



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

TITLE "The Reaction of San Francisco Newspapers to Emerging German
Anti-Semitism from January, 1933 to April 7, 1933"

Master's [] Prize Essay []

- Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.**

[illegible]

yes no
Lehel Howard Lipetz
Signature of Author

Microfilmed 7/29/76
Date

Mona Steiner
Signature of Library Staff Member

THE REACTION OF SAN FRANCISCO NEWSPAPERS
TO EMERGING GERMAN ANTI-SEMITISM FROM JANUARY, 1933 TO APRIL 7, 1933

LELAND HOWARD LIFSCHIZ

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the Degree of Master
of Arts in Hebrew Letters and Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

Cincinnati, 1976

Referee: Prof. Stanley F. Chyet



I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Chyet, the staff of the San Francisco Public Library and the University of San Francisco Library for their assistance in completing this thesis, and to Moira Steiner for typing the final version.

L. H. L.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	1
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER	
I. (January 1st to March 5th, 1933)	6
II. (March 6th to March 16th, 1933).	14
III. (March 17th to March 24th, 1933)	20
IV. (March 25th to March 27th, 1933)	37
V. (March 28th to March 31st, 1933)	48
VI. (April 1st to April 4th, 1933)	87
VII. (April 5th to April 7th, 1933)	102
CONCLUSION	109
NOTES	116
APPENDIX	128

ABSTRACT

Once Hitler gained power, the San Francisco Chronicle, Examiner and Emanu-El were replete with detailed descriptions of the persecution of German Jewry. There could be no question that anti-Semitism was rampant in Germany. The response of the American Jewish Community was divided. On one side was the American Jewish Congress and like-minded organizations which demanded overt opposition to Germany. Other groups, such as the American Jewish Committee and the B'nai B'rith held that overt measures would further jeopardize the situation of German Jewry. This latter attitude was given more force by the State Department which held that direct confrontation was not only dangerous for German Jewry but also for American investments in Germany; hence the opposition of the State Department to protest meetings and anti-German boycotts. The most dramatic event of the period from January 1st to March 5th, 1933, was the one-day boycott of German Jews. The boycott aroused much anxiety and in a sense masked the permanence of the deprivation of German-Jewish civil rights, so that after the boycott had ended the State Department could not only hold that the situation in Germany was improving, but American Jews believed the statement.

INTRODUCTION

This study is the result of a long held desire to investigate what information on the persecution of Jews in Germany was published and available to an American newspaper reader during the 1930's. When I began this investigation, I was of the opinion that probably very little information was carried in the contemporary newspapers. As my research developed, I found that, contrary to my assumption, an enormous number of articles had been published on this subject. Because of the mass of the material, it was necessary to limit this study to the period from January 1, 1933, to April 7, 1933, in order to treat the material in a detailed fashion.

At this point, it might be best to establish the validity of research dealing exclusively with material found in newspapers. While there are numerous documentary works which have treated this time period, the vast majority of these studies have made use of source material which became available only after the Second World War. The object of my research will not be to repeat those effects, but to approach the subject from a different perspective.

Along with the historical record, there stood a "contemporary record." The contemporary record, mainly journalistic accounts, did not have the privilege of retrospection, for it was the instantaneous account of events. It was at times indecisive, confusing, distorted, and even utterly false, yet it remained the primary documentary source of public information, contributing to the formation of public opinion and constituting the basis of any public reaction. No attempt will be

made to correct this information in the light of present knowledge, but rather it will be presented as much as possible in an unprejudicial manner. The material will essentially be allowed to speak for itself.

In the early 1930's, newspapers, radio, periodicals, books and pamphlets were the media of the contemporary record. The newspaper, however, was the primary, extensive and detailed source of the public's knowledge.

The two daily newspapers, from which I have abstracted material, in order to convey the feeling of the times, were perhaps more representative of the bulk of American journalism than some other newspapers which addressed themselves to an esoteric readership. The San Francisco Chronicle, hereafter referred to as the Chronicle, and the San Francisco Examiner, referred to as the Examiner, were the only two morning newspapers published in San Francisco. The Chronicle, according to the journalistic trade periodical, Editor and Publisher, the Fourth Estate (Vol. 66, No. 37, January 27, 1934), was locally owned, had an independent-Republican political outlook and subscribed to the Associated Press and the Chicago Tribune News Service. It had an average daily circulation of 94,809 and an average Sunday circulation of 134,566. The Examiner was characterized by Editor and Publisher as having an independent political outlook. Being a Hearst-owned newspaper, it subscribed primarily to Hearst's Universal News Service. Additionally, the Examiner carried dispatches from the Associated Press and the International News Service. It had an average morning circulation of 164,007 and a Sunday circulation of 364,621.

The Chronicle looked upon itself as the New York Times of the West. Of the two daily morning papers, only the Chronicle published letters

to the editor. The only syndicated columnist of note to be published by the Chronicle was Will Rogers. The front page usually was dominated completely by national and local news, only occasionally would foreign news be found there. The normal place for foreign news was on the second page.

The Examiner's front page was likewise taken up with national and local news, with the second page devoted to foreign events of interest. The first column of the front page featured the Hearst newspaper chain's editor-in-chief Arthur Brisbane's column "Today," which appeared in all Hearst-owned newspapers.

Certain general observations may be made about both these newspapers. First, the reader of the 1970's is amazed at the extent of the coverage of foreign news, much more than one generally finds today. Second, during the entire period of this study, the United States was undergoing its greatest economic depression on record, and various radical cures were attempted, to which much newspaper space was given, but it is beyond the scope of my study to take more than passing note of this. Third, meetings and social affairs of the local Jewish community were mentioned with regularity in both of these newspapers; reference, however, to these articles will be made only when they relate to the objectives of this study. Fourth, I received the impression that both papers were favorable to the Jewish community; in one instance, there was even editorial support for the fundraising efforts of the local Jewish community along with a request for the philanthropic support of the general community.

One additional periodical used in this study was Emanu-El, the local San Francisco Jewish weekly. This paper featured various inspirational

articles written by rabbis and learned laymen from all over the world. It also contained editorials written by the editor, Sol Silverman, and some local individuals. The bulk of the material in Emanu-El was concerned with the activities of the various local Jewish organizations and local Jewish society. This newspaper usually had sixteen pages; on the fifteenth page, world news was generally given. There was no indication that Emanu-El subscribed to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency or to any other syndicated source for world or national news, with the exception of one article which was attributed to the Worldwide News Service. Emanu-El occasionally published letters to the editor. From reading this paper, I got the impression of a vital, active, but conservative Jewish community. Also of passing interest was the large amount of non-Jewish advertising carried by Emanu-El.

My study, which is an attempt to reflect on the newspaper reaction in San Francisco to the oppression of Jews in Nazi Germany, starts arbitrarily at the beginning of 1933. This date was chosen, because this was the period when a more than casual interest in German Jewry was first manifested on a sustained basis by the secular press. It should not be assumed, however, that the threat of Nazi anti-Semitism arose abruptly, without warning. The Jewish community, which was naturally more sensitive to the threat of anti-Semitism, had been following the rise of Nazism for a long time, as was reflected in articles in the Jewish press previous to this time. One example of this was a report on remarks by Rabbi Jacob Rader Marcus at the 1932 meeting of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. Marcus advocated "that the only solution lay in a unison of Jewish forces," Emanu-El (November 11, 1932, p. 5, cc. 1-2) related, "in order to consider steps against 'the

mass hysteria of the anti-Semitic movement.'"

Each chapter considers all the foreign news first, then national news, local news, the thoughts of columnists, letters to the editor, and finally editorials, for the period under study. After I had become aware of all the material published in San Francisco newspapers, it seemed important to understand how the readers might have reacted to these articles. I have tried to put myself into the place of the reader in the 1930's. I cannot call this completely unprejudiced, though I have attempted to suppress my knowledge of the Nazi persecution and murder of Jews which I gathered by reading materials other than newspapers of the period. In a sense, I have tried to justify or show why the San Francisco community in general and the Jews in particular reacted the way they did. The appendix presents selected articles in their original form.

CHAPTER I

(January 1st to March 5th, 1933)

This study begins with a period of "normalcy." Emanu-El¹ held that the year was a year of hope for the Jews of Germany; however, by the time of the German elections, there was great fear, especially in view of the report from the London Daily Herald^{2,3} warning of the impending murder of German Jewry. The dominant theme of the period was one of the danger to German Jews the election of Hitler and a Nazi government represented.

On January 27th, Emanu-El,⁴ in a very short article, noted that German-Jewish leaders were fearful that too many Jews would come to study in Germany; there were already 200 American Jewish students there. Two hundred students did not appear to be a large number, but perhaps when added to the number of Jewish students from other countries, there were a large number studying there. Perhaps, for the sake of German Jewry, at this uncertain time, it might be better for fewer American Jewish students to study there.

It was only on February 1st that indications of trouble for German Jewry were sent from there and appeared in the secular press. The article briefly noted that some Jews were leaving Germany⁵ "in anticipation that the Nazis will put their anti-Semitic doctrines into effect." What was the reader to make of this? He might have thought that those Jews who were leaving Germany were paranoid. True, Hitler was by then chancellor, but his party did not rule by a majority. The German elec-

tions were coming up; surely the enlightened people of Germany would not allow a reversion to anti-Semitism to become official policy. The German Jews should wait until the election before deciding to flee.

On February 3rd, Emanu-El⁶ held that the head of the Medical School of Cologne University had designed a "rigid entrance examination" calculated to reduce the number of Jewish students. He claimed that many of them could not even speak German. Perhaps the rector was an anti-Semite, on the other hand, he could be right about their linguistic abilities. It was a small incident. It would pass.

February 5th's Chronicle⁷ carried the most significant story up to this time. In a report from Berlin, announcing the restriction of the freedom of the press, or internal censorship of German newspapers, it was claimed by a Nazi newspaper, that the censorship resulted from "The unexampled excitation of feeling against the political and economic regeneration of Germany by the Jewish press." If the Nazi paper had but suggested that censorship should be imposed, the reader would forget the whole matter. However, the fact that censorship had been imposed by the German government prompted fear for the security of German Jewry. The very concept of press censorship, except informally during wartime, was abhorrent to the American mind. The concept that the press should be censored to prevent the free expression of one's opinion, might have caused some readers to interpret this action as a Nazi declaration of "war" on German Jewry. Most readers, however, would be impelled to hope that press censorship was but a passing phase in Germany and not directly imposed against the Jews. Certainly, the Nazi party was just as antagonistic, if not more so, against Socialists and Communists. The Jews were not a political party! Might not the restriction of the

press be directed against all of those opponents of the Nazis, not just the Jews? On the other hand, the imposition of censorship by the German government gave an indication of the power that the Nazis held in the government. Perhaps the German elections would reduce the power of the Nazis, and the freedom of the press would be restored.

As a result of the internal censorship of the German press, the reader might infer that the gathering of news by foreign correspondents would become more difficult and that their dispatches might in the future be subjected to censorship, thereby impeding the free flow of news from Germany.

On February 8th, both the Examiner⁸ and the Chronicle⁹ carried a report of a meeting of the "Reichstag committee for safeguarding the freedom of elections," the committee whose deliberations had been interrupted by the shouting of anti-Semitic epithets. The reader was beginning to wonder what was happening in Germany. Shouting such statements during a parliamentary meeting did not appear to be consistent with the behavior one would expect to find among civilized men.

The February 10th issue of Emanu-El¹⁰ related that the government headed by Hitler intended no "unjustified experiments" with respect to German Jews. This statement, the Nazi official said, was to "reassure American Jews . . . that the German government is earnest and determined in its desire to guarantee safety and order for all its citizens." As regards acts of violence towards Jews, the spokesman held that "the followers of Hitler have not been as restrained in action as the Chancellor has tried to be in expression." The use of the phrase "unjustified experiments" seems odd. Persecution was one thing, "experiments" another matter. Could one really believe in the truth of the statements of the

Nazi spokesman? One would want to believe that the Nazis would "guarantee safety and order for all its citizens." Such a statement in itself was reassuring. It was true that Hitler's followers might be more fanatic than Hitler; the reader wanted to persuade himself that Hitler might not be as bad as he was made out to be.

The interest in the shouting at the Reichstag committee meeting had not abated on February 12th, when the Chronicle published another article on the incident.

The February 17th edition of Emanu-El¹¹ published an account of an interview with Hitler before he became chancellor. Hitler was said to have used the example of the immigration policy followed by the United States of excluding undesirables as a rationale for his wanting to exclude German Jews, who he held were always "torch-bearers of the 'anti-German' spirit." It was true, the reader knew, that the United States had strict immigration policies, but it had never expelled any of its citizens because of their religion. As to the allegation that German Jews were "anti-German," at least Jewish readers would have found that to be absurd. If one could make generalities, one might be tempted to say that the German Jews were as patriotic as, if not more than, any segment of the German population.

Emanu-El's¹² February 24th issue carried more frightening news. After Hitler's first radio broadcast heard throughout Germany, "Scores of hoodlums paraded through Kurfuerstendamm, the Jewish street [in Berlin], and attacked everyone of Jewish appearance." What would have happened had the Germans given the Nazis a majority in the government? Luckily, the Berlin police put an end to the riot. What would have happened had the police not responded? The article held out hope that

the Catholic Center Party would not side with the Nazis and was soliciting Jewish votes. Perhaps matters might be put right if enough Catholic Centralists were elected.

On Friday, March 3rd, both the Chronicle¹³ and the Examiner¹⁴ published the substance of a horrifying account in the London Daily Herald, which related that "The whole Jewish population of Germany . . . is living under the shadow of a campaign of murder, which may be initiated within a few hours and cannot at the most be postponed more than a few days." This information was ascribed to a high source in London. It was true, the reader knew, that the Nazis were anti-Semitic. The most the Nazis would do, it would seem, would be to expel the Jews, persecuting them in order to hasten their departure. But murder? It seemed inconceivable that the Nazis would resort to that; after all, this was the twentieth century, not the middle ages; Germany was a civilized, modern, Central European country whose culture was admired. No, it could not happen in Germany, Jews could not be murdered--persecuted, yes, but killed? Only the most insane man would believe that, or could it be possible? The London Daily Herald intimated that the British government would intervene in the matter, "but the form it is to take is a matter of extreme delicacy." Most readers would think that the entire story was the invention of a sensation-minded journalist gone wild. Still, on the same date there was a report that the office of the Central Society of German Jews had been raided. Was the account of the impending murder of German Jewry really a fabrication? Did the British government really intend to intervene?

On March 5th, the day of the German elections, it was reported that "Many Jews are leaving the country, while those unable to go are sending

out their women and children."¹⁵ Why leave so soon?--maybe Hitler would change.

There was very little national news dealing with the situation in Germany. The January 27th issue of Emanu-El,¹⁶ related that the secretary of the British Ethical Union, speaking in New York, called Germany "the 'cradle' of modern anti-Semitism." A rather unenlightening article.

The only other national news was a report that Albert Einstein, then in the United States, would not be "immediately returning to his home land."¹⁷ Surely the Nazis would not harm someone of Einstein's stature, but, on the other hand, perhaps he was wise not to return directly.

Local news was also rather sparse. The January 14th issue of the Chronicle¹⁸ carried an interview with Lion Feuchtwanger, who was in San Francisco to publicize his newly translated novel, Power. Feuchtwanger held that many anti-Semitic pamphlets were being published in Germany. He concluded "The individual Jew has no chance in Germany, and I see no hope of bettering his condition." Feuchtwanger, who should have known what he was speaking about, did not paint a good picture of Germany or held out much hope for the future of German Jewry.

Another visitor to San Francisco, Wolf Gold, president of the American Mizrachi Organization, was quoted in the February 24th issue of the Chronicle¹⁹ as asserting that Germany was returning to "the ancient religion of the Huns--a worship of the gods of militarism and power." He felt that "The only solution is for the persecuted Jews to return to Palestine." But what other response would the reader expect from a Zionist?

The February 17th edition of Emanu-El²⁰ carried a fuller account

of Feuchtwanger's views than appeared in the Chronicle. In the Emanu-El article, Feuchtwanger appeared much less negativistic. Though he acknowledged the growing anti-Semitism in Germany, he said: "We may state with gratification that even now we have a rather large group of individuals [in Germany] whom we may designate as fair, and that they, in spite of everything, get along quite tolerably amidst the mass of barbarians." He concluded on an optimistic note: "They suffer many insults from the mob, but in the end they will carry the day, as certain as man of the Bronze Age triumphed over Stone Age man." Feuchtwanger's verbosity could be reduced to his contention that the Jew in Germany might suffer now, but in the end would be the victor over the Nazis. Though he concluded on a hopeful note, his observations on Germany might have caused others to be uneasy and unsure. The reader might have speculated that Feuchtwanger, who was born in Germany and had lived there all his life, could not conceive of life without living in Germany, for German culture and thought were a natural part of his environment. He had witnessed other periods of stress, the reader might think, but those troubles had passed as aberrations. Germany's people would not permit the persecution of Jews to get out of hand. Feuchtwanger's friends, the intellectuals of Germany, would not abandon him. The immigrant Jews might be exiled, but the native German Jews, those patriots who had spoken German for centuries, surely they would be all right.

Arthur Brisbane, in his February 20th column in the Examiner,²¹ thought that Hitler had forgotten about driving the Jews out of Germany. In his February 22nd commentary, he suggested that Hitler had switched his antagonism from the Jews to the Catholics. The reader might have wondered what the source of Brisbane's information was, and he would have

hoped that Brisbane was right, that Hitler had forgotten about the Jews.

On February 3rd, Sol Silverman, the editor of Emanu-El,²² published a rather apologetic editorial called "An Answer to Hitler." His reasoning was that Hitler had used the Jew as a scapegoat, for everyone can see, as Silverman went to elaborate pains to show, how patriotic, loyal, good, and beloved the Jews were in the United States and Britain.

The March 2nd issue of the Chronicle²³ carried the first editorial by the Chronicle on the German-Jewish situation. Though the subject was "Fascism in Germany," the writer got around to castigating Hitler for his stupidity in persecuting the Jews. Not even Hitler's model, Mussolini, had persecuted the Jews; rather, Hitler should oppose his real enemies, by implication, the reader would have surmised, the Communists. The author made an analogy to what happened in Spain when she expelled her Jews; while England and Holland had prospered through the activities of the Jews who had immigrated to those countries. The analogy was a little forced, there were other reasons for Spain's decline and England's and Holland's prosperity. The editorial could have been characterized as very sympathetic to the Jews.

The year, which had begun with a respite for German Jews, had by the time of the German elections on March 5th, assumed a nightmarish quality. The future of German Jewry would depend on the elections, which all had acknowledged the Nazis would win. Would the Nazis in full control perpetuate their brand of anti-Semitism, or would they, with the power finally in their hands, realize that reason must come before emotion? So ended a period of relative calm.

CHAPTER II

(March 6th to March 17th, 1933)

During this period of time, whilst the position of Jews in Germany became precarious with the new Nazi government becoming established there, it must be borne in mind that at almost the same time a new administration was beginning to guide the United States. Both Roosevelt and Hitler, coming into office at approximately the same time, faced a harsh depression and tried to counter it through different ways of a radical nature. Additionally, both men devoted most of their attention to domestic issues. The American officials in Germany at that time were appointees of the previous president. The American government did not want to jeopardize the repayment of the German debt. Foremost in the attention of the newspaper reader of this period was the bank holiday of the week beginning March 6th. All these extraneous matters must be borne in mind with respect to the actions of the United States government.

The first articles which are confronted in this period reflect outrage that violence was done to American citizens, not because they were Jews, but rather because they were American citizens. This would account for the omission by the Chronicle and perhaps the Associated Press of the religion of those assaulted; though the reader might be led to infer from their first and last names that they were probably Jewish.^{24,25,26}

Only on Friday, March 10th, was it reported that violence was not confined to a few American citizens, but that organized attacks and demon-

strations were taking place against department stores because they were either Jewish or foreign owned, and also against individual Jews, Socialists, and Communists. These actions by uniformed Nazis did not seem to be opposed by the police, though they were supposedly not countenanced by the civil authorities.^{27,28}

Emanu-El²⁹ on March 10th reported on two meetings held in New York on February 26th, to protest the anti-Semitism of the Nazis. It is curious that Emanu-El did not carry a report of these meetings in its March 3rd issue, nor did the Examiner or the Chronicle mention them. The purpose of both of these meetings was to cause that mystical entity "public opinion" or "the conscience of the civilized world" to somehow dissuade the Nazis from anti-Semitism. In the same issue of Emanu-El are reassuring words by former United States Ambassador to Germany, James W. Gerard, to the same effect: "Nor will the public opinion of the civilized world suffer a return to the prejudices and policies of the Middle Ages."³⁰ This feeling was given added emphasis by Sol Silverman's editorial, a few pages removed from Gerard's analysis.³¹ Arthur Brisbane carried this theme forward in the March 11th issue of the Examiner when he writes that "If Hitler and his friends imagine they can carry on a systematic campaign of abuse against any particular class or race, and not suffer for it, they will probably find themselves mistaken."³²

To return to Ambassador Gerard's article in Emanu-El, his was the first report to outline what Hitler's plans for German Jewry were before he assumed the chancellorship--essentially the disenfranchisement of the German Jews and a return to their medieval status. Yet it is Gerard's contention that Hitler used the issue of the Jews only so that he could get power in Germany, for Gerard, like Hitler, was fearful of the Com-

munists. Thus Gerard points out that "Nothing sobers like the attainment of high office," and that soon Hitler "will be willing and eager to disassociate himself from . . . anti-Jewish policies." Silverman in his editorial, previously noted, does not say that Hitler will change, but rather that the United States Government, which "has never failed the petition of her Jewish citizens," will somehow effect a change in German internal policy, because of America's humanistic policy of always responding to outrages of "public opinion."

The week starting on March 13th marked new attacks on American citizens and more anti-Semitic violence. At the same time Hitler is reported to have called on his followers to desist from violence.^{33,34}

While these affairs were taking place in Germany, Albert Einstein, the intellectual of the century, perhaps the best known "German" Jew (though he held a Swiss passport), decided not to return to Germany.^{35,36} This decision, Arthur Brisbane holds, in the March 17th Examiner,³⁷ disturbs the German government and he seems to intimate that this development might change the anti-Semitic character of the German leadership. Einstein's decision was also used by the Chronicle³⁸ on March 14th as the basis for a second editorial against German anti-Semitism. Einstein's exile was seen as a "public protest," a means to bring pressure to bear on the German government. The editorial writer points out that "it is no credit to any government that Albert Einstein thinks it is not fit for him to live under."

The New York Times Foreign Cable Service report from Vienna, carried in the March 16th issue of the Chronicle, which described the torturing of Jewish and political prisoners by the Nazis, was probably thought by most readers to be an exaggeration or "yellow journalism," for the civil-

ized people of a modern Central European country certainly would not resort to the tactics of the less enlightened, backward countries.³⁹

On Friday, March 17th, it was reported that Mussolini warned Hitler to "go easy" on anti-Semitism.⁴⁰ This encouraging news was buttressed by Karl von Wiegand's report, in the Examiner⁴¹ on the same day, that violence against Jews was decreasing in Germany, while at the same time noting ominously that "anti-Jewish sentiment among Nazis is undiminished."

The very lengthy article carried in the March 17th issue of Emanu-El, "The German Situation, Another Kishineff?," seems to reflect the confusion and uncertainty engendered among Jews by the anti-Semitism in Germany. The writer almost intimates that he could understand attacks on the poor of German Jewry, especially those bearded Orthodox Jews from Eastern Europe, but assaults against the genteel established Jewish families which for centuries had lived in Germany seem totally without reason or logic. The same article speaks of organized boycotts of Jewish businesses, which was not previously related in any of the media under study.⁴²

Sol Silverman's editorial in the same issue of Emanu-El appears to reflect the same attitude of the writer of the preceding article. Silverman seems to say that he could understand if the Nazis were to say that "Jews are undesirables," but he cannot comprehend how the Nazis could hold that the Jews "are ruining their very economic integrity and impairing their personal safety." According to Silverman, one only needs to look at the example of Governor Lehman who by his expertise in banking helped ease the financial crisis in New York. Therefore Silverman argues that the Nazis will have to come up with new reasons for their anti-Semitism, which is "shocking the conscience of the civilized world."⁴³

The second article in Emanu-El,⁴⁴ "Hitler Entrenched," brings new

information that there were raids on branches of the Union of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith, and that there was "rigid censorship of cables."

In most of the articles during this period and the months covered in the first chapter, reports usually associated Jews with the mention of Socialists and Communists. Because of this association, at times, it appeared that the Nazis considered the Jews a political group; while on other occasions, at first, it seemed that Nazi anti-Semitism was due to the Jewish members of the Socialist and the Communist parties.

Another point that was indirectly reflected in the preceding articles and which will become more apparent in future dispatches, was the question of how much power Hitler actually had. This question was further divided into two diverging questions. First, who was the real power behind the government? Was it Hitler and the Nazis, von Hindenburg, or the industrialists and the Junkers? The view projected by both wire service reports and some editorials was that Hitler and the Nazis are or will be controlled by the other groups. The other question was how much power did Hitler really have over the Nazis. Were they a fanatic group he could not control? Were other members of the Nazi hierarchy really running the Nazi party? The prevailing attitude of the writers seems to be one of total confusion, which was helped along by speeches wherein Hitler seems to be saying one thing, while Goering says something else.

A rather minor point, the reader will note the use of the term "anti-Jewish" as a synonym of "anti-Semitic." This use follows no pattern. It appears to be used only for stylistic reasons, primarily to avoid repetition.

The chapter began with more attacks against Jews, it ended on encouraging notes that anti-Semitism in Germany or at least, attacks and

assaults on Jews was lessening. As will become apparent there was no softening of anti-Semitic activities. On the contrary, they would increase.

CHAPTER III

(March 17th to March 24th, 1933)

The cautious optimism which was noted on Friday, March 17th swiftly disappeared during the next week. A large number of articles appeared giving detailed accounts of the happenings in Germany. Protests were organized, Jewish leaders appeared in the capital at both the Congress and the State Department. The word "atrocities," used during World War I, was now used in reference to violence on Jews in Germany. The German government replied that all was well in Germany, and that Jewish and Socialist propagandists were responsible for the "unfair" treatment Germany received in the foreign press. However, the great number of articles about violence and persecution of Jews seemed to belie the German government's position.

Einstein was still a locus for protest against Germany. The Chronicle⁴⁵ used the statement of a German newspaper editor on Saturday, March 18th, to show the then current feelings in Germany. By placing the article on the front page, the Chronicle further emphasized the unhealthy nationalistic fanaticism of Germany, when the "Editor Hails Einstein 'Exile,'" and wrote "Relativity is little in demand here now. On the contrary, national honor and patriotism, which Einstein wanted to see extirpated, have become absolute values again for Germans." On Tuesday, March 21st, both the Chronicle⁴⁶ and the Examiner⁴⁷ carried on their front pages accounts of the Nazi search of Einstein's home for weapons. It seemed incredible that the Nazis would invent or believe

rumors that Einstein's home would be storehouse for arms. Even more amazing is their admission that they found nothing incriminating. It would have seemed to have been helpful for the Nazi propaganda efforts if they had claimed that they had found something even if in fact they had not. The Chronicle,⁴⁸ in one of its four editorials this week on the situation in Germany, wrote on Wednesday with respect to the Nazis that "Their raid on Albert Einstein's home in search of large secret stores of arms was just silly," for Einstein's pacifistic views were well known. His decision against returning to Germany was a public protest. "The Nazis make themselves ridiculous in suspecting he would turn his country home into an arsenal." Rabbi Wise in recounting the difficulties suffered by Jews in Germany to Congress noted that "Einstein is a lovable soul, who does not know the difference between Communism and Fascism. He is persecuted because he is a Jew, not because of any political beliefs he may have." On Thursday, March 23rd, the Examiner⁴⁹ quoted Einstein as saying that "The raid on the home of my wife and myself in Caputh by an armed crowd is only a single example of the arbitrary acts of violence." On Friday, Einstein in a message to the Jewish Agency for Palestine intimated that the persecutions in Germany would stimulate the rebuilding of Palestine.^{50,51}

Einstein, however, was not the only well known German Jew, whose home was broken into by Nazis. Previous to the search of Einstein's home, author Lion Feuchtwanger's house was entered. He reported on Saturday, March 18th that his automobile was stolen and that books and manuscripts were destroyed.⁵² Arthur Brisbane used this forced entry as an occasion to again chastise Germany. He related "They referred to him as 'this impudent Jew' because, when criticizing a book by Mr. Hitler, Dr. Feucht-

wanger remarked that in the 140,000 words of the book there were 139,900 mistakes." Brisbane again reminded Germany what happened to Portugal and Spain when they drove the Jews out. He noted that already Germany is feeling the effect of her actions, for the mayor of Hamburg related that "Germany's present policy is leading to destruction of German shipping and the ruin of Hamburg." The New York Times Foreign Cable Service report in the Chronicle⁵⁴ pointed out that "His patriotic writings have not served to pardon even Lion Feuchtwanger, the foremost and most popular German novelist, for the crime of being a Jew."

More frightening, though, than breaking into homes, was the report on Saturday, March 18th, of attempts to put restrictions upon Jewish professionals. Forerunner in the attempt was Julius Lippert who "intended to cancel contracts of 'Jewish, Socialist and Communist' physicians in [Berlin] city hospitals."⁵⁵ An example of a fait accompli was the forced cancellation of Bruno Walter's concerts in Berlin and Leipzig.⁵⁶ With respect to doctors, their expulsion from Berlin hospitals as a reality was reported on Tuesday, March 21st.⁵⁷ The next day, Dr. David, a president of the Supreme Court at Leipzig was forced to retire.⁵⁸ On Thursday, Arthur Brisbane reported in the Examiner that "all Jewish members are dropped from the German civil service, and all Jewish employees from hospitals, health institutions and other public departments."⁵⁹ Emanu-El⁶⁰ on Friday, March 24th, reported in "Nazi Attack Widens Against Jews of Germany in the Professions" that "Musicians, physicians, lawyers, engineers, architects have all felt the weight of the Hitlerite wrath. They are threatened with loss of their posts or have already been dismissed in the case of government institutions."

On Sunday, March 19th, the Chronicle⁶¹ in an article entitled "Nazi

Chief is Under Eyes of Industrialists," reflected the confusion of the press with respect to Nazis and other elements of the German power structure. It pictured extreme and moderate wings of the Nazi party. The extreme wing being the one which had unleashed anti-Semitic violence; while the moderate wing of the Nazi party supposedly opposed this course. According to the author, von Hindenburg, von Papen, "the Nationalists and the moderate wing of the Nazis have opposed the [anti-Semitic] campaign, and several times this element has compelled Hitler to put restraints on Goering and his own wild followers." Similarly in a Monday editorial "Anti-Semitism Gone Mad,"⁶² the Chronicle editorialist pointed out that "Surely sober, enlightened German opinion must look upon the events of the last two weeks with infinite shame. And sooner or later Hitler will feel the force of this resentment."

On Tuesday, March 21st, the Chronicle⁶³ carried a New York Times Foreign Cable Service report entitled "Nazi Cruelties Bared." This article pointed out that censorship in Germany was "ironclad." The German government controlled all news media. Further, it reported that all alleged persecution of Jews were now listed as "committed by 'persons' masquerading in Nazi uniforms or 'professing to be Nazis.'" Nevertheless, the accounts of visiting Americans show that "there is no longer any doubt that to be either of Jewish faith or of Jewish origin and to exist in Germany now constitutes a crime in the eyes of the ruling faction there." There were also reports of wealthy Jews leaving Germany, along with various accounts of persecution and brutality.

On Wednesday, Arthur Brisbane⁶⁴ revealed that "a spokesman of the new regime declares, without rebuke from high authority, that if any individual should fire one shot at a Hitler official, 'even though the shot

missed,' there would follow 'a pogrom' which nothing could stop." The reader was left to ponder if this was another example of journalistic invention. The next day, Brisbane⁶⁵ told about a photograph of a bare-headed, barefoot Jew forced to walk through German streets with a sign saying "I shall never again complain to the police." Was the reader to think this was a single isolated instance, an example of the current German situation or a cleverly put together photograph by a publicity seeking journalist? On the same day, Universal Service's Karl von Wiegand⁶⁶ told of the dumping of Jewish corpses for three consecutive nights by Nazis at a Jewish cemetery. Von Wiegand's dispatch was first in a San Francisco newspaper to use the word "atrocities" when referring to events in Germany. He also noted that German journalists in New York charged that American correspondents were writing "atrocity tales" and inventing "lying propaganda" unfavorable to Germany. He further asserted that the German Foreign Office had acknowledged that violence had taken place in Germany and was fearful of the developing opinion in America and the various boycott movements, which have so far resulted in the cancellation of reservations on German ships.

On Friday, the German Foreign Office felt impelled to instruct its embassies and consulates to denounce foreign press releases on conditions in Germany. Universal Service⁶⁷ saw this action by the Foreign Office as being caused by financial losses engendered by hostility to Germany on account of newspaper reports. It was also noted that the German newspapers carried on a "tirade against America" and one warned that "The United States and other countries should remember that Germany one day might not be able to meet debt service if there are economic boycott measures against Germany." This argument appeared to have been accepted

by many Americans. It must be remembered that the United States had a large financial investment in Germany. With the economic difficulties in the United States that was a compelling argument. On that same day, Hitler was said to have "warned German Jews they must cooperate in the 'Third Reich.'"

In an effort to prove that conditions in Germany were normal, Goering offered to take the press to visit political prisoners. He said, "You can go anywhere in Germany and you won't find a store or a warehouse that has been demolished. You can go to any synagogue or any Jewish cemetery and you won't find one that has been desecrated. Germany never has been more peaceful."⁶⁸ The reader was left to wonder and perhaps hope that Goering's statement was true.

