lies' of Jews," April 1, 1933, 10.
[51] "German Business Protests Boycott," Birchall also surmises that no one was publicly protesting the boycott.
[52] Friedländer, p 72. The excess shopping took place because the public did not know how long the boycott would last.
[53] *New York Times,* "Says Nazis Want Jobs," March 30, 1933, 12. See also, *New York Times,* "Jews' Jobs Sought For Nazi Backers," March 31, 1933, 15.

The following day *TNYT* reiterated Sauerwein's view by stating that the reasons given for the boycott were false; reprisals against Jews for anti-German propaganda were staged "as a pretext for economic sanctions against the Jews."[54] The middle class, it seemed, was primarily responsible for the attacks on the Jews and was most likely to reap the economic spoils of the Nazi revolution.[55] Although many positions had already been taken from Jews during the previous months, many more were predicted to fall upon the many Germans who had jumped on the "Nazi bandwagon," many of whom were awaiting their reward promised by the Nazis.[56] Thus, the argument that the Jews, in association with the foreign press, were responsible for the lies and slander perpetrated against Germany was nothing more than official propaganda.

The Jewish boycott began at 10 am on Saturday April 1, as scheduled, and was called off that night, due to lack of public participation and fear of international reprisal. *TNYT's* representation of the April 1 boycott was mixed. As could be expected, a great deal of the news about the day's events did not arrive in the States until the following day, with only a few exceptions. On page 10 of the April 1st publication, readers of *TNYT* could read, though briefly, about some of the tactics implemented by the S.A. "…in the town of Annaberg," it read, "shoppers leaving Jewish stores were stopped by Nazi pickets, who passed stamps reading: 'We traitors bought from Jews' on their foreheads."[57] The following day, however, news from Germany filled the pages of *TNYT*. Despite the ongoing tactics implemented by the Nazis, in Hanover shoppers ignored the guidelines and "crowded Jewish stores," while in Hamburg bombs were used to show the

---

[54] "Says Nazis Want Jobs."
[55] *Ibid.*
[56] *Ibid.*
[57] *New York Times*, "Whips Crowd Into Frenzy," April 1, 1933, 10.

disapproval of the people to the boycott; one ultimately destroyed a Nazi headquarter, while others, found on the statue of Bismarck, failed to detonate. Overall, tactics utilized by the Nazis to prevent entrance to Jewish shops failed.[58]

That same day *TNYT* ran a lengthy piece by Edwin L. James, in which the ineptitude of the Nazis was described. According to James, the fact that the Nazis were unable, or unwilling, to back up their platform without having to "… seek special and foreign reasons…" spoke only of the fact that they "lacked the courage of their convictions."[59] James also drew the conclusion that the economic losses of the day, compounded with the inevitable economic losses abroad, were some of the main reasons why the Nazis ultimately called off the boycott; "…it is apparent that the Nazis are seeking a way out of the mess they created." Significantly, James was convinced the end of the boycott was not going to resolve the on-going persecution of the Jews, or the worldwide disapproval of it – even going so far as calling the "…closing [of] Jewish stores, removing Jews from office and boycott on Jewish professional men, and other steps [taken] to rob of a livelihood the 600,000 Jews in the Reich, constitute atrocities quite as serious and as dangerous as act of physical violence against a limited number of individuals."[60] The Nazis' anti-Semitic policies, he predicted, would not end, and that the anti-Jewish boycott had to occur because anti-Semitism had been an integral part of the Nazi political program.

Various reports were published illuminating the chaos and complexity of the situation taking place in Germany. As a result of the increased business that had occurred the days

---

[58] *New York Times*, "Goebbels Warns Jews," April 2, 1933, 29.
[59] Edwin L. James, "The Nazis Begin to Dodge Anti-Semitic Boomerang," *New York Times,* April 2, 1933, E1.
[60] *Ibid.*

before and during the boycott, German housewives decided to take it upon themselves to educate women who seemed confused or uneducated about the Jews, by calling for a "Holy War on Jews." "We will continue," they stated, "until Jewry has been destroyed. The Jew must be forever eliminated from our people and our State."[61] Conversely, despite all evidence pointing against him, *TNYT* also ran a piece in which a Berlin Jew, Hans Priwin, a member of the executive committee of the Association of German National Jews, denied the atrocity stories originating from Germany. In addition, he pleaded with individuals abroad to cease the "anti-German sentiment."[62] The stories regarding the persecution of the Jews, he stated, were "…despicably false, a groundless misrepresentation of the facts."

> We have had a revolution in Germany – a revolution so bloodless and so quiet as has not been seen in centuries. … The German Jews are pictured as the victims of a deliberate, despicable incitation of pogroms. It is even foolishly asserted that the national revolution in Germany was the work of a group whose only aim was to massacre Jews.[63]

The boycott against German products was not only affecting Germans, but Jews as well – a point he felt was grossly overlooked. The best way to help was "…to help Germany and you will have helped also the Jewish Germans.[64]

The direction the Nazis took regarding the "Jewish Question" was an ongoing topic for *TNYT*. Would "…the Nazis be content with their one-day demonstration"?[65] Though the question could not be answered, *TNYT* did appear to agree with the *London Times'* view that Germany's persecution of the Jews lacked any admirable qualities. Germany

---

[61] *New York Times*, "Women Urge 'Holy War' on Jews," April 2, 1933, 29. Women were members of the National Socialist Women's Federation.
[62] *New York Times,* "Berlin Jew Denies 'Atrocity' Stories," April 2, 1933, 28
[63] *Ibid.*
[64] *Ibid.*
[65] *New York Times*, "Expects Further Clash," April 3, 1933, 8

had become a nation that was capable of "…numerous examples of the prostitution of a patriotic movement to the satisfaction of racial jealousies and personal spites."[66] Though the boycott did not resume on the following Wednesday, due to the intervention of Vice Chancellor von Papen, the *Völkischer Beobachter* explicitly stated the direction of Nazi Jewish persecution.

> The Jews have now been made to understand that we no longer intend to bargain with them but we propose to tackle them in their most vulnerable spot – their purses.[67]

Only a day later, *TNYT* reported, the situation in Germany appeared to present a semblance of normalcy. Windows were being washed, removing all evidence of the previous days' events, while some shoppers were beginning to frequent shops and cafes.[68] Still evidence of the boycott persisted beneath the façade. As Birchall reported,

> … the school teachers, university professors, lawyers and doctors -not to mention the judges and other public servants – outlawed by successive Nazi rescripts remain unemployed and under the ban, and all they can do when their cash savings have been exhausted will be to join the breadlines. They cannot draw out their bank deposits nor can they leave Germany without passports.[69]

Continuity regarding the position of shoppers and the events at times appeared to be lacking. While Birchall described the return to normalcy, G.E.R. Gedye was privileged to eye-witness accounts of the S.A. severely beating passers-by "…who were believed to have indicated their disapproval of the boycott."[70] Similarly, Gedye presented shoppers plagued with contemplation, unsure about the "race" of the shop(s) they wished to enter. If the shop was Jewish, was it acceptable for them to enter? Ultimately, gender was the

---

[66] *Ibid.* See also *New York Times*, "Nazis Hunt Arms in Einstein Home," March 21, 1933, 10.
[67] Frederick T. Birchall, "Boycott at an End, Germany Believes; Cabinet Against it," *New York Times*, April 3, 1933, 1.
[68] *Ibid.*
[69] *Ibid.*
[70] G.E.R. Gedye, "Crowds Re-Enter Stores in Munich," *New York Times,* April 4, 1933, 12.

determining factor on the decision to enter a shop since "usually the women wished to buy and their husbands tried to dissuade them."[71] A source described as 'the manager of one big store' confided the details of the cat and mouse game that usually transpired between husband and wife.

> If the gentleman in the Brown House only knew it, they are among our best customers. The German housewife generally gets a fixed housekeeping allowance, and she is permitted to keep for herself any balance she can save by economy. The result is that she naturally agrees fervently with his anti-Semitic principles at the breakfast table and when her husband has gone off in his brown shirt and revolver to pursue campaigns against the Jews she goes around to an inexpensive Jewish store and gives her orders, ' to be delivered in plain parcels.' In other words, the housewife's common sense is stronger than political propaganda.[72]

"Common sense" generally dictated whether stoppers frequented Jewish stores, in addition to their overall interaction with German Jews since, as *TNYT* noted, Germans were not innately anti-Semitic.[73] Regardless of propaganda and decrees "…obtaining the best value for their money" would generally dictate what shop a shopper would frequent.[74] Despite the financially driven solidarity, *TNYT* made some poignant predictions about the fate of Jewish shops.[75]

> Individual shops and stores in the cities which depend on an anonymous public will survive, possibly with some readjustment, because the German people … will continue to buy where they get the best value for their money provided that they

---

[71] *Ibid.*
[72] *Ibid.*
[73] *New York Times, "*3,000,000 in Reich Feel 'Cold Pogrom'," April 16, 1933, 21.
[74] See Ian Kershaw, *Popular Opinion and Political Dissent in the Third Reich: Bavaria 1933-1945*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), 240. "Those who stood to gain economically through trading in Jewish shops, trafficking with Jewish cattle-dealers, providing accommodation for Jewish visitors to tourist resorts, or finding work for Jewish owned firms were not eager to break off their contact and to boycott the Jews. Economic self-interest clearly prevailed over ideological correctitude." See also Ian Kershaw, *The Persecution of the Jews and German Popular Opinion in the Third Reich*, 261-289, Downloaded from leobaeck.oxfordjournals.org, December 31, 2010. "Nazi racial propaganda played no great part in shaping the attitude and behavior of the great many Germans who ignored intimidation to continue their economic relations with Jews in 1935. Their actions were determined wholly by material considerations and by economic self-interests."
[75] "3,000,000 in Reich Feel 'Cold Pogrom'."

> can so it without danger and annoyance. … Jewish shops and stores in the small towns and villages whose customers are under neighborhood scrutiny and control will suffer more and many will probably go to the wall.

Yet, despite the nearly inevitable demise of Jewish businesses, post-boycott Germany appeared to possess a general sense of solidarity with German Jews. At the end of the boycott, for example, residents of Hamburg, ashamed of the persecution and boycott, sent flowers to Jewish friends and residents "…as tokens of their sympathy and continued esteem."[76] The act simultaneously functioned as passive opposition against the Nazis.[77]

Random acts of solidarity generally meant little to German Jews, particularly as persecution intensified. Although Jews were appreciative of the various acts of kindness, they were fearful of what awaited them. While some were insistent the current pogrom was nothing more than an isolated event, others recognized the inherent danger represented by the Nazis.[78] Others, as *TNYT* stated, feared their friends.[79] Although the boycott had been officially terminated, throughout Germany the existence of "brown-clad hawkers" in front of Jewish establishments became almost normal.[80] To sum up the desperate state of Jews, on 12 April 1933, *TNYT* quoted at length the views of Georg Bernhard, editor of the *Vossiche Zeitung*, a well known liberal newspaper comparable to *TNYT*,

> One must believe that even if destruction of Jewish competition was not the aim of the boycott, still it has become a consequence of it. Even though the boycott

---

[76] *Ibid.* The flowers, though well-meant gifts, appeared to Jews "very much like the traditional flowers sent to those in mourning."

[77] *Ibid.*

[78] See Kaplan, 72-73. "… About 37,000 Jews left Germany in 1933. More discrimination, however, was not matched by more emigration. In 1934, 23,000 fled. By early 1935, about 10,000 had returned because Jewish émigrés abroad were increasingly sliding into poverty…."

[79] "3,000,000 in Reich Feel 'Cold Pogrom'."

[80] Birchall, "Nazis See Victory in their Boycott," *New York Times*, April 4, 1933, 1. Ironically, despite the various publications and perpetual statements that the Jews leave Germany, the Nazis' passport regulations made emigration nearly impossible

> has been withdrawn after one day – whatever the real reason may have been – that day still was sufficient, both materially and spiritually, for bringing upon the German Jews the most irreparable damage. Naturally, the Jews may reopen their shops, but who will buy from them? The official boycott is withdrawn, but the actual boycott continues. The Jewish business world in Germany was brought under moral and spiritual pressure. Nothing can be worse than the fear that the Damocles sword may fall any day. One must go as far back as medieval times to realize how strong is the feeling of dejection and uncertainty and the deterioration gripping German Jewry. Besides, the general unemployment growing out of the anti-Semitic excitement last year had left many Jews unable to obtain employment in the larger companies. German retail concerns then began in ever increasing degree to act in accordance with the motto, 'Gentlemen prefer blondes,' and this sad condition has now become hopeless. The damage which has been inflicted on the poorest part of the German population – that is to say, all those who live on the work of their hands – now, thanks to the one-day boycott, has been made irreparable. That day breaks down for the Jews the laborers of the 100 years since the liberation of the Jews. Jews now, as before, may live in Germany, even without suffering injury if, by that expression, it is understood that they will neither be beaten to death nor thrashed. But is that life? When they are cut off from all work, when they are brought to desperation by means of a cold system reducing them to proletariansim, when they are held down by steady fears that their passports may be taken from them or visas refused them or made difficult to obtain, how long will such a life then be tolerable?"[81]

With the failure of the boycott, the Nazi regime continued to expand legal measures against German Jews. Like the boycott, the decrees enacted on April 7 perpetuated the economic persecution. The "Law for Restoration of the Professional Civil Service" aimed at the removal of Jews from civil service, either through dismissal or retirement. It also legally defined a "non-Aryan" as anyone who had at least one 'non-Aryan' grand parent. As such, the prosecutorial tactics implemented by the Nazis as early as the 1920s became accepted and codified in law. In response, *TNYT* stated this "spelled the degradation of the Jew to second-hand citizenship."[82] As a result, in Berlin alone, twenty-five hundred

---

[81] *New York Times*, "Boycott Declared Ruin to Reich Jews," April 12, 1933, 16.

[82] *New York Times*, "Rule By Aryan Decreed," April 9, 1933, 12. "…Thousands of officials held over from the previous regime will be ousted as a result of the law, and in the future all Jews well be barred from public office. Certain Jews now serving will be spared. All civil service officials who obtained office after

Jewish lawyers were left in limbo, while only thirty-five were allowed to continue in their professions.[83] In Bavaria, Gedye discovered people were beginning to support the position of the Nazis on the "Jewish Question" only weeks after the Boycott of April 1.[84] One of the reasons for the shift in opinion was the policy of reducing the proportion of Jewish doctors, judges and lawyers to 1 percent of their non-Jewish colleagues, opened the positions to "Aryans." The newly unemployed Jews, it was stated, could still "…keep shops, write articles and books, be unlicensed legal consultants or engage in any other "free" occupations.[85]

Within a few months between 200,000 and 300,000 German Jews were "deprived of any hope of the future," while Hitler ranted and raved about the successful decline in unemployment. In addition, in a speech given on 21 May, he also addressed the persecution of the Jews:[86]

> As to the 'persecuted' Jews, whom you see peacefully walking in the streets and dining in all the best cafes in Berlin, I would be only too glad if the nations which take such an enormous interest in the Jews would open their gates to them. ... It is true we have made discriminatory laws, but they are directed not so much against the Jews as for the German people, to give equal economic opportunity to the majority. …You say Jews suffer, but so do millions of others. Why should not the Jews share the privations which burden the entire nation? …You must remember our fight is not primarily against the Jews as such but against the Communists and all elements that demoralize and destroy us. When I proceed against a Communist, I do not ask if he is a Saxon or a Prussian. What I mean is that I cannot spare a Communist because he is a Jew.

1918 on the basis of membership in a political party and without necessary qualifications will be ousted after receiving three-month's pay."

[83] *Ibid.,* Before the decree there were 3,400 lawyers in Berlin, 900 of them Gentiles.

[84] G.E.R. Gedye, "Bavaria is Swinging to the Nazi Regime," *New York Times*, April 23, 1933, 13.

[85] *Ibid.*

[86] *New York Times*, "Seeks New Homes for Nazis' Victims," May 22, 1933, 11. See also, *New York Times,* "Hitler Seeks Jobs for All Germans," July 10, 1933. According to Hitler, unemployment was reduced by 126,000.

The situation in Germany had become "uncertain and precarious." The economic future of German Jews, a "…matter of serious concern," *TNYT* concluded.[87] German Jews had become disenfranchised, "…not for their opinion, their religion, their attitude towards the government, for anything they have done or not done, or anything they can change or help."[88] By mid-year, confiscation policies of property and citizenship had been enacted. Anyone fortunate enough to leave Germany found that even outside its borders, the Nazis were still able to take from them any semblance of their previous lives.[89] Apart from what was taken upon leaving Germany, any funds or property were lost, confiscated and turned into property of the State. Property of enemies of the state would also be seized, regardless of location and social label, should criticism of the Reich occur. Anyone deemed Communist, Socialist, Jew, or 'sub-human' was no longer safe. As Birchall stated,

> It is beginning to be realized in Germany now that the relegation of a sizeable proportion of her people to a place even lower than that of second-hand citizens – 'to be like toads under a harrow' is the bitter simile of one eminent British publicist – from mere motives of political hatred and race prejudice is a serious handicap to her economic as well as her diplomatic rehabilitation.[90]

The end of 1933 left German Jews in a state of limbo, unsure of what to feel, how to react, while in a constant state of disbelief and shock. In many respects foreign correspondents experienced similar reactions to the persecution and pogrom directed at German Jews. The chaotic situation in Germany had convinced many German Jews that the "cold pogrom" directed towards them was nothing more than an isolated incident.

