

The David S. Wyman Institute for Holocaust Studies

Whitewashing FDR's Holocaust Record

An Analysis of Robert N. Rosen's
Saving the Jews: Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Holocaust

by

Dr. Rafael Medoff
Director, The David S. Wyman Institute for Holocaust Studies

Dr. Racelle Weiman
Director, Center for Holocaust and Humanity Education
Hebrew Union College – Jewish Institute of Religion

Dr. Bat-Ami Zucker
Department of History, Bar Ilan University
Author, *In Search of Refuge: Jews and U.S. Consulates in Nazi Germany 1933-1941*

September 2006

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
<i>Executive Summary</i>	3
I. Background: Robert N. Rosen and <i>Saving the Jews</i>	4
II. Rosen's Extreme Attacks on Reputable Historians	5-10
1. Deborah Lipstadt	5
2. Henry Feingold	5
3. David S. Wyman and Rafael Medoff	6-8
4. Michael Beschloss	8
5. Elie Wiesel and Haskel Lookstein	8-9
6. Laurel Leff	9
7. Other Historians	9-10
III. Rosen's Misrepresentations of the Historical Record	11-18
1. FDR's Failure to Speak Out About the Jews	11
2. FDR's Immigration Policy	12-14
3. FDR's Response to Kristallnacht	14-15
4. FDR's Response to the 1939 British White Paper	15-16
5. FDR and the Hoskins Plan	16
6. FDR's Unfriendly Comments About Jews	16-17
7. FDR's Policy of Not Mentioning Hitler's Jewish Victims	18
8. FDR's Refusal to Seek Release of Jewish Refugees	18
IV. Was Rescue Possible?	19-21
V. The Failure to Bomb Auschwitz	22-26
1. The Jewish Agency	22-24
2. Nahum Goldmann and the World Jewish Congress	24-25
3. Jacob Fishman	25
4. The Reasons for the Roosevelt Administration's Refusal	25-26
VI. Rosen's Attack on the Bergson Group	27-29
VII. Rosen's Questionable Use of Others' Work	30-33

The David S. Wyman Institute for Holocaust Studies
 on the campus of Gratz College
 7605 Old York Rd. - Melrose Park, PA 19027
 tel 215-635-5622 / fax 215-635-5644 / www.WymanInstitute.org

The Wyman Institute is grateful to Dr. Burton Appleton and Ms. Elizabeth Cutler for their research assistance.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Saving the Jews resembles an attorney's brief in defense of Franklin D. Roosevelt's policies toward European Jews during the Holocaust. Indeed, that is how the author, divorce lawyer Robert N. Rosen, privately characterized the book prior to its publication.

* **Calls Critics of FDR "Anti-American":**

Rosen impugns the patriotism of scholars with whom he disagrees. He asserts that those who have criticized FDR's response to the Holocaust are promoting "an anti-American version of history" (p. 332) and are engaging in "America-bashing." (p. 324) He specifically names Prof. David S. Wyman, the widely respected and award-winning historian, as one of those "America-bashers." (p.324)

* **Makes False Allegations against Reputable Historians:**

Rosen makes false allegations against prominent Holocaust scholars such as Deborah Lipstadt, Henry Feingold, David Wyman, and Laurel Leff. For example, Rosen accuses Prof. Feingold of calling President Roosevelt "a coward," and alleges that Feingold essentially manufactured evidence to make a State Department official appear antisemitic. Rosen accuses Prof. Wyman of altering the words of a historical document. And Rosen alleges that Dr. Medoff writes different versions of historical events according to whether his particular reading audience is predominantly Jewish or non-Jewish.

* **Severely Misrepresents Key Historical Facts:**

--Rosen misquotes historians Richard Breitman and Alan Kraut to make it seem as if they praised FDR's response to Kristallnacht, when in fact they were critical of that response. (p.78)

--Rosen manipulates immigration statistics to claim the U.S. accepted twice as many refugees from Hitler as the rest of the world combined (p.442), when in fact the rest of the world took in nearly twice as many the United States.

--Rosen falsely claims that FDR was so "incensed" by the 1939 British White Paper (which closed off Palestine to almost all Jewish immigrants), that he began pushing for the removal of Arabs from Palestine to make room for the Jews. (p.485) (In fact, FDR's discussions about Arab emigration took place much earlier, and his response to the White Paper was very weak.)