Also on Friday "the German government threatened drastic measures against foreign correspondents guilty of spreading 'atrocities reports.'"⁶⁹ Further, foreign newspapers carrying stories critical of the German government were cautioned that their papers might be barred by the German postal service.

On Thursday, the Russian Embassy in Berlin protested mistreatment of its citizens.⁷⁰ Friday found the Polish government protesting attacks on her citizens in Germany. In one case a rabbi was attacked and a synagogue damaged. In Berlin two Polish Jews were reported beaten.⁷¹

Friday saw the publication in the Examiner⁷² of a story by Nathaniel Wolf, one of the first American Jews who had been beaten in Germany. He gave a personal account of his attack and told of his association with socialists and communists. This might have given the reader cause to disbelieve him. Nevertheless, he gave a detailed account of living conditions in Germany. Mail was opened, telephones tapped, and there was the ever-

present anonymous Nazi spy, who could even be one's relative. Finally, he notes the words of a Nazi marching song "When Jewish blood first stains our steel, How well and happy we shall feel!" These words and the picture of the situation in Germany were hard for the reader to accept, he might be inclined to believe that they were falsifications engendered by Wolf's association with communists and socialists, who wanted to vilify Germany.

The Chronicle⁷³ for its part on Friday carried a Jewish Telegraph Agency report from London, wherein a London Jewish doctor "Tells of Atrocities" he witnessed in Germany. He told of destruction of Jewish shops by Nazis, and brutality toward Jews, and also of strict censorship of the press. This point was also made by a World News Service dispatch in Emanu-El,⁷⁴ which noted that "The heavy clamp of Nazi censorship . . . permits only a few of the outstanding incidents of terrorism to leak through to the press. The torturing and abusing of Jews in neighborhood "Nazi barracks" was mentioned in a New York Times Foreign Cable Service report carried by the Chronicle⁷⁵ on Tuesday, and re-emphasized by the report in Emanu-El⁷⁶ which noted that "Outdoor demonstrations have been abandoned for the time being to a large extent, and the new pastime is to torture Jews in the private headquarters of Hitler lieutenants." This same article, "Nazi Attack Widens Against Jews of Germany in the Professions," told of a pitiful effort by the Jewish Ex-Service Men's League to turn back Nazi anti-Semitism. The league held a meeting to which "Members of the Stahlhelm and the Nazi storm troopers were invited." The president of the league tried to argue that Jews were just as nationalistic and patriotic as any other German citizens. "He pointed out that during the war almost 100,000 Jews had served in the German army and that

12,000 had died on the battlefield." But his argument was to no avail, so in a last effort, he said "It is a bitter injustice to generalize from the undeniable misconduct of numerous German Jews and to indict the whole of German Jewry and try to exclude it from the community with which it is united in German loyalty." Even this admission was not destined to save the Jewish veterans from the scourge of anti-Semitism.

The first sign that the present incipient events in Germany had affected the American Jewish community, was an article in the Chronicle on Monday, March 20th, entitled curiously "Police Called to Jewish Meet."⁷⁷ It related that police were called to "restore order" at a meeting of the American Jewish Congress. During the meeting a committee of one hundred was named "to direct the protest." It was also decided to have mass meetings throughout the country.

On Wednesday, March 22nd, the Examiner^{78,79} and the Chronicle⁸⁰ reported that concurrently with the setting up of protest meetings, the American Jewish Congress, under the direction of Bernard Deutsch and Stephen Wise embarked upon arousing the State Department and the Congress to protest Nazi anti-Semitism. At the State Department both men spoke to Under Secretary of State Phillips and asked the Department to intercede. This caused Secretary of State Hull to request the embassy and the consulates in Germany to send "a complete report on the situation" to the State Department. It was further related that "The State Department tonight was searching records for precedents on which to base a possible diplomatic exchange with Germany Numerous instances were found where this country had intervened in the name of humanity against the mistreatment of minorities."⁸¹ This hopeful note seemed to imply that if the accounts of mistreatment of Jews which had been pub-

lished by the press were substantiated by the American diplomatic establishment in Germany, a note of protest would be forwarded to Germany.

It was also noted that Rabbi Wise wanted more than a note of protest, he wanted the revocation of an executive order which prevented parents and minor children of American citizens from joining their families in the United States because they might become public charges or "competitors with American labor." In Wise's attempt to justify this request, he argued that "More than \$290,000,000 of American money" had been sent by Jewish families to relatives in Germany and that if those individuals were permitted to come to America, that money would then remain in the United States. This caused Representative Dickstein to introduce a bill to that effect in Congress, noting that "Some 24,000 more Germans could be received here under our present laws, which have been set aside by the executive order." Both Representative Celler and Fish also made statements protesting anti-Semitism.

Nevertheless, Wise realistically understood that all 600,000 Jews in Germany would not be welcome in America, basically because of prejudice and the massive depression here, "The Jews must find their place in the sun chiefly in Germany. It is their home." He hoped that diplomatic efforts by the United States government would "make life a little more tolerable for them."⁸²

Also on Wednesday, March 22nd, plans had been finalized for mass meetings under the sponsorship of the American Jewish Congress in eleven cities in the East. The New York City meeting was to be held on Monday night with prominent Jewish and non-Jewish speakers.⁸³ On Thursday, three Orthodox Rabbinical organizations in New York City declared Monday a fast day with special synagogue services. The World Organization of

Jewish Women announced plans to meet next Wednesday "to appeal to mothers of the world, Jewish and non-Jewish against the Hitler terrorism." Also the Jewish War Veterans of the United States called for a boycott of German goods and services.^{84,85} On Friday, Alfred Smith, a Catholic, former presidential candidate and former New York State governor, was announced as one of the speakers at the New York City meeting. Additionally, the Catholic Truth Society sent a message of support to Rabbi Wise. The Fellowship of Faiths and the Commission of International Relations of the General Council of Congregational and Christian Churches also protested the German actions.^{86,87}

On Friday, both the Chronicle⁸⁸ and the Examiner⁸⁹ reported a protest parade, led by the Jewish War Veterans, of between 8,000 to 10,000 people that had taken place in New York City Thursday. Dramatically it was led by a cantor chanting El Malei Rachamim carrying a Torah. The parade ended at City Hall where resolutions protesting outrages in Germany were presented to the mayor. The American Jewish Congress estimated that 20,000 individuals would attend the Madison Square Gardens protest meeting. The police, however, felt that over a hundred thousand people might attend and made preparations for placing loudspeakers at Columbus Circle for those unable to be seated. It was announced that the speeches in New York would be carried by closed circuit radio to 300 simultaneous gatherings in as many other cities. The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America requested all Orthodox congregations to help it in its efforts to "ease immigration so German Jews may find refuge in this country."

On Wednesday, March 22nd,⁹⁰ Representative Fish expressed what would be tantamount to the United States policy. "Attacks on American citizens of Jewish origin in Germany must cease immediately . . . American citi-

zens are entitled to and must be accorded protection in every foreign land, and this is no time or occasion to temporize or compromise with such an issue." Note that Fish implied that protest was valid in the case of United States citizens only.

On thursday, it was reported that the State Department was attempting to hasten the receipt of reports on the German situation from its consular officials in Germany. At the same time in Congress attempts to pass resolutions of protest were held up until the State Department received its report.⁹¹ On Friday, it was announced that the report from Germany was expected in a week's time, but that an official protest was unlikely; rather, if the situation as depicted in journalistic accounts was true, the State Department might make an expression of concern "in the name of humanity" for "alleged acts" against Jews. Nonetheless, Representative Dickstein, while feeling that the State Department's report would be impartial, was sure that the United States government would take actions that "will assure the world that we, the people of the United States, do not wish to condone or look with indifference on massacres and outrages against the Jews of Germany."⁹²

On the local front, the Chronicle had the greatest number of editorials against the events in Germany. The Chronicle's Monday editorial, "Anti-Semitism Gone Mad,"⁹³ tried to show that a large number of Jews became physicians because of "racial" characteristics, "It must be the ancient benevolence of the Semitic race" that has drawn them so largely to the healing art." Further it was held that "Civilization owes them an incomparable debt for their work in medicine." Therefore, it seems to the editor that the actions of the Nazis are nothing but madness, which he hoped would soon pass. While it might be argued that not all

Jews went into medicine because of "the ancient benevolence of the Semitic race," the editorialist misses the main point of anti-Semitism, that it is a totally irrational phenomenon, a type of mass madness or insanity. He cannot, however, be taken to task for considering Jews a "race," for even Jews of that time considered themselves a race.

The Chronicle's ⁹⁴ Wednesday, March 22nd editorial, "Nazis Lose Sense of Humor," dealt with the searching of Einstein's home and has already been mentioned. "Germany's War on Jews Is Past All Understanding," was the editorial which the Chronicle⁹⁵ published on Thursday. It was based upon the statement that if a German official were fired upon by a Jew, a pogrom would result. This seemed like an irrational statement to the writer of the editorial, it was one he could not understand, "To our American mind this war on Jews in Germany is beyond understanding." He related that Americans of German origin were normal people, so his only conclusion was that a "small . . . group of fanatics has seized . . . Germany," for German Jews had shown through the centuries how faithful they were to "the German fatherland." While this statement is not totally correct, the patriotism of the German Jews during World War I was well known. Again the editor misses understanding the irrational quality of anti-Semitism.

The Friday Chronicle⁹⁶ editorial was titled "Hitler Strains American Friendship for Germany." In this editorial, the writer held that because of the atrocities in Belgium during the War, America turned against Germany and lost insured Germany's defeat. Now once again Germany by its treatment of Jews is turning American opinion against Germany, which will have disastrous consequences for that country. America had been Germany's best friend since the War, now "Herr Hitler is putting a

severe strain on American friendship for Germany. The harm of this falls on Germany."

The Examiner, besides publishing Arthur Brisbane's editorial-like comments, on Friday published its first editorial against Germany, "GERMANY'S PERIL."⁹⁷ The writer pointed out that even with strict censorship in Germany, it was apparent what was happening in that country. Though the writer makes no mention of Jews or anti-Semitism, it is apparent that he refers to it when he wrote "But worse . . . is the unbelievable welling up of racial hate and persecution--dreg passions of a people gone mad." He concludes "If Hitlerism means pillage, cruelty and oppression, as well as tyranny, it is doomed, and Germany perhaps with it," for "Every nation must learn--and Germany is no exception--that it cannot renounce the respect of mankind, without certain and grievous penalties. No nation can trample upon human rights and not atone for its offending in anguish and bitter sorrow."

The grist of all of these editorials had been to inform the readership of what had happened in Germany and to present arguments against Germany's actions or to give Germany reasons why she should not follow her anti-Semitic course. None of the editorials addressed the more important task of how to put an end to these outrages of "public opinion." Only Arthur Brisbane in one of his columns offered any possible remedial action, his being a boycott. Even this small measure was not suggested in any editorials.

On the local scene, there was great caution. Only on Thursday, March 23rd, was any reaction of the San Francisco Jewish community noted. As the Examiner⁹⁸ remarked "While the program to focus public attention on the plight of German Jews . . . gained impetus through the country yes-

terday, San Francisco's Jewry was marking time yesterday." Judge Golden is reported to have said "It is, perhaps, a bit premature to say just what will or can be done." Golden in the Examiner article seemed quite sympathetic to Germans, "Germany as a whole is not to blame, she is still suffering from the war." By the time the Chronicle's⁹⁹ reporter interviewed Golden he was able to report that a mass meeting was scheduled for San Francisco, apparently, though not mentioned, to be held Monday simultaneously with the New York meeting. Golden diplomatically held that he did not care what kind of government Germany had, "but we are concerned, and vitally so, if the disciples of Hitlerism would destroy 600,000 people who have contributed much in the past thousand years to German art, culture, and civilization." He implied that good Americans should protest against this injustice in Germany. It would seem to be superfluous to argue as Golden had that the persecution of Jews was unjust because of the great contributions Jews had made to German culture, or as the editorialists, and Brisbane were wont to use the decline of Spain and Portugal as an argument against anti-Semitism. The simple argument that persecution of any people is unjust and repulsive should have been sufficient unless these men tended to believe that anti-Semitism had a rational basis, that the anti-Semites might be partially right.

On Friday, both the Chronicle¹⁰⁰ and the Examiner¹⁰¹ staged a type of "written debate" on Germany between Judge Golden and the German Consul in San Francisco. The German Consul essentially denied the truth of press accounts from Germany. He used disclaimers such as "so-called refugees." With reference to the "so-called refugees from Germany to the effect that they had been arrested and cruelly ill-treated and especially, that foreigners had been attacked . . . ," which implied that perhaps

German nationals were attacked but foreigners had not. He also called the reports "exaggerated and unfounded," again a disclaimer to the effect that he was acknowledging that some of the stories were based on fact--"exaggerated"; while others did not occur--"unfounded."¹⁰² Golden, for his part, hurt his presentation by using all inclusive terms such as "Every Jew holding office of any description has been forced out," since perhaps a few had not yet been. "No Jewish physicians, or lawyers, or business men are permitted to function in any way"--but some were indeed allowed to follow their occupations. "Every business house, shop and store belonging to a Jew has been closed"--but surely one or more Jewish businesses were still open in all of Germany. The current situation of the persecution of Jews, Golden felt, bore out Hitler's promise that "many heads would fall and 'German rivers would run with blood.'"¹⁰³

Emanu-El, by setting aside page nine for German coverage attempted to describe some of the events then taking place in Germany, most of which had been better covered in the daily newspapers. It noted in connection to the mass meetings to be held on Monday, that San Francisco had as yet no plans for such a meeting. One curious note mentioned in Emanu-El's coverage was that German insurance companies were planning to issue new coverage against "possible pogroms and confiscation of property."¹⁰⁴

Emanu-El's Sol Silverman saw promise in developments in Washington. In his editorial "AMERICA LEADS THE WAY,"¹⁰⁵ he felt that the investigation conducted by the State Department was a very important "gesture" by the American government. He saw "behind this delicate and swift action the sympathy of President Roosevelt," who had many influential Jewish friends. Silverman in his innocence, followed the lead of Repre-

sentative Fish; naively he asked the question "how far can America go in her official gesture?" He prefixed this as a "legal question" as if legality operated in international relations. He came to the conclusion that America cannot "tell Germany what to do with her citizens, be they Jewish or otherwise [any more], than Germany can tell her [America].

There is no international sanction for such internal intrusion." Rather, Silverman held that all the United States could do was protest the "mis-treatment of American citizens in the land of another sovereign." He believed, however, that America's protest of the abuse of her own citizens in Germany would somehow mobilize "world opinion" against Germany, and thus stop German anti-Semitism. He realized, he noted, that some might hold that "world opinion cannot be mobilized against the Nazi outrages," but he felt that it is "the most feasible way of getting results." The reader should realize that the opinion that the United States could not interfere in the internal affairs of another nation "in the name of humanity" against brutal outrages was a current thought among some influential Jews. The manipulation of "world opinion," assuming that such an entity existed, by individuals was felt to be the only measure to combat anti-Semitism.

Thus the period from March 17th to March 24th could be characterized as a time of massive intensification of the persecution of German Jewry. It was also the time when American Jews first began to react. Yet it was also the period during which American foreign policy was determined with respect to German Jewry, viz., the United States government could not or would not interfere in the internal affairs of Germany. There was still hope, nevertheless, that if American officials in Germany substantiated the newspaper accounts of the violent happenings in Germany, the State

Department might officially protest the attacks on American citizens in a more energetic way.

CHAPTER IV

(March 25th to March 27th, 1933)

The period from Saturday, March 25th to Monday, March 27th, saw a large mass of articles published on the German situation. The optimism which prevailed on Friday, March 24th, was increased on Saturday, when the Examiner¹⁰⁶ noted that a "Definite U.S. Move Over Nazi Attacks on Jews Indicated." It was further reported that a "Precedent of diplomatic representations to Germany was found"; however, the form of the remonstrations would depend on the report from American consular officials in Germany. At the same time as possible diplomatic action was being prepared in Washington, the German government was fast at work denying published reports of persecution. Among those who claimed that correspondents were engaging in "irresponsible distortions" were the Association of German National Jews,¹⁰⁷ the Central Union of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith¹⁰⁸ and the Patriotic Society of National German Jews.¹⁰⁹ Both the Association of German National Jews and the Patriotic Society of National Jews stressed that, as "Germans," they rejected "foreign attempts to blackmail Germany." The reader is hard put to interpret these statements. Could it be that the reports of anti-Semitism were "pure invention"? Probably not, then why did these Jewish groups make those statements? A likely possibility would be that they thought that the situation would be worsened for them if publicity of anti-Semitism was published abroad. Further, I would tend to think that they felt much as the Jewish Ex-Service Men's League did, they could reason with

the Nazis. Thus, they attempted to show other Germans that they were as "German" as their non-Jewish German counterparts. Some of the German Jews undoubtedly thought that anti-Semitism was a transient phase of Nazi Germany. Hence, as good Germans they would suffer in silence persecution and attempt to combat any attempts to disclose the nature and extent of anti-Semitism in Germany. For after all, they were Germans, they had lived in Germany for centuries, and Germany needed her Jews.

That same day, Saturday, also found a rather curious journalistic endeavor in the Examiner.¹¹⁰ Universal Service in New York arranged a telephone interview conducted by a member of the official German press agency in New York with a spokesman of Hitler in Germany. The conversation was carried on in German. It was reported that Hitler called the reports of anti-Semitism "dirty lies," though he acknowledged that violence had erupted during the "national revolution." These disturbances, Hitler held, were of a non-discriminatory character. The spokesman added "As a matter of fact, our storm troops have in many cases at the risk of their own lives, protected life and property of political opponents, among which may have been some Jews." The reader is left to ponder what "among which may have been some Jews" means. Does that mean that "some Jews" by mistake were saved? When the question was asked if any of the molestations were done for religious reasons, Hitler was said to have replied that "when you fight somebody, you don't bother to find out first to what church he belongs." Additionally, he noted "In general, I would like to say that many German Jews as individuals, and Jewish organizations, too, support our government, realizing that the national revolution was faced by alternatives of Communism and terror." At first glance, the reader might consider the

preceding to be a reasonable answer. Certainly, in street fights one would just attack his opponent and not ask if he was Jewish. Also, supporting this argument, three Jewish organizations were reported to have supported the government. Not being in Germany, it would be hard for the reader to know if the only alternatives to a Nazi government were "communism and terror." Depending upon the newspaper reader, "communism" might have been thought to be a worse form of government than the Nazi's was; on the other hand, the reader might think that communism was the best form of government, for this was the time when communism was gaining adherents in the United States. The reader would also wonder if there were not some other government which Germany could have had that was neither communist nor Nazi. Nevertheless, the reader would find it hard to accept the contention that the Nazis were not anti-Semitic and had not participated in wanton violence against Jews. For weeks, the newspapers had carried stories of Jewish persecution and had carried translations of Nazi newspapers with decidedly anti-Semitic bias. The unique interview finally noted that the German government was not displeased by the investigations at that time being conducted by the State Department; the spokesman pointed out that "Investigations by the Swedish and Dutch embassies revealed that not a single Jew has been either killed or injured." The reader having not previously heard of investigations undertaken by the Swedish or the Dutch embassies would probably be tempted to believe that their results were as the Germans claimed, since either the government of the Netherlands or of Sweden could refute the statement, if it was false; on the other hand, the many reports of Jewish murders would cause the reader to suspect that those two governments had not done a thorough investigation. Next, it

was argued that "every tourist can learn for himself that in the last fourteen years of socialistic rule Germany has never been as quiet and peaceful as during the last several weeks--with the possible exception of the first few hectic days." By stipulating that there had been violence during the "first few hectic days," the statement takes on a cast of truth. Yet, too many journalistic reports held the opposite view for the reader to take that statement seriously. Further, with the arrest of political opponents, with whom could the Nazis engage in street fights? As a whole, then, what is the reader to make of this "telephonic interview"? It seemed to have been totally controlled by the Germans. One might hold that Hitler through his spokesman was lying, that he was indeed anti-Semitic and he hoped that enough people would believe his lies to prevent any American governmental criticism of his government. A second line of thought could have been that Hitler really believed what he was related to have said, that he did not know what was happening in Germany, that he was a figurehead. It must be remembered that Mein Kampf was largely unknown to the American public. Thus, as I assume was the German government's goal, the reader was further confused as to who was running the German government. The German situation seemed as clouded as it had weeks before. Those who wanted to believe that Hitler was not anti-Semitic could readily reassure themselves by his statements. Those who wanted to believe the opposite could easily justify that view also.

Along with the seemingly encouraging developments at the State Department was the report that "Pope Pius XI may intervene in Germany."¹¹¹ Further, there was the announcement of the formation in New York of an inter-faith "provisional committee for protest against German Fascist

atrocities."¹¹² Additionally, there was the initiation of a project to send German-Americans to Berlin "to bring about a conciliation of all factors affected."¹¹³

Sunday saw further optimism in that Karl von Wiegand reported that there were "indications of an approaching retreat on the Jewish question." He also mentioned that the German Foreign Office deplored the mistakes made.¹¹⁴

Goering struck a note of candor in admitting that Jews had been molested, but he held that it was difficult for the government to stop these attacks. Moreover, Goering allowed foreign journalists to speak to selected political prisoners, none of whom reported mistreatment or harm. In an interview at the prison, Goering pledged that he would "never stand for persecuting a man simply because he is a Jew." The reader might have become puzzled as to who was persecuting Jews, when all the Nazi leaders protested that they were against mistreatment of Jews.¹¹⁵

Monday saw optimism mixed with pessimism. On one hand, the State Department related that Jewish persecution had been "virtually terminated";^{116,117} on the other hand, the Department held that because of the so-called termination of molestations of Jews, no protest would be made by the American government. Notwithstanding the admissions by certain German officials that Jews had indeed been harmed and the report of American diplomats in Germany which acknowledged the truth of the mistreatment of Jews, von Neurath, the German Foreign Minister, categorically denied those reports and classed them in the same category as German atrocity stories allegedly circulated by the Allies in World War I.¹¹⁸ The reader was left with the impression that communications among German officials was rather poor.

Nationally, Rabbi Wise told his New York congregation that the American Jewish Congress would send four "demands" to the German government, viz., 1) "There must be an immediate cessation of all anti-Semitic [sic] activities and propaganda in Germany"; 2) "the abandonment of the policy of racial discrimination against and of economic exclusion of Jews from the life of Germany"; 3) "the protection of Jewish life and property"; and 4) "there shall not be an expulsion of 'Ost Juden,' Jews who have come into Germany since 1914."¹¹⁹ The use of the word "demands" might be taken by some to be too strong a term to use by an organization when addressing a foreign government or even for a government to use with another sovereign power. The term "request" would seem to be more proper. On the other hand, the use of the term "demands" would seem to imply some action by the party who makes the "demand" against the party to whom the "demand" is addressed, in the case that the "demand" is not fulfilled. The reader was not informed of what nature the implied action was, if in fact, any action was contemplated. Nevertheless, I would be inclined to believe that most Americans would agree with a "request" on the four points, assuming that the request related to German Jews who were citizens. If some of the eastern European Jews were not citizens, I would think that most Americans would agree that those non-citizens' lives and property should be protected, but that they would probably not protest their expulsion. There was mention on Monday of boycotts by London Jews, and protests by Polish Jews. Perhaps a boycott was the "action" that Rabbi Wise had in mind.

On Sunday, Arthur Brisbane¹²⁰ quoted Winston Churchill who "thanks God for the French army, in the face of anti-Jewish violence in Germany." Brisbane related that "He might better thank God for the French air fleet.

Planes, bombs, deadly gas from the air, not in a creeping caterpillar army, will be the reliance of France . . . if war should come." Brisbane seems to infer that Churchill suggests that France through its military forces should somehow curb German anti-Semitism. He reflected the attitude current at the time that someone else or some other nation should be Germany's chastiser. He also seemed to imply that the persecution of Jews made the peace of the world fragile.

Chester Rowell, the editor of the Chronicle,¹²¹ still held the conception that the military controlled Germany's government and that the germs of anti-Semitism came from Hitler. He felt that the military should stem this persecution: "Certainly his military backers are far too sensible to think that anything could be gained by an outbreak which can only discredit Germany in the eyes of enlightened people everywhere." Nonetheless, while Rowell was himself indignant with the German policy, he still felt that America was powerless to protest the discrimination against German Jews because of "The technical rules of international intercourse." He naively suggested instead that "the Jewish people themselves, all over the world . . . make it to its interest to use pressure on the German government." Rowell's policy with regard to protests with respect to the internal happenings among German nationals was consistent with the State Department's view; while his contention that Jews have the power among themselves to cause a foreign government to disown anti-Semitic policies, was consistent with the Nazi view of the vast power of international Jewry. Rowell gave more influence and power to the Jewish people than they possessed. Rowell's feeling with respect to Jewish mercantile interest and their power was probably held by a goodly segment of the American public. Jews seemed to be rich and powerful. Rowell next ridiculed German racism

which he held was a "pseudo-scientific theory." The term race at that time was confused nevertheless, with Jews calling themselves a race, so a German conception of a German race would not be unbelievable.

On Sunday, Arthur Brisbane¹²² compared the German-Jewish protestations of "all such reports are pure inventions," to a fictional card sent from a German prisoner of war camp which noted: "We are fine here, swell food, every convenience and luxury, nothing but kindness. P.S.-- Myer was shot for complaining." Was Brisbane insightful or did he just dislike Germany? The same day the Examiner¹²³ also carried a lengthy analysis by Emil Ludwig wherein he tried to present his understanding of German anti-Semitism. His main point was that the Jew and the German are very similar and therein lies the trouble. The success of the Jews made their fellow Germans envious and thus when troubled times came over Germany, "they always say the fault lies with the Jews." Many Germans "would very much like to earn the money of these Jews who occupy the best callings," thus their expulsion from certain sectors of the German economy. Ludwig held that the Germans could not eliminate the Jews from banking "without uprooting the whole German State." He concluded that "If Jewish capital in New York wishes, it can force an improvement in the position of German Jews." Ludwig's analysis is interesting, though he relies on stereotypes to a great degree. He does not tell how he defined a German or a Jew, but attributed his theory to Goethe. Certainly in troubled times, he who does not have a job would want someone else's job. As to German banking having an inherent need for Jews, the reader could not make a judgement. His solution is essentially the same as Rowell's. Again the myth of the power of the Jews is promoted. Let the Jews help their own people, Ludwig proposed. He

seemed to imply that if Jewish banking interests were to accept some losses, they could help the German Jews. The reader was again left with the impression reinforced by this article of the great wealth of Jews. The reader might be led to believe that Jews should and could take care of themselves, and that the United States, which had enough of its own problems, should not get involved with the persecution of German Jews. He might even come to the conclusion that the Nazis were right, that the Jews had too much power and wealth.

Chester Rowell in Monday's Chronicle¹²⁴ took up the problem of what to make of German denials of mistreatment of the Jews. In a long commentary he considered both sides of the issue. He came to the conclusion that Jews were being persecuted in Germany, it was the only conclusion that fitted all the evidence. What then was the purpose of the German lies? Rowell held that Hitler "wishes to inform us, indirectly but plainly, that it is none of our business"--which is just what Rowell advocated the day before. What does Rowell suggest now that he had solved the German puzzle? Nothing much, only that if the German government is running a serious risk of putting itself into the same position as the present military authority of Japan, whose official statement "nobody believes." Well, the reader is somewhat comforted now that Rowell has informed him that the Germans had been lying, but Rowell seems to have run out of ways to combat this evil.

On Saturday, it was reported that "Several hundred Jews, Catholics and Protestants met last night in Temple Sinai, Oakland and protested at reported atrocities against Jews in Germany."¹²⁵ While there did not seem to have been any protest meetings in San Francisco, there had been one in Oakland representing the three major faiths. Rabbi Coffee seemed

to be more interested and active than his San Francisco colleagues.

Sunday witnessed the result of the campaign in Germany to influence American public opinion to the view that conditions in Germany were normal.¹²⁶ The former president of the University of California received a cable from a German acquaintance which he dutifully publicized. It carried the official German line "Shocked at gross misrepresentation of recent German events No leading Jewish papers suppressed." With the prestige of the former president of the University of California vouching for the telegram, some readers might have believed the German propaganda.

Sunday, also, finally found the San Francisco¹²⁷ Jewish community belatedly organizing a meeting. Judge Golden, head of the anti-defamation committee on the west coast seemed to be the organizer or delayer of the meeting. He noted that a committee would be appointed Monday and an announcement of the date of the protest meeting would be made known on Wednesday. The Orthodox rabbis in San Francisco apparently were not satisfied, and followed their New York colleagues in proclaiming Monday a fast day. This action seemed to have been prompted by the mass meeting held in Oakland, Friday, and the delay of organizing a meeting in San Francisco.

Monday found the Jewish National Welfare Fund announcing that major use of the funds collected in the coming campaign would "be used to alleviate the sufferings of Jews in Germany who have become victims of Adolf Hitler's persecution." The most influential Reform rabbi, Rabbi Reichert of Temple Emanu-El, was appointed the campaign manager. Rabbi Reichert noted, "In our last campaign we exceeded our quota of \$250,000. This year, not because the need is less, but because we are not blind to

the realities of existing conditions, we have set our goal at \$200,000."¹²⁸ One received the impression that the San Francisco protest meeting might have been delayed for the sake of the Jewish National Welfare Fund campaign. One is puzzled by the setting of the goal at \$200,000. Was that really a recognition of "existing conditions?" Or was it an attempt to portray that Jews were also suffering from the depression and didn't have the mythical wealth that was ascribed to them? Why wasn't the goal left at \$250,000 to spur contributions even if it was known that it could not be reached?

CHAPTER V

(March 28th to March 31st, 1933)

Besides the threat of physical violence to German Jewry, there now hung the specter of economic strangulation of the Jewish corporate body. The preceding weeks had seen what seemed to have been indiscriminate persecution of German Jews. Here and there, a murder was reported, more often beatings were mentioned, Jewish merchant's stores were picketed and Jewish employees of the government had been dismissed. But on each occasion there was some degree of hope along with these tragic happenings. It was felt that perhaps the government had not yet gained full control of her fanatical followers. The government, also, seemed to be amorphous, true, there was a chancellor, cabinet members, a president of the republic, but no one seemed to have the power firmly in his grasp. This uncertainty and seeming non-direction gave rise to the thought that when the government would be firmly in power, or when whoever was behind the government exercised control, the situation in Germany would stabilize. For after all, this was the twentieth century, world opinion was in its highest stage of development and would not stand for a civilized country to revert to barbarism. Wasn't that what the World War showed?

These hopes were shattered with the announcement of the boycott of Jewish firms organized by the Nazi Party.^{129,130,131} It became apparent that the German government which seemed to rule through the Nazi Party, would brook no opposition from its opponents or from the civil authorities. The police were told not to interfere with the Nazis. The German

states which attempted to show their autonomy from the Nazi Government were taken over by the Nazis and Hitler had become a dictator. Only President von Hindenburg, an aged former war hero, appeared as a possible moderating influence, since he was technically Hitler's superior.

Both San Francisco morning newspapers devoted front page space to the announcement of the coming anti-Jewish boycott in Germany. In a manner, which the writers described as reminiscent of the Soviet method, the Nazi Party, and not the German government, was the group which would direct the boycott. This fictitious arrangement portrayed a dichotomy between the Nazi Party and the German government, with the Nazi Party warning the government not to interfere. Nevertheless, the Associated Press held that "because of the interior censorship exercised in Germany, it would have been impossible for Telegraphen-Union to carry the above communiqué [about the prospective boycott] had the government opposed it. Goering¹³² tried to argue that the government was separated from the anti-Jewish disturbances and the planned boycott. Von Wiegand wrote "Again Goering frankly told of some incidents that had happened but said he had quickly gained full control. He said he would remain in control unless discipline were broken by popular anger over reports from abroad."¹³³

The equivocal reason given for the boycott by the Nazi Party was very similar to sentiments expressed by Nazi Party officials who were in the German cabinet. The alleged reason for the boycott was "to answer the boycott pleas of international Jewry."¹³⁴ The Associated Press saw that "the German [government] could use such a boycott as a bargaining power against other governments to halt projected anti-German campaigns."¹³⁵ The German government, fictitiously through the Nazi Party, was in effect blackmailing the civilized peoples of the world. They in

effect stipulated that if legitimate protest against the persecution of German Jews was halted, the Nazi Party would call off its boycott of German Jews, and they contemptuously held that the dire results of the boycott should not be charged to the Nazis who organized it, but rather to those who protested it. A rather circular form of reasoning. From the news reports one gathered the impression that the idea of a boycott against German Jewry was not a spontaneous idea, but one that had been long in the planning stages.

Added to the boycott threat, which if carried on for a lengthy period of time would result in the poverty of German Jews, was the proposal that "Jews in various professions would be reduced to the proportion Jews bear to the entire population."¹³⁶ This short statement seemed to mean that even if the boycott were called off, the civil rights of Jews in Germany would be permanently reduced. Ominous were the vile anti-Semitic remarks which accompanied these announcements. Speaking of the boycott, the Nazi Party wrote "Thereby will this Jewish international hymn of hate against Germany, because of a revolution in which no Jewish hair was ruffled, produce the long awaited declaration concerning the relations between the German people and those who have no conception of the hospitality guaranteed to them."¹³⁷ Goebbels, the Minister of Propaganda, a Nazi, and fictitiously not officially behind the boycott, stated, "A blow shall be struck at the intellectual movers and beneficiaries of these treasonable machinations, most of whom are Jews of German origin."¹³⁸ Goering, also a Nazi cabinet member, remarked "If Judah wants war with us, I think we can give them plenty."¹³⁹ An unidentified cabinet member was reported to have told Karl von Wiegand: "They [the Jews] were informed that if they do not discontinue this atrocity propaganda campaign

against the National Government, stories which are being printed without truth may easily become true."¹⁴⁰ The Prussian commissar of justice, Hans Kerri, also a Nazi, held that "the Jew was born from a sin against the Holy Ghost, and always has shown himself the servant of decay."¹⁴¹

Von Wiegand also noted that Jews and Socialists travelling abroad "have been threatened with reprisals against Socialists and Jews in Germany unless the travelers succeed in persuading political and racial friends abroad to desist from further agitation against Germany."¹⁴² Another example of blackmail.