---

[87] *New York Times*, "Handicaps of Jews in Reich Detailed," October 16, 1933, 4.
[88] Anne O'Hare McCormick, "Hitler Threatened by Extremists Nazis; Outbreaks Feared," *New York Times*, July 24, 1933, 1.
[89] Otto D. Tolischus, "Hitler Will Seize Property of Foes," *New York Times*, July 15, 1933, 1.
[90] Birchall, "Third German Reich Fully Established," *New York Times*, April 24, 1933, 5. For greater detail regarding dismissals and the fate of German Jews at the end of 1933 see *New York Times*, "Small Hopes Seen By Jews in Reich," December 24, 1933, 1.

After all, despite the propaganda and violent tactics of the S.A, non-Jewish German shoppers continuously flocked to Jewish stores to show their solidarity against the Nazi aggressor, in some capacity or another. Not to mention the fact that, despite threats, the boycott was called off after just one day. One belief, however, resonated within the German Jewish population; Jews had been targets of persecution before and, despite hardships, they had survived. Regardless of their current plight, normalcy would prevail.[91] Similarly, the reports penned by *TNYT* reached an American public that was unsure what to believe. On the one hand there were German Jews denying the allegations being reported, on the other, interviews within the pages of *TNYT* questioned the validity of the stories originating from Germany. Lack of consensus and confirmation complicated the job of *TNYT* correspondents.[92]

Insofar as the economic persecution of German Jews before, during, and after the April boycott was concerned, however, evidence and confirmation was on their side. Quotes from victims and perpetrators alike flooded the pages of *TNYT* during 1933. There simply was no denying the aims of the Nazi regime towards German Jews, even before April 1, 1933. Unfortunately for *TNYT*, not once was the term "economic persecution" used regarding the plight of the Jews. Was there a need to? *TNYT* all but spelled out the various tactics being implemented by the Nazis to remove German Jews from German economic life, up to and including beatings and incarceration in prisons and concentration camps. How much more evidence was *TNYT* required to present beyond describing the extent of unemployment, devastation and destitution that was thrust upon German Jewry? As the years progressed *TNYT* representation of the various elements that

[91] Eve Nussbaum Soumerian, and Carol D. Schultz, *Daily Life During the Holocaust*, 2nd ed., (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2009), 35.
[92] *New York Times,* "Calls Hitler a Menace," March 23, 1933, 20.

encompassed the economic persecution of German Jews would make it difficult for the reader to claim ignorance to their plight at the hands of Nazi oppressors.

Chapter 3

The Nuremberg Laws – Legislating Destruction

"… the Jews are doomed, for in this drive Jews have been barred not only from social and recreational, but also from all business relations with 'Aryans.' Their enterprises have been subjected to rigid boycott enforced by guards or public defamation of their 'Aryan' customers, and they themselves have been barred from 'Aryan' business establishments. They have likewise been barred in many places from owning real estate or even renting it."[1] – Otto D. Tolischus

Steps taken by the Nazis to remove Jews from German economic life were initially slow to develop. Insofar as the Nazis were concerned, the April 1 boycott had been unsuccessful. The legislation of April 7, 1933, though effective, had also been problematic. While in one case they were successful in putting into effect legislation that legalized the removal of Jews from civil service, they failed to take into account the number of Jews who would be permitted to stay in their professions. On April 9, 1933 further legislation banned the admittance of Jews to Universities, thus preventing, in a more direct manner, the emergence of educated Jews. In addition, it also indirectly prevented Jews from attaining the more coveted positions within civil service.

During 1934 the policies of expropriation continued – "Aryanization" began, and Jews in all professions throughout Germany fell prey to the Nazis. Significantly, as *TNYT*

[1] Otto D. Tolischus, "Hitler Due to List New Laws on Jews," *New York Times*, September 1, 1935, 12.

reported, Nazi policies yielded a successful, if not unexpected, result within the German community; people started becoming jaded about the plight of the Jews. Still, many Germans, or "Aryans," ignored the Nazis legislation and decrees, choosing instead to continue shopping at Jewish shops – contributing, among other things, to the development of the Nuremberg Laws of 1935. The impact of these laws caused a shift in the dynamics between "Aryans" and German Jews. *TNYT* presented the development and result of the shift in social and political policy. This included the emergence of the classification of Jews as "second-class citizens," alongside the destruction of Jewish economic existence.

"*Meanwhile Jewry is anxiously awaiting the final implications of the laws…*"[2]

The boycott of April 1, 1933 concluded in a less than successful manner. Beyond the Nazi concerns about public opinion abroad, public opinion at home was less than favorable and created a significant dilemma in need of resolution. Repeatedly, despite the widespread anti-Jewish propaganda, German citizens continued to flock to the defense of German Jews – at times their actions were in solidarity with their Jewish countrymen, at others acts of resistance against the New Regime.[3] Many, however, sought services of Jews for no other reason than the fact that they provided shoppers with lower and more

[2] *New York Times*, "Berlin Works Out Anti-Jewish Laws," October 2, 1935, 6.

[3] David Bankier, *The Germans and the Final Solution: Public Opinion under Nazism*, (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1992), 69. According to Bankier, "Not only did sizeable parts of the population severely condemn the persecution, but even Nazi sympathizers did not fully endorse it. Sometimes there were animated discussions in front of Jewish shops and fighting broke out between public and party. Even generals wearing medals came into stores owned by Jews in Berlin to demonstrate their disapproval of the Nazi policy. The educated bourgeoisie seized the occasion of the rioting to take a stand and vent expressions of censure and protest. This sector in particular did not subscribe to the boycott, showing indignation and disgust that Germany should resort to medieval methods." See also Schleunes, 94

stable prices than their German counterparts.[4] As of the result of the boycott's failure, the Nazis and their sympathizers sought more ingenious methods of dissuading Germans from doing business with Jews in addition to driving Jews from their businesses, while unofficially the Nazi boycott of Jewish businesses continued.[5]

Within the business community false allegations against Jewish competitors began to spread.[6] These allegations varied and included "…tax fraud, falsified weight listings in customs declarations and in purchases of consumer goods, particularly better, substandard wages, income tax evasion, foreign currency violations, capital flight, punishable indiscretions against female employees, and so on."[7] If that did not suffice, the Nazis utilized other more forceful and compelling methods as deterrents against doing business with Jews. As Marion Kaplan described,

> Government orders evaporated, officials and employees of the public service sector were forbidden to buy from Jewish shops, other non-Jewish buyers gradually withdrew, welfare recipients were not allowed to use their food coupons in Jewish businesses, and local newspapers were forbidden to print advertisements from Jewish companies.[8]

On 21 March 1934, *TNYT* reported, at length, about the new unofficial discriminatory tactics being utilized by the Nazis throughout Germany. Referring to this shift as a "negative boycott," "Aryans" throughout Germany were being "…put under moral and sometimes physical pressure to buy in 'German' shops and avoid Jewish

---

[4] Motivation based on price was a driving force well into 1935; See Ian Kershaw, *Popular Opinion and Political Dissent in the Third Reich: Bavaria 1933-1945*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), 240, 242.
[5] See *New York Times*, "New Drives Aimed at Jews in Reich," March 21, 1934, 10; Otto D. Tolischus, "Nazi Press Pushes New War on Jews," March 13, 1934, 30.
[6] See Bankier, 71.
[7] Kershaw, 14-15.
[8] Marion A. Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 36. See also, *New York Times*, "Jews in Reich Barred by Engineers' Group," October 1, 1935, 18.

establishments."[9] In Ludwigshafen, for example, a butcher was arrested for the undignified act of attempting to borrow money from a Jews after having had "molested" him.[10] Yet, many Germans continued to shop at Jewish stores, and some newspapers allowed the advertisement of Jewish businesses, regardless of the position enforced by the Nazis well into the late 1930s.[11]

In an effort to deter German housewives from shopping in Jewish establishments, *TNYT* reported that:

> Many of the local branches of the [National Socialist Retailers and Handicraft] organization had taken advantage of this drive to send out questionnaires to German housewives asking them why they still patronized Jewish shops and department stores, and threatening them with dire consequences if they continued to do so. [In Nuremberg] Evening schools have been established for housewives to "enlighten" them as to where to buy and why not to buy from Jews. Banners are strung across streets and posters are pasted on walls to warn against buying in Jewish shops. The press supports the campaign. There is even a threat of pillories for purchasers in Jewish shops.[12]

In Hanover, different tactics were being implemented as deterrents for German shoppers. There, Jewish business became the target of vandalism as "show windows and pavements in front of Jewish shops are smeared with warnings against buying from Jews."[13] This, in conjunction with the various methods of discrimination against German Jews, began to have a significant effect on the German public. While many still continued to shop in Jewish establishments, many began to show signs of indifference, "…accept[ing] the new

---

[9] *New York Times*, "New Drive Aimed at Jews in Reich," March 21, 1934, 10. See also Bankier, 72-73.
[10] *New York Times*, "Two Germans Punished After Attacks on Jews," October 14, 1935, 1.
[11] Karl A. Schleunes, *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz: Nazi Policy Towards German Jews, 1933-1939*, (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 170.
[12] "New Drives Aimed at Jews in Reich." See also Bankier, 72. "…Worker's wives, the commentator notes, said they couldn't care less whether the store was owned by a Jew or a German."
[13] "New Drives Aimed at Jews in Reich," As per *TNYT*, these tactics included the following: In Holzminden, "The local branch of the National Socialist Retailers and Handicraft Organization has proclaimed the slogan 'Whoever buys from Jews is a traitor,'" while in Hildesheim, "Trucks fly banners calling attention to the anti-Jewish pronouncement of the Nazi platform. Placards are issued to 'German' shops."

campaign with a helpless shrug of a shoulder."[14] The development of laws only intensified the shift in the dynamics between "Aryans" and German Jews.

In 1933 and 1934, the Nazis enacted 496 laws and directives against German Jews.[15] Beginning with the "law for the re-establishment of the Professional Civil Service," the anti-Jewish legislation provided a legal basis for the discriminatory policies against German Jews, resulting in a prominent and decisive shift from condemnation to acceptance.[16] According to David Bankier, three distinct reasons existed for this shift.

First, unlike the boycott, there was little to "…no disruption of bureaucratic activities." Second, the removal of Jews from various professions functioned as a "…source of upward mobility: The extensive dismissals opened jobs for the unemployed and allowed young people to advance their careers." Finally, "… the removal of the Jews from influential positions was consonant with the wishes of the great many majority of the public."[17] Teachers, for example, many of which joined the National Socialist Teacher's League, gladly accepted the classification of civil servants, took the oath of loyalty to Hitler, and "…readily accepted the removal of all Jews from their

---

[14] "Nazi Press Pushes New War on Jews." See also Herta Bahlsen-Cohn, *My German Lessons, 1915-1939*, (New York: Vantage Press, 1995), 136-137. "…It became nothing unusual to hear them [Germans] say, 'I don't have anything against the Jewish people personally. I have Jewish friends myself, but…' and then the statements that followed were vague and unconvincing even to the speaker himself, it seemed. It was the myth of a superior German race that slowly got a hold of the Germans. Its unsoundness did not matter. Its validity simply was not questioned. It had met with a desire so great and powerful that all reason was abandoned."

[15] Margarete Limberg and Hubert Rübsaat (eds). *Germans No More: Accounts of Jewish Everyday Life, 1933-1938*. Translated by Alan Nothnagle. (New York: Berghahn Books, 2006), 3. See also Office of United States Chief of Counsel for Prosecution of Axis Criminality, *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression, vol. 1*, (Washington: United States Printing Office, 1946), 300. See page 300-01 for a more complete list of laws; and Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967), 56-57.

[16] Bankier, 69.

[17] *Ibid.*

profession."[18] They were but one of the many groups that benefitted, in significant ways, from the removal of Jews from professions in the civil service.[19]

The economic persecution of German Jews during 1934 showed signs of increasing intensity. Nazis were no longer limited to the boycott and legislation of the period. They were successful in implementing a variety of tactics against German Jews in their attempt to remove them from German economic life. As Schleunes has described, however, the progress was mostly a result of trial and error. For example, the "Law for the Re-Establishment of Civil Service," although successful in removing a large number of German Jews from professions within civil service, had also failed. This failure, according to *TNYT*, was not ignored by Nazi radicals, who were "…engaged in a drive to bar them even from occupations in which protection was promised to them by the Nazi authorities. …[even] Hitler himself has ruled that equal rights must be accorded to the Jews in these fields."[20] "There is no reason," it continued, "to doubt Hitler's sincerity, for he has long realized the catastrophic effects of the anti-Jewish campaign on Germany's political and economic future."[21] Any limitations, however, were eradicated early in the year.

The new legislation enacted by the Nazis during 1934 had an immediate and drastic effect on German Jews throughout Germany. In the months leading to "May Day," the

---

[18] Christof Dipper in Michael Marrus (ed.), *The Nazi Holocaust, vol. 5: Public Opinion and Relation to the Jews in Nazi Europe*, (Wesport: Meckler, 1989), 157. Although there were no such "protected" occupations, what *TNYT* was referring to was the clause, enacted at the request of President Hindenburg, which protected the positions of Jewish veterans of the First World War.

[19] Kaplan, 25. For a break down of dismissals see Michael R. Marrus, *The Nazi Holocaust vol. 8: Bystanders of the Holocaust*, (Wesptort: Meckler, 1989) 187-188. See also "Frank S." in Greene and Kumar, 14.

[20] *New York Times*, "Rabid Nazi Push Drive on the Jews," April 1, 1934, E1.

[21] *Ibid.*

day when "…the Nazi labor code went into effect," *TNYT* reported that a "noticeable shift" was taking place in Germany. "Jewish families," were beginning to downsize - moving to smaller apartments "…where they [could] live inconspicuously" as they attempted to "…avoid provoking attention by their seeming influence." Many of these individuals, *TNYT* continued, "…are also giving up their more expensive homes because their earnings have been curtailed as a result of the 'Aryan' legislation and their economic future therefore remains in doubt."[22] This legislation, *TNYT* summarized, "…is bringing to the forefront of public interest a problem that may prove both a test of Nazi leadership and Jewish owned property."[23]

As was predicted by *TNYT*, the arrival of "May Day" had yielded catastrophic implications for Jewish business owners and the manner in which they were able to run their businesses. As it explained:

> Under the labor code the owner of a shop, store, or factory employing more than twenty persons is a 'leader' and the workers are his 'followers'. The leader fixes wages, but is responsible for the social welfare of his followers, and the latter owe him unconditional loyalty – an analogy with the feudal lord and vassals. The Nazi radicals have now put the problem as thus: 'Can a Jew be a leader of German men?' They emphatically answer no. To admit Jewish leadership of any kind, they insist, is a negation of the whole Nazi philosophy based on racial exclusiveness. … 'We too are of the opinion that Jews are impossible as leaders of German workers.' … 'The might of Pan-Judaism is broken. The Jew is no German. The alien and homeless Jew can never be a leader of German men. We cannot imagine our National Socialist comrades swearing loyalty to a Jewish employer. We did not fight fifteen years for the soul of the German worker to present him a Jew as a leader.'[24]

---

[22] *New York Times*, "Nazis Deny Holding 215,000 Party Foes," January 18, 1934, 8.

[23] "Rabid Nazis Push Drive on Jews."