--Rosen defends FDR's failure to speak out about the persecution of Europe Jews, on the grounds that verbal protests would have led to increased persecution. (pp.455-456) Rosen also defends the British White Paper, claiming that if Jewish immigration to Palestine would have caused Arabs to become pro-Nazi and possibly kill Jews in the Middle East. (pp.274, 116-117)

--Rosen falsely claims that not a single prominent U.S. Jewish leader asked the Roosevelt administration to bomb the Auschwitz death camp. (pp. 404, 475) In fact, Nahum Goldmann, co-chairman of the World Jewish Congress, did ask the administration to do so, and his request is mentioned even in a document from 1944 that Rosen himself lists in one of his footnotes.

* **Uses Other Authors' Language without Appropriate Attribution:**

Saving the Jews contains at least twenty-one passages that have language identical, or virtually identical, to language used in other published works. In these twenty-one instances, Rosen's does not use quotation marks to indicate that the words were composed by a different author.

* **Falsely Portrays Jewish Activists as Draft-Dodgers:**

Rosen falsely claims that leaders of the 1940s Jewish activists known as the Bergson Group "sat out the war in America, preferring to agitate for the overthrow of the British in Palestine rather than enlist and fight Nazis themselves." (p.303) In fact, two of their five leaders enlisted and fought in the Battle of the Bulge and the Normandy invasion, and the other three were classified 4-F.

I. BACKGROUND: ROBERT N. ROSEN AND *SAVING THE JEWS*

Saving the Jews: Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Holocaust, by Robert N. Rosen, was published by Thunder's Mouth Press in April 2006. Soon after the book's publication, Rosen was invited to speak at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library in Hyde Park, New York and at the Jimmy Carter Presidential Library in Atlanta, Georgia. He has also been interviewed by various media.

Rosen, 57, is an attorney with the Rosen Law Firm, in Charleston, South Carolina, specializing in divorce law. He earned a B.A. at the University of Virginia (1969) and an M.A. in history at Harvard (1970), before graduating from the University of South Carolina School of Law in 1973. He has practiced law full time since then. Rosen has also authored several books on the history of Charleston and Southern Jewry. He is not known to have previously written about America's response to the Holocaust.

While still at work on the manuscript, Rosen privately described *Saving the Jews* as "a defense attorney's brief" for FDR. He made the statement in a conversation on November 4, 2001, with Benjamin "Buddy" Korn, former executive editor of the *Philadelphia Jewish Exponent*, and son of American Jewish historian Rabbi Dr. Bertram W. Korn, at a conference of the Southern Jewish Historical Society, in Norfolk, Virginia.¹ Asked by Korn what his next book would be, Rosen replied that he was writing a book about FDR and the Holocaust, explaining, "I see myself as FDR's defense attorney; I am writing a brief on his behalf."

"My research in the archives and the history of the times [was what] led me ... [to conclude] that Roosevelt did not abandon the Jews of Europe," according to Rosen. (p. xxiv) Likewise, Rosen's web site describes the book as "based on vigorous research." However, a close examination of the sources listed in Rosen's end notes finds that 91% of them are secondary sources --that is, other authors' published books or articles-- rather than original archival research by Rosen. In 135 instances throughout the text, Rosen quotes other authors by name, and in many additional instances he quotes or closely paraphrases other authors, sometimes without appropriate attribution.

¹ Since 2003, Korn has been associate director of the The David S. Wyman Institute for Holocaust Studies.

II. ROSEN'S EXTREME ATTACKS ON REPUTABLE HISTORIANS

Rosen's book includes numerous harsh denunciations of reputable, established Holocaust scholars. He states that those who have criticized FDR's response to the Holocaust are promoting "an anti-American version of history" (p.332) and engaging in "America-bashing." He names Prof. David S. Wyman, author of *The Abandonment of the Jews*, as one of those guilty of "America-bashing." (p.324) In a similar vein, Rosen said in a recent interview that "America-bashing has become an epidemic," and the book is his response.²

Some of Rosen's specific targets:

1. Deborah Lipstadt

What Rosen Claims: Referring to Prof. Deborah Lipstadt's book *Beyond Belief* (about American media coverage of the Holocaust), Rosen lambasts Lipstadt for allegedly "referring dismissively" to the December 1942 Allied statement confirming the Nazi genocide. (p.453)

What Really Happened: Lipstadt included ten pages about the declaration, the press coverage of it, and the factors behind its drafting and publication. (pp.186-196). She was anything but "dismissive."