On this same Saturday, the Associated Press revealed the contents of a cable, from the German Foreign Minister to Cardinal O'Connell of Boston, seeking to dissuade him from speaking at the protest meeting at Madison Square Gardens in New York.¹⁴³ In this attempt von Neurath was successful.¹⁴⁴

Both the Chronicle¹⁴⁵ and the Examiner¹⁴⁶ carried the text of a telegram wherein the "Crown Prince Deplores U.S. Belief in 'Lies.'" The prince held that the tales of the molestation of Jews were similar to the atrocity stories of the World War, such as "the mutilation of Belgian children, the crucified Canadian and the factories in which corpses were to be converted into soap." He held that Germans were being "victimized by this [new] propaganda of lies," which served to undermine German-American relations. He stated that he was speaking unofficially and that even German-Jewish organizations agreed with his views. He concluded "I can only wish that the cultured classes in America, conscious of their responsibilities, will not refuse to accept this view, and that they . . . will use their efforts in the cause of truth and fair play in the relations between our nations."¹⁴⁷

The crown prince's telegram might have persuaded some readers that he was speaking truthfully of the situation in Germany. Certainly the examples of atrocities taken from the World War seemed too far fetched to have been believed. Civilized people would not have done such things. They were examples of war propaganda. Thus, if they were false, it follows that these current gruesome reports of "putting out of eyes, the mutilation of corpses, the searing of parts of the body, etc.," might also be false. Yet, the reader was probably doubtful, he would have liked to believe him, it would relieve his conscience if the prince were right, but the atrocity tales of the World War had been circulated during war time. Now there was no war. What would be the sense if inventing such tales now? True, the German government had said that the Jews were responsible for spreading these stories. But what use would it serve the Jews to bring down the Nazi government? Certainly 500,000 Jews in Germany could not rule the country, they would only expose themselves to a counter-reaction. What were German Jews anyway? The Nazis called them communists on one hand and at the next breath they were called capitalists who were too powerful. One cannot hold two opposite political or economic views at the same time, it is absurd.

Perhaps the prince did not know what he was talking about, but felt impelled to defend Germany's dignity. Yet, there had been statements by German-Jewish organizations which were printed in the newspapers which held that these persecution stories were lies. It, again, would have been comforting if the prince were right. But assuming that the accounts of anti-Jewish feeling were true, if one were an official of a German-Jewish organization, and the government threatened your members with harm if your organization did not denounce these reports, one would feel compelled

to comply with these demands. Or in the case where no such threat was made, but still assuming that the stories were true, might not a leader of a Jewish organization denounce the reports as lies, hoping thereby to improve the position of that organization's members or at least not cause their situation to deteriorate further.

On Wednesday, much more detailed reports of the proposed boycott appeared in both the Chronicle¹⁴⁸ and the Examiner.¹⁴⁹ Karl von Wiegand of Universal Service in the Examiner¹⁵⁰ gave a translation of the eleven points of the Nazi manifesto for the boycott. He inferred that the boycott "was organized and ordered by the National Socialist party headquarters in Munich, obviously with the sanction of Chancellor Hitler following a conference with Dr. Joseph Goebbels." After noting that Hitler was still at the Brown House, Nazi headquarters, situated in Munich, von Wiegand detailed the eleven points. First, the boycott should extend "down to the smallest village" against all self-employed Jews. Second, care was to be taken that foreigners were not involved. Third, the main object, was that "no German is to buy anything from a Jew or permit a Jew to offer him anything." Other points required newspapers to carry boycott propaganda or else "the newspaper is not to enter a German home and also it shall not carry advertisements of any German firm or business." The boycott was to be carried out even in rural areas against "Jewish peddlers and small dealers." The eighth point was that "The program calls for concentrated efforts to deliver a blow to Jewry, and storm troops are to picket shops and warn people away from Jewish stores." The ninth point was that mass meetings were to be organized "to demand that Jews be permitted to practice in professions, in business or in any employment in proportion to their numbers compared with

the rest of Germany's population," i.e., 8/10 of 1 percent of the population. This reduction in civil status applied even to elementary and secondary school children. However, "Banks are so far exempt." The tenth point was to be the organization of a campaign whereby every German who knew someone in a foreign country was to communicate with that person and tell him the "truth about Germany." The final point was that "not a single Jewish hair" was "to be harmed."

This detailed a program reinforced the reader's idea that much previous planning had gone into the organization of the projected boycott. The only new things mentioned were that newspapers were to take a large part in the boycott and the demand that Jewish school children be accommodated in educational institutions on a basis proportionate with their census. It was noteworthy that banks were excluded. Perhaps the Nazis would allow a few Jews to have a livelihood. The manner in which the points were presented indicated that the Nazi party or the government had some method or means of insuring that its aims were strictly carried out, for there did not seem to be any voluntary aspects to the boycott announcement.

While none of the news dispatches, commentaries, or editorials mention it, the boycott and the measures associated with it, self-evidently served to separate the German Jew from the rest of the German population. The most dominant character of the campaign, then, was the segregation or the cutting off of the Jew from the German fatherland, in a manner similar to that condoned by the German peoples from medieval times to the first World War. If the boycott accomplished nothing else, it would serve to remind both the Jew and the non-Jew that the Jew was again an "alien" in Germany. Though this fact was hard for Jews who had lived in Germany for centuries

to acknowledge, the boycott would drive it into the German Jew's consciousness.

The Chronicle's Chicago Tribune Foreign Cable Service account¹⁵¹ related that the boycott would last "until Jewish life in Germany is paralyzed." The reason given for the Nazi choice of a boycott as a counter-measure against Jews was that "This is their tenderest spot and there they must be struck the hardest." They held that "Many Jewish intellectuals fled abroad with their money and from foreign shores are now carrying on an unscrupulous campaign of hate against the people of Germany." The Nazis failed to mention what caused the Jews to flee. Both Universal Service and the Chicago Tribune Foreign Cable Service announced that the boycott which was scheduled to go into effect on Saturday was being carried out already in a few scattered areas. Was this a Nazi attempt to inject fictitious spontaneity into the boycott to show that all Germany was enraged with German Jews?

More anti-Semitic statements were reported by von Wiegand.¹⁵² Der Angriff wrote "We now go over from defense to attack; to knock the poison and swollen head from the Jewish lying-hydra." Another example from Der Angriff "Germany can thank the Jews for all the misery and suffering of the post-war period. The righteous German cause will triumph over Jewish hatred, Jewish meanness and Jewish lies."

Von Wiegand speculated "There are many predictions that the boycott may have an effect abroad contrary to expectations. The campaign can be likened in some respects to the von Tirpitz submarine campaign to starve England. Whether this economic 'torpedoeing' of the Jew is to be more successful than the u-boat campaign will be answered in a few weeks." The reader could have hoped that the predictions would come true, but

would involve the United States in war as had been the case in the submarine campaign? No, perhaps protests.

The reader was amazed at the detailed accounts of the boycott preparations. It would not seem likely that the German government would have wanted this much publicity. Similarly it seemed highly irregular that the German government had not attempted to stop the boycott, unless, that is, the government was in favor of this program. Furthermore, there seemed no way by which the boycott could be ended once it started. The best hope then would be to stop it before it began, but how? Should the newspapers of the world bow to the Nazi demands that they should not describe or report on the persecution of Jews because it might be prejudicial to Germany? Would that stop it? Probably not. If the newspapers had acceded to the German desire, what would prevent the Nazis in the future from using similar blackmail techniques to suppress any reports they thought were unfavorable? As to the German claims that the news accounts are lies, the great amount of anti-Semitic sentiment attributed to the Nazi leaders belied the attempts of the German government to claim that the mistreatment of Jews was not motivated by their religion or "race." Additionally, those quotations by their virulent character would tend to persuade most newspaper readers that the dispatches from foreign correspondents in Germany were probably true.

The New York Times Foreign Cable dispatch from Frankfort,¹⁵³ "Ghetto Fear Grips Jews; Economic Persecution Real Worry; Lips Sealed in Germany," dramatically told of the plight of Frankfort Jewry. Its stylized melodrama could have caused the reader to disbelieve its substance, "Back to the Ghetto. This, and not the fear of Nazi blackjacks and guns, is the secret dread which grips German Jewry today." The article continued in

the same vein: "Here in Frankfort the chosen people are in despair, and these words invoke a more poignant meaning here than anywhere else." Further, "They shrug one of those inimitable Yiddish shrugs, expressing mingled contempt, amusement and sadness." Moving away from the author's melodrama, he quoted a Frankfort Jew, whose family had long lived in Germany as saying, "It would be less terrible for the Nazis to kill a few hundred of us outright than to make thousands of us live without a means of livelihood. The fear of arousing more violence make it so that Frankfort Jewry's lips are sealed like the lips of a witness in an American gang murder case, and for the same reason." The writer claimed that American publicity of Jewish persecution is frightening Frankfort Jews. One was said to have pleaded: "For God's sake tell all American Jews to go easy unless they want to get us all massacred." The indignation meetings which at the time this article was written, had not yet occurred, were "viewed largely with apprehension." Finally, the author related that already 60 percent of the Jewish doctors had been excluded from hospitals.

What did the reader make of the preceding article? As was noted, because of the manner in which it was written, it might tend to be dismissed. Yet, on the other hand, the main point projected by the dispatch was the fear of Frankfort Jewry of foreign actions which might jeopardize their position. This type of article might have been the kind that the Nazis welcomed, for it was an appeal by German Jews to their fellow Jews to forget about their condition, anything other Jews might do would probably worsen their situation. Thus the foreign Jews were asked, implored and begged not to protest against the Nazis. In point of fact, while the propaganda value of the article seemed poor

for the Nazis, the actions advocated by the report could not have been better expressed by the Nazis themselves.

Thursday brought more developments on the boycott, with the stories remaining on the front pages of both the Chronicle¹⁵⁴ and the Examiner.¹⁵⁵ Von Wiegand's presentation was by far more graphic than the Associated Press report in the Chronicle. Von Wiegand's dispatch was entitled "German Jews Ask Hindenburg To Halt Economic Pogrom."¹⁵⁶ The author told that fear caused a German-Jewish organization to appeal to the German government. The statement read in part "For the mistakes of the few for whom we are not responsible, economic destruction is being prepared for us German Jews who cling with every fibre of our hearts to our German homes." It went on to recount the number of the German-Jewish war dead, and asserted that German-Jews were not responsible for German indignation manifested abroad. It concluded "We appeal to the German people, to whom justice has always been the highest virtue. We trust in the Reich's President and the Reich's government, that they will not permit the facilities of life and livelihood to be taken from us." The Chronicle's Associated Press version,¹⁵⁷ entitled "Jewry Begg Hitler, Hindenburg to Halt Nazi Party Boycott," related the appeal asked "let [not] our rights and means of existence be taken from us." Further, "the reproach that we injured the German people is a very heavy blow to our honor."

Von Wiegand¹⁵⁸ held that Hitler had now associated himself with the boycott, when he said: "The boycott had to be organized, we now have the action in our hands. World Jewry should realize that the Jewish war against Germany can only hit German Jews." Von Wiegand doubted that von Hindenburg would intervene, for he noted, that while von Hin-

denburg was not anti-Semitic, he did not have the same feeling for Jews as the former Kaiser, who had friends among upper-class Jews. A slight possibility that the boycott might have been halted was given in an account that representatives of American banks in Germany hoped to get the boycott postponed, so that they could "use influence in America and England either to check or to minimize anti-German movements." Additionally, von Wiegand said there were unconfirmed reports that "the Nazis would call off the boycott Friday night if the effect of its measures in foreign countries should be by then such as to satisfy the party." Also reported were more instances of the boycott already taking place in various localities. The Chronicle's¹⁵⁹ account told of the arrest of Jewish judges and lawyers in one city, and in Berlin, it was reported that municipal supplies would henceforth be only bought from Nazis. Additionally, in Berlin, forty-eight Jewish shops were reported to have closed after they had been picketed by Nazis. There were scattered arrests of Jews and closing of Jewish businesses throughout Germany.

Any doubts about Hitler's approval of the boycott were removed, since he appeared to the reader to be as anti-Semitic as other members of the Nazi Party leadership. Von Hindenburg seemed remote and unmoved by the appeal of the German Jews. The various scattered outbreaks of picketing and the arrest of Jews, gave the whole situation a somewhat spontaneous character. The reader did not know if this was organized confusion or not. It might have been an attempt by the Nazis to portray their boycott movement as a result of the general indignation of the German people against the Jews. At the same time it tended to show a rather powerless government or at least one which counted

nanced these various disturbances. Still, these different actions seemed quite out of character for a modern civilized nation and may have led the reader to suspect that the situation in Germany was rather more organized than was officially acknowledged. How else could one explain these reversions to barbarism? Nevertheless, as was the case with most news from Germany during this period, no matter how bad, there was always present the possibility that things might get better. Thus, the unconfirmed reports that the boycott might be canceled, might lead the reader to think that perhaps it might be better not to do anything, and hope that events would work themselves out.

Friday, found more anti-Semitic statements attributed to Nazi leaders. Streicher, head of the Nazi boycott activities, used the slogan "Jews Are Our Misfortune."¹⁶⁰ Der Angriff¹⁶¹ held that "Mercy cannot be granted. World Jewry must immediately discontinue attacks on German reconstruction, or Jewry in Germany will be finished, morally and commercially." The Nazi paper Voelkischer Beobachter¹⁶² held that "Judah is stabbing Germany in the back with the same methods it employed to perpetuate the criminal World War. Again Judah is at work calumniating the German people as huns and barbarians."

More aspects of the boycott preparations were reported. Jewish merchants were to hang out placards "written in yellow on a black background."¹⁶³ Jewish merchants also were instructed that they might not dismiss Christian employees and that they must pay them their wages during the full length of the boycott.¹⁶⁴ An interesting edict was that "windows are not to be smashed," the reason being that German insurance companies would have to pay for the destroyed windows.¹⁶⁵

Von Wiegand¹⁶⁶ wrote optimistically that "The impression prevails

that, if the boycott is not called off tomorrow night, it probably will be ended Monday, after the Nazis have demonstrated their power." He also noted that von Hindenburg had not made any statement with respect to the appeal from German Jewry. In another article in the same issue, von Wiegand¹⁶⁷ wrote, "Hopes that Chancellor Hitler will order the national anti-Jewish boycott called off as the 10 a.m. Saturday deadline approaches, were strengthened today by an editorial in Der Angriff." The editorial told that there was "still 48 hours, which should be sufficient, in which to suspend this unprecedented lying campaign abroad." Von Wiegand hastened to add that German newspapers gave "the impression that the anti-German campaign abroad is dying down." He also pointed out that many German leaders were opposed to the boycott, fearing "what a self-destructive boomerang it can develop into for Germany." Von Wiegand held that only Hitler, Goebbels and one other cabinet member, unnamed, were in favor of the boycott. All others, including von Papen and von Neurath, were opposed to the action.

The Associated Press reported that in Breslau all Jews were ordered to turn in their passports.¹⁶⁸ A Chicago Tribune Foreign Cable Service dispatch¹⁶⁹ told of the arrest of thirty-five Jewish merchants in Frankfort, and their forced march through the streets with their hands locked behind their heads. Two non-German Jewish reporters "were arrested on a charge of spreading false news of violence in Frankfort." Again the reader was impressed with the thoroughness of the Nazi preparations for the boycott and other actions against Jews. Though more optimism was expressed in the reports of this day, that the boycott might be called off, the reader might have had the impression that the reporters were grasping at any ray of hope. Basically, the question

resolved itself into the amount of power the Nazis held. If the Nazis really controlled the government, by the nature of their overt anti-Semitism, it seemed unlikely that the boycott would be called off. On the other hand, if the Nazis did not control the government, the government should have suppressed the preparations for the boycott. A third possibility would be that no group fully held power in the government, and this could be an explanation for the governmental inactivity.

News of anti-German boycotts in Paris¹⁷⁰ and Holland¹⁷¹ appeared. The English,¹⁷² following the lead of the State Department, decided not to make a protest to Germany. Perhaps as an attempt to influence American public opinion, Berlin police arrested a number of men who were accused of beating an American Jew.¹⁷³

Accounts of the protest meeting in New York against Germany's treatment of Jews were featured by Tuesday's Chronicle¹⁷⁴ on the front page, while the Examiner¹⁷⁵ carried its report on the second page. Much of the Chronicle's Associated Press article¹⁷⁶ was devoted to quotations from Alfred E. Smith's speech which expressed universal indignation. Both accounts gave a list of the important speakers. The Examiner¹⁷⁷ characterized the meeting: "In one of the most tremendous demonstrations in the city's history, New York Jewry tonight poured forth a mighty protest against anti-Semitism in Germany." It reported that "millions" listened by radio in many countries. Also, about 125,000 persons were present at the meeting itself. After giving a list of the speakers, the Universal Service dispatch noted that "Bishop John J. Dunn, who was scheduled to represent the Catholics, announced, after receiving the State Department report that anti-Jewish violence has ceased, that he would not speak." The Chronicle's¹⁷⁸ report on the

meeting was not particularly impressive, in that it omitted mentioning the number of people who attended the proceedings. On the other hand, the report that the speakers were "Flanked by American and Jewish flags," gave the meeting a patriotic atmosphere. The reader of the Examiner¹⁷⁹ report was impressed with the number of people who attended, a very large group for those days. Also interesting to the reader was the reason given for Catholic Bishop John Dunn's failure to speak. It would appear to the reader that the State Department was against the demonstration, why else would the Department have sent the report to the bishop. The reader might also have felt a vague sense of relief that something, even if it might prove unproductive, was done for Germany's Jews. The Jewish reader would have felt gratified that non-Jews had joined the protest. He might have also thought that perhaps something like the "opinion of the civilized world" existed and that Germany would now be forced to listen to it.

The Associated Press report¹⁸⁰ of Representative Sirovich's attempt to abrogate American treaties with Germany, the reader knew was bound for defeat. What was noteworthy was Congressman Blanton's acknowledgment that "unreasonable foolish persecution of Jews [occurs] right here in the nation's capital." Did this mean that one should not protest anti-Semitism in Germany until it was eradicated in the United States?

Wednesday's Universal Service report told Examiner¹⁸¹ readers that an anti-German boycott was getting under way in New York. It added: "Although the boycott movement was not mentioned in last night's meeting of protest in Madison Square Gardens, prominent Jewish leaders today admitted that such a movement is undeniably under way." The

reader might have remembered the boycott organized by the Jewish War Veterans. Might this report have really dealt with a rejuvenation of that boycott meeting which was caused by the indignation meeting? Unquestionably a boycott of German goods and services was a more serious and direct means of protesting German anti-Semitism, than mere words of indignation. The problem with a boycott, which might have arisen in the mind of the reader, was that it was by its nature a tricky device. Would not a boycott result in a counter-boycott? As was the exact case on this Wednesday, with an anti-Jewish boycott scheduled to begin in Germany on Saturday. The thought that must have gone through the minds of Jewish and many Christian readers was what effect a successful anti-German boycott would have on German Jews. It would seem to only increase their peril. Yet, a boycott was the only concrete action that was available for protesting German anti-Semitism.

Friday brought the news that Rabbi Wise and other members of the American Jewish Congress returned to Washington to speak with officials of the State Department. No details of the conversation were given by the delegation. The Chronicle's¹⁸² version of the Associated Press dispatch contained no guesses as to the reason for the meeting. Was this visit initiated by the State Department to thwart the efforts of the American Jewish Congress to protest against Nazi treatment of Jews? Or did the members of the American Jewish Congress again ask for American intervention in Germany? The reader could not be sure. The Examiner's¹⁸³ report of the same Associated Press report was headed "STATE OFFICE GETS 2ND PLEA." It related: "After a second visit of prominent American Jews to the State Department, there were indications tonight that the American government will employ its [sic] influence

quietly and in neighborly fashion to avert the economic war scheduled to be opened against Jews in Germany Saturday." It was further mentioned that during a meeting at the State Department with the German ambassador "Opportunity was afforded to acquaint the German government informally with the attitude of the United States." The article concluded: "It is felt in official circles that a formal protest should be avoided if possible to prevent the appearance of pressure." According to this account, Rabbi Wise and his group asked the State Department to "use its good offices in averting the boycott." If that was indeed the case, the reader might have the feeling that the State Department advised the American Jewish Congress to let the Department deal with the matter and not to engage in publicity.

The statements by various state governors in Emanu-El¹⁸⁴ giving their support to the boycott movement, were impressive to the reader, even though he might have thought that many of the statements were not necessarily motivated solely by humanitarian but political impulses. The statement by Representative Fish of New York,¹⁸⁵ a conservative Republican, showing that he made a clear dichotomy between American Jews and German Jews, might have been noticed by some readers. Fish was quite indignant against attacks on "American citizens of Jewish origin in Germany." But with regard to German Jews, he would only join "in the name of justice and common humanity in condemning the rise of racial hatred" In other words, he would do nothing. He emphasized this point of view in the conclusion of his message to the protest meeting: " [I] assure you as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of my utmost co-operation to protect the lives, property and rights of American citizens in Germany and throughout the world."

A fitting conclusion for a message expressing indignation at the persecution of German Jews, who were not American citizens. It was implicit that Fish was against interfering in the internal affairs of Germany.

San Francisco Jewry was unmentioned by San Francisco newspapers until Wednesday, when the Examiner¹⁸⁶ published "Indignation Over Threats of Hitler Increases Here." Judge Golden of the Anti-Defamation League said that "With threats of 'even greater destruction' the Nazis think to call off foreign opposition." Rabbi Reichert of Temple Emanu-El held that "The boycott being waged against German tradespeople was not launched as a retaliatory measure against the wave of protest that has arisen, Hitler's claim is but a facile excuse." He added: "Recently the average newspaper reader has been lulled into a belief that reports of Jewish persecution were greatly exaggerated. The truth is that Hitler never dreamed the world would protest his cruelties in the way it has, and he has become alarmed." There was also mention that the Reverent Observance of Good Friday Committee offered sympathy to San Francisco Jewry. Yet, indignation was not the motivation of the article, rather it was to announce that "San Francisco Jews will launch their drive for \$200,000 to aid their brethren in Germany Monday." The article gave the reader the sense that even though there had been no public protest meeting as in Oakland and many other cities in the United States, the Jews of San Francisco were actively involved in protesting Nazi anti-Semitism. Why there had been no indignation meeting in San Francisco was not told to the reader. It was reassuring that Catholic leaders in this city with a large Catholic population had expressed their sympathy. Still it was puzzling that there had been no mass meeting in San Francisco. Did San Fran-

cisco Jewish leaders want to channel all the energy that would have been dissipated by a mass meeting into the Welfare Fund drive?¹⁸⁷

On Thursday, the Examiner again reported on the preparations for the fund drive in a second page article. Again there was the association of the needs of the Welfare Fund with the situation in Germany. The article concluded with a quotation of a message sent by the firm of L. Oppenheimer Company in Mannheim, Germany, to the E. Clemens Horst Company, whose location was not given. The telegram read "Please inform your friends that widespread rumors about cruelties against Jews are absolutely untrue and mere inventions of reports for sensational purposes." It was not mentioned in the article why this telegram was inserted here. Was it provided by the Welfare Fund to stem possible criticism of there not having been a San Francisco protest meeting? Or did the newspaper think this was an appropriate place to publish it at the conclusion of a report on the activities of the Jewish Welfare Fund drive?

Friday found another report published in the Examiner¹⁸⁸ on the Jewish Welfare Fund, entitled "All Creeds Join in Condemning Hitlerite's Acts." The article began, "Leaders of all creeds in California have united in condemning persecution of Jews in Germany." Next was a portion of a letter, written by the Episcopal Bishop of California, protesting anti-Semitism, which was sent to Rabbi Reichert. Finally, there was a quotation by Rabbi Reichert telling of how Nazi anti-Semitism made the fund drive more important than ever. These three articles were probably prepared publicity releases.

The reason for the absence of a protest meeting in San Francisco was found in Emanu-El and will be dealt with later.

Emanu-El¹⁸⁹ noted that the Board of Rabbis of Northern California passed a resolution asking for liberalized immigration for German Jews whose relatives resided in the United States and also a resolution of support for the fund drive. All of the Reform rabbis, the only rabbis who provided sermon titles to be published in Emanu-El, planned to speak Saturday on the German situation.¹⁹⁰

The Chronicle editorial for Tuesday was "Responsibility Sobers Even Herr Hitler's Anti-Semitism."¹⁹¹ Since this editorial was presumably written before there were reports of the anti-Jewish boycott from Germany, the editorialist was still preoccupied with the question of who was responsible for Jewish persecution. At this date, the writer held, "It is the old story of elected responsibility embarrassed by its own preelection propaganda." Now that Hitler was in power, "He sees that this Jew-baiting . . . won't do for Germany." The author held that though Hitler used anti-Semitism as a means to get power, he cannot now allow it. "We have no doubt that Wilhelm Goering speaks by Hitler's book when he says the Nazi government will not permit attacks on any Jew because he is a Jew." In the same vein, "As the firebrand leader of a faction Herr Hitler thought it 'popular' to propose to attack the Jews. As the ruler of Germany he knows it won't do." The editorialist nevertheless conceded that "We do not, however, take this declared attitude of the German government to mean that the movement to drive all Jews out of public positions has been discontinued." The reader would like to believe the substance of this editorial, which conformed with similar published statements. It seemed reasonable that Hitler as head of the German government would have to temporize his views to a degree for the good of Germany. It might also ap-

pear consistent with Nazi anti-Semitism that Jews would not be able to hold public positions. If this editorial had been published the day before, more might have believed it; however, with the announcement of the German anti-Jewish boycott, the situation was completely changed. No longer would anti-Semitism be a scattered phenomenon, but now an organized mass demonstration of fanaticism, with the backing of Hitler's Nazi Party. Again, it could be argued that extreme elements of the Nazi Party were responsible for planning the boycott, and Hitler as Chancellor with his new responsibilities could not allow this action to be carried out.

The first editorial written after the boycott announcement appeared in the Chronicle on Wednesday; it was entitled "Brown Shirts Hold Reich Firmly in Their Grasp."¹⁹² In this editorial, the writer reversed his previous opinions. He saw the boycott as an official phase of anti-Semitism, different from the unofficial, physical violence phase of anti-Semitism, which the State Department had declared ended. With respect to the boycott the author held: "It is the deliberate policy of the Nazi government itself to eliminate German citizens of Jewish race from all important part[s] in German life--public or private." The author now agreed with the assertion made by both the Associated Press and Universal Service that the boycott had governmental sanction, "Except that they do not bear the official seal of the government these [boycott] announcements cannot be taken as anything else than governmental." Next, the Chronicle editorialist held that Hitler had been made chancellor with the expectation that he would be "a mere figure-head." But "Hitler's advancement has become a real revolution in which the Brown Shirts have seized Germany. They are in absolute control."

The point of this editorial discourse was that "The Nazis are in as complete control in Germany as the Bolsheviki are in Russia and von Papen who was supposed to act as Hitler's tutor and guardian, is on the way to becoming another Kerensky." In other words, Hitler was now seen as controlling Germany, and the Nazi Party was seen to be as disreputable as the Communist Party. The reader might still have hoped that von Hindenburg and respectable Germans held a slender margin of power, or that they might be able to wrest the government from Hitler. If Hitler did have power, the hope would have been as the writer expressed the day before, that responsibility would sober Hitler. Yet, the writer this day did not venture that opinion.

An attack on Hitler came from an unexpected place, when the Chronicle published the thoughts of its music editor, Alexander Fried, himself a Jew.¹⁹³ He made a forceful argument when he pointed out that Jews "are communists--says Hitlerism--threatening with their Marxist doctrine to destroy the institutions of private property; and--says Hitlerism--they gloat, while Germans starve, in ownership and control of 62 percent of residential and business property of Berlin." Most of the article was an attempt to refute Nazi dogma with respect to German Jews. He then expressed his sorrow for German Jewry, for those Germans who did not vote for Hitler, "And the millions who voted for him in sincere patriotic hope, not sharing the meanest of his furies, must now run the risk of whatever harm his recklessness may create." Overall, the article was impressive and well thought out. Its main effort seemed to be to show the absurdity of Nazi anti-Semitism. The reader would probably have agreed with Fried.

An example of the German "anti-atrocity" drive was a letter published

in the Wednesday's Chronicle¹⁹⁴ which carried the Nazi line, "Letters which I have in my possession emanating from Germany and Austria, of most recent date, show that there is no truth in what is being printed in the American press regarding outrages perpetrated against foreigners, etc. On the contrary, law and order more so than ever prevail everywhere." The reader would find that this letter conformed to the dispatches from Germany which told of the organization of letter writing campaigns. For those who wished to believe all was well in Germany, letters such as this one would just reinforce their own views.

Thursday's Chronicle editorial was entitled "Hitler's Ideas of 'Abuse.'"¹⁹⁵ It related that "Hitlerite propaganda continues to assume that so long as no ears are cut off or faces smashed, Jewish citizens in Germany are not 'abused.'" While the government ordered that "Jews are not to be beaten or mutilated, they are merely to be starved, to be prevented from earning a living, and to be forbidden to exercise the common rights of men." Finally, "It is no excuse for these acts to protest that nobody's jaw has been broken. And these things, far from being denied, are officially and formally proclaimed." The editor compared the German actions to Czarist Russia. The purpose of this editorial was to portray Hitler as being responsible for these anti-Semitic actions, that the arguments that the Nazi Party was responsible and not Hitler could not be accepted by the writer, and that economic persecution was as great an "abuse" as physical molestation. Again, the reader would probably find the editorialist's viewpoint acceptable.

Friday's Emanu-El carried a front page commentary by Lion Feuchtwanger, called "Hitler's Delusion."¹⁹⁶ Feuchtwanger expressed his disappointment with Germany which he had often defended. "The cultural

collapse of Germany," Feuchtwanger held, had not occurred "almost over night." Rather, he felt the World War, when "the nations worshipped force and exalted might," contributed to Germany's decline. While "Germany suffered more than any other country from the creed of force which was preached there with tenacity and violence," he defended Germany by saying, "It is an evidence of the solidity of German culture that it could resist Fascism so long." He argued that "the Fascist movement counted on the mass man's inferiority complex." Since Germans could not understand how they lost the war, they concluded that Jews were the reason. All of Germany's misfortunes were blamed by the Nazis on "The devilish group of Jews." Even with the happenings in Germany, Feuchtwanger was still mildly optimistic that the intellectuals would eventually prevail over the Nazis for the "intellect has always been stronger than force and that German culture will reassert itself against the barbarism seeking to engulf it." The reader's feelings were mixed. On one hand, he felt immeasurable pity for Feuchtwanger, who could not yet fathom how it was that Germany which he had so often risen to defend, could now sink so low. He clung to the hope that somehow the intellectuals, those civilized Germans with whom he had social and intellectual intercourse, would help to reassert what Feuchtwanger held was the glory of German culture. While the reader felt great pity for Feuchtwanger, even though he saw that Feuchtwanger's hope seemed impossible, just the same the reader desired that Feuchtwanger would be proved right, that German culture would overturn German barbarism.

Claude G. Bower, United States Ambassador to Spain, expressed his thoughts in Emanu-El in a commentary entitled "Mob Violence Rules Germany."¹⁹⁷ He held that it is now apparent that the Nazi aim "is the persecution of

the Jewish people." He found it "incredible from this distance that Hindenburg is in sympathy with . . . the acts of violence." He argued against Feuchtwanger's alleged opinion that Hitler was not to be blamed. He admitted that the World War atrocity stories were false and that after the war, Germany was gaining world respect. But that respect had been swiftly lost because "throughout the outside world the medieval persecution of Jews in Germany is being savagely denounced." Furthermore, "No friend of Germany can think with satisfaction of the hostile reactions of the world." Bower then took to task those who exonerated the German government: "It never is enough that government does not authorize a crime; it is the duty of government to prevent if possible, and if impossible to prevent it, to punish the culprits." He concluded, "At the moment the friends of peace are deeply concerned over the disturbing events in Germany and if these events are not in accord with Hitler's purpose, the world speedily will pass judgment on his capacity to rule on what he does to end them." In other words, the "world's conscience" will oppose Hitler, which might lead to another war. The reader would have found Bower's arguments well thought out with the exception, perhaps, of the last. His recourse and that of others to a mythical entity, "world's conscience" or "the opinion of the civilized world," seemed to be no solution. War might have been an option, but, I am sure, the reader would have felt that the persecution of Jews would not cause any nation to make war on Germany.

Herbert Solow, formerly of the Menorah Journal, noted in Emanu-El in his "A Lesson In Politics,"¹⁹⁸ that Jewish leadership in Germany failed to follow the right policy. "It was persistently to tolerate the existing situation, to refrain from any frank public statements or

sharp criticism of the existing regime, on the grounds that alternatives might be worse." Thus it supported one German government after another. He concluded, "If instead of tolerance and even flattery German Jewry had treated first Bruening, then von Papen and then von Schleicher [Hitler's predecessors as chancellor] with frank criticism, perhaps Hitler would not have become chancellor. As it was, Jewish leadership soothed the road for him." The reader might have found these words rather sharp, with some truth in them. But he would probably have found it unlikely that German Jewry could have prevented Hitler. It was an interesting argument, perhaps as efficacious as telling a corpse what disease one thought caused its death.