[24] *Ibid*., *TNYT* also admits that the position of the Nazis towards Jewish enterprises seemed to be contradictory to their position on unemployment. It stated, "The labor code admitted Jews, foreigners and women as 'leaders' because its framers realized that unless the owner was also the manager a business was unlikely to survive long, and, furthermore, he could not be held responsible for the welfare of the worker. At a time when the government's principle aim is to reduce unemployment this is important, but economical considerations count for little with fanatics." See also, *New York Times*, "New Drive Aimed at

As a result, the tactics that had been previously utilized to "blackmail" Germans into only shopping in "Aryan" establishments intensified. All the while, the boycott of Jewish establishments continued. In Neustadt, for example, based on the orders of Julius Streicher, whom *TNYT* deemed the "leader of he anti-Semites," Jews were "…forced to paste posters in their windows reading, 'Streicher is right; we Jews are Germany's ruin'." Similarly, in Ansbach, which by this time was "…plastered with posters reading, 'Jews not wanted here'," citizens were "…forced to sign a pledge on their 'word of honor' that they would not do any business with Jewish stores, lawyers and doctors."[25] In order to prevent the on going patronage by Nazi party members of Jewish shops, party members were given direct instructions to "…buy only from designated 'German' shops" going so far as demanding receipts as proof."[26] As a testament of the ongoing siphoning of finances, *TNYT* reported that with receipts in hand, the merchants and artisans paid a percentage of the total listed as a "voluntary contribution."[27]

That same year, the topic of "Aryanization" also found its way to the pages of *TNYT*.[28] As the *Frankfurter Zeitung* fell to what would have then been "voluntary

---

Jews in Reich." March 21, 1934, 10. According to *TNYT*, Dr. Kurt Schmitt, the Minister of Economics, was in many ways the only member of the Party who opposed the economic persecution of German Jews, recognizing "…the economic handicap they impose on Germany and [was] doing the best to stop them." "Thus, when the Nazi shop-cell organization in Nuremberg declared on its own authority in violation of the national labor code that Jews could no longer be 'leaders,' that is, managers of their own businesses, the Economic of Ministry stepped in and through the labor trustees of Bavaria cancelled this decree."

[25] *Ibid.* See also Johannes Steinhoff, Peter Pechel and Dennis Showalter (eds.), *Voices From the Third Reich: An Oral History*, (Washington D.C: Regnery Gateway, 1989), 42-44.

[26] "Rabid Nazis Push Drive on Jews."

[27] *Ibid.* The Nazi party organ that was responsible for this drive was S.A.G.T., the initials for the party organization for "mutual support."

[28] Tolischus, "Nazis Seize Jews Re-Entering Reich," *New York Times*, October 10, 1935, 13. At this point *TNYT* begins to refer to "Aryanization" as the "liquidation" of Jewish properties. In addition, it produces "reliable estimates" regarding the sum of Jewish capital investments, valuing them at 12,000,000,000 RM, which were even them being sold, "under greater or lesser pressure," at bargain prices. It also proceeds to discuss the various boycott tactics being utilized by the German public against Jewish concerns of all sizes; See also Tolischus, "New Ban on Jews Hits Reich Stocks," *New York Times*, October 15, 1935; and "An

Aryanization," *TNYT* presented an almost apologetic piece on the subject. "The *Frankfurter Zeitung*," it stated, "The last of the great liberal newspapers in Germany to face the 'Aryanization' of Nazidom, has now also succumbed to it. Their proprietary interest has been taken over, … by 'old proved friends of the newspaper, who have been aiding it financially during the recent hard years."[29] This was but one more method utilized by the Nazis as a form of economic persecution against German Jews. As a result, until the official unveiling of the Nuremberg Laws, as *TNYT* reported,

> The only avenue still left open for intelligent and educated Jews are business, banking, and industry. Even agriculture is shut, because Jews may not own land. Already new hostility is breaking out against the Jews because thousands of capable men, driven from other occupations, are striving to get into the few vocations left.[30]

*TNYT*s' coverage of the Nuremberg Laws and their effect on German Jews was at times both passionate and urgent, but sporadic. Mimicking the coverage of the April 1, 1933 boycott, actual coverage of Nuremberg Laws and the economic persecution that resulted from them, in addition to the continued coverage of the continued persecution coverage, focused in varying degrees on the economic destruction of German Jews. Their continued use of victims and perpetrators in their reports made their reports nearly impossible to ignore. The detailed chronology of the ongoing economic persecution of German Jews left little doubt regarding the influence the Nuremberg Laws had on Germans and Jews.

Aryanization Contract" in Raul Hilberg (ed.), *Documents of Destruction: Germany and Jewry, 1933-1945*, (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971), 164-173.

[29] *New York Times*, "Nazis 'Aryanize' Big Liberal Paper," June 1, 1934, 2.

[30] *New York Times*, "Nazi Persecution of Liberals Rises," March 4, 1934, 10.

In the months leading up to the unveiling of the Nuremberg Laws, *TNYT* covered the wide spectrum of issues involving economics, upto and including the disillusionment of the "Special Guard" upon hearing of Göring's salary. [31] Insofar as the Jews were concerned, however, the helplessness of the previous years continued, as *TNYT* reported.

> …from time to time, despite the ever-tightening economic pressure and despite the ever-accumulating decrees and regulations inflicting new hardships and new humiliations upon the Jews of Germany there constantly arise, without any substance whatever, new hopes that, somehow or in somewise (*sic*), life will be made easier for them under the new regime.

Jewish bankers were just one example of the many individuals within Germany who faced the uncertainty of the period. According to *TNYT*, however, bankers, unlike others, simply could not leave Germany because, "…their entire resources [were] tied up in Germany and [could] not be extricated without physical danger to themselves."[32] Their confusion was only exacerbated by the fact that they were needed. As such, they were "…tolerated and even well-treated because they [were] necessary; and, in these circumstances, they are taking the long chance of remaining because they, too, hope for a chance under which they can remain."[33] Any hope for the return to normalcy, however, was eliminated as the months passed. The "Aryan" paragraph, which up to that point had been successful in "outlawing the Jew politically" by 1935, *TNYT* stated, " now increasingly threaten[ed] an economic boycott affecting his means of livelihood."[34]

Jews were continuously under pressure from German citizens and Nazi legislation despite the assistance that had been obtained by one of their only defenders, Minister of

---

[31] *New York Times*, "Nazis Fear Party Purge," January 6, 1935, 19.
[32] Frederick T. Birchall, "German Tighten Anti-Jewish Bans," *New York Times,* May 28, 1935, 5
[33] *Ibid.*
[34] *New York Times*, "Nazis to Define Citizenship," August 11, 1935, E4. This was the view in Cologne.

Economics Dr. Hjalmar Schacht.[35] However, the assistance provided by Schacht was not directed towards the protection of German Jewry so much as it reflected his interest in the protection of German economy. Unfortunately for the Nazis, in order to protect the German economy and the view of Germany abroad, Germany would have to protect, to some extent, German Jewry. Fortunately for the Nazis, the shift toward more anti-Semitic sentiment within Germany during 1934 had only strengthened by 1935. No longer did Germans respond to the campaign against the Jews with a "shrug of a shoulder" – instead, the majority of the population was simply "…unwilling to support Jews any longer." The transformation was reported at length by the "*West-German Beobachter*" and picked up by *TNYT*.

> The Jews' provocative behavior has resulted in reports from numerous villages and towns indicating that Jews are barred from migrating from these localities. No property will be sold to them there, and all municipal facilities, like municipal halls, baths and theaters, and also private places or entertainment, hotels, restaurants, moving pictures theaters and cabarets are closed to them. The report further indicates that public orders will be given only to Aryans. The people represented by their Village or Town Councils have thus shown their will to put the Jews in his place.[36]

Significantly, the shift had led to a more sinister development. The campaign against the Jews, *TNYT* reported, "…is approaching success so rapidly that any protest will soon seem academic. … the aim of that campaign – namely, to take over all Jewish enterprises and segregate the Jews into ghettos – will soon be reached in fact and in law, making continued extralegal activities unnecessary."[37] This would not be the first or the last mention by *TNYT* of the use of ghettos as a form of Jewish segregation. Until then Jews

---

[35] Otto D. Tolischus, "Schacht Protests to Hitler on Press," *New York Times*, August 22, 1935, 1.
[36] *Ibid.*
[37] *Ibid.*

throughout Germany were systematically being eliminated from various social arenas, including photoplay houses, cattle markets, spas and business organizations.[38]

On 1 September 1935, *TNYT* mentioned, for the first time, the clauses and restrictions that would be enforced upon the Jewish population by the Nuremberg Laws. Among them, the first, third, and fourth, clauses dealt primarily with the continued economic persecution of the German Jewry, directly or indirectly. They were presented as follows:

> First, Jews will be deprived of German citizenship and reduced to the status of "subjects" or "guests" of the Reich, which would exclude them from voting and most other privileges of citizenship.
> Third, the "Aryan clause" restricting Jews to the ghetto in culture and professional activities, will be confirmed and extended.
> Fourth, Jews will be subjected to certain restrictions concerning their business activities and relations with the rest of the population….[39]

Responding to the new legislation against German Jews, *TNYT* stated that the Jews were "doomed," for

> … in this drive Jews have been barred not only from social and recreational, but also from all business relations with 'Aryans.' Their enterprises have been subjected to rigid boycott enforced by guards or by public defamation of their 'Aryan' customers, and they themselves have been barred from 'Aryan' business establishments. They have likewise been barred in many places from owning real estate or even renting it.[40]

Within days, *TNYT* mentioned for the first time, the term "exterminate" in conjunction with the Jews. Although the extermination policy described at that time was made in reference to the Jewish influence within Germany, specifically that, "…Jewish alien

---

[38] *Ibid*. See also *New York Times*, "Troopers' Parade Answers Schacht," August 23, 1935, 9. See also *New York Times*, "Nazi Tells of Protest," September 15, 1935, 23; *New York Times*, "Jews in Reich Barred by Engineer Group," October 1, 1935, 18.

[39] Tolischus, "Hitler Due to List New Laws on Jews," *New York Times*, September 1, 1935, 12. "Disregarding the mental anguish and moral stigma involved in this reduction to second or third class citizenship, it is obvious that the fourth point is the decisive one because it will determine whether or not Jews will be able to make any kind of living in Germany."

[40] *Ibid.*

element must be exterminated and no one should buy from Jews or use their services, so that they would leave of their own accord," it was a significant statement – one that would be mimicked by *TNYT* over the next few years.[41] The term "liquidation" on the other hand, would be presented by *TNYT* repeatedly in 1935 alone, along side mention of the development of a Jewish ghetto.

Often associated with "Aryanizations," the term "liquidate" involved the dismantling of Jewish businesses, more often than not for far less than their value. Many of these "Aryanized" businesses were the smaller firms that were more susceptible to the boycotting tactics of the Nazi regime. Other businesses "still pronounced to be in a healthy condition," due to the continued patronage of German shoppers, had not yet fallen victim.[42] They were not far behind. Even stock companies were being "…squeezed out by the 'Aryan' owners to make the business qualify as 100 per cent German and thus save it from the boycott." Similarly, *TNYT* later stated, "the economic 'liquidation' of Jews in Germany, already underway through National Socialist pressure and other 'unofficial' methods, has become a part of the German Government's official policy."[43] By the end of the year, however, even large Jewish concerns were being "Aryanized."[44]

Although, as *TNYT* reported, new decrees were still in the works that would further deal with the economic and financial issues involving the Jews, the existing decrees and legislation sufficed to displace most Jewish business owners and Jewish employees.[45]

---

[41] Tolischus, "Storm Troopers Push War on Jews," *New York Times*, September 4, 1935, 14.
[42] Tolischus, "Nazis Seize Jews Re-Entering Reich."
[43] Tolischus, "New Ban on Jews Hit Reich Stocks."
[44] *New York Times*, "Germany Admits Factory Seizure," December 23, 1935, 8.
[45] Frederick T. Birchall, "Reich Puts Laws on Jews in Force; Trade Untouched," *New York Times*, November 16, 1935, 1.

Throughout Germany, Jews found themselves in dire straights. The inability to obtain work left Jews, both employers and employees, sustaining themselves with little more than the assistance provided by state relief. The attainment of state relief, however, soon proved to be yet another vindictive tactic implemented by the Nazis since,

> … To obtain relief they are forced to do manual labor, so formerly well-to-do Jews may be seen digging ditches to earn food and shelter and are subject to jeers from the Nazi press in consequence.[46]

As a further consequence, Jews throughout Germany found themselves not only unemployed but also homeless, as "Aryans" throughout Germany took it upon themselves to remove Jews from their homes. Throughout Germany signs reading "Jews Not Wanted" began to appear in front of apartment houses, while owners of properties purchased with government loans had begun to cancel all rental contracts with Jews.[47] Mistakenly listed as a Jew, a correspondent of *TNYT* was nearly expelled from one such apartment building. After clarification, the correspondent concluded that, " 'Aryan' furniture movers are evidently not loath to undertake the removal of belongings of Jews."[48] Still, the situation of Jews would only worsen.

The coverage of the Nuremberg Laws placed little emphasis on the actual application of the new laws to German Jewry. Few lines were devoted to the Law for the Protection of Blood and Honor. Instead, there was an increased drive within *TNYT* to focus on the practical application of the laws, primarily how the laws would affect the already increasing economic persecution of German Jewry. In its assessment of the new legislation, *TNYT* made some poignant observations, including the omission of the Jewish

---

[46] *Ibid.*
[47] "Nazis Seize Jews Re-Entering Reich."
[48] *New York Times*, "'Aryan' Youths Ask Jewish Home Jobs," November 14, 1935, 10.

boycotts that had, up to that point, been on going. "It was this omission," *TNYT* stated, "…that inspired the belief that Jews would not be molested in the legitimate pursuit of their livelihood and that the … boycott activities would be definitely outlawed."[49] Yet, despite this blind belief in the promise of tomorrow, persecution of German Jews intensified to the point of "…almost brutal ruthlessness."[50]

> The policy of segregation is being pushed to a point where it had become one of complete isolation, if not oblivion, for Jews, and this is calculated to breed hatreds. The moral defamation to which German Jews are increasingly being exposed and which breaks them in soul and body is obviously designed to promote an economic as well as cultural and racial boycott… The anti-Jewish laws proclaimed in Nuremberg purport to represent National Socialism's final liquidation of the Jewish problem, but pending their authoritative elucidation and expansion into executing ordinances the ultimate fate of German Jewry is still in the balance. For the moment Jewish anticipations wholly turn on what the Third Reich will concede to Jews in the direction in their winning a livelihood, and it is the economic aspect of the impending legislation that puts the seal on German Jewry fate. German Jews are ready to submit to numerous prohibitions … The economic future of German Jewry – which means its physical existence – is wrapped up in those laws.[51]

On 21 November 1935, *TNYT* ran a lengthy article on the development and the implications of the new "ghetto" laws." Focused solely on the economic persecution of German Jews, the "ghetto laws" were deemed as the "pride and symbol of Nazi Kultur."[52] "According to the best available information," *TNYT* stated, "the economic laws are so drastic they will leave the Jews only a slim basis for a bare existence as second-class citizens." Deemed as "…milestones on the road to realization of the Nazi program which calls for the "liquidation" of the Jewish question…" the "ghetto laws" held four specific "disabilities" for German Jews:

---

[49] *New York Times*, "Hope of Reich Jews Is Dimmed By Events." September 22, 1935, E1.
[50] *Ibid.*
[51] *Ibid.*
[52] Tolischus, "New Jewish Laws Ready in Germany," *New York Times*, November 22, 1935, 15.

> First – Barring Jews from acquiring real estate in Germany except by special permission, which presumably will be granted only when necessary to keep existing enterprises going.
> Second – A prohibition against the Jews in smaller and medium-sized villages and towns. Since the few Jewish shop owners in such places have already been ruined by the boycott and are rapidly moving out, this prohibition amounts to the exclusion of all Jews.
> Third – Limitation of Jews in the professions to a percentage corresponding to the percentage of Jews in the whole population, although some of those already practicing in those professions may be continued temporarily because of the growing shortage of jurists and physicians. The exclusion of these limitations among jurists is already being discussed at a session of the juridical organization called by Justice Minister Franz Guertner.
> Fourth – The prohibition barring Nazi party members from buying in Jewish stores is certain to remain, but whether as a consequence Jewish stores will be specially marked as such and whether the prohibition will be extended to government officials remains to be seen.[53]

As news of the ongoing economic persecution of the Jews reached the States, Germans living abroad also began to capitalize on the misfortunes of German Jewry. While many reasons were given for their return to Fatherland, one reason in particular was posited by *TNYT*:

> One is that life abroad is getting difficult for many Germans, the second is that they are welcome here with open arms since quite a number of the highest Nazi rulers are likewise Germans from outside the Reich, and the third and most important is that they can exchange their properties abroad for much more valuable Jewish properties in Germany with the Nazi Government's blessing.[54]

Capitalizing on the anti-Jewish momentum of the period, even individuals who had previously been regarded as "enemies of the State" began to side with the new Nazi government. For example, the economic expert of the *Völkischer Beobachter*, a former Communist, even went so far as giving advice on how a prospective purchaser of Jewish businesses could drive the asking price down further.[55]

---

[53] *Ibid.*
[54] Tolischus, "Reich Jews Plead for Haven Abroad," *New York Times*, November 27, 1935, 11.
[55] Tolischus, "Nazis Told to End Anti-Jewish Acts," *New York Times*, November 5, 1935, 18.