2. Henry Feingold:

What Rosen Claims: Rosen claims (p. xxiii) that Prof. Henry Feingold has asserted that FDR "was a coward." In a similar vein, Rosen claimed that the American and British governments "were excoriated by Feingold as unspeakable antisemites" (p. 603, n50).

What Really Happened: Feingold has never accused FDR of being "a coward" or the Allies of being "unspeakable antisemites."

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen (p. 579 n26) in effect accuses Feingold of fabricating the charge of antisemitism against Breckinridge Long. "In *The Politics of Rescue* [p. 135] he called Long an antisemite and paranoid," according to Rosen. "He equated Long's dislike of liberals generally and activist Jews with antisemitism."

What Really Happened: Rosen ignored the fact that on the very same page, Feingold quoted strong evidence of Long's antisemitism-- namely, Long's praise of

² *Charleston Post and Courier*, 30 April 2006.

Mein Kampf as “eloquent in opposition to Jewry and to Jews as exponents of Communism and chaos.”

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen claims that Feingold tried to beef up his claims of Long’s antisemitism by, in effect, stripping Long’s Jewish acquaintances of their Jewishness: “It was difficult for Feingold to make a genuine antisemite out of Long if Long admired and socialized with Baruch and Steinhardt, and liked and worked with Bloom,” Rosen writes. “Therefore the historian drummed Baruch and Steinhardt out of the Jewish religion. He unfairly referred to Morgenthau and Rosenman as ‘nominal Jews.’” (p.579 n26)

What Really Happened: Feingold used the term “nominal Jews” as a simple and factual summary of their minimal involvement in Jewish religious or cultural life, not as a pejorative attempt to de-Judaize them.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen (p. 245) accuses Feingold of having “belittled” the Allies’ December 1942 declaration by calling it “a joint Anglo-American statement” and “the December 17 ‘solemn resolution’.” According to Rosen, Feingold wrote that the declaration “was worse than nothing because it ‘showed clearly’ that there would be ‘little effort to prevent the Final Solution while the war was in progress.’”

What Really Happened: Nothing about Feingold’s section on the subject can reasonably be considered “belittling”; “Anglo-American” was accurate, since the U.S. and Great Britain were the authors of the statement; the term “solemn resolution” comes from the Declaration itself; and Feingold neither wrote nor implied that it was worse than nothing.

3. David S. Wyman and Rafael Medoff

What Rosen Claims: Rosen attacks David S. Wyman and Rafael Medoff for referring to “the Bergson Group” (in their book *A Race Against Death*), instead of using a phrase or name that would indicate Bergson’s connection to the Irgun Zvai Leumi militia in Palestine. (p.600 n28) Rosen claims (p.322) that they deliberately “hid” Bergson’s relationship with the Irgun in order to protect his image.

What Really Happened: Wyman and Medoff mentioned Bergson’s relationship with the Irgun on pp. 10, 13-14, 20, 103-4, 110, 122-23, 176, 181 and 246. There are even sublistings in the index, under Irgun Zvai Leumi, titled “Bergson group and” and “Bergson’s Irgun connection.”

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen accuses Wyman of tampering with a historical document. On p. 385

and on pp. 613-614 n9, Rosen refers to a memo written by War Refugee Board staff member Benjamin Akzin in 1944, urging the U.S. to bomb the Auschwitz death camp. According to Rosen, "Even Akzin felt that the strongest statement he could make was that bombing the installations *might* slow down the slaughter *at least temporarily*." (his emphasis) Rosen adds: "Wyman in *Abandonment of the Jews* changes Akzin's 'might' slow down the slaughter to 'would' slow down the slaughter." Rosen is thus accusing Wyman of altering Akzin's words to strengthen the case for bombing the camp.

What Really Happened: Wyman was paraphrasing and summarizing, not quoting Akzin's letter. Wyman wrote: "He held that destruction of the killing installations would, at least for a time, appreciably slow the slaughter."

While it is true that in the second paragraph of Akzin's memo (the paragraph to which Rosen refers), Akzin used the word "might" rather than "would," what Rosen fails to acknowledge is that throughout the lengthy memo, Akzin repeatedly used the word "would."