Joseph Salmark, mentioning that the death of Dr. Apfel, a German Zionist leader, was "hardly noticed in the papers," asked: "Are we becoming callous and indifferent to German Jewish news?"¹⁹⁹ The reader might be inclined to agree with Salmark. For after all, one or two tragedies will shock a person, but a barrage of dreadful events will dull a person's sensitivity to individual occurrences.

The Chronicle's Friday editorial in support of the Jewish National Welfare Fund drive was entitled "For the Need is Very Great."²⁰⁰ It made the point, also found in the drive's press releases, of associating the urgency of the need with the Nazi persecutions.

The dissension among San Francisco Jews became apparent in Emanu-El.²⁰¹ The first hints of this were noted in the parts of Rabbi Reichert's sermon "German Jews Face Plight," which filled the whole of the third page of Emanu-El. This was from a sermon Reichert gave the preceding Saturday morning. The reader was aware that Reichert, the anti-Zionist, was one of the most influential rabbis in San Francisco, occupying the pulpit at

Temple Emanu-El, and he knew from the frequent press releases of the past week, that Rabbi Reichert was the campaign manager of the Jewish Welfare Fund drive here. The sermon began: "So many shocking reports have come out of Germany that it requires a calm and judicious discrimination even to attempt to dissociate the fictitious and imaginary from the actual." It would seem that Reichert had doubts. He also asserted that one must be "judicious" in deciding which reports to believe, for many might be false. Next he related: "Some of us who have long held out against crediting many of the reports of the past few weeks, have during the last day or two been forced to acknowledge that there must be a great deal of truth in them." "Some of us," the reader would be led to understand, included Reichert among those who did not believe the reports. Why? Perhaps Reichert could not conceive that such actions were possible in Germany or could not force himself to believe it. Could this have been one of the reasons no protest meeting was held in San Francisco? Well, the sermon was delivered on the Saturday before the protest meeting in New York. Now if Rabbi Reichert had been opposed to such a meeting because he could not acknowledge such reports, and only on Thursday or Friday did he come to accept the reports, when he wrote his sermon, there would still have been time to have a protest meeting Monday.

Reichert reinforced the reader's contention that he did not accept the stories of persecution, when he noted "Speaking personally, all my doubts were dispelled when I read the report sent by Lion Feuchtwanger in the New York Times." Assuming that this report by Feuchtwanger was carried in the Sunday New York Times, the earliest that paper could have reached San Francisco, it being unlikely that airlines were carrying news-

papers in those days, would have been Wednesday, giving a good period of time left for a mass meeting to be organized on Monday. Reichert gave the impression that the reason he would or had not accepted the various stories until then was that they did not seem to give "due discount for passion, hysteria, and excitement," in other words that the accounts might have been "yellow journalism," just an attempt to sell newspaper stories. Feuchtwanger was to Reichert the paragon of a "trained observer." Hence, since Feuchtwanger had now corroborated the authenticity of the German situation, the reports could be viewed in the main as true. Reichert also used as evidence the reports of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, which told of large numbers of Jews emigrating from Germany as another reason for believing the accounts of Jewish persecution. Realistically, he pointed out, "Of course, it is impossible for a whole people numbering half a million to tear itself up root and branch and expatriate itself at a moment's notice." He then expressed sympathetic understanding of "Germany's political and economic difficulties." This was a common statement used also by editorialists and columnists, to assure others that the one who protested Jewish persecution was not against Germany per se. Nonetheless, he warned, "Let Germany beware lest she alienate from herself the sympathy of the entire civilized world by inciting her perplexed masses to unbridled rapacity and barbarism as an antidote for their disillusionment and desperation." Again, the appeal was to be cautious of "world opinion."

A hint as to the non-occurrence of an indignation meeting was Reichert's statement: "At present it is highly difficult for us in America to formulate a statesmanlike program for ameliorating the condition of our suffering co-religionists abroad." Thus, it would be wise

to do nothing for the time being? Could Reichert have been intimating that the mass meetings then being organized by the American Jewish Congress were not "statesmanlike"? His only suggestion for the present in order to help the situation of German Jews was to contribute to the Jewish National Welfare Fund.

After this, Reichert directly confronted the question. "As to the advisability of holding large public indignation meetings, there is a division of opinion as some of you doubtless know, among responsible and, I pause to emphasize the word, among responsible Jewish leaders." It would seem that Reichert considered himself as one of those "responsible Jewish leaders." Further, his "I pause to emphasize the word, among responsible Jewish leaders," would cause the reader to conclude that some violent argumentation might have taken place in San Francisco. Reichert continued: "In a crisis such as this, there are always any number of hysterical individuals representing minority groups who are far more vociferous than judicious, who wish to precipitate action, and possibly involve us all in difficulty and embarrassment." Here the reader saw Reichert's bias: though he had gone to great lengths to "emphasize" the difference of opinion among "responsible Jewish leaders," he characterized those who wanted a protest meeting as "hysterical individuals . . . who are far more vociferous than judicious," and furthermore, that their opinion was a minority position. Notwithstanding the aforementioned epithets, these individuals among which Reichert was not counted, might "involve us all in difficulty and embarrassment." The reader might not have followed Reichert's reasoning as to how a protest meeting would "involve us all in difficulty and embarrassment." If the reports were true, what could be the "embarrassment"? The "difficulty"

might have referred to German Jews or even to fears of anti-Semitic activities in San Francisco.

Reichert's argument then proceeded: "The opinions of German Jewish leaders are being sought by outstanding American Jewish leaders in this emergency." Apparently, he was not referring to the leaders of New York's Orthodox community, the American Jewish War Veterans, or the American Jewish Congress. He related that the Joint Distribution Committee was in constant touch with their German representatives and "The American Jewish Committee, a distinguished national group that is representative not only of Reform Jewry, but all American Jewry, is anxiously and intently following the situation and is in constant communications with German Jewish leaders." It might have seemed to the reader that Rabbi Reichert was attempting to discredit the largely East European and pro-Zionist American Jewish Congress as reckless, and to portray the genteel, non-Zionist American Jewish Committee as the true, judicious representative of American Jews.

Reichert's use of the word "difficulty" became understandable when he explained, "It is necessary for us to exercise restrained and sober judgment until we are sure that any action which we may take may not involve German Jewry in yet greater difficulties." Reichert's reasoning here seemed quite sober. It was a difficult problem to resolve and it involved human lives. On one hand, a public demonstration would enable one to express his indignation and perhaps cause Germany to ease her persecution of Jews, or to induce the United States government that it would be expedient to protest the German disturbances. Yet, the possibility existed that such a demonstration might only engender more violence against German Jews. It could have been argued that a mass meeting

in San Francisco would really have made no difference, since similar protest meetings would take place in other cities. This argument had merits, it would not have caused any more difficulties for German Jews, for if there were to be an adverse Nazi reaction, one city more or less would not have an effect on the degree of the reaction. Rather, the reader might have gathered that what was at stake was not a mass meeting, but the question of whether the American Jewish Congress or the American Jewish Committee would be the representative of American Jewry for the new Democratic administration.

Returning to the sermon, Reichert stated that "Reports have it that Zionist and B'nai B'rith leaders have already been dragged from their beds and flogged and abused. Under these circumstances, all plans beyond those for relief ought necessarily to be held in abeyance." To phrase it differently, there should be no mass meetings or protests.

Reichert next mentioned that though anti-Semitism is "of course, a Jewish problem, [it] is more especially and acutely a Christian problem." Let the Christians do the protesting, Reichert seemed to be saying. He elaborated: "But think of the harm, the irreparable hurt, that the persecution and hatred and malevolence do to the soul of the Christian, to the religion that is Christianity." Does Rabbi Reichert mean to suggest that the Christian is more harmed by anti-Semitism than the Jew?

Besides giving money to the Welfare Fund drive, and putting all matters concerning German Jews into the hands of the American Jewish Committee, he concluded with the hope that the problem would go away, "But if unfortunately it should persist, we can but further hope that the united conscience of mankind will express its horror and its indignation in such unequivocal terms that Germany shall be made to feel that she has

become a pariah in the court of civilized opinion."

Rabbi Reichert's flowery oratory aside, the reader received the impression that Reichert almost came to the point of advocating that one should forget about Jewish persecution in Germany, hoping that it would go away, while those with more knowledge and judiciousness be left to deal with the problem, even though, Reichert seemed to imply, they would not be able to do much.

On the next page of Emanu-El more information on happenings in San Francisco was contained in Sol Silverman's editorial "LOCAL JEWRY ACTS."²⁰² Silverman held: "What action shall American Jewry take" is "the solemn question which has been presenting itself . . . to every Jew the world over." He continued: "Torn between the urges of the heart to do something and the restraints of the mind to be judicious, no unanimity of opinion has developed as to a single course of action." He considered Wednesday evening's meeting "perhaps the most momentous committee meeting in the history of San Francisco Jewry to consider defenses against Jewish pogroms." This was the meeting which was to have determined plans for a San Francisco mass meeting. He stated, "over fifty representatives, speaking for practically all local Jewish interests, determined to hold a mass meeting, if the tragic events, now moving so swiftly in Germany, do not alter their course within the next week or two." The reader would infer that not all were in favor of delay. Was delay to have been a tactic whereby no mass meeting would be held? A period of "next week or two" was rather indefinite. Yet, perhaps delay until more information became available would be more judicious.

Silverman held that "This much is certain in world Jewry: we are all moved by one profound sympathy to bring succor to the stricken." A noble

statement. However, "What method should be adopted to effect the relief, found a split in the three most powerful lay agencies in America, with the American Jewish Committee and B'nai B'rith appealing for the more quiet approach, and the American Jewish Congress advocating the demonstrative mass meeting." It would appear that the American Jewish Committee and perhaps more notably B'nai B'rith under Judge Golden were in control of the San Francisco Jewish community. It was Judge Golden who called the meeting. Next, Silverman noted that "The difference of opinion has crept into the rank and file of our people." Did this mean that a number of San Francisco Jews were in favor of a mass meeting?

Now, Silverman weighed the two opinions. He held that "Hitler has not said that the Nazi boycott would cease should the protest at mass meetings or in the press stop. He has only emphasized that the boycott would be more serious should the protests continue." Well, what should be done? Silverman held that "the only alternative left is to use pressure--the pressure of public opinion and economic force." He felt that public protest in the United States had caused Hitler to be "in a conciliatory mood." However, the situation for the Jew in Germany was tantamount to one in which the "noose has been placed on the victim's neck by the hangman; and if we must choose between a fast or a slow death, let us risk the former." He quoted Alfred E. Smith as holding that a "boycott is as despicable as violence." Silverman, the reader would be forced to assume, was advocating a mass protest meeting and an anti-German boycott. He closed his editorial by holding that we may have "confidence that the German Jews will rise out of the terror as a stronger people, and that perhaps world Jewry may become more unified."

In the first part of Silverman's editorial, the reader might have

had the impression that Silverman sided with those who opposed a mass meeting, those who wanted a "more quiet approach." The last part of the editorial showed where his true feelings were. While Silverman might have felt that a quick death was preferable to a slow one, others might justifiably argue that with time, the situation might change. Nonetheless, Silverman's approach was very diplomatic. His editorial might have seemed a courageous act to some readers who knew the realities of the San Francisco Jewish community.

The second editorial in Emanu-El, "NOISY MEETINGS,"²⁰³ by Joseph Brainin, the reader might have felt, reflected the opinions of the San Francisco Jewish establishment. Brainin told of two men, Judge Joseph M. Proskauer and James Rosenberg, who were "howled down" at the New York meeting of the American Jewish Congress which organized the indignation meetings. These two men, Brainin held, even though they knew that they could not prevent the proposed mass meeting, stood up to oppose it, because "They were motivated by a firm conviction that a mass demonstration at this time would jeopardize the position of German Jewry." These gentlemen pointed out that "the president of the Central Verein of German Jewish Citizens and the president of the Zionist organization of Germany implored the American Jewish leadership not to resort to mass demonstrations at this time." Brainin added as a footnote: "And it should also be known that the American Jewish Committee had the situation well in hand with the State Department at Washington long before Rabbi Stephen S. Wise . . . made that dramatic appearance in Washington to talk over the German situation with the undersecretary of state." The reader could clearly see that Brainin believed the American Jewish Committee a more conscientious organization than the American Jewish Congress;

further, that it operated, he held, quietly behind the scenes, in comparison with the American Jewish Congress, which wanted to get newspaper coverage. He asserted that Rabbi Wise's trip was totally unnecessary. He continued to castigate the American Jewish Congress: "In our anxiety to help our unfortunate brethren in Germany we should not forget that our actions--imposing and impressive though they may appear here--are intended for effect over there, as a political safeguard for German Jewry." He argued, "It is easy indeed to speak courageously in Madison Square thousands of miles away from the battlefield in Germany."

If Brainin was against Jewish protest, what, then, did he propose to do? "Protests against Hitlerism are more useful when they are led by Christian clergy and non-Jewish statesmen of America." Such protests, he asserted, "under non-Jewish auspices are more powerful than Jewish mass demonstrations." He would have liked Christians to organize protests, if need be. Let the Jews be the catalyst of the protest, but let them do it quietly, so that no one would know that Jews helped to bring them about. The argument is a good one. Certainly, Christian clergy and non-Jewish statesmen would make a greater impression on Germany. Yet, it would not seem likely that Christians would hold mass protest meetings, if Jews had not also conducted such meetings. For after all, it was Jews who were being persecuted in Germany, and if Jews did not seem to care enough to protest against that persecution, why should Christians protest? Besides, non-protest by Jews might have been interpreted as an admission that the persecution was justified; if not, why would the Jews refrain from protesting it?

But it was not protest of any kind that Brainin advocated, rather, he held that "In modern politics . . . it is the recognized sequence--

to try first diplomacy and then a direct appeal to the people." For "a mass demonstration very often intimidates official quarters and restrains them from acting." The reader gathered that Brainin felt that the best course of action would be for the American Jewish Committee, which had previously succeeded by quiet methods, to effect a civilized diplomatic solution. If that would not work, then, and only then, would it be time for a "mass demonstration [which] very often compel[s] action" in case "diplomacy fails." Let protest and indignation meetings be the last resort. He concluded, chastising Rabbi Wise and the American Jewish Congress, "Let there be less of a rush on the part of our leaders to make the front page and more of the self-sacrificial spirit of Joseph M. Proskauer and James N. Rosenberg, who were howled down at the American Jewish Congress meeting." Brainin, the reader gathered, had little use for the American Jewish Congress; he tended to see it as a useless organization of rowdies.

The next page of Emanu-El,²⁰⁴ page five, had quotations from Judge Golden's speech "before an overflow of San Francisco [B'nai B'rith] Lodge members." As "the silver lining that was threaded on the German Jewish black clouds of despair," Golden stated that "Our hope in the German crisis--a reign of ferocity and terror--is the good opinion of the American people and the rest of the civilized world, in addition to our own endurance." Public opinion, in other words, was the only "hope" to rescue German Jewry. He cautioned that since B'nai B'rith had 14,000 members in Germany, it has "made it not only desirable but necessary that the order move with great care in its action." Thus, understandably, a protest meeting might cause danger for B'nai B'rith members in Germany if the B'nai B'rith in the United States was associated with such a protest. Golden then came to the cause of the present dissension in the

American Jewish community. He noted that "before the present protest of the American Jewish Congress took place, that body, the B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Committee met in preliminary conference to determine the course to be followed." Then, "The congress suddenly decided to engage in clamorous mass meetings, leaving the other two organizations to make the less demonstrative appeal." By the use of the word "clamorous," the reader might have felt that Golden had contempt for the American Jewish Congress' action. Just exactly what "less demonstrative appeal" the B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Committee would follow was not stated. After Golden related that the press reports of the conditions in Germany "can be taken [as] true," he closed: "The 'Jews' will fight standing up; and with the sympathetic understanding of the American people and the enlightened world shall prevail as they have before." He believed that public opinion, "the world conscience," would cause Nazi anti-Semitism to dissipate, or was Golden forced to assume that opinion due to his status as a leader of B'nai B'rith?

Finally, Emanu-El devoted the rest of the fifth page to an article entitled "Jewish National Welfare Fund Drive Opens As Need for Aid In Germany Is Realized."²⁰⁵ This article, like the press releases in the Examiner and the Chronicle, encouraged the reader who felt he needed to do something for the plight of German Jewry to donate generously to the fund drive. Rabbi Reichert closed the article dramatically: "The entire United States is discussing the plight of the Jew in Germany. It has raised its voice in protest against Hitler's cruelties. And the entire nation knows that San Francisco Jewry has been asked to help its brethren. We must not fail in our duty. Our goal is \$200,000. We must, and we will, achieve it!" Again the question might have arisen in the reader's mind:

was the suppression of an indignation meeting in San Francisco in any way connected with the Jewish National Welfare Fund drive?

On Tuesday, the tremendous outpouring of Jewish protest in the indignation meetings and the announcement of the "second" phase of Nazi action against German Jewry, the anti-Jewish boycott, were reported. As the week progressed, the boycott became more and more associated with the German government. An emergency drive for the Jewish National Welfare Fund was publicized, while the San Francisco Jewish community, along with American Jewry as a whole, was engaged in angry argumentation with respect to what actions should be taken to help German Jewry. The week ended with contention among American Jews and with dread fear for German Jewry on the eve of the anti-Jewish boycott.

CHAPTER VI

(April 1st to April 4th, 1933)

The fear of the consequences of the boycott on German Jewry was somewhat allayed by the German government's announcement that the boycott would be limited to Saturday, and "then will be held in abeyance until Wednesday."^{206,207} The official reason given for the one day boycott was that the atrocity tales "in foreign countries had diminished."²⁰⁸ According to the Associated Press, "This action, taken after considerable pressure had been brought to bear to prevent disruption of the nation's business life, led some observers to assert that the boycott movement would be dropped entirely after a single day."²⁰⁹

Karl von Wiegand²¹⁰ held the same view, "Vice Chancellor von Papen, backed by German industries, banks, steamship lines and Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, president of the Reichsbank, made every possible effort to head off the boycott. There was an unconfirmed report that Dr. Schacht had threatened to resign." He added "the supposed reason for which the boycott was not called off or postponed tonight, as Vice Chancellor von Papen had informed Universal Service it would be, was that an expected official statement from Washington did not arrive." He further asserted that "Vice Chancellor von Papen said tonight that if the American statement should arrive tonight, he hoped the boycott could still be called off or postponed tomorrow morning before 10 a.m., when it is set to begin." The reader was told by von Wiegand that the American statement "was to be to the effect that the American government disapproved the

atrocities campaign and foreign boycott of German goods." To the reader, it would seem logical that German industry would oppose the boycott, for fear of a counter-boycott against their goods. As to the possibility of an American note, it would seem unlikely to the reader that the United States would have "disapproved the atrocities campaign," which would be the same as acknowledging that American correspondents had all engaged in falsifications. Nevertheless, it might have been possible that the American government would oppose the boycott of German goods in the United States, in that it would make the repayment of American loans more difficult.

In a related article from Washington, the State Department, "insisted it knows nothing of a reported 'official statement' by this government in regard to the German Jewish situation. It denied it has sent any such statement, or that it plans to send one."²¹¹ Notwithstanding this official denial, the reader might have still felt that the State Department could have been engaging in secret correspondence with the German government.

Even though the boycott would now be limited to Saturday, Goebbels held that, "If foreign propaganda has not been ended by 10 a.m. Wednesday . . . the boycott will be resumed 'with full force and vehemence which until now has been undreamed of.'"²¹² In other words, blackmail. More details of the regulations for the boycott were given. Von Wiegand²¹³ reported that "Tonight there were torchlight parades and demonstrations for the boycott of the Jews in Berlin and cities and towns throughout the country." He further asserted that the German Jews "know the ultimate goal of radical Nazi sentiment is a 'Jew-less Germany.'" Von Wiegand still gave the impression that there were other Nazis who were

not "radical." He also related, "Here and there, in street cars, buses and other places, there are also indications of sympathy, pity and even something like shame in some Christian faces when a Jew or Jewess enter." Statements such as the foregoing served to give the reader hope that humanity and decency might yet prevail in Germany. Von Wiegand concluded his account with the chilling report: "In well informed circles there is much talk that, under cover of the boycott, it is planned to reorganize completely every business in Germany, eliminating Jews everywhere. It is significant that 'Red hunt' is completely silenced. It is replaced by a Jew hunt." Thus the boycott was seen as a first stage in the economic warfare against German Jewry. Those measures which already had eliminated Jews from governmental offices, now were also aimed to eradicate all Jewish business interests, with the possible exception of banking.

Sunday brought the first actual account of the boycott. Only two deaths were reported, one Jewish and one Nazi. Von Wiegand²¹⁴ and the Associated Press²¹⁵ held that it was unlikely that the boycott would be resumed on Wednesday. This probably caused the reader to feel relief, as did the report that President von Hindenburg intervened to limit the boycott to one day.²¹⁶ Even though it was also reported that the German Foreign Minister, von Neurath, threatened to resign,²¹⁷ it was the action of Hindenburg which seemed most important to the reader. The reader was thus encouraged to hope that Hindenburg, the only German official not subservient to Hitler, would now exert his power to bring Germany to the path of reason.

Von Wiegand²¹⁸ told that in Cassel, "a barbed wire enclosure was erected and labeled 'Concentration Camp for Obdurate Citizens Who Buy From

Jews.' A donkey stood disconsolately inside the barricade." In Annaberg, people who left Jewish shops were forced to have their faces stamped with the statement "We are traitors. We bought from Jews."

More frightening for the future was the report that Jewish workers were dismissed from their jobs in Munich and other cities, and that Jews who had been trying to leave Germany had been ordered to remain in Germany.²¹⁹ Another small measure to cause discomfort to Jews was the cancelling of library cards and their exclusion from library reading rooms.²²⁰

During the boycott itself, Nazi pickets were stationed near the homes of Jewish lawyers and physicians.²²¹ All of these actions, the boycott and those measures extraneous to the boycott, might have seemed to the reader to be another permanent step in the systematic reduction of the rights of German Jewish citizens.

On the Chronicle's²²² front page was a translation of a Nazi poster, which served to show the reader the Nazis' insane hatred of the Jews. One of the representative statements regarding Jews, made after an unattributed quotation from "the Protocols of the Elders of Zion," was "No crime is too base to him to accuse the Germans of it."

On Monday, the Chronicle²²³ again related that it was doubtful that the boycott would be resumed on Wednesday. Karl von Wiegand,²²⁴ by sending his cable from London, was able to avoid Nazi censorship. He gave what appeared to him to be the real reasons for the cancellation of the boycott after one day. He related that von Hindenburg "Aroused by warnings from Vice Chancellor von Papen and Foreign Minister von Neurath," and "warnings that were strongly backed up by friendly representations from Washington and London," personally "intervened and ordered the boycott ended." Von Wiegand held that von Hindenburg threatened Hitler that he

would invoke martial law if the boycott were not called off. Further, "Von Hindenburg, according to well informed diplomatic sources, demanded that his name be immediately removed from the boycott proclamation, which was about to be issued in Munich, declaring use of his name had not been asked nor had consent been given." Additionally, "Chancellor Hitler is declared to have bowed to von Hindenburg's will and ordered the boycott ended before it had officially begun, but Hitler's chief aide, Minister Hermann Goering, is reported to have protested this action came too late, that he could not guarantee what might happen, since the Nazi storm troops were keyed up." Thus, "Von Hindenburg thereupon reluctantly agreed to a one-day boycott only, it is declared, demanding, however, that the boycott end with Saturday's half holiday." In these negotiations, von Neurath was said to have asked von Papen to speak to von Hindenburg. Thus it appeared to the reader that only those three men in the German government were on the side of reason. The American Chargé d'Affaires was also credited with helping to bring about this solution. All references to these developments were censored in Germany.

In a somewhat related development it was alleged that the ex-Kaiser had asked his family "not to participate in Jew baiting."^{225,226}

On Tuesday, the boycott still occupied attention on the front page of both the Examiner²²⁷ and the Chronicle.²²⁸ The Chicago Tribune Foreign Cable Service²²⁹ related that the boycott would not be resumed Wednesday because "the Nazi propaganda machine has brought the great United States to its knees and forced it to behave." The article related that German newspapers also wrote that "Complying with the desire of the State Department and leading members of Congress, American Jews have decided to take an attitude of silence toward the situation of the Jews in Germany." The

reader wondered from whence the German newspapers received their information, probably from the German government.

It was noted that while Jewish merchants had reopened their shops, "Jewish lawyers, judges, professors, teachers, officials, artists, authors and doctors still remain under restrictions." In fact, only thirty-five Jewish lawyers were at that time allowed to practice before the courts. One Jewish judge, who was removed from the bench, committed suicide, and Max Reinhardt, a leading German theatrical producer, was fired by the Deutsches Theater. For the readers of the Nazi newspaper, who might have had difficulty in determining that Reinhardt was Jewish, he was re-named "Reinhardt-Goldmann." Another frightening development was that "Starting at midnight all Germans desiring to leave Germany must get a certificate of integrity stamped on their passports." How would a Jew get a "certificate of integrity" stamped on his passport from a Nazi? A bribe? What was the reason for this action?

Karl von Wiegand²³⁰ reported that Jewish shops had opened without opposition and that in some instances "Nazi storm troops in some places were even seen washing off shop windows the 'dirty Jew' signs they had painted there on Saturday." If the storm troopers had indeed washed off windows, the reader would have been astounded. He also noted that Jewish employees who had been dismissed on Saturday had returned to work. Nonetheless, he held that the Nazi newspapers did not reflect any lessening of their rabid anti-Semitism and that the Jews felt that "After Saturday's boycott, their stores and shops are now marked places, even if the boycott is not resumed officially and openly, it is feared its effect will continue for some time." Further, he related "I have found many Jews of the better classes completely crushed and hopeless under humiliations,

especially the Nazi efforts to deny them a country where families have lived for generations." A question which arose in the reader's mind was why, if the Nazis wanted the Jews to emigrate, they would be stopping them from leaving the country.

Another cause for unease was the declaration by Julius Streicher that the time is "near when Jewish-Christian intermarriage will be banned by German law."²³¹ The reader by this time was well aware that the prophecies of German fanatics had a way of being fulfilled. Was this the next step in the Nazi war against the Jews to completely segregate them from all social intercourse with Christians and return them to the ghetto?

Sunday, the same day the boycott was first described, also brought Einstein back to the front page. It was reported that the Prussian government had confiscated Einstein's bank account and his securities.^{232,233} The reader might have thought it would have been more prudent for the German government not to publicize this seizure. On the other hand, it did tend to further intimidate German Jewry. At the same time, it was announced that Einstein had resigned from the Prussian Academy of Sciences and the co-presidency of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Physics.^{234,235} He had also renounced his German citizenship.²³⁶

Report of a large number of German Jews fleeing to Denmark was published Sunday. Among the refugees was "Henni Steiner, a composer, who remarked that the change in air was good for his health."²³⁷ Perhaps Steiner still had relatives in Germany.

Sunday also witnessed the start of a campaign to ban some American music, notably that by American Jewish composers.²³⁸ In Paris an anti-German boycott was begun.²³⁹ On Monday, it was reported that Catholic churches in Paris distributed tracts saying "The Old and New Testaments

should unite to combat these crimes unworthy of our civilization."^{240,241}

On Saturday, it was mentioned that "Leaders of American Jewry visited the State Department twice today [Friday] to keep in touch with the anti-Semitic situation in Germany, but both the callers and Government officials refrained from any comment because of the delicacy of the matter."²⁴² Who were these Jewish leaders? Were they Stephen Wise and members of the American Jewish Congress? Finally, when information became available that the boycott would last only one day, initially, "There were evidences of relief in Washington official quarters."²⁴³ Did this intimate that if the boycott had not been limited to one day, the United States would have filed a protest? Or was it relief caused by the success of American diplomacy in Germany?

Sunday found Arturo Toscanini joining ten other American musicians in sending a cable of protest to Berlin with regard to the treatment of German artists. The reader would presume that the protest was against the treatment of Jewish artists in Germany, though it was not specifically stated.^{244,245}

The revelation of intense American diplomatic efforts was made known on Monday.²⁴⁶ "Secretary of State Cordell Hull and his chief assistants talked by long-distance telephone with George Gordon, American chargé d'affaires in Berlin, and were given a report of conditions."²⁴⁷ The ten minute call was made on Sunday morning,²⁴⁸ and perhaps could have been preceded by earlier calls. The admission that such a conference call was made might have served to pacify American Jewry by calling to the fact that the State Department was officially concerned with the plight of German Jewry. The American Jewish Congress was reported to have "adopted an attitude of silence on the German situation."²⁴⁹ This

was said to have been done "in deference to the wishes of the State Department."²⁵⁰ How much pressure was exerted by the State Department and Jewish organizations was left to the reader's imagination.

The opening of the Catholic Holy Year was also an occasion to express indignation directed to Germany.²⁵¹ To the reader it was good to see Catholics and Jews cooperating.

Most of the local news dealt with the Jewish National Welfare Fund drive. In each of these articles, the situation of German Jewry was stressed. On Saturday "It was announced last night that during the ten-day campaign in this city, which starts Monday morning, money will be turned in hourly by workers and will be transmitted immediately to the Jews in Germany."²⁵² It was further noted that the entire public was invited to the opening campaign luncheon.

Sunday's article²⁵³ related "The situation of thousands of Jews in Germany as the aftermath of Nazi aggression . . . is serious," Rabbi Reichert said. "A generous portion of the funds collected will be sent immediately to the headquarters of the joint distribution committee in Berlin. Tuesday's report on the initial fund raising luncheon quoted Archbishop Hanna as saying, "It is abhorrent to every caste, creed and religion to contemplate the children of a common Father being discriminated against because of race." Both the Chronicle²⁵⁴ and the Examiner²⁵⁵ listed the major donors. The Examiner's list began with those who donated \$50. It was probably hoped that such listings might cause others to give more money.

Adolf Werbik, a San Francisco artist, who was in Germany in 1932, was the subject of an article in the Chronicle.²⁵⁶ He held that there is a misunderstanding in the United States about Hitler's attacks on the

Jews. Werbik held that Hitler was not attacking native German Jews, but the "80,000 immigrant Jews who came in after the war." He asserted that these immigrant Jews "cared nothing for Germany, but they exploited Germany, even exploiting German Jews." He added "They are doing this today, and that exploitation by this small, but rich and powerful class, is what Hitler has sworn to end." The reader would be somewhat comforted if Werbik's interpretation of the situation is correct, but he probably would not accept it. The news accounts from Germany made no real distinction between native and immigrant Jews.

On Monday, both the Chronicle²⁵⁷ and the Examiner²⁵⁸ carried a report that Raymond J. Roth or Rath, a leader of the Knights of Columbus in California, in a post-communion breakfast denounced German anti-Semitism. He held that "Racial prejudice leads to religious bigotry and the breakdown of the moral fiber of the people, fomenting hatred equalling the wartime animosities of 1914." Catholic support was impressive.

Saturday found Arthur Brisbane²⁵⁹ trying to give hope to American Jews, "Berlin describes Nazi-Hitler preparations for a nationwide boycott of Germany's Jewish citizens that the Nazis called 'the beginning of a war on the entire Jewish race of the world.' That is easy to say, not easy to carry out." He held that "All but the ignorant know that this will hurt Germany far more than it will injure the Jews." He concluded "That which could not be done by wholesale murdering, torturing and other atrocities of the Middle Ages will not be done now." The reader might wish he had Brisbane's faith. On Sunday, Brisbane²⁶⁰ told of the plight of Jewish vaudevillians who were mistaken for non-Jewish Germans and denied jobs in New York because of a boycott against German artists in retaliation for the German anti-Jewish boycott. The Jew couldn't win.

Monday saw the publication of another article by the Chronicle's music critic Alexander Fried.²⁶¹ Fried described what to him would have been a typical Nazi to whom he gave the name "Hans Mueller." It was a partially sympathetic attempt to determine the reason for the attraction of the Nazi party. He recounted the military defeat of Germany, the "humiliation" of the terms of the surrender, the massive unemployment and inflation. He concluded "Today Hitler is in power. 'Hans Mueller' has inherited the earth. The day of reckoning has come. His behavior is unpardonable, but it is not incomprehensible. He is still fighting the war." This most unusual article covertly tried to give a rationale for German anti-Semitism, the reason being Germany's post-war troubles. It seemed to have been motivated by Fried's desire to somehow understand how the Nazis gained power in Germany. The reader might have thought Fried, though he himself was Jewish, was too sympathetic to Germany.

On Tuesday, Arthur Brisbane²⁶² remarked hopefully that "The wiser men in Germany are endeavoring to moderate the anti-Jewish boycott. Even the lower stratum in race and religious hatred shows less violence." He asserted that "Germans of Jewish blood could teach race hatred a useful lesson, if it were possible for all to leave Germany with their property and their important enterprises simultaneously." Brisbane seemed to be the eternal optimist. He felt that Jewish enterprise might prove more important than racial hatred for Germany. He also foresaw that the younger Jewish professionals would leave Germany and "They will be missed." He was right in thinking that older people would be less likely to leave the country of their birth.

Chester Rowell, the editor of the Chronicle in his Tuesday's "World Comment"²⁶³ column discussed the absurdity of the Nazis. Writing about

Heine, Rowell asked "What right had a man of Jewish ancestry, even though himself a Christian, to enrich the German language with anything so perfect [as 'Du bist wie eine Blume']?"