By year's end most of Germany's Jews had been systematically removed from their positions, homes, and pride. The Nuremberg laws only helped to exacerbate their situation. No longer deemed citizens of the Reich, Jews became second-class citizens, "guests" of a nation that wanted nothing to do with them. Many had set their hopes on emigration, a goal that few were able to attain, in part because of the restrictions placed on visa and passport regulations by the Nazis. Any hopes of attaining some monetary gain from the sale of their businesses were shattered when funds were immediately deposited into blocked bank accounts – further complicating the situation for German Jews.[56] On the occasion that payment was received and a business owner was able to emigrate, the Nazis inflicted another devastating blow to Jewish wealth; bank notes circulating abroad were refused for exchange on the basis that they must have been smuggled out of the country.[57] These and other methods of discrimination led Abraham Barkai to argue that the period spanning the years 1934-1938 was an "open season" for the looting and boycotts of German Jews that were pushed forward relentlessly – a view shared by correspondents of *TNYT*.[58]

The Nuremberg Laws, the ongoing boycotts, the effects of the previous legislation, in addition to the evictions and the "ghetto laws," left little opportunity for the survival of German Jews within Germany. Their deplorable situation led *TNYT* to quote the words of Governor Lehman:

> In peace they contributed to Germany's well-being; in war they laid down their lives for Germany's greatness. Suddenly, almost without warning, by official and national edict, all the Jews of Germany – 600,000 people – were singled out for destruction, economically, socially and politically. They have been harried and

[56] Tolischus, "New Jewish Laws Ready in Germany."
[57] *Ibid.*
[58] Barkai in Limberg and Rübsaat, 36.

> driven out of their positions in business, in public life, in industry and in commerce and in the professions.
> There has been no secrecy, no equivocation on the part of the German Government. Hundreds of thousands of men and women in all walks of life have been ruthlessly and without pity deprived of their means of livelihood and of the primary rights of citizenship. Even the right to education is now being denied the Jewish children and youths, regardless of their intellectual qualifications. These men and women in great numbers are now undergoing indescribable suffering and hardships.[59]

Despite extensive coverage of the economic persecution of German Jews, *TNYT* coverage of the Nuremberg Laws seemed lacking. Little emphasis was placed on the role of the laws within Jewish society, or even Jewish reactions to the laws. It was not until 1936 that the ramifications of the Nuremberg Laws were actually described within the pages of *TNYT*. The reason for this is not clear. Perhaps the ongoing battle to determine the meaning of, and who was affected by, the laws left little to be described. What is known is that the suffering of the Jews intensified as a result of the Nuremberg Laws. The newspaper's extensive coverage of the economic persecution of German Jews made it impossible to ignore their plight, regardless of its placement within *TNYT*.

Beyond this, *TNYT* made some significant assessments regarding the fate of the Jews. The repeated use of terms such as "liquidate," and "exterminate," functioned as dark predictions of events that would come later in time. By 1937, these terms appeared with more frequency, in addition to the first use of the term "holocaust."[60] Simply put, *TNYT* made no attempts to mask the true intents of the Nazi Regime. Never once was the word "Jew" masked or qualified to hide the real focus of Nazi persecution. Still, critics of *TNYT* maybe correct in their assessment of the placement of reports of the persecution of Jews, with one glaring fault. While many reports may have been located well inside the

[59] Governor Lehman, "Nazi Treatment of Jews," *New York Times, Question marks*, October 6, 1935, 66.
[60] *New York Times*, "Arrests Continued," November 13, 1938, 1.

newspaper, they were far from hidden. Most, if not all, covered multiple pages. Simply put, anyone who wanted to know anything regarding the economic fate of German Jews in this "new Germany" being built by the Nazis needed only turn to *TNYT*.

During the next three years *TNYT* would continue to report regularly on the economic fate of German Jews with the same tenacity and poignancy that it had since before the April 1933 boycott. It would delineate the on-going transformation of "Aryan" attitude towards Jews, the growing public indifference, and its significance for the Nazi regime.

Chapter 4

Kristallnacht – Prelude to Destruction?

"The world… is more interested in the fate of the individual and the press has stopped reporting the fate of single Jews in the Third Reich. The propaganda machine and so-called legislation of the Nazi regime, on the other hand, has regulated the Jewish fate. It has simply regulated cruelty. The world in general cannot understand the fate of the German Jew. … According to the Nazi view, the fate of the Jews has been regulated by the Nuremberg laws, but when the execution of the law begins the authorities of the totalitarian State are allowed to act as they see fit. Consequently, …the entire German Jewry is now exposed to torture and slavery. It is the fate of these masses the civilized world should be worried about." - Georg Bernhard[1]

Martin Gilbert has referred to *Kristallnacht*, and the events that occurred during November 9/10 as the "prelude to [the] destruction" of German and European Jews.[2] While the events of that night did signal a concrete shift in the persecution of, and eventual policy towards, German and European Jews, it was not in and of itself, the "prelude to destruction." As has been shown, the years leading up to 1938 presented a series of social and political events that signaled the intended destruction of German Jewry. These included, but were not limited to, physical altercations, incarceration in concentration camps, disenfranchisement, the removal of rights as people and citizens of

[1] *New York Times*, "Bernhard Says Nazis Now Crush All Jews," June 30, 1936, 8. Georg Bernhard was the previous editor of the *Vossiche Zeitung* during 1933, then German exile and editor-in-chief of the *Pariser Tageszeitung* in the United States.
[2] Martin Gilbert, *Kristallnacht: Prelude to Destruction*, (New York: Harper Perennial, 2006).

Germany, looting, and, as *TNYT* presented, the repeated mention by members of the Nazi party regarding the intended "liquidation" of German Jews.[3]

According to Michael Marrus, these five years constituted the first five of six "equally divided … periods of nationwide trends and *Reich*-level measures."[4] And, while November 9/10 marked the prohibition of all Jewish activities in the German economy, the previous years had included a series of economic and exclusionary measures that combined were more drastic than *Kristallnacht* alone.[5] As Frank Bajohr summarized, "…the violent confiscation of such vast amounts of property was not repeated even in the 'Old Reich' during the excesses of the November pogrom of 1938, when similar 'wild' confiscation and plundering occurred."[6]

Yet, these developments are seldom incorporated or even viewed as part of the process of destruction of German Jewry. One aspect that seems to dictate the view that *Kristallnacht* marked the "prelude to destruction" was the speed of the violent social and political persecution. Upto then, legislation had occurred steadily but had been marked with moments of caution by the Nazi regime. These pauses included the end of the boycott of April 1, 1933 and the months leading up to and during the 1936 Olympics. Despite all warning signs, these pauses allowed German Jews time to emigrate, re-assess, and even believe that there was hope for survival within Germany under the Nazis.

TNYT representation of the events leading up to *Kristallnacht* had covered a wide spectrum of Nazi discriminatory measures against German Jewry. Beyond simply

---

[3] See Frank Bajohr, 'The Holocaust and Corruption,' in Gerald D. Feldman, and Wolfgang Siebel (eds.), *Networks of Nazi Persecution: Bureaucracy, Business and the Organization of the Holocaust*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005), 120-121.
[4]Michael R. Marrus, *The Nazi Holocaust vol. 8: Bystanders of the Holocaust*, (Westport: Meckler, 1989), 178. Italics original.
[5] *Ibid,* 178-180.
[6] Bajohr in Feldman and Siebel, 121.

covering major events, such as the April 1, 1933 boycott and the unveiling of the Nuremberg Laws, it had summarized and predicted on several occasions the fate of German Jewry. 1936 and 1937 would be no exception. In its continued coverage of the economic persecution of German Jewry *TNYT* would consistently report the process of destruction leading up to, and directly after, *Kristallnacht* with the same integrity and steadfast unbiased view that had been used during the previous years. Its coverage of *Kristallnacht*, however, fell short – following the precedent set with the Nuremberg Laws.

"…This here is Germany."[7]

Historians have customarily viewed the years leading up to *Kristallnacht* to be quiet, and uneventful. With the impending arrival of the 1936 Olympics any outward violence and restrictions placed upon German Jewry were removed – hidden from foreign spectators.[8] Hitler's explicit instructions banning "individual actions" against Jews did not prevent the persecution of Jews from continuing, or even advancing beyond what had been implemented during the previous years.[9] The Nuremberg Laws not only demoted German Jews to second-class citizens, stripping them of civil rights and protections, it formally established a legal basis from which Germans, Nazis included, could rob, loot, and disenfranchise German Jews. *TNYT* was witness to this evolution; "…the steady economic pressure," it stated, "still makes their stay here impossible."[10]

---

[7] Leff, 50-51.
[8] Ian Kershaw, *Popular Opinion and Political Dissent in the Third Reich: Bavaria 1933-1945*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), 239.
[9] *Ibid.*
[10] Fredrick T. Birchall, "Condition of Jews is Acute in Poland," *New York Times*, April 24, 1936, 11. While reporting the conditions faced by Police Jews, Birchall stated that, Germany is well governed; Poland is not so well governed or so well policed. Wholly apart from the pogrom reported from larger centers of the

As early as 1933, before the "Jewish Question" crystallized, emigration had been one of the primary objectives of the Nazi government. Initially, the desired emigration of German Jewry proved to be a chaotic endeavor, mostly due to the Nazis' self-imposed restrictions and legislation.[11] Despite this, it also proved lucrative. For example, the Reich Flight Tax (*Reichsfluchtsteuer*) initially established during the Brüning government as a precautionary measure against "capital flight," had yielded more than 900 million RM from emigrating German Jews.[12] Many Germans benefitted from the cost of emigration. As survivor Gerdy Stoppleman recalled, "To be able to pay the . . . tax I sold our furniture, valuable paintings and carpets. . . dirt cheap. Many a home of true Aryans, SA and SS became exceedingly well furnished."[13] The emigration of German Jews helped to line the pockets of Gestapo agents, and the police, in addition to providing many Germans an opportunity to possess coveted goods.[14] Despite the dwindling number of

---

population, it is alleged – and instance in proof of the allegations are cited – that Jews are being beaten, plundered and even killed in villages where there is not a single policeman or even a telephone by which aid could be summoned. And the outside world hears nothing about them.
There is a campaign on 'to starve the Jews'."

[11] See Birchall, "Boycott At An End, Germany Believes; Cabinet Against It," April 3, 1933, 1; Birchall, "Nazis See Victory In Their Boycott," *New York Times*, April 4, 1933, 1.

[12] Marion A. Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 70. For further examples see 70-72. See also Alfons Kenkmann, "The Looting of Jewish Property and the German Financial Administration," in Gerald D. Feldman and Wolfgang Siebel (eds.), *Networks of Nazi Persecution: Bureaucracy, Business and the Organization of the Holocaust*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005), 154. "Starting in 1935, tax revenues from the Flight Tax increased steadily: in the fiscal year 1935/36 (April 1935-March 1936) to 45.6 million, in the following year to RM 69.9 million and in 1937/38 to RM 81 million. The Reich collected the largest amounts, some RM 342.6 million, in 1938/39. See also Hilberg, 91.

[13] Kaplan, 70.

[14] Alfons Kenkmann, 151. Strict policies were in place to prevent Jews from fleeing without paying the Flight Tax. For example, "The tax office issued 'tax-evasion warrants' (*Steuersteckbrief*) against persons who emigrated abroad without paying the Reich Flight Tax … The warrants listed names, old and new foreign addresses and the amounts of unpaid flight taxes. On the strength of such a warrant the emigrant could be taken into temporary custody by officials of the Police and Security Service as well as the Tax and Customs Offices," 154. See also, Francis R. Nicosia and Jonathan Huener (eds.), *Business and Industry in Nazi Germany*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2004), 28.

emigrants, by the end of 1935 the perception of German Jewry had been transformed into an industry from which Germany benefitted handsomely.[15]

Unable, or unwilling to emigrate, many Jews sought the solace of big cities, such as Berlin, as a method of survival – economic, social, and personal.[16] *TNYT* reported the Nazi response to the relocation trend. Furious,

> …Goebbels foreshadowed tonight new edicts to expel Jews from Berlin. 'We will make a law … that will see to it that the Jews disappear from Berlin very soon. We have completed a revolution…but now we find that the Jews today feel themselves better off and spread themselves even more than they dared before. Is it not enough to drive a blush of anger into our faces when we realize that 3,000 Jews have come to Berlin during the last four months? What do they want here? What will we say to the fact that Jews are again loitering around the cafes as if there had not been any revolution at all? I am solving this problem by means of legal regulations issued by the party and State, not by actions in the street. But why all this excitement simply because the word 'Jew' is written on a shop window? Now we at least know where these shops are, and there are still too many of them. The Jews irritate us by simply being here.'[17]

As a testament to the confusion within Germany, 1936 helped to solidify among many German Jews the belief that the Nuremberg Laws had presented relief from the persecution that had been experienced during the previous two years. Some believed that signs of the re-integration of German Jewry within the Nazi state were noticeable. For example, many Jewish business owners continued to experience some success despite the many threats intended to deter "Aryans" from shopping at Jewish establishments. Many shoppers, as Kershaw and Bankier pointed out, continued to care more about the cost of

[15] Michael R. Marrus, *The Nazi Holocaust, vol. 8: Bystanders of the Holocaust,* 174. Emigration statistics read as follows: 1933, 37,000; 1934, 23,000; 1935, 21,000; 1936, 25,000; 1937, 23,000; 1938, 40,000.
[16] Barkai, 7.
[17] *New York Times*, "Goebbels Warns Jews Must Leave," June 22, 1938, 14.

goods than of the designation of an establishment or proprietor.[18] The motivation behind the continued "support" from their fellow countrymen, however, may not have been acknowledged at the time. Simply put, boycotting Jewish businesses did not pay – in Germany or abroad.

The persistence of hope for a reasonable existence within Germany continued well into 1938, despite the ever present, escalating persecution of Germany Jews. No longer limited to the strict definition of "Jew," new policies enacted in 1936 began to include what *TNYT* referred to as "hybrids."[19] According to "the Reich Medical Leader," Dr. Gerhard Wagner, "…no Jew, no Jewish hybrid and no 'German' married to a Jew or to a Jewish hybrid would be admitted to medical practice."[20] "This decree," *TNYT* continued, "goes beyond the Nuremberg ghetto law, which in principle excluded from German citizenship rights 75 per cent and 100 per cent Jews and those 50 per cent Jews belonging to the Jewish community."[21] All the while, an additional "…763 notaries [were] ousted through the recent Nuremberg anti-Jewish laws."[22]

Justifying the continuing disenfranchisement of German Jews, Hans Frank, Reich Commissioner for Justice, declared that the Nuremberg Laws were created for the protection of the German race, "…not because we hate the Jews but because we love the German people…."[23] Mocking Frank's view of the current situation in Germany, particularly as it pertained to the Jews, *TNYT* translated his love into a "…roseate picture of contemporary Germany,…as a country without strikes, where employer and employe

---

[18] David Bankier, *The Germans and the Final Solution: Public Opinion under Nazism*, (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1992), 72, 73; Kershaw, 240.
[19] *New York Times*, "Nazi Ruling Outlaws New Jewish Lawyers," February 23, 1936, 30.
[20] *Ibid.*
[21] *Ibid.* The evolution of the Nuremberg Laws were applied to "…physicians already in practice."
[22] *New York Times*, "Reich Intensifies Anti-Semitic Drive," March 2, 1936, 10.
[23] *New York Times*, "Denies Nazis Curb Jews from Hatred," June 27, 1937, 23.

(*sic*) worked in sweet harmony and where the peasant lived freely and happily on his land since he had been freed from Jewish pressure."[24]

The Nazis persecution policies even extended outside the German borders, reaching Poland and Austria, where Jews experienced a series of measures including unemployment, being beaten, or even killed.[25] The situation in Poland was infinitely worse than anything that had been experienced in Germany. The anti-Semitic policies that had taken the Nazis a minimum of three years to implement seemingly occurred overnight, leaving Birchall to declare that in comparison, Germany was "…well governed."[26] A legal framework was unimportant. Poles had simply set off "…a campaign 'to starve the Jews'."[27]

> Wholly apart from the pogrom reported from larger centers of the population, it is alleged – and instance in proof of the allegations are cited – that Jews are being beaten, plundered and even killed in villages where there is not a single policeman or even a telephone by which aid could be summoned. And the outside world hears nothing about them.[28]

Within months, the situation had become so acute that *TNYT* printed a plea for help from the Polish Foreign Prime Minister,

> The whole Jewish congress is besought to aid the Polish Jews. Anti-Semitic agitation is indoctrinating large sections of the population, especially the youth, who are seeking the destruction of Polish Jewry by physical terror and an economic boycott of extraordinary proportions. Anti-Semitic agitation is making the Jews the scapegoats for the country's ills and has led to the loss of Jewish life and property. … There is no employment for Jews in State and municipal jobs. Additional burdens are imposed by the compulsory Sunday-closing law. The pauperization of Polish Jewry is rapidly bringing about an indescribable poverty.