For example, in the very same paragraph that Rosen singles out, Akzin also wrote: "Some saving of lives would therefore be a most likely result of the destruction of the two extermination camps." In paragraph four, Akzin wrote that "it would also seem correct to mark them for destruction as a matter of principle..." Also in paragraph four, Akzin wrote that "the destruction of the extermination camps would presumably cause many deaths among their personnel..." In paragraph six, Akzin wrote: "The destruction of the camps would not change their fate [of the Jews who were doomed to death], but it would serve as visible retribution on their murderers and it might save the lives of future victims." In paragraph seven, Akzin wrote that "refraining from bombing the extermination centers would be sheer misplaced sentimentality, far more cruel than a decision to destroy these centers."

Rosen's claim that even Akzin was not fully convinced of the wisdom of bombing does not square with the full text of Akzin's letter, and Rosen's charge that Wyman changed Akzin's words is demonstrably false.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen (p.600 n28) asserts that Medoff "referred to Bergson as 'a Zionist emissary' when writing for a broad audience (See, e.g., the *Orlando Sentinel*, January 13, 2005), but as a member of 'Menachem Begin's Irgun Zvai Leumi' when writing for the *Jewish Ledger* (January 17, 2003)." Rosen thus suggests that Medoff deliberately deceives predominantly Gentile audiences by hiding from them Bergson's Irgun connection, mentioning that fact about Bergson only when he writes for Jewish readers (Rosen seems to imply that Jewish readers would already know something about Bergson's background and thus could not be fooled into thinking he was not connected to the Irgun).

What Really Happened: Medoff has repeatedly written about Bergson, including mention of the Irgun, for "broad audiences," such as the *New York Sun* (April 5, 2004), the *Washington Times* (January 7, 2003) and the *Baltimore Afro-American* (January 6, 2003). Conversely, Medoff has written about Bergson without mentioning the Irgun for numerous Jewish publications.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen claims Medoff referred to American Jewish leaders as “cowardly.” (p. 628, n39) As his source, Rosen cites pp. 59-62 of Medoff’s book *The Deafening Silence: American Jewish Leaders and the Holocaust*.

What Really Happened: Neither on those pages, nor anywhere else in that book, nor in any of his other books, has Medoff referred to American Jewish leaders as “cowardly.”

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Without citing any sources, Rosen writes (p. 599 n24): "Wyman did not tell his readers that Hecht and the Irgun disliked not only Roosevelt but also the Zionist movement as a whole, including Ben-Gurion, Weizman [sic], Moshe Dayan, Yitzhak Rabin, and Golda Meir."

What Really Happened: Contrary to Rosen's claim, on pp. 85-86, 90, 92, 144, 168 and 202 of *The Abandonment of the Jews*, Wyman did describe the tension between the Bergsonites, who were followers of Ze'ev Jabotinsky, and the mainstream Zionist movement (led by Chaim Weizmann). Wyman and Medoff also discussed the animosity between Jabotinsky's movement and Weizmann's World Zionist Organization in further detail on pp. 13-16, 18-20, 27, 35-36, 42-43, 46, and 51-54 of *A Race Against Death*. Why Rosen thinks Wyman should have written that Ben Hecht or other Bergson Group activists "disliked" Dayan, Rabin or Meir, is not clear, since the Bergsonites probably had never even heard of them. During the 1940s, they were not public figures; Dayan was a soldier in the Haganah, Rabin served in the Palmach, and Meir (then known as Meyerson) was a minor figure in the Labor Zionist movement. Rosen leaves the impression that he singled out Dayan, Rabin and Meir because they are popular among American Jews and it would therefore reflect badly on the Bergson activists if they are perceived as having been against Dayan, Rabin and Meir.

4. Michael Beschloss:

What Rosen Claims: Rosen accuses Michael Beschloss of following “the anti-FDR, America-as-bystander line” by using only “a pale paraphrase and selective quotation from the [1942 Allied] declaration.” Rosen criticizes him for not quoting the word “extermination” from the declaration. (pp.452-453)

What Really Happened: Beschloss’s book was not about the Holocaust, so the section concerning the Nazi massacres and America’s response to them was necessarily brief. But while Rosen criticizes him over the word “extermination,” Beschloss does quote the phrase “mass executions [of] many hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women and children” (p.39).