The Chronicle's editorial for Saturday was entitled "Hitlerite Mind Fails to Grasp Human Psychology."²⁶⁴ The writer held, "Now the Hitlerite government, alarmed by world disapproval, says it will stop its persecution of Jews if the rest of the world will stop criticizing. With all due respect to Herr Hitler, HE started this thing, it is up to HIM to stop first. The criticism will stop then. It will not stop while he is still persecuting Jews." Most readers of the Chronicle would be inclined to agree with the editorialist. The writer next pointed out that "abuse" either physical or economic was the same, "Cutting off Jewish ears would be a minor atrocity compared to driving Jews to starvation." He concluded: "Despite all the lessons of the World War, the Prussian governmental mind still retains a singular inability to understand how other nations think and particularly to realize how other peoples will act when confronted with a spectacle of inhumanity." It seemed as if the author of the editorial believed the atrocity stories of the World War and held that the then present persecution of the Jews was of the same order.

Sunday found the Chronicle²⁶⁵ publishing an editorial on the front page in bold type. The editorial held that the atrocity tales were inventions of the Nazis, that they had not appeared in American newspapers. Rather, "The real 'atrocity' is not these fantastic mutilations, of which nobody ever heard before It is the denial to Jews of the common rights of men--to earn their living, conduct their businesses and practice their professions." The reader would be forced to disagree with the writer that "atrocity" type stories had not appeared in American news-

papers. In fact, the Chronicle published a number of them. The second point, that the "real 'atrocities' . . . is the denial to Jews of the common rights of men," was indeed as tragic and perhaps more lasting than "mutilations." The editorial also gave the writer the opportunity to point out that the quotation contained in the Nazi poster mentioned in the front page Chronicle article, Nazi Hatred for Jewry Emblazoned in Poster,²⁶⁶ was from the forgery, the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion,"²⁶⁷ a point not noted in the article itself.

Both the Chronicle and the Examiner editorials on Monday dealt with the local Jewish National Welfare Fund drive. The Chronicle²⁶⁸ used biblical quotations and pointed out "Not only has the prolonged economic distress multiplied the calls upon their benevolence to maintain their charities at home, but a particularly poignant and tragic situation has developed abroad through the persecution of their brethren in Germany." This was the main theme of the welfare drive. The writer added "Although this appeal for funds is not directed to non-Jewish people, it is one that will be a gracious thing if all San Franciscans, of whatever faith, join according to their abilities in putting the drive over the top." The Jewish National Welfare Fund drive could not have hoped for better publicity.

The Examiner²⁶⁹ made a similar point "While the direct appeal is made only to members of their own race, the whole city should be interested in this campaign and the list of contributors should transcend lined of creed, both because of the proverbial generosity of Jewish people in contributing to all welfare funds, irrespective of denomination, and because of the sympathy aroused among all people by the mistreatment of Jews in Germany." Another publicity coup for the fund.

Noteworthy was the fact that on Tuesday, the Chronicle, which had been publishing an editorial almost every day on the German-Jewish situation, did not publish one on this day. The Examiner,²⁷⁰ which had infrequently published such editorials, for the second straight day carried an editorial on the situation. The satirical writer held that Hitler was at last "assured a place in history," by his seizure of Einstein's bank account. He asserted that a thousand years from now, that will be the only point of historical importance with respect to Hitler. The reader probably enjoyed the satire.

On Saturday it was announced that the boycott would last but one day. It seemed to have been conducted with strict discipline. The American government, it appeared, in order to forestall the indignation of American Jewry, exerted pressure on the German government through diplomatic channels to cancel the boycott. Von Hindenburg, at the insistence of von Papen and von Neurath, finally exercised his authority and caused the boycott to be limited to one day. Many Jews were reported to have fled Germany during this period.

Ominous was the report that one now needed to be certified by the Nazi government before one could leave the country. Some Jews had already been forced to remain in Germany. Various petty forms of discrimination were initiated by the Nazis in order to intimidate the Jew and separate him from his non-Jewish neighbors. Yet, it was the boycott, even though of one day's duration, which was the most significant event of this time period. For it served to mark the Jew out as an alien in Germany, and the fear of another boycott hung over the head of German Jewry like the blade of a guillotine held by a rotted rope. The complete segregation of German Jews might have been foreshadowed by the possible

prohibition of the marriage of Jewish and non-Jewish Germans. A sense of great unease had fallen upon German Jewry.

CHAPTER VII

(April 5th to April 7th, 1933)

Besides the news that the boycott would not be resumed on Wednesday, the most significant report, which served to heighten the uncertainty of the fate of German Jewry, was the government's indirect prohibition of kosher slaughtering.²⁷¹

Violence also was the keynote of Wednesday. A Jewish merchant was shot while defending his home from being searched by police. The Chronicle²⁷² related: "A large force of police assisted by Nazi auxiliaries, raided a Jewish quarter in East Berlin, searching everywhere for weapons and papers. Streets were closed and pedestrians were halted. Worshipers leaving synagogues were searched and those not carrying double identification cards were arrested." What provoked the Nazis to engage in this massive search was not explained. Perhaps it was the same rationale which motivated the Nazi search of Einstein's house for weapons. The writer reported that "even flower boxes were overturned in the search through houses, and some printed matter and a few weapons were seized." The idea must have seemed repugnant to the American reader who regarded his home as secure from search without a special warrant. The Nazi propagandist must have learned from the negative reaction to the search of Einstein's home that even if one did not find anything, it is better to assert that one had made some seizures. However, "some printed matter and a few weapons," would not seem to have warranted such an intensive search.

Of more importance to the future of the Jewish mercantile interests was the announcement by the boycott committee that it would in the future supply "German stores" with "big placards identifying them as such." The writer, the reader would agree, correctly held that this was done "to mark out a distinction between German and Jewish stores."²⁷³ In other words, an unofficial boycott, so that if the Germans failed to remember which stores had been boycotted, they would know which stores to patronize. This was another action abhorrent to the American mind.

On the diplomatic front, a Nazi news service, the Pan-German Press Service, stated that "an atrocity lie factory has been set up in the American Consulate-General."²⁷⁴ The reader certainly would not have believed such an absurd statement. George S. Messersmith, the American consul general, declared, "We strongly resent these unwarranted implications and will by proper representations insist on immediate stoppage." He added, "Naturally, during the past days the Consulate has received as is its duty, American citizens who complained of mistreatment." His statement concluded with a reference to foreigners who had applied for visas that "Whenever they tried to tell us their stories of personal hardship we politely declined to entertain these on the ground that this is not our business."²⁷⁵ This last statement might be partially false, in that the United States government would not make official complaints with respect to mistreatment of non-Americans to the German government, but it would seem likely that the consulate might have related some of these incidents to Washington.

Thursday was the day that it was announced in the newspapers that "GERMANY WILL OUST JEWS IN OFFICIAL JOBS."²⁷⁶ This, according to Hitler, would allow the "rebirth of the nation." Hitler, it should be noted,

did not discriminate only against Jews, but all his opponents.

On Friday appeared the astounding statement--the "Nazi Church To Oust Old Testament."²⁷⁷ Alfred Rosenberg, who made this statement, also "paraphrased Voltaire in his speech, saying there was no world history, only the recitation of the various fights peoples and races had with one another." Hitler compared the exclusion of Jews in Germany to "the exclusion of the yellow race by the United States." He stated that "The American people were the first to draw the practical political consequences from the inequality in the difference of races."²⁷⁸ To be realistic, a large number of Americans, at that time, did believe in the inferiority of Orientals and Negroes. The United States did exclude Orientals for essentially the reasons that Hitler used to justify the exclusion of the Jews from Germany. Nonetheless, the Jew in America, while perhaps considered somewhat different, was not considered a threat to the country or an intellectual inferior to non-Jews. One needed but to look at Einstein to see the intellectual development of the Jew. In popular imagination, the Jew in the United States was known for his financial acumen, and Roosevelt had even appointed a Jewish Secretary of the Treasury. So Hitler's analogy would be dismissed by most Americans.

Charles Flick of Universal Service²⁷⁹ characterized Hitler as having taken "a definite stand advocating a 'purification' of the the [sic] German people by purging them of Jewish influence, at the same time warning the German press that criticism of any Government moves must be guarded and discreet." It was difficult to think of "purification" in a country, such as the United States, made up of peoples from so many national backgrounds. Furthermore, the idea that the press should

be censored was totally incomprehensible to the American mind.

Emanu-El²⁸⁰ on Friday, in a belated account of the indignation meeting in New York, waxed eloquent on the speeches.

On the local level, all the news referred to the Jewish National Welfare Fund drive.^{281,282,283,284,285} The points made were similar to previous articles. Luncheon meetings were held at the St. Francis Hotel. The reader might have wondered how much money might have been saved if the campaign's luncheons were not held in San Francisco's most expensive hotel. Both the Examiner and the Chronicle, but not Emanu-El, apparently in a sympathetic attempt to help the drive, listed a number of the major donations by name and amount. A recurrent theme in these articles was the splendid help the non-Jewish community was giving to the campaign by donations, "Out of the flood of donations, emerged \$5 sent from 'a German Gardener,' \$3 collected from the pen-nies of Troop 82 of the Boy Scouts, and \$200 from an anonymous 'Christian friend.'"²⁸⁶ This must have been very inspiring to the Jewish community and pleasing to the public at large.

The speeches of the non-Jews at these luncheons were rather patron-izing, but that might have been the character of such talks at that time. W. P. Fuller of the Community Chest said, "I have come to re-spect and admire them for their public spirit, their generosity and their useful devotion to every good cause."²⁸⁷

One further article of news was an account of the committee appoint-ed by Judge Golden to plan "appropriate action" to help German Jewry.²⁸⁸ Golden said "We will not stand by idly, while the economic life of the Jew is being crushed out of him, in the professions and commerce alike." He did not state what action his committee might suggest, but he added

the provision that any action taken must be "consistent with the demands of the Department of State." It would seem that the State Department did not approve of the mass indignation meetings. It would seem unlikely that the State Department would approve of any action of protest.

The Chronicle on Friday published a rather lengthy letter to the editor²⁸⁹ which used Einstein's example to portray the insanity of Nazi anti-Semitism: "How this honest, sincere thinker must measure the other world of the destroyer of his race--a world of chaos, unreason, misplaced power; a world which is the antithesis of this scientist's sliding rule of perfection. Measure, if you can, the recent thoughts of Einstein."

Arthur Brisbane on Wednesday held that the exclusion of Jews from life in Germany is "not in the least a question of religion but of business competition."²⁹⁰ True, perhaps, to a degree.

Chester Rowell²⁹¹ on Thursday tried to show the insane fanaticism of Hitler, who held that "I am doing the Lord's work," by persecuting Jews. A song book of the Nazis had these words:

So stand the storm battalion
Ready for racial fight
Only when Jews lie bleeding
Can we be really free.

What sane man could even think such vile thoughts, let alone sing them.

On Friday, Rowell²⁹² attacked the Nazi claim that American newspapers were printing atrocity stories or that such stories originated in the American consulate in Berlin. "The outlawing of 'kosher' meat, so that the orthodox Jew must violate his religion or starve is evidently not an 'atrocity,'" since "It is announced by the 'Nazi' authorities themselves." He concluded that "The real outrages are not these

incidents [of violence] true or false, but the openly announced policies of the Nazi government itself." There could be no mistaking of the Nazi attitude towards the Jews.

Rabbi Reichert, writing in the Passover issue of Emanu-El,²⁹³ held that "Had the Jew not been invidiously demarcated from his fellowmen and singled out for persecution, it is highly doubtful whether our people could have continued its group existence." He added "The antidote to Jewish assimilation has always been the hostility of anti-Semitism." Thus even in the tragic events in Germany, he asserted, "This ordeal will unite German Jews as they have not been united in the last one hundred years." He prophesied: "Long after Hitler's infamous career has become only a footnote of history, German Jewry will be carrying on." Did Rabbi Reichert really believe this, or did he say it to comfort San Francisco Jewry?

Wednesday's editorial in the Chronicle²⁹⁴ spoke of the prohibition against breaking the glass windows of Jewish shops, because German insurance agencies would be liable. The author wrote: "The warning might have gone further and have said that it would be cheaper to mistreat these shopkeepers personally and leave their windows alone." Nevertheless, he concluded "When the books are balanced it will not be merely a record of windows smashed, of trade boycotts, of exile of some of her most distinguished citizens, but a loss of prestige and respect among the family of civilized nations." Nazi insanity knew no bounds.

"Real 'Atrocities' Are in Official Hitler Accounts,"²⁹⁵ was the title of Thursday's Chronicle editorial. This could have been looked upon as a continuation of the Wednesday editorial. The author wrote "Whatever isolated cases of personal violence against Jews may have happened in

Germany are nothing compared to this Hitlerite effort to drive all German Jews into starvation. That IS AN ATROCITY bigger than any story the Nazis say has been invented." He added: "It is an official decree, not a yarn from Greenland or Natal, that has forbidden kosher meat to the adherents of the Jewish faith." Finally, "To all persons with balanced minds it is an example of the humorless and senseless lengths to which Hitlerite fanaticism can go." To put it differently, this persecution is really happening in a civilized, Western European country!

In Friday's Emanu-El, Sol Silverman first wrote an editorial on the Jewish National Welfare Fund drive, entitled "We Must Not Fail,"²⁹⁶ which held that the situation in Germany made a successful drive more imperative than ever. His second editorial, "WE CANNOT BE SILENT,"²⁹⁷ held that in a crisis situation such as then, San Francisco Jewry must not remain silent, it must "join the other California cities and towns that have added respected Jewish and gentile utterances to the great mass of public opinion that will have its salutary effect in time." It seemed that other California communities had indignation meetings. Silverman held, however, that San Francisco Jewry should speak "at an appropriate moment in the near future." Did the addition of "an appropriate moment" indicate that Silverman's opinion had changed from the last week? The rest of the article dealt with the reasons advanced by the Nazis to persecute Jews; Silverman showed their absurdity.

The week which began with the fear of a boycott witnessed it, saw a brief period of respite, and ended with expanding fear and terror. It seemed that the Nazis would not let up on the Jews. The reader could only hope that by Passover of the next year the situation would have been cleared up, that the Pharaoh of Nazi Germany would have been deposed, and that Germany would once again have found her reason.

CONCUSION

In the period from January 1st to March 5th, 1933, when the first reports of trouble for the Jews in Germany became generally known, one was tempted to dismiss the matter as a temporary aberration. Certainly Lion Feuchtwanger had expressed his worry about the situation, but later he held that German Jewry would suffer for a brief time, but in the end would be all right. The London Daily Herald's account, one could justifiably dismiss as an example of "yellow journalism." The murder of German Jews was a ridiculous notion. Press censorship was a serious matter, but Germany was moving through a difficult period. Hitler had not yet received majority rule; the experience of governing as civilized a nation as Germany would surely sober him. If not, von Hindenburg could always be counted upon to restrain him, if he did attempt to go too far. True, there had been some incidents of anti-Semitism, but when Hitler got control of his more radical followers, this would soon pass, so it seemed. The assurance of the Nazis that all German citizens would be safe tended to reassure the reader.

From Friday, March 5th onward to April 7th, 1933, the last date covered by this study, fear for the safety of German Jewry increased day by day. First there were reports of attacks on American Jews. American Jewish leaders requested that the United States government protest the treatment of Jews in Germany. With isolationism in the air, the State Department stated that it would investigate the situation. Representative Fish, a conservative republican from New York, expressed

what was probably the opinion of the majority of Americans, and would become the opinion of the State Department. He held that by international law, though the persecution of German Jews was a terrible deed, the United States could not interfere in the internal affairs of Germany. It could only protest when American Jews had been molested.

At first, the State Department was said to have found precedents which allowed her to protest, if the investigations ordered by Secretary of State Hull found the situation to be as reported by American newspaper correspondents. Germany claimed that the alleged attacks on Jews were falsifications, to which she eventually gave the name "atrocious tales." The Germans protested against such stories. However, before the reports from American diplomatic officials in Germany could reach Washington, the American Jewish Congress announced that it would hold a mass indignation meeting in New York City. Later, the plans were expanded to include a large number of cities outside of New York.

Due to the pressure of the American Jewish Congress, and the newspaper publicity given to visits of Congress leaders to Washington, the State Department moved to speed up the receipt of its reports from Germany. It seemed as if the State Department was opposed to the protest meetings. Accordingly, the department tried to persuade proposed speakers at these meetings not to speak. The department held that the persecution of Jews in Germany had decreased. Many years later, when the reports from the American diplomats in Germany became public knowledge, it was found that this was not the case. The State Department succeeded in persuading the Roman Catholic Cardinal-Archbishop of Boston to refrain from speaking at the gathering.

The situation of the Jews in Germany deteriorated, and finally came

the news of a proposed boycott of all Jewish business in Germany. The Nazi Party contended that this boycott was to punish German Jews, who had, it was alleged, been spreading malicious tales about Germany. Previously, however, many Jewish professionals employed by the German government, state governments, and municipalities had been dismissed. Jewish judges and lawyers had been removed from the courts, Jewish doctors from the hospitals. The proposed boycott excited the Jewish community both in Germany and the United States. German Jews appealed to Chancellor Hitler and President von Hindenburg to annul the boycott. The German government at first held that it had no connection with the boycott, that it was an action organized solely by the Nazi party. In the meantime, Hitler's Nazi Party, while not winning a majority in the elections, so effectively controlled the German government that Hitler was invested with dictatorial powers. Only one German stood above Hitler, President von Hindenburg.

Some American Jewish leaders approached the State Department for help. In a manner not exactly known to the readers of that era, the State Department was alleged to have convinced the German Foreign Minister, von Neurath, that such a boycott would not be acceptable. Von Neurath and von Papen persuaded von Hindenburg to accept this viewpoint. Thereupon, von Hindenburg called in Hitler and threatened to invoke martial law, if the boycott was not called off. Hitler acceded to von Hindenburg's demand with the proviso that the boycott was to take place for a period of one day. These behind the scenes moves were stricken by Nazi censors from dispatches sent from Germany. Universal Service, by sending its report from London, was able to get around that obstacle. The Nazis held that the boycott was cancelled because the publication

of atrocity tales in the foreign press had abated.

As a result of the apparent success of the State Department's efforts to forestall the boycott, the American Jewish Congress was convinced that silence was the best course. Thus the American Jewish Congress joined the B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Committee in following the suggestions of the State Department to be silent, and to let the State Department handle the matter at an unofficial diplomatic level.

While the boycott had been called off, German Jewry found itself more persecuted. To be a Jew in Germany became a crime. The Jews could no longer use libraries, they were hardly able to practice medicine or law, schools were closed to them and government employment was totally out of the question. As the period of this study ended, it was proposed to outlaw marriages between Christians and Jews. The Jew was marked out as an alien in a society in which many of them had lived for centuries. Anti-Semitism would become the official German governmental policy.

If one considers the length, the sustained nature, the quality and the detail of the many reports from Germany, it would be difficult to say that the American public had no knowledge of what was occurring in Germany. It is true that the reader did not know about the "final solution" which would not be formulated as such until 1942, but even that possibility might have occurred to a concerned reader even at this early date. The foreign dispatches did not appear to have a significant bias. Support from columnists and writers of editorials for German Jewry was impressive.

Locally, the San Francisco Jewish community was engaged in an in-

ternal struggle. The question was, would it be more prudent to remain silent or to protest. San Francisco, unlike many other cities in the United States, did not stage a mass protest meeting. The reasons given were that it was not judicious, perhaps the press reports were wrong, and perhaps more important, such a protest might do more harm for German Jewry than silence. Not all San Francisco Jews felt this way--Sol Silverman, the editor of Emanu-El, felt that San Francisco Jewry could not remain silent at such a time. Rather, the San Francisco Jewish establishment tried to use the Jewish National Welfare Fund drive as a device to channel the indignation of local Jews. At every occasion, be it a speech, an article, an editorial, the needs of German Jewry were stressed. In a sense, donations to the Welfare drive were projected as a more effective substitute for protest. It should be emphasized that this decision for silence and the advocacy of channeling all attempts at protest into contributions to the Fund drive, was not made lightly. It resulted from the agony of the leaders of San Francisco Jewry. One needs but to read a sermon by Rabbi Reichert to see this.

That a problem existed in Germany was very hard for San Francisco Jews to accept. The news reports, at first were held to be false or exaggerated. Germany could not be seen as regressing to medieval barbarism. It was too unlikely. This was a civilized century. German cultural leaders would not let it happen. Besides, Jews in the United States were also undergoing a stressful period. Anti-Semitism seemed to be on the rise, though not to the degree reported from Germany. The American economy was in shambles, American Jewry was hardly able to support its own domestic philanthropies, let alone aid oppressed Jews worldwide. The tendency was thus to disbelieve the reports. The

Nazi-sponsored boycott changed this sentiment in two ways. First, it was now believed that the reports were substantially correct. Second, the help that the State Department gave in allegedly containing the boycott, bolstered a false sense of confidence in the beneficence of the State Department towards German Jews. It was thus accepted, perhaps too readily, as axiomatic that one should follow the suggestions of the State Department and refrain from protest. Donations for welfare were all right, but overt protest might be bad for German Jewry.

It is tempting, knowing now what fearsome events these articles foretold, to suggest that if American Jews had reacted in a different way, in a more vigorous manner, the tragedy which befell our people might not have occurred. Yet, there is no evidence that any course of action which American Jewry embarked upon would have really effectively changed the final gruesome outcome.

As I have intimated previously, the attitude of the United States government might have been strongly influenced by the then current economic position of the United States. The default of the Germans in repaying loans made by American investment houses, could have resulted in their bankruptcy. Thus, the State Department, directed by new, inexperienced leadership, weighed carefully any action which it might take, which could result in Germany becoming unable or refusing to repay those loans. Hence the State Department was opposed to the protest meetings and even more to a boycott of German goods, which during this period was being initiated by a few Jewish organizations in America. Additionally, the feelings of isolationism, manifested by the majority of the American public, and by some politicians, certainly did not impel the American government to protest. Roosevelt first had to deal

with domestic problems. If this view seems forced, one should remember that during this period, for the first and only time in American history, the Federal government closed all the banks in the nation.

Nonetheless, the question which was so relevant during the 30's--does the United States government have the right to interfere in the internal affairs of another country for humanitarian reasons?--still remains current. It could be argued that the United States had intervened in the domestic affairs of other countries, even to help Jews. Since the Second World War, the United States has frequently done this. However, in all of these cases, the aims of the United States were for her own political and economic gains.

Now in the 1970's, we are again told that the United States cannot or rather, will not, exert pressure to improve the lot of Russian Jews. Let the sterling beneficence of American diplomacy to help German Jewry stand as an example and a challenge. The day when no people has to fear persecution, shall find the United States without an enemy. The temporary gains of diplomacy wane and pass, while the world yet remains to be civilized.

NOTES

- ¹Emanu-El, p. 4, c. 4, January 6, 1933
- ²San Francisco Chronicle, p. 2, c. 1, March 3, 1933.
- ³San Francisco Examiner, p. 2, c. 7, March 3, 1933.
- ⁴Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 15, c. 2, January 27, 1933.
- ⁵Examiner, op. cit. p. 12, cc. 2-3, February 1, 1933.
- ⁶Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 15, c. 4, February 3, 1933.
- ⁷Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 1, February 5, 1933.
- ⁸Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 8, February 8, 1933.
- ⁹Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 1, February 8, 1933.
- ¹⁰Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 15, c. 4, February 10, 1933.
- ¹¹Ibid., p. 15, c. 3, February 17, 1933.
- ¹²Ibid., p. 15, cc. 2-3, February 24, 1933.
- ¹³Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 1, March 3, 1933.
- ¹⁴Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 7, March 3, 1933.
- ¹⁵Ibid., p. 4, c. 1, March 5, 1933.
- ¹⁶Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 15, c. 1, Jan. 27, 1933.
- ¹⁷Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 6, March 4, 1933.
- ¹⁸Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, cc. 2-3, January 14, 1933.
- ¹⁹Ibid., p. 2, c. 5, February 24, 1933.
- ²⁰Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 14, cc. 2-3, February 17, 1933.
- ²¹Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, February 20, 1933.
- ²²Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 4, cc. 1-2, February 3, 1933.
- ²³Chronicle, op. cit., p. 10, c. 2, March 2, 1933.

- ²⁴Chronicle, op. cit., p. 3, c. 4, March 8, 1933.
- ²⁵Examiner, op. cit., p. 3, c. 8, March 8, 1933.
- ²⁶Ibid. c. 1.
- ²⁷Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 4, March 10, 1933.
- ²⁸Examiner, op. cit., p. 5, c. 1, March 10, 1933.
- ²⁹Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 15, c. 1, March 10, 1933.
- ³⁰Ibid., p. 1.
- ³¹Ibid., p. 4, c. 1.
- ³²Examiner, op. cit., p. 1. c. 1, March 14, 1933.
- ³³Ibid., p. 5, c. 1, March 13, 1933.
- ³⁴Ibid., p. 12, c. 1, March 14, 1933.
- ³⁵Ibid., p. 4, c. 1, March 13, 1933.
- ³⁶Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 5, March 16, 1933.
- ³⁷Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 1, March 17, 1933.
- ³⁸Chronicle, op. cit., p. 10, c. 1, March 15, 1933.
- ³⁹Ibid., p. 2, cc. 2-3, March 16, 1933.
- ⁴⁰Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 6,
- ⁴¹Ibid.
- ⁴²Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 15, cc. 1-2, March 17, 1933.
- ⁴³Ibid., p. 4, c. 1.
- ⁴⁴Ibid., p. 15, cc. 3-4.
- ⁴⁵Chronicle, op. cit., p. 1, c. 2, March 18, 1933.
- ⁴⁶Ibid., p. 1, c. 3, March 21, 1933.
- ⁴⁷Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 5, March 21, 1933.
- ⁴⁸Chronicle, op. cit., p. 8, c. 1, March 22, 1933.
- ⁴⁹Examiner, op. cit., p. 4, cc. 5-6, March 23, 1933.
- ⁵⁰Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 1, March 24, 1933.

- 51 Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 3, March 24, 1933.
- 52 Ibid., p. 2, c. 6, March 18, 1933.
- 53 Ibid., p. 1, c. 1, March 19, 1933.
- 54 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, cc. 4-5, March 21, 1933.
- 55 Ibid., p. 1, c. 2, March 18, 1933.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 5, March 21, 1933.
- 58 Ibid., p. 2, c. 5, March 22, 1933.
- 59 Ibid., p. 1, c. 1, March 23, 1933.
- 60 Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 5, cc. 2-3, March 24, 1933.
- 61 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2F, c. 1, March 19, 1933.
- 62 Ibid., p. 8, c. 1, March 20, 1933.
- 63 Ibid., p. 2, cc. 4-5, March 21, 1933.
- 64 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 1, March 22, 1933.
- 65 Ibid., p. 1, c. 1, March 23, 1933.
- 66 Ibid., p. 4, cc. 1-2.
- 67 Ibid., p. 1, c. 6, March 24, 1933.
- 68 Ibid.
- 69 Ibid., p. 2, c. 6.
- 70 Ibid., p. 4, cc. 1-2, March 23, 1933.
- 71 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 1, c. 2, March 24, 1933.
- 72 Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, cc. 5-6.
- 73 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 74 Emanu-El, loc. cit.
- 75 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, cc. 4-5, March 21, 1933.
- 76 Emanu-El, loc. cit.
- 77 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 6, March 20, 1933.

- 78 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, cc. 6-7, March 22, 1933.
- 79 Ibid., p. 2, c. 6.
- 80 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 1, c. 7, March 22, 1933.
- 81 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, cc. 6-7.
- 82 Ibid., p. 2, c. 6.
- 83 Ibid., c. 4.
- 84 Ibid., p. 1, c. 1, March 23, 1933.
- 85 Ibid., p. 4, c. 4.
- 86 Ibid., p. 1, c. 7, March 24, 1933.
- 87 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 1, March 24, 1933.
- 88 Ibid.
- 89 Examiner, loc. cit.
- 90 Ibid., p. 2, c. 6, March 22, 1933.
- 91 Ibid., p. 4, c. 8, March 23, 1933.
- 92 Ibid., p. 2, c. 4, March 24, 1933.
- 93 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 8, c. 1, March 20, 1933.
- 94 Ibid., p. 8, c. 1, March 22, 1933.
- 95 Ibid., p. 6, c. 1, March 23, 1933.
- 96 Ibid., p. 1, c. 2, March 24, 1933.
- 97 Examiner, op. cit., p. 11, c. 1.
- 98 Ibid., p. 4, c. 3, March 23, 1933.
- 99 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 1, cc. 6-7, March 23, 1933.
- 100 Ibid., p. 2, c. 1, March 24, 1933.
- 101 Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 4, March 24, 1933.
- 102 Ibid.
- 103 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 104 Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 9, cc. 1-2.

- 105 Ibid., p. 4, c. 1.
- 106 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 2, March 25, 1933.
- 107 Ibid.
- 108 Ibid., p. 2, cc. 5-6.
- 109 Ibid.
- 110 Ibid., cc. 6-7.
- 111 Ibid., c. 4.
- 112 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 8, March 25, 1933.
- 113 Ibid.
- 114 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 2; p. 6, cc. 2-3, March 26, 1933.
- 115 Ibid.
- 116 Ibid., p. 2, c. 4, March 27, 1933.
- 117 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, cc. 6-7, March 27, 1933.
- 118 Ibid., c. 3.
- 119 Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 4.
- 120 Ibid., p. 1, c. 1, March 26, 1933.
- 121 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 11, c. 2, March 25, 1933.
- 122 Examiner, loc. cit.
- 123 Ibid., p. 6, c. 1.
- 124 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 7, c. 2, March 27, 1933.
- 125 Ibid., p. 2, c. 3, March 25, 1933.
- 126 Ibid., p. 2, c. 5, March 26, 1933.
- 127 Examiner, loc. cit.
- 128 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 5, March 27, 1933.
- 129 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 1, cc. 7-8; p. 2, c. 6, March 28, 1933.
- 130 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 2, March 28, 1933.
- 131 Ibid., p. 2, c. 6.

- 132 Ibid.
- 133 Ibid., p. 1, c. 2.
- 134 Ibid., p. 2, c. 6.
- 135 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 136 Ibid.
- 137 Ibid.
- 138 Ibid.
- 139 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 2.
- 140 Ibid.
- 141 Ibid., p. 2, c. 6.
- 142 Ibid., p. 1, c. 2.
- 143 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 144 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, cc. 7-8; p. 2, c. 6.
- 145 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, cc. 2-3.
- 146 Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 6.
- 147 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 148 Ibid., p. 1, cc. 7-8; p. 2, cc. 2-3, March 29, 1933.
- 149 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 8; p. 2, cc. 1-2, March 29, 1933.
- 150 Ibid.
- 151 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 152 Examiner, loc. cit.
- 153 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 1, c. 8.
- 154 Ibid., p. 1, cc. 6-7; p. 2, cc. 1-2, March 30, 1933.
- 155 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, cc. 7-8; p. 2, c. 1, March 30, 1933.
- 156 Ibid.
- 157 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 158 Examiner, loc. cit.

- 159 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 160 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 2, March 31, 1933.
- 161 Ibid., p. 7, cc. 2-3.
- 162 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 4, March 31, 1933.
- 163 Ibid.
- 164 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 2.
- 165 Ibid.
- 166 Ibid.
- 167 Ibid., p. 7, cc. 2-3.
- 168 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 169 Ibid., cc. 2-3.
- 170 Ibid., p. 1, c. 8.
- 171 Ibid., p. 2, c. 6.
- 172 Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 4.
- 173 Ibid., c. 6.
- 174 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 1, c. 7, March 28, 1933.
- 175 Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 5, March 28, 1933.
- 176 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 177 Examiner, loc. cit.
- 178 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 179 Examiner, loc. cit.
- 180 Ibid., c. 6.
- 181 Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 2, March 29, 1933.
- 182 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 1, c. 8; p. 2, c. 6, March 31, 1933.
- 183 Examiner, op. cit., p. 7, c. 4, March 31, 1933.
- 184 Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 9, cc. 2-4, March 31, 1933.
- 185 Ibid., c. 4.

- 186 Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 2, March 29, 1933.
- 187 Ibid., p. 2, c. 2, March 30, 1933.
- 188 Ibid., p. 7, c. 5, March 31, 1933.
- 189 Emanu-El, op. cit., c. 1.
- 190 Ibid., p. 11, c. 3.
- 191 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 8, c. 2, March 28, 1933.
- 192 Ibid., p. 8, c. 2, March 29, 1933.
- 193 Ibid., p. 9, cc. 1-4.
- 194 Ibid., p. 8, c. 3.
- 195 Ibid., p. 8, c. 1, March 30, 1933.
- 196 Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 1; p. 8, cc. 2-3.
- 197 Ibid., p. 2, cc. 1-3.
- 198 Ibid., c. 3.
- 199 Ibid., p. 4, c. 3.
- 200 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 10, c. 2, March 31, 1933.
- 201 Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 3, cc. 1-3; p. 8, c. 3.
- 202 Ibid., p. 4, cc. 1-2.
- 203 Ibid., cc. 2-3.
- 204 Ibid., p. 5, cc. 1-2.
- 205 Ibid., cc. 2-3.
- 206 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 1, c. 1; p. 2, c. 1, April 1, 1933.
- 207 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 8; p. 2, c. 1, April 1, 1933.
- 208 Ibid.
- 209 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 210 Examiner, loc. cit.
- 211 Ibid., p. 2, c. 1.
- 212 Ibid., p. 11, c. 8; p. 2, c. 1.

- 213 Ibid.
- 214 Ibid., p. 1, c. 2; p. 4, cc. 4-7, April 2, 1933.
- 215 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 1, c. 1; p. 2, cc. 2-3, April 2, 1933.
- 216 Examiner, loc. cit.
- 217 Ibid.
- 218 Ibid.
- 219 Ibid.
- 220 Ibid.
- 221 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 222 Ibid., p. 1, c. 2; p. 2, c. 5.
- 223 Ibid., p. 1, c. 8; p. 5, c. 1, April 3, 1933.
- 224 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 8; p. 2, c. 1, April 3, 1933.
- 225 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 1.
- 226 Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 1, April 4, 1933.
- 227 Ibid., p. 1, c. 8; p. 2, c. 1.
- 228 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 1, c. 5; p. 2, c. 1, April 4, 1933.
- 229 Ibid.
- 230 Examiner, loc. cit.
- 231 Ibid.
- 232 Ibid., p. 1, c. 3, April 2, 1933.
- 233 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 4, April 2, 1933.
- 234 Examiner, loc. cit.
- 235 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 236 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 3.
- 237 Chronicle, loc. cit.
- 238 Ibid., p. 2, cc. 6-7.
- 239 Ibid., p. 2, c. 4.