---

[24] *Ibid.*
[25] *New York Times*, "Anti-Semitic Move Arises in Austria," March 30, 1936, 3. In Austria, *TNYT* stated, "…the difficulties encountered by the Austrian Phoenix Life Insurance Company are being shifted to the shoulders of the Jews because the chairman of the firm, Mr. Berliner, is a Jew."
[26] Birchall, "Condition of Jews is Acute in Poland."
[27] *Ibid.*
[28] *Ibid.*

> … Most recently our justified demands for the means of existence have been countered with the reply that we should leave this country.[29]

Towards the end of 1937 "mass confiscation of Jewish property continue[d] mostly under the pretext of tax evasion."[30] It was not uncommon for a Jewish business owner to be accused of tax evasion, or any other minor offense, by an "Aryan" competitor, or other interested party, with the intention of acquiring their business. Kaplan cites the case of Jewish business owners, hairdressers, who, after declining an offer to sell their businesses were accused of tax evasion. After being arrested for their "crime," their valuable equipment was confiscated. Within days they were "ruined."[31] A drugstore owner who had been interested in selling his business shared a similar fate. After being imprisoned, the owner was forced to sell his business "for a pittance."[32] Explicit and implicit blackmail was commonplace in every aspect of confiscation of Jewish property and jobs.

An increase in the confiscation of Jewish property, including "Aryanization," was additional consequence of the Nuremberg Laws and the escalating persecution of German Jews. Throughout Germany, Jews were finding themselves victims of on-going defilement of their business establishments, while finding themselves homeless or in need of selling their belongings in the hope of survival. It was not unusual to see men in civilian clothes, usually in groups of two or three, "…painting on the windows of Jewish shops the word 'JUDE' in large red letters, [or] the Star of David and caricatures of Jews."[33] In some of the more fashionable shopping districts, such as the Kurfürstendamm

---

[29] *New York Times,* "Terror in Poland Reported by Jews," August 11, 1936, 4.
[30] *New York Times*, "Nazis Will Defend Germans Abroad," November 28, 1937, 33. The use of tax evasion as a method of obtaining Jewish concerns was in existence in Danzig in the early 1930s.
[31] Kaplan, 23.
[32] *Ibid.* See also Kankmann, 153-154.
[33] John Mendelsohn, *The Holocaust, vol. 1: Legalizing the Holocaust, The Early Phase, 1933-1939*, (New York: Garland Publishing, 1982), 139.

and the Tauentzienstrasse,"… the task of the painters was made easy by the fact that Jewish shop-owners had been ordered the day before to display their names in white letters."[34] On many occasions, the looting of shops, and the beating of their owners accompanied the defiling of Jewish businesses.[35]

More than before, from 1936 to mid-1938 German Jews were being removed from their homes. In September 1938, for example, *TNYT* reported that the German Labor Front had proceeded to "…serve notice … on all Jewish boarding house owners, 'advising' them to liquidate their businesses by September 30."[36] As a result, *TNYT* proceeded,

> Berlin Jews were thrown into consternation by this measure. As more and more Jewish tenants are receiving notice from non-Jewish real estate owners to leave their residences, allegedly because their non-Jewish tenants object to their presence, Jews increasingly have been engaging rooms in Jewish boarding houses. …If these boarding houses also are to be liquidated many Jews will face a problem [finding] places to live.[37]

For many, the shift from their homes to Jewish houses, or *Judenhäuser*, resulted in the confiscation of Jewish property by private individuals and public figures. By 1939, so much Jewish property had passed hands that Bajohr viewed it an enterprise that "developed into the single greatest exchange of property in modern German history."[38] For many Jews, however, the Nazis persecution was simply unbearable, choosing death

---

[34] *Ibid.*
[35] *Ibid.*
[36] *New York Times*, "Warns Jews Owning Boarding Houses," September 2, 1938, 2.
[37] *Ibid.*
[38] Konrad Kwiet "Without Neighbors: Daily Living in Judenhäuser," in Francis R. Nicosia and David Scrase, *Jewish Life in Nazi German: Dilemmas and Responses*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 117. See also Jörg Friedrich, "The Apartment Keys Are to be Relinquished to the House Manager: The Cannibalization of Jewish Estates" in Jörg Wollenberg (ed.), *The German Public and the Persecution of the Jews, 1933-1945: "No One Participated, No One Knew,"*(Humanities Press International, 1996), 141-151. For more on the situation of Jews, their unemployment and persecution, in Vienna, see Jack Sutters (ed.), *Archives of the Holocaust, vol. 2: American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia, 1932-1939*, (New York: Garland Publishing, 1990), 335, 361-362, 366-367.

over the ever-growing anti-Semitic drive. As *TNYT* reported, "the principal cause of many of the suicides can be found in the continued 'Aryanization' of Jewish-owned shops…leaving proprietors without funds."[39]

As 1937 came to a close, *TNYT* printed, among other things, a summary of the economic persecution of German Jews that had occurred to date. Citing three distinct phases, *TNYT* stated that the

> Elimination of Jews from Germany is the inevitable result of the present policy of the Nazi regime… In the first phase of Hitlerism the idea was to appeal to the economic interests of the Aryan intellectual proletariat and of the judges, notaries, government officials, phy*sic*ians, journalists, actors, mu*sic*ians, teachers, chemists, engineers, university professors and students by the simple expedient of throwing out some 20,0000 Jewish competitors. Since of the 700,000 men and women engaged in these professions the Jews constituted a mere 4 per cent, the elimination brought no solution to the problem. …In the second phase of Hitlerism…, the attempt is being made to satisfy the middle classes by various measures. Going concerns are put on sale at ridiculously low figures. Jewish shops are closed down; Jewish market dealers and peddlers are driven away; Jewish merchants are confined to a commercial ghetto; business men are systematically annoyed and intimidated until compelled "voluntarily" to liquidate their establishments or at least to reduce their scale af (*sic*) activities so as to become less conspicuous, to limit their advertising and to refrain from legitimate competition. …These activities soon whetted the cupidity of the salaried workers. About 50,000 Jewish employees had to leave their positions to make room for others. …During the year 1935…a total of 101,873 Jews registered at eight Jewish employment bureaus. Of these only about 5 per cent were placed. In 1936 the activity of the Jewish employment agencies was suspended.[40]

TNYT representation of *Kristallnacht* was lacking in comparison to its coverage of the months leading up to and directly after. Insofar as the economic persecution of the Jews was concerned, its coverage included emigration, the destruction and intimidation of business owners and businesses, fines, and arrests. Yet, the brutal nature of *Kristallnacht*

[39] *New York Times*, "Sudden Suicide Wave Breaks Out in Vienna," May 7, 1938, 5.
[40] *New York Times,* " Exile of All Jews from Reich Seen," December 19, 1937, 35.

was barely mentioned. Like its coverage of the Nuremberg Laws, *TNYT* chose to minimize the extent of the violence, and discrimination of the period.

As 1938 developed, Jews throughout Germany found that their lives were literally in the hands of their perpetrators. In June 1938 *TNYT* summarized this period when it stated that, "the process of eliminating Jews from participation in German commerce, finance and business entered its final stage today with the announcement of a series of decrees and ordinances…. They virtually spell attrition for Jewish economic and business activities of every sort."[41] Beyond the definition of a "Jewish" establishment, German Jews would subsequently be forced to declare all property that exceeded 5,000RM. All declarations, *TNYT* reported, "…must be turned in to the Economics Ministry by June 30."[42]

German Jews, particularly "wealthy Jews," *TNYT* reported, would have to "reconcile" themselves to the "…realization that they will not be allowed to retain much of their cash belongings should they wish to emigrate."[43] The financial situation in Germany was affecting "Aryans" married to Jews, as well. While "Aryan" men married to Jewish women no longer had access to their private bank accounts, new regulations made Jews increasingly vulnerable to persecution.[44] Taking the name "Sarah" or "Israel" for example, meant in practice, "…the utter barring of Jews and 'half-Jews' from the professions and from business, trade and industry except among themselves." In addition, *TNYT* continued, "Since no 'Aryan' may employ a Jew, it implies that within a very few

[41] *New York Times*, "Germany Tightens Boycott of Jews," June 18, 1938, 1. Among the ordinances and decrees described in the article was the definition of what a "Jewish" business was and was not.
[42] *Ibid. TNYT* proceeded by stating that the registration was not proceeding to plan and the date would, in all certainly, need to be extended. These declarations would be helpful in collecting Jewish property from emigrating Jews in post-*Kristallnacht* Germany.
[43] *Ibid.* "One official estimate places the amount of money a Jew is able to take abroad at about 3 per cent of his total capital after the payment of all his taxes and levies, although this cannot be confirmed."
[44] *New York Times*, "Germany Tightens Pressure on Jews," August 24, 1938, 1.

years the only Jews – if any – left in Germany will be those able to live from the scant capital they receive from the liquidation of their business and dependents."[45]

At this point, the Nazis attacks against Jewish owned businesses were no longer limited to German Jews. At the end of April 1938, property belonging to American Jews came under attack. As a result of this new wave of attacks, *TNYT* reported that, "should Germany undertake to utilize or confiscate property of American citizens, there undoubtedly would be international complications. If application of the decree is restricted to Germans, the situation presumably will not present a cause for action by the United States."[46] As a response, the *Völkischer Beobachter* stated:

> It is foreign Jewry that has attacked National Socialist Germany so violently as to create apprehension that foreign Jews will smuggle their inland possessions out of the country and even use these abroad in the fight against us. That, too, the decree makes definitely, impossible. … Although Jewish property belongs to legally to the Jews, it is also part of Germany's economy. According to the National Socialist Idea, every German entrepreneur is a trustee of Germany's national wealth. We cannot expect Jews to entertain the same sentiment. But since even private property belonging to Jews is part of the German national wealth, it is only right to take care that this Jewish wealth is being used for the welfare of the entire German people.[47]

TNYT reports had indicated, well before *Kristallnacht*, that the Nazis persecution policy against the Jews had shifted to disregard foreign opinion; no Jew was safe in Nazi Germany.

The chaos and confusion of November 9/10 left more than just the destruction of synagogues and business storefronts. Most Jews found themselves victims of raids by civilians, police and Nazis alike. Civilians, Nazis and police alike found within the Jewish community a never-ending supply of goods. All saw fit to gather the "booty" of

---

[45] *Ibid.*
[46] *New York Times*, "Goering Starts Final Liquidation of Jewish Property in Germany," April 28, 1938, 1.
[47] *New York Times*, "Nazi Property Law Arouses Legations," April 28, 1938, 1.

the destroyed businesses and Jewish homes. As Gilbert described, "… in downtown Berlin, crowds pushed police aside in their hunt for plunder."[48] All the while, "…Everything [that Jews] had accumulated in Germany during ten, twenty, even thirty years, their furniture, cutlery, linens, bed, stoves, books, was seized as booty, both by the Nazis and authorities and, in hundreds of recorded instances, by their neighbors."[49]

Most, if not all, of these events were covered, although briefly, by *TNYT*. The extent of the looting and economic destruction of the night were such that they should be covered at length. In its report of November 10, *TNYT* stated

> Raiding squads of young men roamed unhindered through the principal shopping districts, breaking shop windows with metal weapons, looting or tossing merchandise into the street or into passing vehicles and leaving the unprotected Jewish shops to the mercy of vandals who followed in their trail in an unprecedented show of violence.
> Many of the raiders in the downtown districts wore boots – which are worn by all party groups when in uniform – and they worked with a precision that was a tribute to "spontaneous demonstration."
> Alighting quickly from the cars, the vandals hacked away at windows, accompanied by the laughs and jokes of onlookers. The windows were destroyed, the goods were removed from the showcases and tossed into the streets or passing vehicles, and the vandals passed on to the next jewelry shop – easily recognizable because since the anti-Jewish demonstrations in the early Summer all Jewish-owned shops must have the name of their proprietors whitewashed on the windows in large block letters.
> The writer observed three cases of looting after raiders had broken the windows of lingerie, fur and jewelry shops. The looters waited until the raiders passed on to the next Jewish-designated shop and then quickly grabbed something from the show windows, after which they ambled unconcernedly away.
> On the Nuernbergerstrasse a man took a handful of hats from a broken shop front and walked leisurely away in full sight of three uniformed night watchmen.[50]

The following day, Jews were given forty-eight hours to leave Munich, and as *TNYT* reported, "…would hand over the keys to their dwellings and garages. … Instructions

---

[48] Gilbert, 33, 42.
[49] *Ibid*, 23.
[50] *New York Times*, "Berlin Raids Reply to Death Envoy," November 10, 1938, 1. See also Miller, 106, and *New York Times*, "No Regret Voiced," November 12, 1938, 1. All discredit the belief that looting did not occur, while the latter tries to cloak the role of looting at the hand of the Nazi party.

were issued to confiscate all Jewish owned cars and the sale of gasoline to Jews was forbidden."[51] Businesses in various states of "Aryanization" were subjected to greater indignation, all the while Jews, as well as Jewish owned businesses suffered the prolonged wrath of *Kristallnacht*.[52] Of a more significant nature, Jews were required to pay for the damage caused during *Kristallnacht*, in addition to any subsequent reparations. Although insurance would cover the damage of the night, any payment would be redirected to the State.[53] As a result, *TNYT* reported, "…there is fear that whatever remains of Jewish fortunes will be drafted to repair the damage."[54] "In many cases," it continued, "Jews who came to large cities from smaller ones where their livelihood was destroyed are being shipped back to an uncertain fate."

As a result, *TNYT* reported, "Germany's National Socialist regime celebrated its final victory over the Jews and prepared to consolidate that victory in new decrees designated to 'liquidate' Germany Jewry as effectively as the Bolsheviks did the Aristocratic and bourgeois classes in Russia."[55] The definition of "liquidation" took on a variety of definitions. It included, but was not limited to, the emigration of Jews, "slow physical extermination," and, or, the removal of Jews from all German economic life.[56]

In addition to the various persecution tactics already in place, *TNYT* reported that Jews were to be "…barred from operating retail, mail order and handicraft establishments, and

---

[51] *New York Times*, "Jews Are Ordered to Leave Munich," November 11, 1938, 3.
[52] *Ibid.*
[53] *New York Times*, "Berlin is Awaiting Ruling on Damage," December 5, 1938, 31. "Since the amount of insurance money to be paid to the Reich in each case is deducted from fines to be paid by Jews, those subject to the levy alone have a material interest is recovering from insurance companies.
The Reich is apt to disallow claims for theft because the occurrence of theft has been officially disputed. The government is only directly interested in claims returnable in this division from reinsurance companies or when cash in payment of fines would be obtainable more quickly through the insurance companies than through liquidation of Jewish property."
[54] *New York Times*, "No Regret Voiced," November 12, 1938, 1. The report also indicated that the estimated damage caused during *Kristallnacht* reached well over 13,000,000 RM.
[55] *New York Times*, "Reich Celebrates 'Victory' Over Jews," November 13, 1938, 75.
[56] *Ibid.* See also Tolischus, "Reich Insists Jews Depart Penniless," *New York Times*, November 20, 1938, 1.

after that date no Jew can be a shop leader directly in charge of personnel. Jews in leading positions in corporate businesses who are not shop leaders can (which means must) be dismissed within six weeks' notice."[57] Throughout Germany, Jews were to relinquish their positions as shop owners, in the "interest of the employes (*sic*)."[58] Despite the extent of the coverage presented on the various decrees and the ever-declining position of Jews in Germany, one word, above others, stands out. *TNYT* used, for the first time, well before its use in a post WWII world, the word Holocaust. Integrated with a description of the loss of property and rights, is it possible that *TNYT* recognized the intended fate of the German, and possibly European, Jews?

> How much of this property remains after this week's holacaust (*sic*), and what it is still worth now that its business value is gone, it is also a guessing matter, but it cannot much exceed half of what it was before.[59]

This was the first time TNYT would use the word.

During the remainder of the year *TNYT* concentrated on reporting the economic fate of German Jewry. With the assistance of the forced declaration of property, for example, Nazis were able to begin the steadfast confiscation of any remaining Jewish wealth. As *TNYT* reported,

---

[57] *New York Times*, "Arrests Continued," November 13, 1938, 1. The title of this article is confusing, as it encompasses 2 articles in one. As such, this article may also be cited as, Tolischus, "New Decrees Against Jews," *New York Times*, November 13, 1938, 1. The above restriction was the fourth of five decrees issued as a result of *Kristallnacht*. The other four decrees were as follows: "First, a fine of 1,000,000,000 RM [were] imposed on German Jews as a whole; Second, all damage inflicted on Jewish business and homes by the nation-wide wave of wrecking, looting and incendiarism this week must be repaired immediately by Jewish owners at their own cost and apparently irrespective of nationality; Third, all settlements of insurance claims of German Jews resulting from the outbursts are confiscated for the Reich's benefit; Fifth, further drastic measures 'for the elimination of Jews from German economic life and the removal of provocatory (*sic*) conditions' will be issued shortly." In addition, *TNYT* attempted to convert into US dollars, the 1 billion RM fee imposed on German Jews. "It is difficult to translate the 1,000,000,000-mark fine into an American equivalent. While the German official rate is around 40 cents, which would appear to make a total of 400,000,000, there are at least eight issues of marks. The tourist one sells for about 22 ½ cents and other ones can be bought outside Germany at six to the dollar, or less than 17 cents."
[58] *Ibid.*
[59] *Ibid.*

> Experts from the Reich Chamber of Culture, accompanied by members of the Secret Police, today made a tour of homes of formerly wealthy Jews and removed works of art. They were taken in trucks to the National Museum here. This action was foreshadowed in Interior Minister Adolf Wagner's speech Friday, when he said works of art would have to be preserved for the Reich. The work of the experts and police today was made easier because at the time they registered their property under Field Marshall Hermann Goering's April decree the Jews were required to declare antiques, paintings, china, etc.[60]

In addition, as the forced emigration of German Jews continued, referred to by *TNYT* as the "…policy of 'liquidating' the Jewish question by the Germans' own methods…," Jews faced a predicament that had until then been non-existent.[61] Although the Nazis were insistent the German Jews emigrate, new restrictions effectively prevented any emigration. *TNYT* summarized their predicament, stating that

> Pending the completion of this expropriation, virtually all emigration of propertied Jews has been stopped through the simple expedient of refusing tax payment certificates, without which they cannot leave – which means that for the present virtually all Jews in Germany are being held as hostages both for the good behavior of Jews everywhere and for payment of the reprisal levies imposed on them. Current reports speak of a list of several hundred wealthier Jews who reportedly will never be permitted to leave Germany.[62]

Held prisoners in Germany, *TNYT* began reporting that Jews were being murdered, with brazon disregard of public knowledge.[63] Twice, before the end of the year, Otto Tolischus utilized words predicting the fate of German, and European Jews –

---

[60] *New York Times*, "Munich Jews' Art Taken," November 18, 1938, 3.
[61] "Reich Insists Jews Depart Penniless." Justifying the current emigration policy, *TNYT* reported Goebbel's position: "…because of the participation of the settlement and transit countries, which quite understandably refuse to pay the whole cost of the 'Jewish migration' out of their own pockets, while the always overly clever Jews, in conformity with their usual business smartness, have no intention of paying for their racial comrades, which in the last analysis means for themselves. …If this beautiful hope were to be nullified Germany would have to allow Jews emigrating from the Reich to take a percentage of 'their' possessions with them for their new settlement. We can already reveal to them that this hope will not be fulfilled because the Third Reich is neither so stupid nor so inconsistent as to give Judah even one little finger because there is involved not 'Jewish wealth' but German money which Ahasuerus swindled, extorted and otherwise drew from the pockets of German racial comrades somewhere or at some time in the Reich. …If the whole world should become anti-Semitic, how would we get rid of our Jews? We want the world to become so friendly to the Jews that it will relieve is of our German Jews."
[62] *Ibid.* See also, Guido Enderis, "Jews' Movements Limited By Nazis," December 1, 1938, 1.
[63] *Ibid.*

extermination, and liquidation. Fearing for the fate of the Jews, Tolischus pleaded for assistance, stating that, "…unless the democracies evacuate the German Jews at once and at their own expense, they will be starved into crime and then exterminated with 'fire and sword'."[64]

Kristallnacht eliminated any hope German Jews had of survival in Germany by planting within the minds of the German people the belief that a "Jewish Question" did exist. In addition, it also shifted the Nazis' drive and resolve, approaching the "Jewish problem" in a swift and brutal manner. The development of a ghetto, *TNYT* reported, appeared to be just one solution.[65] Until a final solution was determined, the Nazis continued to fuel the flame of propaganda by publishing stories regarding the wealth possessed by German Jews, in addition to seeking new methods of removing any form of survival or item of value from German Jews.[66]

Germans eagerly awaited this transition. The eviction of Jews from their apartments and homes, for example, could not occur fast enough. In Berlin, For example, German greed was so pronounced that the authorities had to plead with the eager applicants "…to be patient until the number of apartments eventually to be available was known."[67] Quite

[64] Tolischus, "'Fire and Sword' New Nazi Threat," *New York Times*, November 23, 1938, 1. The term "Fire and Sword" was used again by Tolishus in "Nazis in Final Phase of their War on Jews," *New York Times*, November 27, 1938, 77.
[65] *Ibid.* According to the Schwarze Korps "…The Jews must … be chased out of our dwelling houses and our residential districts and must be quartered in streets and housing blocks where they will be among themselves and come into touch with Germans as little as possible. …In this isolation the parasitic people, confined to themselves and neither willing nor able to work, will become impoverished"
[66] *New York Times*, "Goering Declared a Halt on Attacks," November 25, 1938, 12. See also, "'Fire and Sword' New Nazi Threat," and *New York Times,* "Jewish Flats Causing Scramble," November 28, 1938, 6.
[67] "Jewish Flats Causing Scramble."

often, after being released from a concentration camp, Jews found themselves without a home to return to. Such a case was reported by *TNYT*.[68]

Financial institutions also became accomplices of the Nazi Regime. Not only were bank accounts frozen, the sale of stocks were prohibited by the State. According to *TNYT*, Jews attempting to use stocks to pay the imposed *Kristallnacht* levy should first liquidate their

> … gold, jewelry and art objects…. Financial sources believed the reason for this regulation was that gold and jewelry could be converted readily into badly needed foreign exchange, whereas German securities might find a less ready market.[69]

The uncertainty of 1938 rendered German Jews helpless. Any hope of survival and success were dashed as synagogues were set ablaze and businesses were destroyed. Beyond being sent to concentration camps, losing their livelihoods and possessions, German Jews feared for their lives. As Luise Solmitz summed up, "I always thought, now we have reached the worst point. But now I see it was always just a prelude to the next thing. Now the end is near."[70]

Emigration was generally halted, either by decrees imposed by the State, or by regulations set by consulates.[71] Payment for the damage that was accrued on November 9/10 was denied to Jews, regardless of the protection and relief that insurance would have afforded. Instead, the State would reap the benefits, collecting all payments, since, as *TNYT* reported,"…the Nazis view was that the action of the mobs was a 'force majeure,'

---

[68] Harold Callender, "Nazi Excesses Fall Upon Children Too," *New York Times*, December 22, 1938, 12. "The following dispatch, the third of a series, was sent by a staff correspondent of *The New York Times* after a tour of Germany and Czechoslovakia. It was written in Paris and so was not censured."
[69] "Jews' Movements Limited by Nazis."
[70] Jürgen Matthäus and Mark Roseman (eds.), *Jewish Responses to Persecution, 1933-1946: vol. 1, 193-1938*, (Maryland: Altamira Press, 2010), 353.
[71] Bat-Ami Zucker, *In Search of Refuge: Jews and US Consuls in Nazi Germany, 1933-1941,* (Oregon: Mitchell Vallentine and Company, 2001), 168.

or an inevitable force not unlike and "act of God'."[72] To summarize, Jewish "…fate [was] relentlessly approaching doom."[73]

Overall, *TNYT* coverage of the economic persecution of the Jews from 1936-1938 was more pronounced than its coverage of the April 1, 1933 boycott, and certainly the announcement of the 1935 Nuremberg Laws. While it covered the economic plight of the German Jews, its focus on *Kristallnacht* could have been more complete. While it is possible that *TNYT* failed to fully describe the events of that night for fear of being perceived as "too Jewish," its extensive mention and use of the words "Jew" and "anti-Semitism" would seem to weaken the theory – or, at the very least minimize it. This includes the language used in describing the persecution of the Jews. One seldom reads the words "Holocaust," "liquidate," and "exterminate" without conjuring up a less than favorable image of the fate of German Jewry. But, is this projection valid? Could someone in 1938 understand the words in the same manner as someone in 2011? Does retrospective knowledge dictate the interpretation? If it does, does it minimize the impact of the reports provided by *TNYT*?

[72] "No Regret Voiced."
[73] Matthäus and Roseman, 353.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

The economic persecution of the Jews did not end at the end of 1938 – it only intensified. Before the outbreak of war on September 1939, even more Jewish property was confiscated by the state. Marion Kaplan cited various examples of how German Jews "lost" their property to bribes or even because of legislation. If a Jew was planning to emigrate, for example, bribes were generally paid to the various state agencies, to "…Gestapo agents, civil servants, packers, and even people in foreign consulates…."[1] Far beyond "banal bureaucrats who were just 'taking orders'," Kaplan stated, "many government officials were highly corrupt, relishing their new roles."[2] As survivor Lola Blonder recalled,

> They. . . took whatever little objects they liked-from the wall, . . . from the tables. . . . I was used to this by now. Whenever a group of Nazis visited, they helped themselves to . . . valuables. Robbing, robbing! Every day robbing me! later, they took her to the bank, where they forced her to withdraw her money and give it to them.[3]

[1] Marion A. Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 72.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Ibid.*

Within Germany, new interpretations of previous legislation helped the state collect an unprecedented amount of wealth from deported Jews. Using the 11th Implementation Decree of the Reich Citizenship Law, for example, German Jews being deported to the East were considered to be "living abroad" and "compelled to sign away their assets to the Reich before being deported."[4]

"Ordinary Germans" also relished, and benefitted handsomely, from the economic persecution of German Jews. *TNYT* correspondents, in addition to survivors, cited several examples of state sponsored auctions taking place throughout Germany.[5] The attendance rate during these auctions undermines the ever-present notion that "no one participated, no one knew." As a young Aryan man later recalled

> I overtook Frau Lachmann and another woman, who were carrying a rolled-up rug . . . Their faces were covered with sweat as they stopped for a moment to breathe. Frau Lachmann shouted that I should tell my mother that genuine Persian rugs were being auctioned off for next to nothing at the Hotel Bavarian Court. She shouted, 'Tell her to hurry, the best things were already gone!'
> But my mother knew already about the Persian rugs. Frau Beyer was there, talking to her. Frau Beyer had bought three of them 'cheap as dirt'; she said over and over again in a firm voice that they had been bought 'legally, very legally, everything was in the open!' -that the government itself had sold them, 'therefore there was nothing to worry about.'
> . . . Nobody explained anything to me; my eyes and ears gathered innuendoes from the air. The rugs, the silver, the furs had a dark origin. Nevertheless, they made everybody happy! The objects had fallen 'out of the blue,' a fantasy come true. They made Frau Beyer stutter and perspire with excitement, yet on the

---

[4] Francis R. Nicosia and Jonathan Huener (eds.), *Business and Industry in Nazi Germany*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2004), 28.

[5] See Laurel Leff, *Buried By The Times: The Holocaust and America's Most Important Newspaper*. (Cambridge: University Press, 2005), 71; Martin Dean, *Robbing the Jews*, (Cambridge: University Press, 2008), 160, 291; Richard Lawrence Miller, *Nazi Justiz: Law of the Holocaust,* (Connecticut: Westport, 1995), 100, 110-111, 129; Avi Becker (ed.), *The Plunder of Jewish Property During the Holocaust: Confronting European History*, (New York: New York University Press, 2001), 48-49; Office of United States Chief of Counsel for Prosecution of Axis Criminality, *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression, vol. 1*, (Washington: United States Printing Office, 1946),188-189; Jörg Friedrich, "The Apartment Keys Are to be Relinquished to the House Manager: The Cannibalization of Jewish Estates" in Jörg Wollenberg (ed.), *The German Public and the Persecution of the Jews, 1933-1945: "No One Participated, No One Knew,"*(Humanities Press International, 1996), 142-143; and Francis R. Nicosia and David Scrase, *Jewish Life in Nazi Germany: Dilemmas and Responses*, (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 128-129.

> streets one didn't talk about them. . . . All around me in other homes that winter there were ghosts: they had slipped in with certain objects that made the apartments shine. These objects had a suspect character to them-my mother said so. I was afraid to touch them. The objects belonged to mysterious 'others.' They radiated something I could not understand.[6]

Insofar as the economic persecution of German, and eventually European, Jewry was concerned, "everyone participated, everyone knew" seems more appropriate. From "Aryanization," to deportation, many Jews saw their property being divvied up amongst their countrymen like "… jackals over a carcase (*sic*)."[7]

As Germany began to expand throughout Europe, Jewish wealth became spoils for the taking. Many Nazi supporters took it upon themselves to acquire Jewish property well before becoming occupied by Germany. In Austria, for example, *TNYT* reported that

> The plight of the Jews in Austria [was] much worse than that of the Jews in Germany at the worst period there. In Austria, over night, Vienna's 200,000 Jews were made free game for mobs, despoiled of their property, deprived of police protection, ejected from employment and barred from sources of relief.[8]

While in Poland, where expropriation policies began as early as 1938, Polish citizens saw it fit to rob, kill, and/or act as a direct link to the inevitable murder of Jews.[9] As Martin Dean assessed, "...right from the start, the invasion of Poland was accompanied by economic plunder on an unprecedented scale."[10] Few non- Jewish Poles required the

---

[6] Miller, 129.
[7] *Ibid.*
[8] G.E.R. Gedye, "Nazi Terrorism in Austria Barred; Vienna Arrests are Put at 34,000," *New York Times*, April 3, 1938, 1. See also Deborah Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaust, 1933-1945*, (New York: The Free Press, 1986), 87.
[9] *New York Times*, "Terror In Poland Reported By Jews," August 11, 1936, 4. Quoting the words of Polish Foreign Prime Minister, *TNYT* stated "The whole Jewish congress is besought to aid the Polish Jews. Anti-Semitic agitation is indoctrinating large sections of the population, especially the youth, who are seeking the destruction of Polish Jewry by physical terror and an economic boycott of extraordinary proportions. Anti-Semitic agitation is making the Jews the scapegoats for the country's ills and has led to the loss of Jewish life and property. … There is no employment for Jews in State and municipal jobs. Additional burdens are imposed by the compulsory Sunday-closing law. The pauperization of Polish Jewry is rapidly bringing about an indescribable poverty. … Most recently our justified demands for the means of existence have been countered with the reply that we should leave this country."
[10] Dean, 177.

protection that the Nazi legislation afforded to proceed with their confiscation of Jewish property. That being said, once Germany became the occupation force, Jews found themselves even more at the mercy of their non-Jewish countrymen. "Rescuing" and "helping" Jews escape the Nazis also functioned as a method of expropriation. Safety was directly linked to the amount of liquid assets a Jew possessed. Unable to pay for the assistance and silence of their countrymen, Jews were either turned over to the Germans, or turned away.[11] As Miller stated,

> Police offered rewards to anyone revealing property that could be confiscated, an opportunity to turn a profit while settling private grudges. Citizens who betrayed a hiding Jew might receive one-third of the Jew's property. Himmler noted that such rewards could total thousands of Reichsmarks for the informer.[12]

Jewish wealth became a topic of public and state interest. The policy of expropriation was so prolific that few, if any, failed to benefit from it. Even if one was, in theory, privately opposed to the persecution of German Jews, they were more than willing to ignore bullet holes or the presence of Star of David on clothing given them during the war.[13]

Auschwitz proved to be one of the more lucrative locations for acquiring Jewish property for guards and the Reich.[14] What little property Jews still possessed, including their hair and clothes, were removed, acquired by and for the Reich.[15] In 1943 alone,

> … 824 freight cars full of textiles and leather goods stolen during the extermination of the Jews left Auschwitz. Most of these goods were too worn for any other use but industrial recycling, especially the "rags" (*Lumpen*), of which

---

[11] Maria Countess von Maltzan, "Hiding at the Home of Strangers" in Wöllenberg, 37.
[12] Miller, 130.
[13] Jörg Friedrich in Wöllenberg, 147.
[14] Linda Hunt, 2005, "Corruption," Disk 4. *Auschwitz: Inside the Nazi State*, DVD, London: BBC. See also Disk 2, "Orders and Initiatives," and Disk 3, "Factories of Death."
[15] For more on who benefitted and how, see Tadeusz, Iwaszko & Helena, Kubica & Piper, Franciszek, & Irena, Strzelecka & Andrzej, Strzelecki, *Auschwitz, 1940-1945, vol. 2: The Prisoners, Their Life and Work,* Translated from the Polish by William Brand, (The Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum, 2000).

> 569 carloads were received by the Reich economic ministry. Hundreds of thousands of pieces of men's, women's and children's clothing, bedding, tablecloths, towels and other items were sent, in 211 freight cars…. The remaining 44 freight cars full of clothing and footwear were sent to other concentration camps, to the IG Farbenindustrie plant in Auschwitz-Monowitz, to the Todt Organization in Riga, and to paramilitary Nazi youth groups. The IG Farbenindustrie plant, for instance, received 4,000 men's suits.[16]

The sheer amount of wealth that was accumulated in Auschwitz alone defies the imagination.[17] While estimates of the amount of Jewish wealth can be inferred, as can the number of victims of the Nazis, the exact number may never be precisely established.