- 240 Ibid., p. 2, c. 1, April 3, 1933.
- 241 Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 1, April 3, 1933.
- 242 Ibid., p. 2, c. 1, April 1, 1933.
- 243 Ibid.
- 244 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 7, April 2, 1933.
- 245 Examiner, op. cit., p. 4, cc. 2-3, April 2, 1933.
- 246 Ibid., p. 2, cc. 4-5, April 3, 1933.
- 247 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 1, April 3, 1933.
- 248 Ibid.
- 249 Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 1.
- 250 Ibid.
- 251 Ibid., c. 2.
- 252 Ibid., p. 2, c. 2, April 1, 1933.
- 253 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 8, April 2, 1933.
- 254 Ibid., p. 2, c. 1, April 4, 1933.
- 255 Examiner, op. cit., p. 11, c. 8, April 4, 1933.
- 256 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 1, April 2, 1933.
- 257 Ibid., p. 5, c. 2, April 3, 1933.
- 258 Examiner, op. cit., p. 2, c. 2, April 3, 1933.
- 259 Ibid., p. 1, c. 1, April 1, 1933.
- 260 Ibid., p. 1, c. 1, April 2, 1933.
- 261 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 9, cc. 2-4.
- 262 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 1, April 4, 1933.
- 263 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 9, c. 2, April 4, 1933.
- 264 Ibid., p. 8, c. 2, April 1, 1933.
- 265 Ibid., p. 1, c. 3, April 2, 1933.
- 266 Ibid., p. 1, c. 2; p. 2, c. 5.

- 267 Ibid., p. 1, c. 3.
- 268 Ibid., p. 8, c. 2, April 4, 1933.
- 269 Examiner, op. cit., p. 8, c. 1.
- 270 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 9, c. 2.
- 271 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 3, April 5, 1933.
- 272 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 6, c. 1, April 5, 1933.
- 273 Ibid.
- 274 Ibid.
- 275 Ibid.
- 276 Examiner, op. cit., p. 3, c. 6, April 6, 1933.
- 277 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 1, c. 6, April 7, 1933.
- 278 Ibid.
- 279 Examiner, op. cit., p. 5, c. 7, April 7, 1933.
- 280 Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 33, cc. 1-4, April 7, 1933.
- 281 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 2, c. 1, April 5, 1933.
- 282 Examiner, op. cit., p. 8, c. 6, April 6, 1933.
- 283 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 5, cc. 2-5, April 7, 1933.
- 284 Examiner, op. cit., p. 5, c. 1, April 7, 1933.
- 285 Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 7, cc. 1-2; p. 11, c. 1.
- 286 Examiner, loc. cit.
- 287 Emanu-El, loc. cit.
- 288 Ibid., p. 20, cc. 3-4.
- 289 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 14, cc. 3-4.
- 290 Examiner, op. cit., p. 1, c. 1, April 5, 1933.
- 291 Chronicle, op. cit., p. 9, c. 2, April 6, 1933.
- 292 Ibid., p. 15, c. 2, April 7, 1933.
- 293 Emanu-El, p. 3, cc. 1-3.

²⁹⁴Chronicle, op. cit., p. 10, c. 2, April 5, 1933.

²⁹⁵Ibid., p. 8, c. 2, April 6, 1933.

²⁹⁶Emanu-El, op. cit., p. 10, cc. 1-2.

²⁹⁷Ibid., p. 21, cc. 1-2.

ABBREVIATIONS FOUND IN THE APPENDIX

C - CHRONICLE

E-E - EMANU-EL

EX - EXAMINER

Central Europe--E-E, Feb. 3.

Germany--E-E, Feb. 10.

Hitler & Gigantic Pogrom--EX, Mar. 3

CENTRAL EUROPE

BECAUSE OF THE INCREASING NUMBER OF American Jews who have recently come to the Medical School of Cologne University, the officials of the latter institution have announced rigid entrance examinations calculated to reduce the number of Jewish eligibles to the vanishing point. The rector of the school declared that many Jews come to Cologne without knowing a word of German and thus retard the development of their classes, having insufficient background to cope with the laboratory facilities. He declared that not anti-Semitism but a desire for higher academic standards had dictated the school's action.

GERMANY

Pressed by Jewish correspondents for a statement on the intentions of the new Hitler government with respect to the Jewish population, the press department issued a declaration giving assurances that no "unjustified experiments" are contemplated.

The statement, apparently authorized by Chancellor Hitler, said: "In order to reassure American Jews who are anxious as to the fate of the Jews of Germany, we wish to state that the German government is earnest and determined in its desire to guarantee safety and order for all its citizens and it has no intention of making any unjustified experiments."

In the meantime, however, there have been isolated incidents in which the followers of Hitler have not been as restrained in action as the Chancellor has tried to be in expression. The setting of March 5 as the date for new national elections has intensified the nervousness in the country. Determined to win a safe majority of seats in the next Reichstag, the Nazi leaders are sparing no measures to assure themselves of victory.

HITLER PLACES GAG ON NEWS SENT ABROAD

2,775 New Arrests Made in His
Drive Against German 'Reds';
Scores of Raids Conducted

By KARL H. VON WIEGAND.
BERLIN, March 2.—(By Special
Cable to Universal Service.)—Chancellor Adolf Hitler's "Red hunt" continued unabated throughout Germany today with 2,775 new arrests, scores of raids and a new gag on the sending of news abroad. Hitler made a radio speech on the "Red menace" tonight.

As if Chancellor Hitler, Vice Chancellor Franz von Papen and Minister Without Portfolio Capt. Hermann Goering seek to make the election outcome Sunday certain as a Government victory, the intensified activities of police and their Nazi auxiliaries seem to indicate a determination to smash the Communist and Socialist organizations before then.

JEWISH SOCIETY RAIDED.

Bremen police and Communists exchanged shots and several Communists were wounded. A Red was found in his bed here today, shot to death. Three Nazis were wounded. Eighty-five Reds were arrested in Hamburg.

There is increasing nervousness among Jews. Among places raided was the Central Society of German Jews. Two of its leaders were arrested but later released. Also raided was the headquarters of the International Workers' Relief, an organization ardently supported by Prof. Albert Einstein.

REICHSTAG TO POTSDAM.

The government published a drastic decree muzzling the foreign press, virtually stopping as in Russia and Italy—any one from talking in foreign correspondents.

The cabinet decided to bring the new Reichstag into session in the famous Garrison Church at Potsdam, where reposes the body of Frederick the Great. The church holds only 400, and any Communist or Socialist deputies likely to be elected Sunday are not "expected" to attend.

Gigantic Pogrom Against German Jews Foreseen

London Paper Says Campaign
of Murder Imperiling 600,000
Imminent

LONDON, March 2 (Friday).—(AP)—The London Daily Herald said today that plans are complete for an anti-Jewish pogrom in Germany on a scale as terrible as any instance of Jewish persecution in 2,000 years. The paper ascribed its information to a "highest source," otherwise unindicated.

The entire Jewish population of Germany, totaling 600,000, is living under the shadow of a campaign of murder that may be initiated within a few hours and cannot at the most be postponed more than a few days, the Herald said.

THOUSANDS MARKED.

Tens of thousands of Jews, the newspaper continued, have been secretly indicted as Communists and Marxists, and already are marked as victims, and the list is growing hourly.

The Herald said complete evidence of the intentions of the German National Socialists has reached London and has been considered in the highest quarters.

INTERVENTION IMMINENT.

Intervention is imminent, asserts the newspaper, but the form it is to take is a matter of extreme delicacy. In the Herald's opinion, only the massed pressure of world opinion can avert catastrophe.

An official spokesman for Chancellor Adolf Hitler's National Socialist government in Germany said earlier this week that reports of an impending massacre were "completely groundless."

U.S. Protest--EX, Mar. 8.
Modern Haman--E-E, Mar. 10.

U. S. PROTESTS BERLIN BEATING OF 3 AMERICANS

Embassy Demands Citizens Be
Protected by Hitler Govern-
ment Against Nazi Attacks

By KARL H. VON WIEGAND.

International Service Special Cable

BERLIN, March 7.—The United States Embassy here today lodged a strong protest with the German Foreign office against the beating of three American citizens by Nazi storm troops of Chancellor Adolf Hitler, and demanding that Americans be protected by the German government.

The representation was made by First Secretary of Embassy Alfred W. Killefoth on instructions from Ambassador Frederic M. Sackett, who is ill.

Nathaniel S. Wolf of Rochester, N. Y.; Henry Sailer of New York City, and Edwin Dakin, a writer, of Hannibal, Mo., were the victims of the attack.

TRIO SIGN AFFIDAVITS

All three made sworn affidavits describing their beating, and U. S. Consul General George S. Messersmith turned the cases over to the Embassy for action.

Wolf had been in Germany only three weeks.

At 5 a. m. Sunday, election day, Wolf said he was aroused from bed by five uniformed Nazi storm troops, kidnaped, beaten, bound, gagged and held prisoner. He was forced to sign a statement saying he is a Jew, and promising to leave Berlin at once and never to return to Germany.

Terrified, Wolf departed immediately for Paris.

AMERICAN JEWS IN FEAR

Sailer, also a Jew, was beaten up on the street. Dakin, mistaken for a Communist, was attacked in his boarding house.

The cabinet today summoned the new Reichstag, elected Sunday, to convene April 3. The government will ask for dictatorial powers.

THE MODERN HAMAN

CHANCELLOR Adolf Hitler stands before the world as the modern Haman. According to a recent dispatch of the London Herald, taken on high authority, he and his Nazi followers have plotted to destroy the Jews. An anti-Jewish pogrom, as terrible as any in two thousand years, has been completely planned, and is now ready to take its toll. This, in effect, was the alarming news released through the Herald a few days ago.

As Purim approaches, we cannot commemorate the event as one in which the Jews of the modern era have been delivered and found rest from their enemies. We do, however, with a relentless determination, look forward to help, not as in the more simple days from an Esther and a Mordecai, but to the civilized expression of mankind. Our problem has grown, for in the last one hundred years, according to recent statistics, the Jews have increased from three million to nearly sixteen million.

In seeking relief, we look to America, now, as we have in the last century, to take the lead. America has never failed the petition of her Jewish citizens since the epochal precedent established in 1840. A quick review shows her beneficent intervention in other countries, on the following occasions:

Turkey, 1840. Thirteen Jews were accused of a ritual murder for which they were brutally mobbed and tortured.

Switzerland, 1850. Switzerland grants certain rights and privileges in favor of Christians only.

Rumania, 1872. Disabilities and pogroms are rampant.

Rumania, 1902. Continuing disabilities and pogroms cause John Hay, Secretary of State, to send his famous note to great nations.

Russia, 1903. Massacres, ending in famous Kishinev barbarism, victimizes thousands of Jews.

Russia, 1905. The pogroms become unbearable.

James W. Gerard, ambassador to Germany during the critical World War period, sounded the sentiment of America when he recently said: "Nor will the opinion of the civilized world suffer a return to the prejudices and policies of the Middle Ages."

The battle between civilization and barbarism has become an open one. While the situation must be handled with delicacy, it must be done promptly and decisively. We join in the protest lodged in New York City last Sunday evening at Carnegie Hall, when representatives of all of the major faiths assembled to create a world-wide opinion that no minority shall go down under the brute force of the majority.

We hope that this Purim may usher in those influences that will relieve Israel in pogrom-stricken countries from their suffering, and bring them that joy and festivity that mark the holiday. We know that America, in the midst of her internal problems, will be foremost in bringing her traditional pressure to bear.

—Sol Silverman.

Vienna Tortures Told

Refugees Maltreated by Troopers

Attacks Laid to Nazis

(Copyright, 1933, N. Y. Times Foreign Cable Service)

VIENNA, March 15—Reports of the torturing of Communist, Socialist, radical and Jewish deputies, newspaper men, lawyers and writers are printed daily in the newspapers of Vienna, which has become for Germany, as for the Balkan nations, an asylum for refugees.

Not all refugees receive shelter. Kurt Ullstein, son of one of the two proprietors of the Berlin publishing house of that name, was arrested at Reutte in the Austrian tyrol when he arrived there by automobile from Berlin. Austrian frontier authorities said his extradition for communist activities had been requested by Germany.

DEPUTY IS BEATEN

The Arbeiter-Zeitung relates today how Nazi storm troopers broke into the house of Socialist Deputy Solimann in Saar Brücken, beat him unconscious, revived him by burning his feet with a torch, spat in his face and then threw mustard in his eyes.

The Wiener Montag Zeitung prints an interview with "one of the best-known personalities in Germany," now a refugee in Vienna, for whose authenticity the newspaper vouches, giving details of the fate of a number of well-known radical writers.

"I spent fourteen days in cells in Spandau Fortress," he said, according to the paper, "and then a night in a cell in Berlin police headquarters with sixty-two other prisoners. These men, mostly working men and Jewish passersby, had been beaten half to death."

EYES GOUGED OUT

"I saw men whose eyes had been gouged out. The teeth of most of them had been knocked out with rifle butts. Their hands had been burned. All the Jews had been thrown on the floor and Nazi storm troopers had jumped on them until they fainted."

The most prominent prisoners were kept in the old Spandau Fortress. There are Karl Ossietzky and other martyrs of German culture. They are not all communists, there, also, were the elderly Lehman-Russbuehlt, president of the League for the Human Rights of Man, who was arrested with Dr. Apfel, a lawyer, and Egon Erwin Kisch, a radical writer.

"The old man was kept in chains for days. When he was brought before the Berlin police prefect he was told to stand at attention. When he did not comply promptly with this military order he was taken into a dark corridor and beaten by a crowd and again chained."

Vienna Tortures--
C, Mar. 16.
Anti-Semitism--
C, Mar. 20.

Anti-Semitism Gone Mad

NAZI ANTI-SEMITISM has lost its head—if there ever was any thinking in its mad fury against the Jews of Germany. The Nazi attack on Jewish physicians is madness. It could hardly have picked upon another group so strongly placed in the good opinion of the world.

The roll of medicine is full of notable Jewish names. It must be the ancient benevolence of the Semitic race that has drawn them so largely to the healing art. The researches of Jews in this field have contributed mightily to the lessening of human suffering. Civilization owes them an incomparable debt for their work in medicine.

Surely, sober, enlightened German opinion must look upon the events of the last two weeks with infinite shame. And sooner or later Hitler will feel the force of this resentment. The Nazi leader has yet to learn the lesson of history. No nation that has persecuted the Jew has prospered.

Nazi Cruelties Bared

Fleeing Americans Tell Tales

Jews Are Maltreated

(Copyright, 1933, N. Y. Times Foreign Cable Service)

PARIS, March 18—Americans arriving here from Germany are expressing more and more concern over the course of events in that country. Neither the full truth about them nor the implications arising therefrom are reaching the outside world, these Americans say. Nor can the truth come out except gradually and by stealth for excellent reasons.

The first and most obvious of these is an unrelenting censorship, more severe than Germany has ever known, except in war time. Not only are all outgoing dispatches from accredited correspondents subjected to the closest scrutiny and passed only when certain "objectionable" subjects are either untouched or treated so innocuously that Nazi susceptibilities will not be offended thereby, but the censors of all information unfavorable to Nazi interests have been dried up.

CONTROL NEWS SOURCES

The government—meaning the National Socialist—control all news sources and publication outlets. Indirectly it forbids even mention of the reasons for which any newspaper is suspended—has resulted in the promulgation of what even the Germans are said to regard as transparent fiction.

Thus all the outrages, all the violence are now committed by "persons masquerading as National Socialists" or "professing to be Nazis."

Particularly, returning Americans say, there is no longer any doubt that to be either of Jewish faith or of Jewish origin and to exist in Germany now constitutes a crime in the eyes of the ruling faction there.

TREAT ALL JEWS ALIKE

There is no discrimination in the matter of punishing this crime of being a Jew. Neither professional eminence nor capacity in business, public service or private virtue is being counted against it. Professors are being driven from their classrooms, music conductors from their concert halls and actors from the stage.

His patriotic writings have not served to pardon even Leon Feuchtwanger, the foremost and most popular German novelist, for the crime of being a Jew. His Berlin home has been invaded in his absence by Nazi rowdies, his manuscripts removed and his motor car stolen. He has sought refuge in Switzerland.

MANY FLEE COUNTRY

The Riviera, Semmering, the Bernese Alps and other resorts outside Germany have become in the last few weeks refuges for most of the Jewish families from the Reich who have the means to get there. France, Belgium, Poland, Holland and Italy are receiving daily hundreds who are poorer but just as effectively self-exiled, and Germany is losing a stroke some of the best brains in her financial world and many of the best in commerce, medicine, the law and arts.

FLOG ONE ANOTHER

Small Nazi "barracks" or headquarters for storm detachment men have now been established throughout Berlin, one or more in each quarter. Seven Jews living together in the Frankfort district of the city were ordered to go to the "barracks" in their district to undergo questioning. They inquired of the police what they had better do, and were advised to obey.

At the "barracks" they were con-

fronted with leveled revolvers and compelled under threats of death to flog one another until several of them lost consciousness. Among the victims were a father and his sons.

Here is another printed in the Paris newspaper La Liberté as coming from the American wife of a German of the Jewish faith living in Munich, who is said to have just arrived with her baby at a hotel near the Champs Elysees. The newspaper, at her request, prints only her initials, "P. C." because her husband is still in a German hospital, and she fears the result of the publication of her story upon him. For the same reason La Liberté declines to reveal her residence.

HEAD OF BUSINESS

She told the newspaper reporter that her husband had been in charge of an industrial enterprise financed by the Bavarian capital by American funds. Before the recent election he received anonymous letters warning him to leave Germany, but he ignored them.

Late Friday night, when the couple had gone to bed, the doorbell rang. When the wife answered five armed Nazis entered, crying "Death to Jews!" They attacked her husband, using bludgeons and chairs, beating him unconscious and fracturing several of his ribs. When she protested and pleaded in broken German she was pushed aside. Why had she married one of the Jews who had had Germany under their control for fourteen years and now have to pay for their crimes?

C, Mar. 21.

Germany Buries Republic; Hitler Will Rule as Despot; Crown Prince Paid Homage

America Asks Report On Anti-Jewish Drive

EX, Mar. 22.

Concern Voiced Over Racial Outbreaks; Embassy Told to Give Details

WASHINGTON, March 21.—(By the way on the ground they may become public charges.)—The State Department moved today toward possible diplomatic exchanges with the German Government over the anti-Jewish campaign of the Hitler regime.

The American embassy at Berlin was instructed to make a complete report on the situation.

The State Department acted after Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, noted Jewish leader, and Bernard S. Deutsch, president of the American Jewish Congress, had laid before Under Secretary of State Phillips a detailed account of the anti-Jewish activities in Germany since the advent of the Hitler government.

MESSAGE TO BERLIN.

Phillips reported the results of the conference to Secretary of State Hull, who then ordered the instructions forwarded to Berlin. Hull said:

"Following the visit of Rabbi Wise the Department has informed the American embassy at Berlin of the press reports of mistreatment of Jews in Germany. The Department also informed the embassy of the deep concern these reports are causing in this country.

"The Department has instructed the embassy to make, in collaboration with the consuls, a complete report on the situation."

Indignation spread to Congress over the anti-Jewish activities. Moves were initiated to open the doors of this country to Jewish refugees from Germany.

ACTION TODAY.

Representative Celler, Democrat of New York, served notice he will offer a resolution in the House tomorrow to request the State Department to send a protest to the German government against persecution of American citizens of Jewish descent and asking the German government to protect all racial minorities in the interest of humanity.

Celler said he had been promised a hearing by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Declaring there was ample precedent for such a note, Celler predicted the committee would favorably report his resolution.

Designed to furnish a haven for persecuted Jews in Germany, Representative Dickstein, Democrat of New York, chairman of the House Immigration Committee, drafted a bill to vacate an executive order of September 8, 1930, under which immigrants are kept out of the coun-

try on the ground they may become public charges. Dickstein said:

"My bill would permit thousands of persons in Germany, who are mostly wives and children of American citizens, to obtain refuge here from the outrageous persecution of the Hitler government."

"Germany has not exhausted her immigration quota to the United States. Some 11,000 more Germans could be received here under our present laws, which have been set aside by the executive order."

From Representative Fish of New York, ranking Republican on the Foreign Affairs Committee, came a scorching denunciation of the anti-semitic campaign in Germany.

RELAXATION ASKED.

The House Immigration Committee devoted considerable time to hearing Rabbi Wise and President Deutsch present their case. They asked immediate relaxing of the rigid immigration quota restrictions to permit relatives of Americans of Jewish descent seeking refuge from the oppression of the Hitler forces to enter this country.

At the other end of the Capitol the emissaries had lengthy conferences with Senator Wagner, Democrat of New York, and Borah, Republican of Idaho. Borah had been chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee six years ago when a somewhat similar situation of Jewish persecution in Rumania was brought by Rabbi Wise to the attention of the Government here.

It was through Senator Wagner that the State Department conference was arranged.

HISTORY PRECEDENTS.

The State Department tonight was searching records for precedents on which to base a possible diplomatic exchange with Germany, after it receives a report from the Embassy at Berlin. Numerous instances were found where this country had intervened in the name of humanity against mistreatment of minorities. These cases went back almost a century.

In one instance in the days of Czarist Russia, the then Secretary of State Blaine instructed the American Ambassador at London to seek co-operative action of the British Government in a protest against oppression of Jews in Russia.

(Rabbi Wise confers with officials on protest in Germany. See page 2.)

C, Mar. 22.

Nazis Lose Sense of Humor

PERSECUTING THE JEWS, the Nazis have not only lost their heads, they have lost their sense of humor. Their raid on Albert Einstein's home in search of large secret stores of arms was just silly. In protest against the baiting of his people by the Hitlerites, the mathematician had announced that he would not return to his residence in Germany, but would for the time being live in Belgium. But the world has no more distinguished apostle of peace than this philosopher. His pacifistic attitude is known everywhere. He has frequently spoken his detestation of war. The Nazis make themselves ridiculous in suspecting he would turn his country home into an arsenal.

C, March 22.

U. S. to Sift Hitler Moves Against Jews

State Department Acts
to Get Information
on Charges of
Persecution

WASHINGTON, March 21. — The United States moved tonight to obtain from Berlin official information on complaints by American Jews that members of their race are being mistreated by followers of Chancellor Adolf Hitler.

Immediately after receiving from a delegation headed by Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, complaints of "injustices and outrages" against Jews in Germany, the State Department cabled Ambassador Sackett in Berlin telling of the "deep concern" being caused by these reports and asking detailed information as to their accuracy.

FORMAL PROTEST NEEN

The action was interpreted as meaning that if the reports are verified officially, the United States may make formal protest to the German government headed by the fiery Hitler.

The department issued the following statement:

"Following the visit of Rabbi Wise, the department has informed the American Embassy in Berlin of the press reports of mistreatment of Jews in Germany.

"The department also informed the Embassy of the deep concern these reports are causing in this country.

"The department has instructed the Embassy to make, in collaboration with the Consul, a complete report on the situation.

SEEKS HUMANE PROTEST

The protest was laid before Under-Secretary Phillips by Rabbi Wise, who is honorary president of the American Jewish Congress; Bernard Deutsch, New York, its president, and Max Rhoad, its Washington representative.

The group told newspapermen as they left the State Department late today that they had pointed out the American Government thus far has done no more than protest on behalf of American nationals who had suffered mistreatment.

If the facts as learned officially by the department justify, they de-

(Continued on Page 2, Col. 1)

Jews Protest German Action

(Continued From Page 1)

clared, they desired to have the Government take notice of the anti-Jewish campaign on general and humane grounds.

ATTACK ON HITLERISM

"Apart from the American people's deep interest in every problem of human relationships," Wise told reporters as he left Phillips' office, "we are not the first to call to the attention of the State Department that at this moment the government of Germany is making the way of the administration more difficult in dealing with problems of common German-American concern.

"Even the President of the United States will not find it easy to bring about rightful composition of German-American questions as long as the German government day by day is not only alienating Jewish good will in all lands but above all shocking the sense of decency in public life, which is what Hitlerism is doing today."

LONG HISTORY CITED

When Wise appeared before the House Immigration Committee he said:

"As American Jews we are profoundly disturbed at the attempt, if not by physical violence, to annihilate economically the 600,000 Jews in Germany.

"The present Chancellor of Germany has been a citizen of that country only one year. Seventeen years ago we celebrated 1000 years of written records of Jews in Germany. Jews have dwelt, fought and died for the German fatherland for ten centuries. We earnestly hope that something can be done to make life a little more tolerable for them there today.

"Opening doors outside of Germany will not do it. The 600,000 Jews must find their place in the German sun."

EX, March 23.

Today

Quick Action Days.
A Day of Prayer.
The Robin's Reflection.
Canned Blood for Sale.

—By Arthur Brisbane—

(Copyright 1933 Examiner Publishing Co.)

Attacks on Jews continue in Germany, according to news dispatches and private information. International News supplies a photograph taken in Munich of a Jewish resident walking with bare head and bare feet through the streets, accompanied by policemen and carrying sign reading:

"I shall never again complain to the police."

He had reported that Hitler troops had beaten him. Following his compulsory walk through the streets, he was ejected from the city.

Jews complain that prominent Jews have been abducted by Nazi troopers, their bodies found later riddled with bullets. Wilhelm Springer, a Jewish lawyer, candidate at the municipal elections, is said to have been shot down in cold blood, while Alfred Apfel, another lawyer, president of the Zionist organization in Berlin, arrested after the burning of the Reichstag building, was tortured to death.

In addition, all Jewish members are dropped from the German civil service, and all Jewish employees from hospitals, health institutions and other public departments.

Three orthodox Rabbinical associations of America proclaim next Monday "a day of fasting in protest against the persecutions of the Jews in Germany." The solemn fast will call attention to conditions, as will the mass meeting to be held afterward, but cannot be expected to produce much in the way of results across the ocean.

Something more energetic, and nearer to Berlin, is called for.

SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER:

NATION'S JEWS CALL PROTEST FAST MONDAY

EX, Mar. 23.

NEW YORK, March 22.—(By Universal Service.)—American Jews today were enjoined to observe Monday as a day of fast in protest against the persecution of Jews in Germany. The fast was proclaimed by the three Orthodox Rabbinical Associations of New York.

Mrs. Alexander Kohut, president of the World Organization of Jewish Women, called American member organizations to meet Wednesday to appeal in mothers of the world, Jewish and non-Jewish, against the Hitlerite terrorism.

The boycott against German goods called by the Jewish war veterans of the United States is gaining momentum, the veterans reported, including cancellation of reservations on German liners, and recalling of German orders by Jewish merchants.

MASS MEETING.

In New York the fast day will be climaxed by a parade organized by the veterans and a gigantic mass meeting in Madison Square Garden. Similar gatherings are to be held simultaneously in 200 other cities.

Among the Jewish, Protestant and Catholic laymen and clerics who will address the meeting are Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Alfred E. Smith, Bishop William T. Manning, Bishop Francis J. O'Connell and Senator Robert F. Wagner.

The International Catholic Truth Society sent a message of encouragement and a copy of a protest sent to the State Department.

Other organizations supporting the protest are the Fellowship of Faiths, made up of members of all the world's creeds, and the Commission on International Relations of the General Council of Congregational and Christian Churches.

FAST PROCLAMATION.

The fast proclamation said in part:

"All Jews are called upon to fast on Erev Rosh Chodesh Nissan Monday, March 21. Juveniles, women younger than 18 and men younger than 18 may be excused from fasting by a gift to the funds being raised to supply poor people with food for Passover. They may also contribute to the fund to further the protest against anti-Semitic measures in Germany."

It called special synagogue services of prayer for German Jews on Monday; ordered New York Jewish merchants to close their shops during the protest parade; and enjoined rabbis to devote their Saturday sermons to the German situation.

C, March 23.

6—Editorial Page

March 23, 1933

Germany's War on Jews
Is Past All Understanding

THE CIVILIZED WORLD is concerned and anxious over the situation of the Jews in Germany—and over Germany as well. Dictator Hitler and the fanatic portion of his followers have put the German Jews in a position so critical that the act of some irresponsible may put them all to extreme peril.

It was a rash and most unjust move to declare that the Jews would be held responsible for any attack, by anyone, on an official of the Reich. That, in effect, sentences the Jews in advance to suffer for the act of any lunatic, or perhaps of a Jew hater, taking that means to precipitate an attack on the general objects of his spite.

To our American minds this war on Jews in Germany is beyond understanding. Can this be Germany as we have learned to think of it by our contacts with Germans and with Americans of German origin—a Germany of kindly, liberal minded, warm hearted people, tolerant and notable for noble sentiment? We cannot believe that it is.

Is it not more likely that a comparatively small, but disciplined, group of fanatics has seized a Germany whose despair it may represent, but whose heart it does not? It is this that makes us fear not only for the Jews of the Reich, but for Germany as well.

On no other basis is it possible to understand this senseless war on Jews in Germany. Germans are sensible people. But fanatics, of any race or nation, do senseless things because, in their concentration on a single idea, they lose their sense of proportion, of humor and every thing else that gives balance. They can even be so senseless as to persecute without discrimination a people who have for centuries done well by the German fatherland, who have, probably out of proportion to their numbers, added to the strength and glory of Germany.

C, March 24.

Hitler Strains American
Friendship for Germany

THE NAZI LEADERS may say it is none of the world's business what Germany does with its own Jews. German leaders, however, ought to know better than to make TWICE the mistake of flouting the world's opinion. Surely they have not forgotten the consequences during the World War when their military chiefs, with Belgium and schrecklichkeit and spurious versenkt, turned the whole world, including the United States, against Germany.

Of all the major countries in the world the United States, without question, has felt the most disinterested sympathy with Germany's struggles for national recovery. The American people have been genuinely friendly toward Germany, a country and a people for which they have always felt strong admiration.

Herr Hitler, by his insane attack on Jews, has come dangerously close to alienating American sympathy and breaking down American friendly feeling. If he is open to any reason at all it should give him pause to observe how Americans of all creeds have joined in protest against the blind anti-Jewish fury of his followers. In this case Americans are not Protestant, Catholic or Jewish, but indignant men and women.

Whether or not Chancellor Hitler considers American friendship worth anything to Germany we do not know. Slight consideration of the strong American reaction to the pogroms of Czarist Russia should have warned him that pogroms in Nazi Germany would arouse American indignation to like degree. In this country, where we see amongst us with so much respect and high regard so many citizens of German Jewish origin, the persecutions in Germany come home to us very closely indeed.

We can only say, as President Wilson said in war time, that our quarrel is not with the German people but with their rulers. We still believe that these Nazi terrorists do not represent the real German nation we know. Nevertheless, Herr Hitler is putting a severe strain on American friendship for Germany. The harm of this falls on Germany.

EX, March 25.

Definite U.S. Move Over Nazi Attacks On Jews Indicated

Congress May Lift
Immigration Bar
for Refugees

FULL INQUIRY

Hull Awaits Reports
From Embassy
in Germany

WASHINGTON, March 24.—(Universal Service.)—Secretary of State Hull plans to take definite action with Germany in connection with the Nazi assaults against Jews, it was indicated today by State Department officials.

Meanwhile, in Congress a move to open the American immigration gates to Jewish refugees from Germany took rapid form.

The bill, introduced by Representative Dickstein, Democrat of New York, chairman of the House Immigration Committee, will ask President Roosevelt to issue an executive order, lifting the immigration barrier for German Jews with relatives in the United States. Hearings will be held next Wednesday or Thursday.

DECISION DISCLOSED.

Hull's decision was disclosed in the statement of a department official that while every effort is being made by the American Embassy to complete the full report of mistreatment of Jews, the investigation is being made with the greatest accuracy in order that it may be of "as much service to the American people as possible."

PRECEDENT FOUND.

This was accepted as definite indication that Secretary Hull has a definite course of action in mind, but that course depends upon actual conditions. The report is expected over the weekend.

Precedent of diplomatic representations to Germany was found today in the history of anti-Semitic outrages in the Near East some years ago. The United States sent several communications to the Turkish and other governments.

NEW ANGLE.

A new angle on the alleged Hitler persecution of Jews came to light here in a telegram from the Berlin foreign office to the German embassy in Washington. It contained a proclamation by the Association of German National Jews in all its members, made yesterday in Berlin, as follows:

"Oppose with the utmost firmness anyone who makes the criminal attempt to influence the formation of the future of Germany through the intermediary of foreign circles.

"If the attempt is made from a Jewish or non-Jewish source, in the United States, in Poland, in Holland or in any other country to force the national government in Germany to take any action whatever, or to refrain from doing so, we as Germans must oppose such coercive attempts to influence with the same firmness and bitterness as any other German citizen or non-Jewish faith."

(For Hitler denial of Jewish persecution and for other related news see Page 1.)

EX, March 27.

OPPRESSION 'TERMINATED,' HULL REPORTS

Embassy Message Indicates
No Official Protest Will Be
Sent by State Department

WASHINGTON, March 26.—(AP)—The State Department tonight reported that an official investigation of conditions in Germany indicated that "whereas there was for a short time considerable physical mistreatment of Jews, this phase may be considered virtually terminated."

This finding, based on reports from the Berlin embassy and American consulates throughout Germany, was telegraphed by the State Department tonight to leading American Jews who had requested the government to verify the reported mistreatment of members of their race at the hands of Hitlerites and to take appropriate action.

IMPROVEMENT SEEN.

While State Department officials did not amplify the telegram, it was understood authoritatively that no official protest to the Hitler government is planned in view of the embassy's report.

Rabbi Outlines Sharp Demands to Germany

NEW YORK, March 26.—(AP)—While 2,000 Jews applauded and cheered, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, honorary president of the American Jewish Congress, announced today during a sermon that the congress tomorrow will transmit to the German government, through Ambassador Wilhelm von Prittwitz, four vital "demands."

They are:

"There must be an immediate cessation of all anti-Semitic activities and propaganda in Germany. . . .

"The abandonment of the policy of racial discrimination against and of economic exclusion of Jews from the life of Germany. . . .

"The protection of Jewish life and property.

"There shall not be an expulsion of 'Ost Juden,' Jews who have come into Germany since 1914."

C, March 27.

WORLD COMMENT

By
CHESTER ROWELL

THE new German government is running a serious risk of putting itself into the same position as the present military authorities of Japan, whose official statements nobody believes. The Hitler government has authorized the announcement that the reports published abroad regarding the treatment of Jews in Germany are "inventions." Now, this denial is either true or false, and the world is going to find out which. If it turns out to be false, nothing else from that government will be believed. If it is correct, every foreign correspondent in Germany ought to be recalled in disgrace. These men were not sent to concoct "inventions."

Let us, therefore, weigh the present evidence.

ON THE one side is the official assurance of the German government. This is the government which at this moment is forbidding the press of Germany to publish anything but the official version of any event. The Prussian government recently ordered the expulsion of M. Camille Loutre, Berlin correspondent of the *Petit Parisien*, for not accepting the official version of the Reichstag fire. The correspondents of the Havas agency and of the *Echo de Paris* were also menaced with expulsion. Whereupon, usually responsible sources of information say, the French Foreign Office is understood to have informed the German government that two Paris correspondents of Nazi organs would be expelled from France for every French correspondent expelled from Germany. This is the standard of "truth" imposed in Germany by the government which now stigmatizes the reports in free newspapers abroad as "inventions."

ON THE other side is, in the first place, the unanimous report of all the foreign correspondents in Germany. These are all men with established reputations for truth and accuracy. The world has relied, for years, on the remainder of their news from Germany and any reports on which they all agreed have never yet been disproved at any important point. They are not infallible, and their news, especially when gathered over the obstacle of internal censorship, may be subject to correction in detail. But when they all tell the same story, and that a story which subjects them to probable expulsion, it means either that the story is substantially true or that they have suddenly entered into a unanimous conspiracy to vilify the country in which they work. Not one of them has ever been caught in doing this before. Now, if the official denial is correct, they have simultaneously risked their careers by all fabricating the same "invention."

IN ADDITION, there is the same consensus of private information. Some of this, to be sure, may be unverified rumor, but if the general situation described were an "invention," somebody would have said so. As it is, the only denial is the official one, and that comes from a source which has prohibited the free expression of the truth in Germany itself.

AND, finally, comes a mass exodus of prosperous and prominent Jews to London and Paris, all telling the same story, plus a wholesale application of poor Jews for permission to enter neighboring countries whose immigration laws restrict the admission of those without adequate personal means of support. Evidently the Jews of Germany are all fleeing from this same "invention." They have all believed it, and many of them, whose word would be accepted on any other subject, testify that they have personally suffered from it or have observed the abuse of others. There was never any such flight from Germany in the previous outbreaks of anti-Semitism. Bad as those were, they were regarded as a less evil than exile. Now, for what Hitler officially declares as an "invention," German Jewry storms the frontiers, in a stampede to escape the country.

IT IS, therefore, more charitable to believe that Hitler does not intend his official dementi to be taken literally. Among individuals, if an impertinent person asks you a question which is none of his business, it is sometimes tactful to rebuke him by responding with a lie so transparent that he is obviously not expected to believe it. To Hitler, this is the exact character of the inquiries of the Ambassadors of the world regarding this epidemic of Jew-baiting. He wishes to inform us, indirectly but plainly, that it is none of our business.

Boycott to Paralyze Jewry in Germany Ordered by Nazis

**No Phase of Semitic Life to Be Spared
Under Policy Adopted by Hitler
Party; Violence Forbidden**

(Chicago Tribune Foreign Cable Service. Copyright, 1933)

BERLIN, March 28—Chancellor Hitler's National Socialist party will clamp down the lid on all Jewish business and professional men at 10 a. m. Saturday, April 1. Final orders for a nation-wide boycott were issued tonight. The announcement said that it will last "until Jewish life in Germany is paralyzed."

No phase of Jewish life will be spared. Hitler's government, while not officially countenancing the boycott, is not expected to intervene.

Nazi headquarters at Munich said that the boycott is "a purely defensive measure solely directed against German Jewry as a retaliation for the anti-German campaign in foreign countries."

LEADERS BAN VIOLENCE

"Not one Jewish hair must be touched," Nazi leaders cautioned their followers. "It must be carried out with complete calm and discipline. Special committees will be

KAISER INVITED BACK

BERLIN, March 28 (AP)—In the midst of scattered disorders attending the beginning of a boycott against Jewish shops, the town of Bad-Homburg issued an invitation to former Kaiser Wilhelm today to make his home there if he should decide to return to Germany. Representatives of the Hohenzollern here said that although there has been much talk about the return of the Kaiser he has expressed no intention of coming back to Germany.

formed in every Nazi group to carry out the plans systematically. These committees will see to it that the innocent are not harmed, so that the guilty will suffer the more.

According to the Nazi proclamation, foreigners must be protected "irrespective of religion or racial origin."

SHOPS TO BE PICKETED

While Jewish merchants, physicians and lawyers will be the chief targets of the boycott, Jewish children also will be affected by the campaign. It even would prevent extensive attendance by Jewish students in high schools.

How the campaign will be conducted was set forth in the proclamation.

(Continued on Page 2, Col. 2)

C, March 29.

Nazi Order Boycott on Jewish Race, to Be Effective April 1

(Continued From Page 1)

Indo. Nazi storm troopers will be assigned to picket Jewish shops.

"This is their tenderest spot and there they must be struck the hardest," said the announcement.

Newspapers declining to cooperate in the campaign also will be boycotted.

"No German shall read these newspapers and no German shall advertise in them," read the order.

The first two pages of the Nazi manifesto recited the grievances against "Marxist Jews" and sought to refute stories in other lands concerning gouged eyes, maimed and crippled men and women, attacked girls and violated corpses.

JEWS BLAMED FOR REPORTS

"Responsible for this atrocity propaganda are the Jews in Germany," the statement went on. "Many Jewish intellectuals fled abroad with their money and from foreign shores are now carrying on an unscrupulous campaign of hate against the people of Germany."

Although the boycott campaign is timed to start officially Saturday, it was unofficially initiated in several centers in Germany today. In many towns, notably Essen, Duisburg and Bochum in the Ruhr, Jewish shops and department stores and American-owned 5 and 10-cent stores were voluntarily closed down when picketed by storm troopers.

JEWS' WINDOWS BROKEN

Others closed down when requested. Windows of Jewish shops in Witten were smashed during the

night but there was no plundering.

Similar picketing was reported in Gleiwitz. It was added that the "police ignored activities of storm troopers." All Jewish shops at Schwerin-on-the-Warthe were closed and the owners compelled to pay their employees two months' salary in advance.

A clash between the Nazi storm troopers and Steel Helmets (war veterans supporting the Nationalist party) in Brunswick last night led to a stormy conflict between Nationalist and Nazi forces in the Cabinet.

INVESTIGATION BEGUN

A special committee flew to Brunswick this afternoon to carry out the investigations followed by Franz Seidler, Minister of Labor and chief of the Steel Helmet organization, who will investigate the clash personally.

The Steel Helmet organization stated it had received many applications from former republican veterans, which was interpreted by Nazis to mean that the republican applicants were admitted into the Steel Helmet ranks. On the strength of this suspicion, 1350 men were taken prisoners in Brunswick by the Nazis.

1200 MEN RELEASED

Beldie late tonight advised that he had secured the release of 1200 of the men arrested last night, but that the rest will be tried.

He achieved a compromise with the Nazi authorities providing that the Steel Helmet organization will be allowed to resume its activities in the State of Brunswick April 1.

C, March 30.

Jewry Begg Hitler, Hindenburg to Halt Nazi Party Boycott

Einstein Renounces Prussia Citizenship as Protest to Anti-Semitic Campaign in Germany

BERLIN, March 29 (AP)—Leading representatives of German Jewry appealed to President von Hindenburg, Chancellor Hitler, Cabinet members and the Berlin police president tonight against a Nazi-inspired boycott of Jews which begins throughout Germany Saturday, and at the same time it was learned that Professor Albert Einstein had taken steps to renounce his Prussian citizenship.

Professor Einstein was born in Ulm, Germany, but subsequently his family moved to Switzerland and he became a Swiss citizen.

In 1914 he was called to the directorship of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for physics, member of the Prussian Academy of Science, and then he became a Prussian in political affiliations.

JEWES DEFEND POSITION

The appeal expressed confidence that the President and the government will not "let our rights and means of existence be taken from us."

Declaring that German Jews had successfully put forth their utmost efforts to counteract reports abroad of Jewish persecutions and foreign boycott campaigns, and pledging that they would continue to do so, the document asserted that "despite this, German Jews, as allegedly the guilty party, are now to be ruined."

The note appealed to the sense of justice of the German people and added that "the reproach that we injured the German people is a very heavy blow to our honor."

WAR DEATHS CITED

The message pointed out that 12,000 of Germany's 500,000 Jews died in the World war.

Direct-action repressive measures by Chancellor Hitler's Nazis got under way against Jews in many parts of Germany today as a prelude to the nation-wide boycott.

Chancellor Hitler was quoted by the Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung as having stated at today's Cabinet meeting that it was necessary to take measures against the "atrocity campaign," as otherwise popular indignation might take undesirable forms.

Einstein Renounces Citizenship In Prussia as Boycott Protest

(Continued From Page 1)

mission and is a member of the German Peace Society.

Anti-Jewish propaganda ceased in Gleiwitz, Duthen and Hindenburg after the Silesian Chamber of Commerce had ruled against the campaign, saying that it was an inexpedient move.

JEWISH SHOPS TARRIED

The immediate closing of all Jewish stores in Eberswalde was demanded by Nazi storm troops. Jewish shops there were smeared with tar during the night and glass show-cases in the two Jewish-owned moving picture houses were smashed. Nazi headquarters expressed disapproval of these acts of vandalism.

In Schwedt pickets were withdrawn from Jewish shops on storm troop orders. This was done after negotiations with the police.

JEWES BARRED FROM COURTS

At Muenster Nazis occupied the courts, declining to permit Jews to enter. They also confiscated knives used in Jewish butchering rites.

In Berlin the municipal government ordered that from April 1 all supplies for municipal projects and offices must be purchased from Nationalist merchants. Forty-eight Jewish shops which were picketed by Nazi storm troops were quickly closed and a number of retail establishments, operated by non-Jews on money borrowed from Jews, were posted with pickets.

JEWISH TEACHERS BARRED

At the University of Westphalia Jewish professors were prevented from entering classrooms, and Professor Hugo Blatzheimer, a member of the faculty, and three Jewish attorneys were placed under protective arrest. The professor was a reporter for the War Guilt Com-

Continued on Page 2, Col. 1

German Jews Ask Hindenburg to Halt Economic Pogrom

EX, March 30.

Hitler and Ministers
Also Receive
Appeals

"WE'RE LOYAL"

Boycott Is Necessary,
Chancellor In-
forms Cabinet

By KARL H. VON WIEGAND

Copyright, 1933, by Universal Service, Inc.

BERLIN, March 29.—Germany's 500,000 Jews today are in a state of alarm over the National Socialist party's proclamation, virtually with Government sanction, of the nationwide "economic pogrom" scheduled to begin Saturday.

The national organization of German Jews today sent an appeal to President von Hindenburg, Chancellor Hitler, all cabinet ministers and the police president of Berlin to intervene. The Jewish appeal said:

"For the mistakes of the few for whom we are not responsible, economic destruction is being prepared for us German Jews who cling with every fibre of our hearts to our German homes.

CITE WAR RECORD.

"In all wars for the fatherland, German Jews brought bloodshed of blood to this unity with the country. In the great war, 12,000 out of 500,000 German Jews gave their lives for our country.

"In peaceful work, we have done our duty with all our strength."

Asserting that Jews in Germany are not responsible for atrocity and economic boycott movements abroad, against which they have fought, the appeal says:

"Despite this fact, German Jews are now to be ruined as the alleged guilty. We appeal to the German people, to whom justice has always been the highest virtue.

GOVERNMENT MOVE.

"We trust in the Reich's President and the Reich's Government, that they will not permit the facilities of life and livelihood to be taken from us."

With Chancellor Hitler identifying himself today with the nationwide boycott of Jews in Germany, this becomes, in effect, a Government movement which practically amounts to the Jews being used as hostages to stem anti-German feeling in foreign countries, whether of an economic nature or otherwise.

The boycott was organized to prevent "spontaneous independent measures which were likely to assume uncontrollable proportions," Chancellor Hitler told his cabinet today.

HITS GERMAN JEWS

"The boycott had to be organized," Hitler said. "We now have the action in our hands."

"World Jewry should realize that the Jewish war against Germany can only hit German Jews."

Thousands of Jews all over the country, who already are beginning to feel the lash of social ostracism, fear that if the boycott once gets into full swing, no one can guarantee that everywhere it will be kept within the non-violent channels demanded by the Chancellor.

In Berlin and other cities, many meetings of troubled Jewish business circles have been held. This anxiety extends down to even the poorest Jewish families.

INTERVENTION DOUBTED.

That President von Hindenburg, who alone might stop the movement, will intervene, was doubted in many circles tonight.

The President is not and never has been anti-Semitic, but in contrast to former Kaiser Wilhelm, who cultivated Jews of the upper strata, it has often been observed that the Field Marshal-President never invites Jews as guests to the presidential palace.

Representatives of American banks in Berlin are endeavoring to have the Nazi leaders at least postpone for one, or possibly two, weeks, the beginning of the boycott. This would give the bankers an opportunity to use influence in America and England either to check or to minimize anti-German movements.

Reports, unconfirmed, tonight said the Nazis would call off the boycott Friday night if the effect

NAZI BOYCOTT BEGUN BEFORE DATE ORDERED

Action Taken to Indicate Organization Not in Hand, or General Disregard of Decree

of its measures in foreign countries should be by then such as to satisfy the party.

Obviously, the Nazis must be able to show they have had success with their extraordinary tactics.

Without waiting for Saturday, the boycott began in many places today, indicating the Nazi organization is not in hand, or else that it is ignoring general orders.

Newspapers report Jewish stores and shops closed in at least fifteen cities and towns. In many places, mobs smashed windows.

This window-smashing led to an extraordinary semi-official notice, appearing in all newspapers, that mobs must desist from breaking windows, inasmuch as not Jews, but German insurance companies suffered thereby.

Fourteen stores of the Woolworth chain are reported to have been closed.

—New America—

C, March 31.

Nazis Ready To Begin Jew Boycott Drive

Instructions Sent to Followers on Plan for Campaign

—BERLIN, March 31 (Friday) (AP)—Nazi charges that the Jews of the world were responsible for the World war, and Nazi declarations that repressive measures against Jews will continue "until victory is ours," set the tone today for the nation-wide Jewish boycott which is to begin at 10 a. m. tomorrow.

The central boycott committee of the National Socialist party issued fiery appeals to followers of Chancellor Hitler throughout the nation, instructing them in the part they are to play in the boycott against Jewish business men, attorneys and physicians.

"JEWS ATAB GERMANY"

In the proclamation, made public at Munich and printed in the Voelkischer Beobachter, the Hitlerite organ, the committee said:

"Judah is stabbing Germany in the back with the same methods it employed to perpetrate the criminal World war. Again Judah is at work calumniating the German people as huns and barbarians."

WILL BE REPRINTED

Local committees were ordered to re-print that the instructions were re-printed prominently in the entire German press. Among other things, these instructions call for outdoor demonstrations and the public display of posters which accuse German Jews of having enlisted the aid of foreign Jews against Germany.

Beginning tomorrow, Jewish stores will be obliged to hang out black placards with yellow print, announcing that they are owned by Jews.

The newspaper, Angriff, edited by Joseph Goebbels, government propaganda chief, said tonight that the threat of a boycott "has had no visible effect up to now on Jewish instigators of atrocity reports published abroad."

On the contrary, said Angriff, "in some sections of the American press Germany's counter measures are being answered with a renewed demand for a boycott of German goods."

PASSPORTS SEIZED

The authorities at Breslau ordered all Jews to turn in their passports, making travel for them impossible.

The Nazi group in the Prussian Diet proposed that Jewish children be restricted to 1 per cent of each school's enrollment.

Nazi headquarters directed members of the party to refrain from interfering with the business of the Woolworth chain stores.

EX, March 31.

Hope That Hitler Will Call Off Boycott Gains

By KARL H. VON WIEGAND

Copyright, 1933, by Universal Service, Inc.

BERLIN, March 30.—Hopes that the anti-German campaign abroad Chancellor Hitler will order the national anti-Jewish boycott called off as the 10 a. m. Saturday deadline approaches, were strengthened today by an editorial in Der Angriff, Nazi newspaper published by Joseph Goebbels, Minister of Propaganda. The paper said:

"There are still 48 hours, which should be sufficient, in which to suspend this unprecedented lying campaign abroad. If these hours are allowed to pass without taking advantage of them, then world Jewry will receive a blow from which it will not soon recover."

The Angriff poured scorn on German Jews for the rapidity with which they went into action once they saw themselves in danger, adding, "But mercy cannot be granted," continuing:

"World Jewry must immediately discontinue attacks on German reconstruction, or Jewry in Germany will be finished, morally and commercially."

Significantly, most evening newspapers gave the impression that the anti-German campaign abroad is dying down.

Economic and financial leaders, big businessmen, hotels and resorts here are frankly in opposition to the Jewish boycott.

The Foreign Office, many men in Hitler's cabinet, banks, mercantile houses, steamship lines and other businesses are endeavoring to impress the powers responsible for the boycott what a self-destructive boomerang it can develop into for Germany.

The economic pogrom against the German Jews was the chief topic of conversation at a big colorful reception given by Vice Chancellor and Frau von Papen, in Prince Friedrich Leopold Palace. The rooms were crowded by a throng glittering with uniforms and decorations.

ONLY THREE FAVOR

I found only three who favored the pogrom. They were Chancellor Hitler, Minister of Propaganda Goebbels and one more. All others, including Vice Chancellor von Papen, Foreign Minister von Neurath, and Minister of Labor Seiditz, strongly opposed it and are fearful of the consequences for Germany.

LEADERS OPPOSE BOYCOTT.

Significantly, most evening newspapers gave the impression that

LOCAL JEWRY ACTS

E-E, March 31.

WHAT action shall American Jewry take, not so much in response to its pulse, as in the interests of the Jews in Germany who are facing grave and multiple perils. This has been the solemn question which has been presenting itself, particularly in the past week, to every Jew the world over. Torn between the urges of the heart to do something and the restraints of the mind to be judicious, no unanimity of opinion has developed as to a single course of action.

On Wednesday evening, in what was perhaps the most momentous committee meeting in the history of San Francisco Jewry to consider *defenses* against Jewish pogroms, over fifty representatives, speaking for practically all local Jewish interests, determined to hold a *mass* meeting, if the tragic events, now moving so swiftly in Germany, do not alter their course within the next week or two.

This much is certain in world Jewry: we are all moved by one profound sympathy to bring succor to the stricken. What *method* should be adopted to effect the relief, found a split in the three most powerful lay agencies in America, with the American Jewish Committee and B'nai B'rith appealing for the more quiet approach, and the American Jewish Congress advocating the demonstrative *mass* meeting. The *difference* of opinion has crept into the rank and file of our people.

Will Hitler recede of his own motion or will public opinion have to be exercised? These seem to be the two crucial issues that are shaping our decision. Hitler has *not* said that the Nazi *boycott* would cease should the protests at mass meetings or in the press stop. He has only emphasized that the boycott would be more serious should the protests continue. The news dispatches indicate that the Nazis do not intend to stop, but to go forward; and we may rely on them, as Chester Rowell tells us, because the foreign correspondents have proven themselves to be men of integrity under other trying circumstances.

Therefore, the only alternative left is to use pressure.—the pressure of public opinion and economic force. Public opinion, spiritual in its nature, and economic force, practical in its effect, have already shown themselves to be powerful defenses. The daily anxiety and the counter-propaganda of the Nazis, as ridiculous in their tone and analysis as the Japanese *excuses*, already indicate that. We are further informed by *Paul Mallon* of the United Press, on high authority, that since the protests, an American official of great influence recently gained an audience with Herr Hitler and found him in a conciliatory mood to temper the terrific drive against the German Jews.

We can be no less shocked at the *eleven* point program of the Nazi government to strangle economically the German Jew, then we were at the murders and other forms of violence. In either case, the *noose* has been placed on the victims' necks by the hangman; and if we must choose between a fast or a slow death, let us risk the former. For, as Alfred E. Smith said on the international broadcast on Monday evening, the boycott is as *despicable* as violence.

Those who are familiar with the history of anti-Semitism; those who are acquainted with previous pogroms in Germany, particularly those which brought the epochal migrations to the United States in the early and middle part of the last century; and those who heard the scholarly and dynamic exposition of Edwin Hill on Wednesday evening over the Columbia Broadcasting Radio Station, telling how the German Jews grew to greater strength after the trying persecutions from 1880 to 1892, all of these people may take confidence that the German Jews will rise out of the terror as a stronger people, and that perhaps world Jewry may become more unified.

—Sol Silverman.

E-E, March 31.

NOISY MEETINGS

THE American Jewish Congress meeting that howled down former Judge Joseph M. Proskauer and James N. Rosenberg when they tried to restrain the representatives of various New York Jewish organizations from passing a resolution to hold a huge mass demonstration against Hitler at the Madison Square Garden acted unjustly and hastily. These two gentlemen undertook a very ungrateful task. They knew the temper and mood of the meeting. They shared every bit of the resentment against the Nazis.

Being versed in political manoeuvres, these two Jewish leaders were entirely aware of the futility of their attempt. If they undertook to stem the tide of a lava-like current at the risk of injuring their popularity (to march against the current is never profitable), they were motivated by a firm conviction that a mass demonstration at this time would jeopardize the position of German Jewry. And while it may be hopeless to cry out in the midst of this fervent, passionate and justified shouting for protest it should not be overlooked that the president of the

Central Verein of German Jewish citizens and the president of the Zionist organization in Germany implored the American Jewish leadership not to resort to mass demonstrations at this time. And it should also be known that the American Jewish Committee had the situation well in hand with the State Department at Washington long before Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, accompanied by Bernard S. Deutsch, made that dramatic appearance in Washington to talk over the German situation with the undersecretary of state.

In our anxiety to help our unfortunate brethren in Germany, we should not forget that our actions—imposing and impressive though they may appear here—are intended for effect over there, as a political safeguard for German Jewry. It is easy indeed to speak courageously in Madison Square thousands of miles away from the battlefield in Germany. Protests against Hitlerism are more useful when they are led by the Christian clergy and non-Jewish statesmen of America. A few words by members of the Roosevelt cabinet or by men of the caliber of Alfred E. Smith under non-Jewish auspices are more powerful than Jewish mass demonstrations.

In modern politics, however, it is the recognized sequence—to try first diplomacy and then a direct appeal to the people. When diplomacy fails mass demonstrations sometime compel action. But a mass demonstration very often intimidates official quarters and restrains them from acting. Let there be less of a rush on the part of our leaders to make the front page and more of the self-sacrificing spirit of Joseph M. Proskauer and James N. Rosenberg, who were howled down at the American Jewish Congress meeting.

—Joseph Brainin

For the Need is Very Great--C, March 31.

Jews Routed by Nazis--C, March 31.

Nazis Ready to Begin Jew Boycott--C, March 31.

For the Need is Very Great

THE Jewish National Welfare Fund opens Monday its appeal for the money with which to support or aid some thirty-eight national and international philanthropical, educational and religious agencies. San Francisco's quota is \$200,000. The present appeal is an emergency drive made imperative by the Nazi persecutions of the Jewish people. Although this appeal is not directed to those of other faiths it is one that will receive their sympathetic cooperation. It is an opportunity to help which must appeal with particular force to all lovers of humanity.

Jews Routed by Nazis

Troops Storm Merchants at Meet

20 Reported in Cells

By EDMOND TAYLOR

(Copyright, 1933, Chicago Tribune Foreign Cable Service)

FRANKFORT - AM - MAIN, March 30 - A business conference of thirty-five Jewish retail merchants which was called by the vice president of the local Chamber of Commerce to explain the boycott, was broken up with some violence this morning and those present were illegally jailed by Fascist storm troopers.

Authorities admit the incident, but say it was just a regrettable error, owing to the failure of the vice president of the chamber, a Dr. Roehm—who is incidentally a Christian—to inform the police that the meeting was being called.

TWO JEWS HELD IN JAIL

The Nazi patrols, it is explained, thought it was a political gathering, which is forbidden by decree, and proceeded to make the arrests. According to the official version, only Jews were kept in jail, the charge against them being that in anticipation of the boycott they were preparing to discharge employees.

From a reliable opposition source, however, it is learned that twenty of the thirty-five are still in jail, and that, far from any talk of discharging or reducing staffs during the boycott, the meeting was called to work out ways of retaining all employees.

MARCHED THROUGH CITY

According to the same account, a large number of armed Nazis roughly broke up the meeting this morning and ordered all present to march off to jail. This involved a twenty-minute walk through the

streets of the town. The prisoners were made to lock their hands behind their heads and walk in formation while the Fascists marched in a cordon around them.

It is alleged that there was a certain amount of roughness in producing and whacking the prisoners with rubber night sticks, but none of them was even slightly injured. The twenty who are being kept in jail were allowed to communicate with their families and keep in touch with their businesses by telephone.

NEWSPAPER MEN SEIZED

It was also announced that two foreign newspaper men, both Jews, one a Rumanian, the other a Russian working for a Swedish paper, were arrested on a charge of spreading false news of violence in Frankfurt.

At a mass meeting called by local Fascist authorities in the historic Roemerberg (market place and town hall), nearly 10,000 attended from the flag draped balcony of the electors' palace, where German Emperors formerly were crowned, local Nazi authorities harangued the crowd while several hundred uniformed militiamen stood lined up below.

Preaching hatred of the Jews, whom the speakers charged were corrupting and materializing German institutions, the orators strongly insisted on the necessity of maintaining discipline.

The boycott was spoken of as something inevitable and the crowd was informed that it would be carried through to the end without violence, but without mercy.

Nazis Ready To Begin Jew Boycott Drive

Instructions Sent to Followers on Plan for Campaign

BERLIN, March 31 (Friday) (AP)—Nazi charges that the Jews of the world were responsible for the World war, and Nazi declarations that repressive measures against Jews will continue "until victory is ours," set the tone today for the nation-wide Jewish boycott which is to begin at 10 a. m. tomorrow.

The central boycott committee of the National Socialist party issued fiery appeals to followers of Chancellor Hitler throughout the nation, instructing them in the part they are to play in the boycott against Jewish business men, attorneys and physicians.

"JEWS STAB GERMANY"

In the proclamation, made public at Munich and printed in the Voelkischer Beobachter, the Hitlerite organ, the committee said:

"Judah is stabbing Germany in the back with the same methods it employed to perpetrate the criminal World war. Again Judah is at work calumniating the German people as huns and barbarians."

WILL BE REPRINTED

Local committees were ordered to see that the instructions were reprinted prominently in the entire German press. Among other things, these instructions call for outdoor demonstrations and the public display of posters which accuse German Jews of having enlisted the aid of foreign Jews against Germany.

Beginning tomorrow, Jewish stores will be obliged to hang out black placards with yellow print, announcing that they are owned by Jews.

The newspaper Angriff, edited by Joseph Goebbels, government propaganda chief, said tonight that the threat of a boycott "has had no visible effect up to now on Jewish instigators of atrocity reports published abroad."

On the contrary, said Angriff, "in some sections of the American press Germany's counter measures are being answered with a renewed demand for a boycott of German goods."

FRANKFURT MEN SEIZED

The authorities at Breslau ordered all Jews to turn in their passports, making travel for them impossible.

The Nazi group in the Prussian Diet proposed that Jewish children be restricted to 1 per cent of each school's enrollment.

Nazi headquarters directed members of the party to refrain from interfering with the business of the Woolworth chain stores.

EX,
Apr. 1.

Germany's Boycott Against Jews to Take Effect Today; Lasts Only One Day as 'Trial'

'Pogrom' Then Will Be Suspended Pending World Action

WAIT UPON U.S.

American Note Might Have Resulted in Postponement

By KARL H. VON WIEGAND
Copyright, 1933 by Universal Service, Inc.

BERLIN, March 31. — Germany's economic "program" against German Jews will go into effect tomorrow for one day only, then to be suspended until Wednesday morning to await the world's reaction.

The Radical sentiment in the National Socialist Party won the verdict putting the boycott into operation at a Cabinet meeting today marked by a terrific struggle between clashing views.

Seeing victory in hand for the Nazi reprisal methods, the morality of which had hitherto been regarded as questionable, Chancellor Adolf Hitler's "Third Reich" and its Minister of Propaganda, Dr. Joseph Goebbels, tonight made conditions to the world.

DISTINCTION WIPED OUT.

All distinction between the Nazi Party and the Government in the nationwide boycott was wiped out when Dr. Goebbels announced this evening that "the campaign of atrocity tales" in foreign countries had diminished. Goebbels said:

"The Reich Government sees herein success for the boycott threat, but also that a united Jewry in Germany has possibilities capable of stopping the atrocity campaign, and is convinced this campaign has passed its zenith."

Then the Minister of Propaganda said the boycott would take place for one day — Saturday — after which it would be suspended until Wednesday, "if no more atrocity reports about Germany are printed in the meantime."

WAITED ON WASHINGTON.

At that time, he said, the Government would consider calling off the boycott.

Curiously enough, the supposed reason for which the boycott was not called off or postponed tonight, as Vice Chancellor Von Papen had informed Universal Service it would be, was that an expected official statement from Washington did not arrive.

The press department of the Prussian Ministry of State authorized a statement that it was planned to call off the boycott at about 8 p. m. The same department later said the Washington document, which was to be to the effect that the American government disapproved of the atrocity campaign and foreign boycott of German goods, did not arrive.

A declaration by the British government, the exact nature of which had not been revealed up to a late hour, had been received. It was said officially. Failure of the American declaration to arrive was given as the reason why the radical Nazis won the fight against Vice Chancellor von Papen to the extent that the boycott of German

HITLER LETS NAZIS 'BLOW OFF STEAM'

Chancellor, Shying From Test of His Storm Troop Control, Permits Day Boycott Decision

Jews should go into effect for at least one day.

Vice Chancellor von Papen, backed by German industries, banks, steamship lines and Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, president of the Reichsbank, made every possible effort to head off the boycott. There was even an unconfirmed report that Dr. Schacht had threatened to resign.

Vice Chancellor von Papen said tonight that if the American statement should still arrive tonight, he hoped the boycott could still be called off or postponed tomorrow morning before 10 a. m. when it is set to begin.

TO "BLOW OFF STEAM"

While the government is said to be dissatisfied with the British declaration and the tardiness of the American view, it is said in well informed circles that Chancellor Hitler, shying away from the severe test of his control over the Nazi storm troops, permitted the decision to let the Nazis blow off steam for one day.

Minister Without Portfolio Goering, the most dynamic and one of the most radical of Hitler's lieutenants, is suspected of being the chief factor in Von Papen's defeat today. Goering is also credited with having prevented Von Papen from becoming Premier of Prussia.

Tonight there were torchlight parades and demonstrations for the boycott of the Jews in Berlin and cities and towns throughout the country. Of Germany's half million Jews, few were on the streets or in public places tonight. Most of them were in their homes, contemplating a gloomy future.

They know the ultimate goal of radical Nazi sentiment is a "Jew-less Germany." They fear they will be driven back into the ghetto of medieval times or, one way or the other, forced to leave their homes and country.

The eve of the first nationwide Government sanctioned economic "pogrom" against the Jews in any cultured nation in modern times is marked by much pathos, tragedy and sorrow in thousands of Jewish homes.

Here and there, in street cars, buses and other places, there are also indications of sympathy, pity and even something like shame, in some Christian faces when Jew or Jewess enter.

EVEN NAZIS BUY.

Numerous bargain sales were held in Berlin and other cities and towns. The Jews were making an effort to realize as much cash as possible on what might have been the last day they would be permitted to do business. In some places even uniformed Nazis bought in Jewish stores, the extraordinarily low prices overcoming their hatred.

Orders of the Nazi boycott committees were carried out by storm troops. Jewish employers must pay their Christian employees two months' wages in advance. At the same time, they must dismiss all Jewish employees without notice.

A mob burst into Berlin State Courts in two places today and forced withdrawal of all Jewish judges and lawyers.

As action "against the atrocity campaign abroad," storm troops occupied the Superior and other courts in Königsberg, East Prussia. These headlines appear in the evening newspapers:

"Injustice Against Germany. Foreign Governments Must Interfere."

They seem to justify the conclusion that Germany plans to act against German Jews until foreign governments force an end of the boycotts of German goods.

In well informed circles there is much talk that, under cover of the boycott, it is planned to reorganise completely every business in Germany, eliminating Jews everywhere. It is significant that the "Red hunt" is completely silenced. It is replaced by a Jew hunt.

WASHINGTON, March 31. — (U.S.) — The State Department tonight insisted it knows nothing of a reported "official statement" by this government in regard to the German Jewish situation.