The importance of the expropriation of Jewish wealth in post 1938 Germany and Europe cannot be denied. It is, however, beyond the scope of this work, as the majority of these practices were not fully reported until well after WWII. What was known between 1933-1938, on the other hand, was limited to what was presented by the media. During that period the American public had at its disposal various methods of obtaining information – radio, television, film, and newspaper. The latter, it could be argued, reached the largest population. Of those in existence, *TNYT* was, and continues to be, viewed as "Americas most important newspaper."

Laurel Leff and Deborah Lipstadt have presented contradictory assessments regarding *TNYT* representation of the Holocaust and its treatment of the persecution of the Jews. Did *TNYT* fail to accurately represent the persecution of the Jews and the Holocaust, or was its presentation "relatively good?"[18] Between condemnation and praise, a question

---

[16] *Ibid*., 156-157.

[17] *Ibid.,*169. "Nazi documents contain too little information to make even a tentative estimate of the profits that the Nazis derived from plundering the victims of the Auschwitz concentration camp. Two items might serve, however, as pointers: On October 23, 1942, the Polish Government-in-Exile's Home Delegation estimated that Jews from France and Holland had been looted of gold and valuables worth sixty million marks at Auschwitz. A member of the camp staff, Fritz Bergmann, estimated the value of the diamonds shipped out of Auschwitz at one billion marks. It seems reasonable to assume that the value of the looting carried out by the SS at Auschwitz must have run, at the very least, into the hundreds of millions of marks."

[18] Leff, 9.

emerged: when did the Holocaust begin? Both have, for the most part, limited their definition of the Holocaust as beginning during *Kristallnacht* and extending through 1945, neglecting the previous five years. In doing so, their analysis of *TNYT* was limited, their assessment incomplete. If the pre-1938 period was more completely researched, would it yield similar results? Did *TNYT* fail to accurately portray the plight of German Jewry? Can researching the reports of *TNYT* between 1933-1938, provide a clearer understanding of its presentation of the persecution of German Jewry? Primarily, how did it represent the economic persecution of the Jews?

What my research found was that *TNYTs'* representation of the economic persecution of German Jewry surpassed the standards set by Leff and Lipstadt. Not only did it repeatedly refer to German Jews as "German Jews," it made no effort to cloak the various persecution policies and tactics implemented by the Nazi government. It referred to the April 1, 1933 boycott, the announcement and implications of the Nuremberg Laws, and *Kristallnacht* as the destruction of German Jewry's influence in the German economy as well as their personal financial ruin. Despite the restrictions imposed by the Nazi regime on the press, particularly the foreign press, *TNYT* consistently reported on the continuing persecution as well as the chaos of the period.

In regards to the April 1 boycott, *TNYT* even went so far as to state that the Nazis had not fully understood the ramifications of their actions against the Jews and made clear statements about its incompetence. Economics dictated the results of the boycott, and the reason for its end.

> It is entirely likely that the foreign protests against the persecution of Jews in Germany made it appear to persons more experienced in government that the Nazi members of the Cabinet that the Reich stood to lose enormously materially through the further development of anti-Semitism; witness the fall in German

> securities last week not only in Berlin but in other financial capitals. It is also possible that the Monarchists and Hugenberg Nationalists, who were the Nazis' running mates in the last election, intervened with the Hitlerites. Hugenberg's supporters in big industry might well have been more discerning about the ultimate effect on the boycott than the overenthusiastic Nazis. In any event, regardless of the cause, it is apparent that the Nazis are seeking a way out of the mess they created.[19]

Such reports provided by *TNYT* left little doubt about the intent and result of the boycott. Note that the term anti-Semitism was utilized, in direct contradiction to the claims made by Leff and Lipstadt.

Anti-Semitism was often used in describing the reasons behind the economic persecution of German Jews. Jews were being persecuted for being Jews- because of their perceived power, their positions within the German economy, and the stereotypic belief that Jews possessed great wealth. The Nazi policy of persecution that had been established well before 1933 only intensified between 1933-1938. As *TNYT* reported,

> …there was a general feeling that the time had come to settle an account with "persons who, rightly or wrongly, the new Germany thinks misled and cheated the people." This is tacit endorsement of all the furious outcries against the Jews with which Hitler has been filling the air for years, and is, moreover, an implied condonation (*sic.*) of crimes committed in the name of anti-Semitism. Herr Göring tries to slip away by asserting that the assaults and robberies and imprisonments had been not of Jews but of Socialists or Communists.[20]

During 1933 alone, *TNYT* reported that, despite some setbacks, including the continued patronage of Jewish shops, the persecution of German Jews had been so successful that German nationals living in the United States were being influenced by the hopes of acquiring the newly "abandoned" Jewish property. After the legislation of April 7, 1933, *TNYT* reported the conversion of teachers into National Socialists, in order to obtain

---

[19] Edwin L. James, "The Nazis Begin to Dodge Anti-Semitic Boomerang," *New York Times*, April 2, 1933, E1.
[20] *New York Times*, "Excuses that Excuse," March 27, 1933, 14.

positions previously held by German Jews. And by 1934, it was reporting on their treatment of Jewish students.[21]

Despite its continuous direct statements regarding the fate of German Jews, *TNYT* seemed to neglect certain areas, including the Nuremberg Laws and the events of *Kristallnacht*; both events could have benefited from additional analysis and reporting. The Nuremberg Laws, for example, were initially reported in a sporadic manner. Although *TNYT* mentioned the term "Nuremberg Laws," only in passing during 1935, its report on their impact on German Jewry was not ignored completely. On the contrary, *TNYT* repeatedly reported on the plight of German Jews. The contradiction in its reporting was confusing. Why report on the results of the Nuremberg Laws but not the cause, or its direct impact? Is it possible that there was not enough information on the new legislation, resulting in a *TNYT* failure to report? Or was there another explanation?

This failure to report adequately about Nazi persecution of Jews has been argued by Leff and Lipstadt. While Leff claimed that it was due, in part, to *TNYT* drive to mask Jewish issues, Lipstadt claimed that too much emphasis was placed on trying to excuse the Nazis action rather than focusing on the persecution. Perhaps, she argues, the lack of coverage was due to the pro-German sentiments of many correspondents of *TNYT*. Evidence proves otherwise. Insofar as the economic persecution of German Jewry is concerned, the post Nuremberg coverage would seem to contradict both of these theories. What is more likely is that the laws were still in a state of transition, which *TNYT* readily

[21] *New York Times*, "Nazi Persecution of Liberals Rises," March 5, 1934, 10. One case came to notice when sports were being organized at a school. The teacher wished to keep out all Jewish children. One Jewish boy was forced to stand before the class and repeat aloud, "I don't want to play," although he was just as eager to be in the fun as the others. If any complaint were lodged, the teacher had the whole class to witness that the child had told everybody that he did not want to play.

stated. It did, however, mention, repeatedly, the implication of various laws on German Jews during 1935. These included the determination of German Jews as "second-class citizens," the "liquidation" of German Jews from the German economy, and the development of the anti-Jewish "Ghetto Laws." All dealt with the economic strangulation of German Jewry. The following summarizes the coverage of the Nuremberg Laws and its implications. According to *TNYT*:

> The anti-Jewish "ghetto laws," the pride and symbol of Nazi Kultur in the Third Reich, are scheduled to be supplemented and completed next week by a proclamation of economic restrictions on Jews.
> According to the best available information, the economic laws are so drastic they will leave the Jews only a slim basis for a bare existence as second-class citizens without political rights and with inferior legal rights. Whether this basis will be broad enough for their ultimate survival only the future can reveal.
> According to Nazi doctrine the laws are merely milestones on the road to realization of the Nazi program which calls for the "liquidation" of the Jewish question and if the laws do not go far enough new ones may be passed at any time or the old ones may be ignored with impunity by the more zealous party members. No courts are entitled to review the "political" acts of the local Nazi chieftains, who are amendable only to Nazi discipline.
> The second factor … forcing moderation is the growing economic distress and the rising unemployment, to which the rapid liquidation of Jewish enterprises has contributed. Employes (*sic*) of Jewish shops and factories protested and forced Dr. Robert Ley, leader of the German Labor Front, to come to Dr. Schacht's aid.
> More concessions are expected to appear in the economic laws and the most important of them is expected to be that Jews will be permitted to remain as "enterprise leaders," managing their own businesses. Heretofore Nazis contended it was beneath the dignity of the neo-Germanic "master man" to work at Jews' orders, but economic necessity supposedly has won this dogma.
> This would imply that some Jewish enterprises, especially the still healthy shops and department stores in big cities, might remain intact. Aside from this, however, new disabilities are considered certain.
> Among the disabilities mentioned are the following:
> First – Barring Jews from acquiring real estate in Germany except by special permission, which presumably will be granted only when necessary to keep existing enterprises going.
> Second – A prohibition against the Jews in smaller and medium-sized villages and towns. Since the few Jewish shop owners in such places have already been ruined by the boycott and are rapidly moving out, this prohibition amounts to the exclusion of all Jews.

> Third – Limitation of Jews in the professions to a percentage corresponding to the percentage of Jews in the whole population, although some of those already practicing in those professions may be continued temporarily because of the growing shortage of jurists and physicians. The exclusion of these limitations among jurists is already being discussed at a session of the juridical organization called by Justice Minister Franz Guertner.
> Fourth – The prohibition barring Nazi party members from buying in Jewish stores is certain to remain, but whether as a consequence Jewish stores will be specially marked as such and whether the prohibition will be extended to government officials remains to be seen.
> Meanwhile, however, the "liquidation" of Jewish enterprises and capital holdings, involving many millions of marks, continues at an accelerating pace. The industrious *Deutsche Bergwerkszeitung* has just published almost a column long, but admittedly incomplete, list of capital stock transfers, most of which it says were due to racial considerations.
> Some of them, as in the case of the "fusion" of the Rhenish Mortgage Bank, are carried through with financial aid from the State, but many are financed by small new private banks, suggesting that somebody is profiting from the transactions. Sometimes these transactions result in curious combinations, such as when the Fritz Cohen textile works in Munich was acquired by the Schmitz & Loh Company, a margarine factory.
> According to the same paper, the capital needed to purchase the many small establishments, especially the Jewish shops and factories in smaller towns so far advertised for sale in the principal newspapers, will amount to more than 50,000,000 marks.
> But for those who manage to save something from the sale of their property Nazi Germany supposedly is preparing two new blows. One is said to be a decree refusing to honor the German banknotes circulating abroad on the grounds that they must have been smuggled out of the country.
> The importation of such notes, sold abroad at a discount of 30 per cent or more, has already been declared to be "unwanted." This would more or less effectively halt one mentioned by which some Jewish capital has fled.
> A second blow is said to be a further restriction on the employment of blocked marks accounts. The larger part of the proceeds from Jewish sales must be deposited in such blocked accounts, which heretofore could be sold abroad even if at a large discount, but which henceforth will be utilized more intensively for financing German rearmament.[22]

Coverage of the Nuremberg Laws continued well into 1936 and 1937. Not once did *TNYT* attempt to hide or mislead the public of the events and the intensifying drive towards German Jews.

[22] Otto D. Tolischus, "New Jewish Laws Ready in Germany," *New York Times*, November 21, 1935, 15.

TNYT's coverage of *Kristallnacht* mimicked that of the Nuremberg Laws. The events of November 9/10 were covered only briefly, yet they spoke volumes about the persecution and destruction that was inflicted on German Jews. Repeatedly, *TNYT* discussed the financial distress caused by the destruction of *Kristallnacht*, including the collection of insurance payments by the state, the atonement tax and further levies on Jewish finances, in addition to the increasing rate of "Aryanizations." Still, despite these articles, *TNYT* did not fully cover all of the persecution tactics implemented by the Nazis. For example, the Flight Tax was not discussed until 1938, despite its implementation and renewed interpretation during early 1933. *TNYT* also ignored the legislation being enforced upon Eastern European Jews as early as 1933, the deportation of Polish Jews in 1938, its direct impact on *Kristallnacht*, in addition to the effect of "Aryanizations" on Jewish business owners.

TNYT coverage of the economic persecution of German Jews was, for the most past, successful in describing the destruction and chaos of the period. Its coverage made it impossible to ignore the plight of German Jews between 1933-1938. Not once during this five-year period did *TNYT* mask the intentions of Nazis towards their Jewish countrymen. Not once did it use euphemisms for Jewish victims – as far as *TNYT* was concerned, Jews were "Jews," and nothing else – a direct contradiction of the claims made by Leff and Lipstadt.

The claims made against *TNYT* regarding their placement were substantiated during this period, to a certain extent. Insofar as the economic persecution of German Jews was concerned, the majority of the reports were placed within the first ten pages of the *TNYT*. Of the 116 articles consulted, sixty-one were located in the first ten pages; twenty-nine

were located on the first page alone. Less than a third were located beyond page twenty, or within its "recesses." Even fewer were limited to a couple lines, or even a paragraph, as was suggested by Leff and Lipstadt. With few exceptions, the reports provided by *TNYT* spanned anywhere from one to two pages. Titles such as "New Jewish Laws Ready in Germany," "Reich Intensifies Anti-Semitic Drive," "Anti-Jewish Raids Continue in Berlin," or "Goering Starts Final Liquidation of Jewish Property in Germany" presented the reader a brief, though important, glimpse of the focus of the report – leaving little to the imagination. Even if any doubt existed regarding the focus of the article, words like "liquidation," "extermination," "Holocaust" only emphasized the economic plight of German Jews.

The question remains, what could American citizens learn from *TNYT* regarding the economic plight of German Jewry? Could Americans have successfully assessed the economic plight of German Jewry from reports made by the foreign correspondents of *TNYT*? The answer is yes. This answer, however, comes with the benefit of hindsight. While *TNYT* presented in a clear and concise manner the majority of the events and legislation taking place in Germany against Jewish economic concerns, there is simply no way of knowing that people cared to act. Even now, while living in a world plagued with social and news media, we tend to care little and act even less for the people suffering around the world. Did we care about the genocide that took place in Rwanda? Do we care about the genocide currently taking place in Darfur? Should Americans have cared more about the plight of the Jews? Did anti-Semitism play a role in American's perception of the Jewish plight?

It is difficult to assess how important readers of *TNYT* found the economic plight of German Jews, particularly in a society plagued with its own racial problems. While many Jews and Jewish organizations followed the developing situation in Germany, few Jewish individuals with influence, such as Arthur Sulzberger, assisted in the emigration of German Jews. Regardless, should an American reader have been interested in following the plight of German Jewry, *TNYT* would have presented more than sufficient, if not above average, coverage. This newspaper kept, at the very least throughout the 1930s, to the standards that it had set for itself since 1896.

The discrepancy that results from this research and the research of both Leff and Lipstadt could be due to the specific focus of each of our topics. However, I contend that their claims that *TNYT* failed to accurately and appropriately cover the Holocaust are misleading. It is unreasonable to begin researching, or focus the bulk of research five years after the Nazis' rise to power, and claim that the coverage of events that led to the Holocaust were flawed. In Leff's and Lipstadt's defense, much of the emphasis and research on the Nazis economic persecution of German Jewry was of little interest until only recently. Had it been, it is possible that glaring oversights could, or would, have been noticed. For example, Lipstadt criticized *TNYT* for attempting to explain the reasons behind the persecution of German Jews in an article entitled, "Anti-Semites Firmly in the Saddle." "Even the *New York Times*," she stated,

> whose front-page headline proclaimed "Anti-Semites Firmly in the Saddle" and whose reporters had been arguing that it was Hitler and his followers' power, not vulnerability, which led them to this new radical offensive, fell prey to the 'weakness, not strength' interpretation. In an editorial it surmised that 'all is not going well' within Hitler's regime and the Reichsführer's 'power seems to be waning'.[23]

[23] Deborah Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaust, 1933-1945*, (New York: The Free Press, 1986), 87.