It denied it has sent any such statement, or that it plans to send one.

The German Embassy also said no statement has been transmitted through its offices.

C, April 1.

Germans Cut Jew Boycott To Single Day

Nazis in World-
Wide Threat to
Stop Press
Attacks

Shoppers Branded
With Stamps on
Foreheads

BERLIN, March 31 (AP)—

The government stepped in at the last minute today with an order that the anti-Jewish boycott, which is to start at 10 a. m. tomorrow, will last one day only and then will be held in abeyance until Wednesday.

This action, taken after considerable pressure had been brought to bear to prevent disruption of the nation's business life, led some observers to assert that the boycott movement would be dropped entirely after a single day.

BOYCOTT ORDER SIGNED

Joseph Goebbels, Cabinet Minister of Propaganda, signed the order which signalized the first official move in the boycott situation. It was the Nazi party of Chancellor Adolf Hitler, rather than the government itself, which ordered the nationwide repressive measure.

Dr. Goebbels asserted in his proclamation that the interim between the end of the one-day boycott and Wednesday should be considered as a respite. In this interim the government hopes that no more reports of anti-Jewish atrocities in Germany will be printed in newspapers abroad.

ISSUE WORLD THREAT

If foreign propaganda has not been ended by 10 a. m. Wednesday, Dr. Goebbels said, the boycott will be resumed "with full force and vehemence, which until now has been undreamed of."

Dr. Goebbels set forth that the government had "observed with satisfaction that reports of atrocities abroad are ceasing."

The Propaganda Minister also issued a set of boycott rules, declaring:

That no banks must be closed.
That Nazis must not enter boycotted premises.

That the boycott must be kept within legal regulations. (Boycotters are liable for any damage inflicted.)

NEW ORDER SURPRISES

The order limiting the anti-Jewish movement to one day came as a surprise notwithstanding that for some time pressure had been exerted on the government.

A few hours before the Propaganda Minister issued his proclamation Nazi storm troopers cleared Berlin law courts of all Jewish judges and attorneys.

SHOPPERS BRANDED

The Wolff News Bureau reported that in the town of Annaberg shoppers leaving Jewish stores were stopped by Nazi pickets, who pasted on their foreheads stamps reading: "We traitors bought from Jews."

Before Dr. Goebbels issued his Continued on Page 2, Col. 1.

German Nazis Cut Jew Ban

Repression Order Held
to Single Day

(Continued From Page 1)

proclamation Nazi orders called for the summary dismissal of all Jewish employees of Jewish stores at 10 a. m. tomorrow. These regulations also called on employers to pay Gentile employees two months' salary in advance.

The Nazi boycott committees tonight were calling in all available reserves and mobilized and put in uniforms civilian members of the storm troopers in order to make the one-day boycott as effective as possible.

To demonstrate to English-speaking visitors in Berlin the severity of the anti-Jewish action, placards with the English text, "Germans, defend yourself against Jewish atrocity propaganda—buy in German shops," will be posted on billboards.

Placarded automobiles with loudspeakers will ply the streets Saturday to advertise the boycott idea.

COOK RECEIVES INJURIES

Unable to say whether he had fallen off a street car or had been struck by one in the Ferry building loop, Bolly Storkoep, 43, assistant cook on the steamer Marthusa, was taken to Harbor Emergency Hospital yesterday suffering a possible skull fracture.

C, April 1.

Hitlerite Mind Fails to Grasp Human Psychology

NOW the Hitlerite government, alarmed by world disapproval, says it will stop its persecution of Jews. If the rest of the world will stop criticizing. With all due respect to Herr Hitler HE started this thing. It is up to HIM to stop first. The criticism will stop then. It will not stop while he is still persecuting the Jews.

The Nazis are still vociferating that Jews are not being physically abused in Germany. All right, let us grant that, as we grant that the stories of torture were probably exaggerated, no doubt as the result of censorship, which inevitably prevents the truth from getting out straight.

But what difference does this make? The abuse may not be physical but it is abuse just the same. Is it not abuse and persecution to throw a Judge out of his place, because he happens to be a Jew; to prevent the Jewish doctors and lawyers from practicing their professions, to discharge all the Jewish teachers, to close all the Jewish shops and stop the Jews from making a living?

Cutting off Jewish ears would be a minor atrocity compared to driving Jews to starvation. The Nazis are not cutting off the ears, but they are taking all possible steps to starve the Jews by preventing them from making a living. And this the Hitler government says it will halt only if the other nations of the world stop disapproving.

Despite all the lessons of the World War the Prussian governmental mind still retains a singular inability to understand how other nations think and particularly to realize how other peoples will act when confronted with a spectacle of inhumanity.

Germans Boycott 500,000 Jews for Day; 2 Men Killed

EX, April 2.

**Semite Attorney Slain
in Kiel Jail After
He Shoots Nazi**

'POGROM' ENDS

**Resumption Unlikely;
Hitler Is Forced to
Relent on Ban**

By KARL H. VON WIEGAND

Copyright, 1933, by Universal Service, Inc.

BERLIN, April 1.—The German nation, which appealed to the world against the injustice of the allied blockade after the war because of misery it inflicted on Germany, today engaged in a one-day boycott of a small section of her own people—her 500,000 German Jews.

The boycott against Jews of German nationality, an "economic pogrom," without parallel in modern times, began at 10 a. m. and ended at 7 p. m. Unofficially, it had been going on in several cities for several days.

It was said in authoritative quarters that resumption of the boycott Wednesday—after the period of grace allowed foreign Jews in which to cease anti-German agitation—is unlikely. Dr. Joseph Goebbels, Minister of Propaganda, nevertheless warned that the boycott may be renewed.

YOUNG JEW KILLED.

Although Nazi party headquarters in Munich issued strict orders of "no violence," a young Jew was killed by angry Nazis and their supporters in Kiel, Schleswig, after a storm trooper had been shot.

Two bombs found in Hamburg by the Bismarck statue were blamed on Reds. These incidents stood out in an otherwise well-controlled demonstration.

It is doubtful if the majority of Germans can be proud of this day in their history except regarding the order and discipline maintained. In circumstances of intense, bitter agitation against Jews, the brown shirts storm troops guarded passions well.

**Einstein's Bank
Account Seized
By Hitler Police**

BERLIN, April 1.—(Universal Service Special Cable.)—A special detective squad from the office of Capt. Hermann Goering, Prussian Minister of the Interior and a member of Chancellor Hitler's cabinet, today confiscated a bank account and securities belonging to Prof. Albert Einstein.

The bank account amounted to about \$1,250, and the securities more than \$3,000. Einstein now is at Ostend, Belgium.

The Prussian Academy of Sciences announced a letter of resignation had been received from Einstein, who said he would be unable to serve the Prussian state under the present government.

The Academy said it had no reason to regret Einstein's resignation.

Einstein also resigned his co-presidency of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Physics.

LONDON, April 1.—(U.S.)—The Central News Agency reported today from Brussels that Prof. Einstein had notified the German Legation he is renouncing his German citizenship and resuming his Swiss citizenship.

DRAMATIC EVENTS.

Dramatic events took place behind a closely curtained stage late yesterday and last night, which virtually forced Chancellor Adolf Hitler to limit the boycott to only one day. It was learned on excellent authority.

Foreign Minister Baron Konstantin von Neurath threatened to—in fact, even did—resign, but his resignation was not accepted. The British and American governments, through their embassies here, made vigorous representations.

Vice-Chancellor Franz von Papen then called on President von Hindenburg with Chancellor Hitler. The President himself sensationally intervened against the boycott, together with another high personage.

DETAILS KEPT SECRET.

What followed then cannot be told immediately, nor can word be spread about the reason the boycott was not called off last night. These important facts, however, are due to be disclosed sooner or later.

Headlines in Berlin papers tonight strove to create the impression that the boycott was a great victory for the Nazis because of their strong, aggressive stand.

But authoritative circles said that in view of the nature of the steps taken by Washington and London, which probably will be made known Monday, an announcement will be made that the boycott is not to be resumed "because the atrocious campaign has ended."

President von Hindenburg is expected to answer Monday the appeal of German Jewry for his aid.

Nazis Maintain Order As Record Boycott On Jews Stifles Victims

C, Apr. 2.

Anti-Semitic Drive Hailed by People in Spirit of Holiday

Shops of Hebrews Generally Stay Unopened

BERLIN, April 1 (AP)—The Nazi boycott against the Jews—the greatest organized anti-Semitic movement of modern times—paralyzed the commercial life of its victims today, but passed with comparatively few disorders.

Reports from all parts of Germany indicated that the only serious outburst was at Kiel, where two men were killed. A Jewish attorney fatally wounded a Nazi leader and subsequently was himself slain in jail by unidentified men.

BOYCOTT LIMIT SET

Indications were that the boycott, which was limited to one day by the government in a proclamation yesterday, would not be resumed as scheduled Wednesday morning, although Joseph Goebbels, Minister of Propaganda, made it clear to a vast cheering throng in the Lustgarten that it would be a simple thing to make repressive measures against all Jews effective again.

"We have the boycott so organized that it can be resumed at 10 a. m. Wednesday," Dr. Goebbels said. "If it must be resumed we will crush German Jewry."

STORES MOSTLY CLOSED

Only a few Jewish stores remained open today anywhere in Germany, and the Nazis succeeded in "persuading" prospective customers not to enter them.

Berlin was exhilarated but orderly during the day, and excellent weather brought droves of people to the streets. The crowds

promenaded as on a holiday, and everywhere they were well disciplined.

Boycott measures were enforced against Jewish doctors and lawyers and all Jews holding government and municipal offices were ordered discharged.

In Hamburg the police said they found bombs on the statue of Bismarck. There was no explosion.

BOYCOTT HAILED AS PICNIC

Although racial hatred was at the back of today's demonstration, in many parts of Germany, particularly in Berlin, people in the streets were in almost picnic mood.

Brown-shirted Nazis swarmed through the thoroughfares carrying buckets of paint with which they splashed identifying signs on every

Nazi headquarters had directed that a black placard marked with yellow be used to designate Jewish shops, but the forces of the boycott had ideas of their own. Such signs as "Danger—Jew Store" and "Attention—Beware of the Jew," accompanied by skull and crossbones were put up. In addition to the traditional black and yellow quarantines.

WOMEN JOIN IN DRIVE

The Nazi women's federation took an important part in the movement by calling upon every woman in Germany to help destroy the Jews.

"You women must see to it that no German frau buys from Jews," said an appeal issued by this organization. "The fight is inexorable. Personal feelings must be disregarded."

"You must educate German women."

Continued on Page 2, Col. 2

Berlin Populace Hails Boycott Of Jewry Shops as Picnic Event

(Continued from Page 1)

anhood to the fact that the same Jewish atrocity propaganda was reported being spread now is also responsible for the result of the World war, for 2,000,000 war dead, for starved old men, women and children, for the lie about Germany's war guilt, for Versailles (the peace treaty), for the Dawes and Young plans.

WOMEN HOLD KEY

"Now Jews desire to deprive awakened Germany of all possibility to live. The German frau in every station of life alone can decide victory in this fight. There will be not a copper henceforth for a Jewish shop, for a Jewish physician or attorney, for the German woman or German family."

"Jews want to continue the fight until the destruction of the German people. We will continue it until Jewry has been destroyed. The Jew must forever be eliminated from our people and our State."

"German women, you are fighting a holy war."

A shoot-on-sight order to prevent looting of boycotted stores was issued by Nazi party authorities at Reckhausen.

At Kassel, Nazis put up a barbed wire fence around a Jewish warehouse and fixed on it a sign reading: "Internment camp for bad citizens who buy from Jews." Within the fence they tethered a donkey.

In Hanover, large numbers of persons disregarded the boycott order and crowded Jewish stores. Police closed off the business streets explaining they were acting in the interests of public safety.

At Stuttgart, police seized five tons of Communist circulars printed in German and supposedly sent from Russia, Switzerland and Austria.

WHISPERER SENT TO JAIL

At Frankfurt-on-the-Main, an emergency court sentenced Hans Loewenstein to one year's imprisonment for circulating allegedly false stories of anti-Jewish atrocities. Jewish brokers functioned in the Frankfurt Bourse until the Bourse committee ruled that all business must pass through the hands of non-Jewish members.

The particularly strong feeling against Jewish lawyers and physicians was reflected by the placing of Nazi pickets near their residences. These pickets were especially strong along Katernaher and the Kurfuerstendamm in Berlin, where they warned everyone against invoking Jewish legal or medical aid.

PLACARDS HIT PROFESSIONS

Signs reading "Germans, shun Jewish physicians and lawyers" and "Boycott—Jewish bankruptcy" were carried through the streets not only by Nazi storm troopers but also by parading working girls and clerks.

Picket groups detailed to courts were reinforced to guard against Jewish attorneys or judges entering the buildings. Before the Courthouse of the Berlin Bureau of Schoenberg Nazi burned the now outmoded republican flag.

All Berlin stores not closed by the boycott locked their doors at 3 p. m. to permit their employees to participate in the meeting in the Lustgarten, at which Propaganda Minister Goebbels spoke.

WORLD ATTITUDE WATCHED

Dr. Goebbels announced that whether the boycott would be resumed Wednesday would depend on the attitude of the Jews of the world. It has been the contention of the boycott leaders that the purpose of the movement was to put an end to the circulation abroad of reports of Jewish atrocities.

The Propaganda Minister disclaimed any intention on the part of the Nazis to look for international trouble. The party desires, he said, to extend the hand of friendship to all nations and to live in peace.

Among the mercantile establishments closed were ten big Berlin department stores and the Tietz chain stores, which alone employ 48,000 persons throughout Germany. The great majority of the Tietz employees are Gentiles.

Einstein's Bank Account Seized On Treason Hint

BERLIN, April 1 (AP)—

Prof. Albert Einstein's bank account, amounting to about \$7000, was confiscated today by police on the ground that he intended to use the money for treasonable acts.

The Prussian Academy

of Sciences expressed indignation at Professor Einstein's "participation in the atrocity campaign abroad," and welcomed his decision to resign from the academy.

Nazi Hatred for Jewry Emblazoned in Poster

Hebrews Charged With
Inciting Attacks in
Foreign Press

Editorial

BERLIN, April 1—The National Socialist case for the anti-Jewish boycott, as compounded for the edification of the German people, is contained in a huge poster displayed by the central committee in all the streets of Berlin today. It reads as follows:

On January 30 Adolf Hitler, the leader of the German movement of liberation, was appointed Chancellor of the Reich. On March 5 the German people in a miraculous uprising went on record for him and his task of liberation. The national revolution broke the old system to pieces; Marxism L. smashed down and Germany advances toward new heights.

This grand German fight for liberation fills the international Jew with hatred and fury. He realized that his power in Germany is coming to an end. He realizes that he cannot make a soviet Jewish colony of convicts out of this Germany.

He now acts according to the program that the Zionist leader, Theodore Herzl, proclaimed in 1897 in Basle at the big Jewish congress (from the minutes of the seventh session):

"WAR" AIDS REVEALED

"As soon as a non-Jewish state dares to resist us Jews we must be in a position to cause its neighbors to go to war against it. As a means to that end we shall use public opinion by working on it through the so-called eighth great power (the press). With a few exceptions that do not figure at all the entire press of the world is in our hands."

According to this broadly conceived plan the Jew these days excites the public opinion of the world against Germany. To this end he uses the press, through the so-called eighth great power (the press). With a few exceptions that do not figure at all the entire press of the world is in our hands. According to this broadly conceived plan the Jew these days excites the public opinion of the world against Germany. To this end he uses the press, through which he pours a tremendous flood of lies over the world. No crime is too base to him to accuse the Germans of it.

The Jew lies: "In Germany members of the Jewish people are being killed through cruel tortures."

NOW WE KNOW, by official "Nazi" proclamation, what are these "atrocity tales" which have been so indignantly denied. Not one of them has ever been seen, at least in the American press. They appear to have been invented by the "Nazi" themselves, as an excuse for retaliation.

The real "atrocity" is not these fantastic mutilations, of which nobody ever heard before, but is precisely the outrage which this party poster decrees. It is the denial to Jews of the common rights of men—to earn their livings, conduct their businesses and practice their professions.

These rights, for one day at least—and the Jewish Sabbath at that, and April 1—are officially abrogated, with the threat to continue the ban unless the foreign press suspends the "lies" it never told. And the intelligence of the world is further insulted by another fiction—an alleged quotation from the long-exposed forgery, the "protocols of the Elders of Zion."

It is fanaticism run mad.

The Jew lies: "The eyes of these Jews are being burned out, their hands chopped off, their ears and noses cut off, and, alas, even their bodies are being cut in pieces!"

The Jew lies: "In Germany even Jewish women are being killed in a horrible way and Jewish girls are being assaulted in the presence of their parents."

Jews spread these lies in the same

(Continued on Page 2, Col. 5)

Nazi Hatred
and Editorial--
C, April 2.

Poster Calls War on Jews

(Continued from Page 1)

way and for the same purpose as they did during the war. They want to excite the world against Germany. Moreover, they agitate for a boycott of German goods. The Jew thus wants to increase the misery of unemployment in Germany and ruin the German export trade.

German men and women, the instigators of this made crime, this base atrocity and boycott agitation are the Jews of Germany. They have called those of their race abroad to fight against the German people. They have reported lies abroad.

The leaders of the German movement of liberty have therefore decided to decree, in defense against this criminal agitation a boycott of all Jewish stores, department stores, offices, etc., to begin Saturday, April 1, at 10 a. m.—We appeal to you, German women and men, to join this boycott.

Do not buy from Jewish stores or department stores! Do not consult Jewish attorneys! Avoid Jewish physicians! Show the Jews that they cannot degrade us and throw dirt upon German honor without being punished! Whoever acts against this appeal shows that he stands on the side of the Germans' enemies.

Long live the venerable Field Marshal of the great war, President Paul von Hindenburg!

Long live our leader, Chancellor Adolf Hitler!

Long live the German people and the sacred German fatherland!

C, Apr. 2.

Nazis Ready To Abandon Jew Boycott

Resumption of Move Set for Wednesday Unlikely

—BERLIN, April 2 (AP)—Germany experienced one of the quietest Sundays in years today on the heels of yesterday's Nazi boycott against the Jews. The boycott appeared likely to be the last organized affair of the sort, at least for the present.

The boycott committee has ordered the organization which carried out yesterday's movement to remain intact preparatory to a resumption at 10 a. m. next Wednesday, but doubts were expressed that even its leaders harbored thoughts of resuming it unless untoward incidents occurred.

RESTRICTION ON SIGNS

The committee further ordered that signs being used in any subsequent demonstration be restricted to reading "Jews."

Some of the signs posted Saturday on Jewish business places carried the words "Danger—Jew store," and "Attention—Beware of the Jew." In addition "quarantine" signs, outlined in black and yellow, were put up.

Only one serious outbreak was reported in Saturday's Nazi boycott of

(Continued on Page 3, Col. 1)

C, Apr. 2.

Jew Boycott To Be Dropped

Nazis Not Expected to Resume Move

(Continued From Page 1)
fied men after he had been taken to jail.

Although indications have been given that the boycott may not be resumed Wednesday as scheduled, Joseph Goebbels, Propaganda Minister, told a mass meeting at the Lustgarten Saturday afternoon that it would be a simple thing to re-establish the movement.

"We have the boycott so organized," he said, "that it can be re-

EX-KAISER AIDS JEWS

(Copyright, 1933, N. Y. Times Foreign
Cable Service)

LONDON, April 2.—It is reported here that the ex-Kaiser has intervened in the anti-Jew campaign. He always has been friendly toward the Jews, and made much use of their financial assistance. He has now sent a personal appeal to all members of the Hohenzollern family, urging them not to participate in Jew baiting.

sumed at 10 a. m. Wednesday, if it must be resumed we will crush German Jewry."

The boycott, imposed by Chancellor Hitler's National Socialist party in retaliation for foreign reports of anti-semitic measures in Germany, by a proclamation issued Friday afternoon was limited to the one day.

French Cardinal Assures

Jews of Church Support

PARIS, April 2.—Thousands of pamphlets inviting Christians to join Jews in an anti-Hitler protest were distributed at the doors of Paris churches today.

The tracts said: "The Old and New Testaments should unite to combat these crimes unworthy of our civilization."

Five hundred representatives of Jewish organizations in Paris Saturday night adopted a protest against the "persecution of Jews in Germany." Effective at 10 a. m.

Hull Gets Phone Report From Berlin on Anti-Jewish Drive

(Special to The Chronicle)

WASHINGTON, April 2.—The close interest with which the government is watching the anti-Jewish campaign in Germany was evidenced today when Secretary of State Cordell Hull and his chief assistants talked by long-distance telephone with George Gordon, American charge d'affaires in Berlin, and were given a report of conditions.

The conversation occurred at 11 o'clock this morning and lasted for about ten minutes.

C, Apr. 2.

Jew Baiting Scored by K. C.

Raymond Roth Says Germany Hurts Self

Jew-baiting tactics in Germany were denounced yesterday by Raymond J. Roth, grand knight of California Council 820, Knights of Columbus, addressing the council membership at a post-communion breakfast in the Hotel St. Francis.

"Individuals gone mad with power are ruining the good name of the nation in which they are directing governmental affairs," said Roth. "Racial prejudice leads to religious bigotry and the breakdown of the moral fiber of the people, fomenting hatred equaling the wartime animosities of 1914."

Other speakers were John T. Donohue of Chico, District Deputy William T. Sweigert, Rev. Joachim Walsh of the Dominican order and Rev. Richard Ryan, council chaplain.

EX, April 3.

Hindenburg Forces Hitler to Call Off Boycott on Jews

CENSORS KILL REICH CABINET SPLIT STORY

Action of President
Follows World
Protests

CABINET SPLIT

Von Neurath's Battle
With Chief Veiled
by Censors

By KARL H. VON WIEGAND

Copyright 1933 by Universal Service, Inc.

BERLIN, via London, April 3.—Germany's national boycott against the Jews can be considered as ended with yesterday's demonstration. It was indicated in all quarters today.

Aroused by warnings from Vice Chancellor Von Papen and Foreign Minister Von Neurath concerning Germany's grave situation in the eyes of foreign nations, warnings that were strongly backed up by friendly representations from Washington and London, President Von Hindenburg intervened and ordered the boycott ended.

MARTIAL LAW THREAT.

With the shadow of martial law hanging over them, since Von Hindenburg with a stroke of the pen could invest the Reichswehr with full executive powers, it is considered most unlikely that Nazi leaders would try to force a resumption of the boycott Wednesday.

This was also foretold by Julius Streicher, chairman of the central Nazi boycott committee, in Munich, when he said that reports from abroad, on the cessation of the "atrocity campaign" led him to believe "a resumption of the boycott can be avoided."

Unofficial, original announcements of the boycott gave foreign Jews a period of grace from the expiration of yesterday's boycott until Wednesday in which to cease anti-German agitation.

Hoping for a resumption of usual business tomorrow, Berlin merchants were scraping and washing off the red oil paint slogans painted across their windows. Police reported absolute quiet throughout the city.

Munich headquarters requested local boycott committees to remove signs painted on Jewish shops yesterday.

REPORTS CENSORED

All reference to the drama in the Wilhelmstrasse Friday night when Von Papen and Von Neurath lost a cabinet fight to call off the boycott, after which Von Neurath tendered his resignation and Von Papen went to Von Hindenburg to urge the president to declare martial law to end the spectacle of a nationwide drive against the Jews, was killed out of Friday and Saturday dispatches by the censor.

Nor could anything be cabled of reports in diplomatic circles of a dramatic session between the President and Chancellor Hitler. The President is declared to have sent for the Chancellor and, in the presence of Vice Chancellor Von Papen, to have reminded Hitler of his oath to the constitution: That he swore to defend the rights of all law-abiding citizens.

NAME UNAUTHORIZED

Von Hindenburg, according to well-informed diplomatic sources, demanded that his name be imme-

Von Papen and Von Neurath in
Losing Fight, but Hindenburg Acts and Ends Boycott

diately removed from the boycott proclamation, which was about to be issued in Munich, declaring use of his name had not been asked, nor had consent been given. The President is said then to have ordered that the boycott be called off.

Chancellor Hitler is declared to have bowed to Von Hindenburg's will and ordered the boycott ended before it had officially begun, but Hitler's chief aide, Minister Without Portfolio Hermann Goerring, is reported to have protested this action came too late, that he could not guarantee what might happen, since the Nazi storm troops were keyed up. Goerring is said to have advised against calling off the boycott at that late hour Friday night. MINISTER "FED UP."

Von Hindenburg thereupon reluctantly agreed to a one-day boycott only. It is declared, demanding, however, that the boycott end with Saturday's half holiday.

Von Neurath, discouraged and completely fed up, resigned Friday afternoon, but, at the earnest request of Hitler and Von Hindenburg, withdrew his resignation when it was promised the boycott would not extend beyond Saturday. The Foreign Minister was reported ill today as a result of the strain he underwent during the tense situation.

American Charge d'Affaires Gordon was indefatigable in helping the government build a platform on which it could retire the boycott with honor and save its face.

Though no official statement was obtainable, indications point to the belief Hitler will not yield to his extremist lieutenants for continuation of the boycott Wednesday in defiance of the President.

Hindenburg Threat To Decree Martial Law Ends Boycott

Pressure From U. S.
and London Also
Sways Hitler

SHOPS REOPEN

Storm Troops Assist
in Removing Anti-
Jew Signs

By K. H. VON WIEGAND.

Copyright 1933 by Universal Service, Inc.

BERLIN (Via London), April 3.—President Von Hindenburg's threat to declare martial law and Washington and London pressure, which cannot be officially admitted, today have apparently driven Chancellor Hitler's Nazis away from any intention to resume their anti-Jewish boycott on Wednesday.

Though continuing to seek creation of an impression in the press that Chancellor Hitler and Germany had forced the world to abandon agitation, it is quite obvious that this is only a face-saving maneuver.

STORES REOPEN.

All Jewish stores and shops reopened today without interference. Nazi storm troops in some places were even seen washing off shop windows the "dirty Jew" signs they had painted there on Saturday.

Inquiries today indicated that Jewish employes returned to work without molestation, after President von Hindenburg on Friday had peremptorily told Chancellor Hitler and the Nazi party to rescind its order to Jewish enterprises to discharge Jewish employes.

That the Nazis have any intention of giving up their anti-Semitic agitation is not reflected in their party newspapers. Jews, meanwhile, are by no means assured of an undisturbed future. After Saturday's boycott, their stores and shops are now marked places, and even if the boycott is not resumed officially and openly, it is feared its effect will continue for some time.

CABINET TENSION EASES.

Within the German cabinet, where tension on Friday and Saturday was almost at the breaking point, there seemed relief and better feeling today, although within Nazi circles agitation against the foreign office continues heatedly.

INDUSTRIALS UNEASY.

Among industrialists there is considerable uneasiness over the Nazis' penetration of the central organization of the Industrial League by placing two confidential representatives on the directorate. Similar steps are envisioned for the national organization of newspaper publishers.

The Jewish situation, meanwhile, is disturbing. I have found many Jews of better classes completely crushed and hopeless under humiliations, especially the Nazi efforts to deny them a country where families have lived for generations. Hundreds of lawyers and physicians have been robbed of their livelihood.

EXODUS IS BLOCKED.

A general exodus of Jews is made impossible because they are not allowed to take more than 100 kilograms of 226 out of the country. Otherwise, hundreds would follow.

The seizure of Professor Albert Einstein's bank account and sequestration of the money of former

EX, April 4.

GERMAN JEWS CRUSHED BY HUMILIATIONS

General Exodus Impossible Due
to Restrictions Upon Funds;
Money Confiscation Feared

Prussian cabinet members are arousing fears that this is the first step in the direction of expropriation and confiscation.

The newspaper, *Nachtausgabe* reports that Friedrich Ebert, son of the late first President of Germany, was singled out as a Socialist and beaten up by Nazis during a meeting of the Brandenburg city council.

REINHARDT OUSTED.

Max Reinhardt, famous theatrical producer, who has been loosely connected with the Deutsches Theatre recently, was definitely ousted today following a conference between the head producer, Ludwig Achatz, and Hans Hinkel, Nazi special commissioner for education.

The Berlin Nationalist *Lokalanzeiger* declared that Julius Streicher, head of the Nazi boycott committee, had declared the time is near when Jewish-Christian intermarriage will be banned by German law.

The Bavarian cabinet in Munich decreed that no more department chain stores, most of which are operated by Jews, may be erected, and also that existing chains cannot extend their operations.

The Frankfurt Stock Exchange elected a council of three Nazis and three Nationalists, which immediately reduced Jewish stockbrokers from thirty-three to eight, and elected nineteen new Christian German members.

EX, April 4.

THE ROAD TO FAME

AT LAST Adolf Hitler is assured a place in history. Of course he has a big spot in the newspapers, getting the headlines these days as much, if not more than any other international figure.

But that doesn't mean historical importance, particularly. What is being done in Germany today may not be considered interesting two hundred or three hundred years from now.

But Herr Hitler has finally managed to embalm his name in books for all ages.

Perhaps a thousand years from now it will be written:

"Adolf Hitler, a German dictator, countenanced the persecution of Einstein, the noted scientist. Hitler's government seized Einstein's modest bank account."

Thus has Hitler won undying fame—if one wants to call it that!

HITLER FOOD DECREE HITS 500,000 JEWS

EX, April 5.

CONTRARY TO RITUAL

The indirect "anti-kosher" decree stated all animals intended for eating must be rendered unconscious before being slaughtered. This virtually forbids the Jewish slaughter ritual, inasmuch as Jewish religion directs all animals slaughtered must be healthy and killed with one swift movement which prevents suffering.

Jews look upon the act of rendering an animal unconscious as unnecessary cruelty, inasmuch as this is done usually by an inexperienced person striking the animal with a heavy club.

The Jewish ritual demands that table meat be slaughtered by an expert, known as a "schochet," who severs the animal's jugular vein with a knife.

ACTS OF VIOLENCE

A German news agency, Telegraf Union, today reported acts of violence against Jews have not completely ceased.

Telegraf Union stated that in Breslau, a Jewish merchant named Alfred Gaumann, his wife, son and maid narrowly escaped lynching after Gaumann opened fire on policemen searching his home on suspicion.

Gaumann used a regular infantry army rifle and fired through the door and windows while his son loaded other rifles. Several police were wounded. Police prevented a crowd from lynching the four after their arrest.

Cabinet Order Indirectly Prohibits Kosher Slaughtering Ritual; Violence Continues

Business Boycott, in Effect Saturday, Won't Be Resumed Today, Nazi Leaders State

BERLIN, April 4. (Special cable to Universal Service)—Chancellor Adolf Hitler's national cabinet today decreed a law which affects 500,000 German Jews by indirectly prohibiting the Jewish "kosher" slaughtering ritual.

Earlier the cabinet stated the Nazi anti-Jewish business and economic boycott, which was in effect Saturday, will not be resumed tomorrow.

Although the new law makes no mention of "kosher" food, it acts as an effective means of preventing meat and fowl, slaughtered in accordance with the Jewish ritual, from reaching the tables of German Jews.

The cabinet also decreed a penalty of death or life imprisonment to anyone convicted of bombing, attempted bombing or incendiarism.

C, April 5.

-6-

SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

Hitler Cabinet Approves Ban on

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1933

CCC

Kosher Slaughtering in Germany

C, April 5.

Jewish Class; German Prestige

THE WORD OF CAUTION given the hoodlum and fanatic Nazis illustrates the temper in which the attacks against the Jewish shopkeepers were carried on. This caution was not framed on high moral grounds, or in indignation against the affronts, but on purely material considerations.

German insurance companies, a warning sent out by the semi-official Wolff's Telegraph Bureau said, rather than Jewish shopkeepers, are the chief sufferers from the anti-Jewish demonstrations that take the form of window-smashing. Hence, in the last analysis, the rioters were deliberately destroying a considerable portion of German national wealth.

The warning might have gone further and have said that it would be cheaper to mistreat these shopkeepers personally and leave their windows alone. But would it? Germany has yet to count the costs of this persecution of the Jews.

When the books are balanced it will not be merely a record of windows smashed, of trade boycotts, of exile of some of her most distinguished citizens, but a loss of prestige and respect among the family of civilized nations. And that is a loss no nation can accept with unconcern.

C, April 6.

Real 'Atrocities' Are in Official Hitler Accounts

HERR HITLER'S GOVERNMENT still sticks to its tale that it will stop persecuting the Jews when the outside world stops spreading atrocity stories. Where are these atrocity stories that the Nazis imagine to be springing up all over the surface of the globe?

The only ones we see are a couple that come straight out of Germany, past the Nazi censor, telling how a Jewish lawyer, charged with firing on a crowd, was lynched, and relating, without details, that not all personal violence has yet ceased. There are no other "atrocity" stories—except those the Hitlerite government tells us itself.

The Nazi spokesmen themselves tell us how they are driving German Jews out of the courts, the schools, the exchanges, the practice of the professions and the arts, and of the efforts they are making to keep Jews out of business and out of employment. This is the real atrocity and it is not invented in any outside country. We know this story and we repeat it on the authority of the Hitlerites themselves.

Whatever isolated cases of personal violence against Jews may have happened in Germany are nothing compared to this Hitlerite effort to drive all German Jews into starvation. That IS AN ATROCITY bigger than any story the Nazis say has been invented. Though we have not heard the alleged invented stories, we do not need to hear them when we have before us, on official Nazi authority, the real atrocity.

It is an official decree, not a yarn from GYPH-land or Natal, that has forbidden kosher meat to the adherents of the Jewish faith. To orthodox Jews we may well suppose this is a serious atrocity. To all persons with balanced minds it is an example of the humorless and senseless lengths to which Hitlerite fanaticism can go.

250287