What was overlooked, however, was of significant importance. According to *TNYT*,

> There has been a lull today in the more violent aspects of the persecution that had so suddenly burst again upon the Jews of Germany. But it may be taken for granted that the lull is merely temporary.
> Events of the last four days have abundantly proved what has frequently been indicated in the dispatches of The New York Times, namely, that under her present rulers Germany is no longer a land in which any self-respecting person of Jewish race or ancestry may find comfort, happiness or security.
> Yet to leave Germany, at the cost of having some more hospitable country, is as difficult to Jews as is continued existence here.
> If they go they must leave behind them everything in the way of property that lifetimes of industry and thrift may have enabled them to acquire. … To stay here and endure, or to go facing unknown but certain hardships: it is a hard choice. Nevertheless the evidence accumulates that this is the choice facing the unfortunate people, who are being assaulted in public places in the German capital, chased through the streets, pursued even into the resorts supposed to be reserved for them, boycotted in business and scorned in social life. Anti-Semitism in its worst form is in the saddle here and there is nothing-save, perhaps, some echo of world opinion – to exercise the least check upon it. And it is spreading from Berlin to other cities.[24]

With limited focus and direction, is it appropriate to blame *TNYT* for failing to accurately represent the plight of German Jews? Similarly, is it appropriate to blame it for not focusing enough attention on "Jewish" issues? Insofar as the economic plight of the Jews was concerned, there is little evidence to substantiate the claim that *TNYT* did not sufficiently and accurately represent the persecution of the German Jewry. As this research has shown, *TNYT* presented ample evidence to the American public regarding the economic plight of German Jewry. Blaming *TNYT* for America's failure to act on behalf of European Jewry in the 1930s is grossly inappropriate. The problem, perhaps, could lay in the definition of when the trajectory for the Holocaust began. The persecution of European Jewry during WWII, however, cannot be separated from the

[24] Frederick T. Birchall, "Anti-Semites Firmly in the Saddle," *New York Times*, July 24, 1935, 1.

economic persecution of German Jewry that began well before the April 1st boycott of 1933.

In the end, the blame for America's failure to act against the persecution of the Jews should not be placed solely on *TNYT*. Doing so opens up a series of issues regarding responsibility to act. Should TNYT be responsible for the anti-Semitism of the period, or even for FDR's unwillingness or inability to allow more Jewish refugees entrance into the United States? Even before 1933 TNYT discussed frankly the developing situation in Germany and continued to do so well after *Kristallnacht*. Reaction to their reports should not be placed on it for, as Arthur Sulzberger stated, " We journalists tell the public which way the cat is jumping. The public will take care of the cat."[25]

[25] Arthur Hays Sulzberger. BrainyQuote.com, Xplore Inc, 2011. http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/a/arthur_hays_sulzberger.html (accessed January 24, 2011).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

The New York Times, 1933-1938

Authored Articles:

Birchall, Frederick, T. "Boycott Spreads Through Reich," *New York Times*, March 30, 1933, 1.

- "German Business Protests Boycott," *New York Times*, March 31, 1933, 1.

- "Boycott at an End, Germany Believes; Cabinet Against it," *New York Times*, April 3, 1933, 1.

- "Nazis See Victory in their Boycott," *New York Times*, April 4, 1933, 1.

- "Third German Reich Fully Established," *New York Times*, April 24, 1933, 5.

- "German Tighten Anti-Jewish Bans," *New York Times,* May 28, 1935, 5.

- "Anti-Semites Firmly in the Saddle as Persecution Spreads in the Reich." *New York Times*, June 24, 1935, 1.

- "Reich Puts Laws on Jews in Force; Trade Untouched," *New York Times*, November 16, 1935, 1.

- "Condition of Jews is Acute in Poland," *New York Times*, April 24, 1936, 11.

Callender, Harold, "Nazi Excesses Fall Upon Children Too," *New York Times*, December 22, 1938, 12.

Enderis, Guido, “Jews’ Movements Limited By Nazis,” *New York Times*, December 1, 1938, 1.

Gedye, G.E.R. “Crowds Re-Enter Stores in Munich,” *New York Times*, April 4, 1933, 12.

- “Bavaria is Swinging to the Nazi Regime,” *New York Times*, April 23, 1933, 13.

- “Nazi Terrorism in Austria Barred; Vienna Arrests are Put at 34,000,” *New York Times*, April 3, 1938, 1.

James, Edwin L. “Herr Hitler’s Nazis Hear an Echo of World Opinion,” *New York Times*, March 26, 1933, E1.

- “The Nazis Begin to Dodge Anti-Semitic Boomerang,” *New York Times,* April 2, 1933, E1.

McCormick, Anne O’Hare, “Hitler Threatened by Extremists Nazis; Outbreaks Feared,” *New York Times*, July 24, 1933, 1.

Taylor, Edmund, “German Jailings Spread Terror,” *New York Times*, March 27, 1933, 1.

Tolischus, Otto D., “Hitler Will Seize Property of Foes,” *New York Times*, July 15, 1933, 1.

- “Nazi Press Pushes New War on Jews,” *New York Times,* March 13, 1934, 30.

- “Schacht Protests to Hitler on Press,” *New York Times*, August 22, 1935, 1.

- “Hitler Due to List New Laws on Jews,” *New York Times*, September 1, 1935, 12.

- “Storm Troopers Push War on Jews,” *New York Times*, September 4, 1935, 14.

- "Nazi Seize Jews Re-Entering Reich," *New York Times*, October 10, 1935, 13.

- "Nazis Told to End Anti-Jewish Acts," *New York Times*, November 5, 1935, 18.

- "New Jewish Laws Ready in Germany," *New York Times*, November 21, 1935, 15.

- "Reich Jews Plead for Haven Abroad," *New York Times*, November 27, 1935, 11.

- "New Decrees Against Jews," *New York Times*, November 13, 1938, 1.

- "Reich Insists Jews Depart Penniless," *New York Times*, November 20, 1938, 1.

- "'Fire and Sword' New Nazi Threat," *New York Times*, November 23, 1938, 1.

- "Nazis in Final Phase of their War on Jews," *New York Times*, November 27, 1938, 77.

Un-Authored Articles:

"Nazis Hunt Arms in Einstein Home," March 21, 1933, 10.

"Calls Hitler a Menace," March 23, 1933, 20.

"Germans Aroused by Attacks Abroad; Deny Wide Violence," March 26, 1933, 1.

"Excuses that Excuse," March 27, 1933, 14.

"Boycott Manifesto Includes 11 Orders," March 29, 1933, 8.

"Says Nazis Want Jobs," March 30, 1933, 12.

"Jews' Jobs Sought For Nazi Backers," March 31, 1933, 15.

"Nazis Lay Boycott to 'Lies' of Jews," April 1, 1933, 10.

"Whips Crowd Into Frenzy," April 1, 1933, 10.

"Goebbels Warns Jews," April 2, 1933, 14.

"Women Urge 'Holy War' on Jews," April 2, 1933, 29.

"Berlin Jew Denies 'Atrocity' Stories'," April 2, 1933, 28.

"Expects Further Clash," April 3, 1933, 8.

"Rule By Aryan Decreed," April 9, 1933, 12.

"Anti-Semitism Held Return to Savagery," April 10, 1933, 11.

"Boycott Declared Ruin to Reich Jews," April 12, 1933, 16.

"3,000,000 in Reich Feel 'Cold Pogrom," April 16, 1933, 21.

"Anti-Semites' Rise in Germany Traced," April 24, 1933, 13.

"Seeks New Homes for Nazis' Victims," May 22, 1933, 11.

"Hitler Seeks Jobs for All Germans," July 10, 1933, 1.

"Handicaps of Jews in Reich Detailed," October 16, 1933, 4.

"Small Hopes Seen By Jews in Reich," December 24, 1933, 1.

"Nazis Deny Holding 215,000 Party Foes," January 18, 1934, 8.

"Nazi Persecution of Liberals Rises," March 4, 1934, 10.

"New Drives Aimed at Jews in Reich," March 21, 1934, 10.

"Rabid Nazi Push Drive on the Jews," April 1, 1934, E1.

"Nazis 'Aryanize' Big Liberal Paper," June 1, 1934, 2.

"Nazis Fear Party Purge," January 6, 1935, 19.

"Nazis to Define Citizenship," August 11, 1935, E4.

"Troopers' Parade Answers Schacht," August 23, 1935, 9.

"Nazi Tells of Protest," September 15, 1935, 23.

"Hope of Reich Jews Is Dimmed By Events," September 22, 1935, E1.

"Jews in Reich Barred by Engineers' Group," October 1, 1935, 18.

"Berlin Works Out Anti-Jewish Laws," October 2, 1935, 6.

"Nazi Treatment of Jews," October 6, 1935, *Question Marks*, 66.

"Two Germans Punished After Attacks on Jews," October 14, 1935, 1.

"'Aryan' Youths Ask Jewish Home Jobs," November 14, 1935, 10.

"Germany Admits Factory Seizure," December 23, 1935, 8.

"Nazi Ruling Outlaws New Jewish Lawyers," February 23, 1936, 30.

"Reich Intensifies Anti-Semitic Drive," March 2, 1936, 10.

"Anti-Semitic Move Arises in Austria," March 30, 1936, 3.

"Bernhard Says Nazis Now Crush All Jews," June 30, 1936, 8.

"Terror In Poland Reported By Jews," August 11, 1936, 4.

"Denies Nazis Curb Jews from Hatred," June 27, 1937, 23.

"Nazis Will Defend Germans Abroad," November 28, 1937, 33.

" Exile of All Jews from Reich Seen," December 19, 1937, 35.

"Goering Starts Final Liquidation of Jewish Property in Germany," April 28, 1938, 1.

"Nazi Property Law Arouses Legations," April 28, 1938, 1.

"Sudden Suicide Wave Breaks Out in Vienna," May 7, 1938, 5.

"Germany Tightens Boycott of Jews," June 18, 1938, 1.

"Goebbels Warns Jews Must Leave," June 22, 1938, 14.

"Germany Tightens Pressure on Jews," August 24, 1938, 1.

"Warns Jews Owning Boarding Houses," September 2, 1938, 2.

"Berlin Raids Reply to Death Envoy," November 10, 1938, 1.

"Jews Are Ordered to Leave Munich," November 11, 1938, 3.

"No Regret Voiced," November 12, 1938, 1.

"Reich Celebrates 'Victory' Over Jews," November 13, 1938, 75.

"Arrests Continued," November 13, 1938, 1.

"Goering Declared a Halt on Attacks," November 25, 1938, 12.

"Jewish Flats Causing Scramble," November 28, 1938, 6.

"Berlin is Awaiting Ruling on Damage," December 5, 1938, 31.

Other Primary Sources

Bahlsen-Cohn, Herta. *My German Lessons, 1915-1939*. New York: Vantage Press, 1995.

Hilberg, Raul., ed. *Documents of Destruction: Germany and Jewry, 1933-1945*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971.

Marrus, Michael., ed. *The Nazi Holocaust, vol. 5: Public Opinion and Relation to the Jews in Nazi Europe*. Wesport: Meckler, 1989.

- *The Nazi Holocaust vol. 8: Bystanders of the Holocaust*. Wesptort: Meckler, 1989.

Matthäus, Jürgen and Roseman, Mark., eds. *Jewish Responses to Persecution, 1933-1946: vol. 1, 1933-1938*. Maryland: Altamira Press, 2010.

Mendelsohn, John. *The Holocaust, vol. 1: Legalizing the Holocaust, The Early Phase, 1933-1939*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1982.

Noakes, Jeremy and Pridham, Geoffrey., eds. *Nazism 1919-1945, Vol. 2: State, Economy and Society 1933-1939*. Exeter: The University of Exeter, 1984.

Office of United States Chief of Counsel for Prosecution of Axis Criminality, *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression, vol. 1*. Washington: United States Printing Office, 1946.

Steinhoff, Johannes, Pechel, Peter and Showalter, Dennis., eds. *Voices From the Third Reich: An Oral History*. Washington D.C: Regnery Gateway, 1989.

Sutters, Jack., ed. *Archives of the Holocaust, vol. 2: American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia, 1932-1939*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1990.

The American Jewish Committee. *The Jews in Nazi Germany: A Handbook of Facts Regarding their Present Situation.* New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1935.

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM)

Secondary Sources

Abzug, Robert H. *America Views the Holocaust, 1933-1945: A Brief Documentary History.* New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999.

Bajohr, Frank. '*Aryanization' in Hamburg: The Economic Exclusion of Jews and the Confiscation of their Property in Nazi Germany*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2002.

Bankier, David. *The Germans and the Final Solution: Public Opinion under Nazism*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1992.

Barkai, Avraham. *From Boycott to Annihilation: The Economic Struggle of German Jews, 1933-1945*. Hanover: University of New England, 1989.

Becker, Avi., ed. *The Plunder of Jewish Property During the Holocaust: Confronting European History*. New York: New York University Press, 2001.

Berenbaum, Michael and Abraham J. Peck, Abraham J., eds. *The Holocaust and History: The Known, The Unknown, The Disputed, and the Re-Examined*. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1998.

Davis, Elmer. *The History of the New York Times*. New York: New York Times, 1921.

Dean, Martin. *Robbing the Jews*. Cambridge: University Press, 2008.

Eisenberg, Azriel. *Witness to the Holocaust*. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1981.

Evans, Richard. *The Third Reich in Power.* New York: Penguin Press, 2005.

Feldman, Gerald D. and Siebel, Wolfgang., eds. *Networks of Nazi Persecution: Bureaucracy, Business and the Organization of the Holocaust*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2005.

- 'Holocaust Assets and German Business History: Beginning or End?'. *German Studies Review*, Vol. 25, No. 1. (February 2002), 24-34.

Friedlander, Saul. *Nazi Germany and the Jews, vol. 1: The Years of Persecution, 1933-1939*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1997.

Gilbert, Martin. *Kristallnacht: Prelude to Destruction*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2006.

Greene, Joshua W. and Kumar, Shiva. *Witness: Voices from the Holocaust*. New York: The Free Press, 2000.

Hamerow, Theodore S. *Why We Watched: Europe, America and the Holocaust*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2008.

Hilberg, Raul. *The Destruction of the European Jews*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books 1967.

Iwaszko, Tadeusz, & Kubica, Helena, & Piper, Franciszek, & Strzelecka, Irena, & Strzelecki, Andrzej. *Auschwitz, 1940-1945, vol. 2: The Prisoners, Their Life and Work.* (Translated from the Polish by William Brand). The Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum, 2000).

James, Harold. *The Deutsche Bank and the Nazi Economic War Against the Jews: The Expropriation of Jewish-Owned Property*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Kaplan, Marion A. *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Kershaw, Ian. *The Persecution of the Jews and German Popular Opinion in the Third Reich*. leobaeck.oxfordjournals.org. [accessed December 31, 2010].

- *Popular Opinion and Political Dissent in the Third Reich: Bavaria 1933-1945*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005.

Leff, Laurel. *Buried By The Times: The Holocaust and America's Most Important Newspaper*. Cambridge: University Press, 2005.

- 'When the Facts Didn't Speak for Themselves: The Holocaust in The New York Times, 1939-1945' in Shapiro, Robert Moses. *Why Didn't the Press Shout: American and International Journalism During the Holocaust*. New Jersey: Yeshiva University Press, 2003.

- 'How the NYT Missed the Story of the Holocaust While It Was Happening.' *History News Network*. April 4, 2005. http://hnn.us/articles/10903.html [accessed February 6, 2011].

Limberg, Margarete and Rübsaat, Hubert., eds. *Germans No More: Accounts of Jewish Everyday Life, 1933-1938*. Translated by Alan Nothnagle. New York: Berghahn Books, 2006.

Lipstadt, Deborah. *Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaust, 1933-1945*. New York: The Free Press, 1986.

Miller, Richard Lawrence. *Nazi Justiz: Law of the Holocaust.* Connecticut: Westport, 1995.

Morse Arthur D. *While Six Million Died: A Chronicle of American Apathy.* New York:Overlook Press, 1968.

Nicosia, Francis R. and Huener, Jonathan., eds. *Business and Industry in Nazi Germany*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2004.

Schleunes, Karl A. *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz: Nazi policy Toward German Jews, 1933-1938*. Chicago: University Press, 1990.

- *Nazi Policy Toward German Jews, 1933-1938*. [Dissertation] Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1966. [Microform]

Sulzberger, Arthur Hays. BrainyQuote.com, Xplore Inc, 2011. http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/a/arthur_hays_sulzberger.html [accessed January 24, 2011].

Soumerian, Eve Nussbaum and Carol D. Schultz. *Daily Life During the Holocaust*, 2nd ed. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2009.

Tifft, Susan E., and Jones, Alex S. *The Trust: The Private Life and Powerful Family Behind The New York Times.* New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1999.

The New Georgia Encyclopedia. 'History and Archeology.' http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/nge/Article.jsp?id=h-906 [accessed on January 26, 2011].

The Truman Library. http://library.truman.edu/microforms/new_york_times.asp [accessed on January 26, 2011].

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

Wollenberg, Jörg., ed. *The German Public and the Persecution of the Jews, 1933-1945: "No One Participated, No One Knew.* Humanities Press International, 1996.

Zucker, Bat- Ami, *In Search of Refuge: Jews and US Consuls in Nazi Germany, 1933-1941.* Oregon: Mitchell Vallentine and Company, 2001.

Other Media:

Linda Hunt, 2005. "Corruption." Disk 4. *Auschwitz: Inside the Nazi State*. DVD. London: BBC.

- "Orders and Initiatives." Disk 2. *Auschwitz: Inside the Nazi State.* DVD. London: BBC.

- "Factories of Death." Disk 3. *Auschwitz: Inside the Nazi State*. DVD. London: BBC.