5. Elie Wiesel and Haskel Lookstein:

What Rosen Claims: Rosen denounces *Were We Our Brothers’ Keepers?*, by Rabbi Dr. Haskel

Lookstein, as “sermonizing fiction” because Elie Wiesel, in his foreword to the book, states that the lives of the St. Louis passengers were endangered by sending them back to Europe. (445)

What Really Happened: Wiesel’s statement accurately reflected the fact that many people in 1938 expected that if the passengers on the St. Louis were sent back to Europe, they would be, as Wiesel put it, “delivered to the executioner.” The fact that they were ultimately sent to European countries not yet under German occupation, and as a result many of them survived the Holocaust (a fact discovered by researchers years *after* Wiesel wrote his foreword), does not justify Rosen’s blanket use of the term “sermonizing fiction” to characterize either Lookstein’s text or Wiesel’s.

6. Laurel Leff:

What Rosen Claims: Rosen (p. 600, n. 28) accuses Prof. Laurel Leff, author of *Buried by the Times: The Holocaust and America’s Most Important Newspaper*, of portraying Peter Bergson as “leading the Palestinian Jews” --that is, as if Bergson was the leader of the Palestine Jewish community.

What Really Happened: Leff actually wrote: “At the beginning of the war, a group of right-wing Jews from Palestine had come to the United States to lobby for the formation of all-Jewish fighting units to combat the Nazi menace. By early 1942, the idea was picking up momentum. American Zionist groups, as part of a coalition known as the American Emergency Committee for Zionist Affairs, endorsed the idea despite their enmity for its original advocates, the Palestinian Jews led by Peter Bergson.” Clearly, Leff was referring to the specific small group led by Bergson, not all of Palestine Jewry, as Rosen suggests.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen (p.600) wrote: “Leff informed her readers that the ‘established [Jewish] organizations refused to ally with the Bergson Group,’ which makes no sense at all unless the establishment was antirescue, weak and cowardly.”

What Really Happened: Leff never described the Jewish establishment groups in such terms.

7. Other Historians

In addition to his attacks on individual scholars, Rosen also makes a series of false accusations in general about those historians who have criticized FDR’s response to the Holocaust. For example:

What Rosen Claims: Rosen claims (p.335) that “some of the anti-Roosevelt historians” – he gives no specific examples – portray the American Jewish establishment groups as “cowardly,” “corrupt,” and “self-hating.”

What Really Happened: No serious historians who have written about this subject have used such terminology.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen writes (p.444): “Scholars, historians, and journalists who wrote about the St. Louis *wanted* to establish that everyone, particularly Americans, bore some responsibility for the Holocaust. After all, if everyone is to blame, Roosevelt, the most powerful man on earth, must be especially at fault.”

What Really Happened: There is no evidence that scholarly criticism of FDR is the product of a group of people who share a personal obsession with ‘getting’ Roosevelt.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen claims that the emergence of what he calls “the Roosevelt decrier school” was “linked” to the Likud Party's victory in the 1977 Israeli elections. (p.604 n.54) Rosen also writes (p.334) that “Revisionist leaders accused Mapai, the mainstream Socialist labor party, of collusion with the British and treason to the Jewish cause. It is this banner and ideology the Roosevelt decriers continue to carry into their histories.”

What Really Happened: Some of the most prominent books on America and the Holocaust, including *While Six Million Died*, *Paper Walls*, *No Haven for the Oppressed*, and *The Politics of Rescue*, were published prior to the 1977 Israeli elections. Moreover, some of the most prominent public voices critical of the Allied response have come from individuals known for their opposition to the Likud, among them historians Blanche Wiesen Cook, Henry Feingold (longtime leader of the Labor Zionists of America), Martin Gilbert and Arthur Hertzberg; journalist-author Louis Rapoport; and the Israeli educational group Lapid, which staged a mock trial at which the presiding judge, Labor Party Knesset Member Shimon Shetreet, ruled that the Allies had a moral and legal obligation to bomb the death camps.

III. ROSEN'S MISREPRESENTATIONS OF THE HISTORICAL RECORD

According to Rosen, Franklin Roosevelt consistently and passionately sought to rescue Jews from Hitler. Rosen refers to what he calls "FDR's efforts to personally save Jews." (p. 615, n21) He writes that "Roosevelt hoped until his last day on Earth to see a Jewish homeland in Palestine. (p. 420) He goes so far as to assert that Roosevelt "gave his life both in the cause of winning [World War II] and saving the Jews from Hitler. " (p. 485) In making this case, Rosen manipulates and distorts historical evidence and misrepresents the historical record.

1. FDR'S FAILURE TO SPEAK OUT ABOUT THE JEWS:

What Rosen Claims: According to Rosen, "Roosevelt had spoken out eloquently and forcefully about Nazi aggression and crimes against humanity generally and against Jews specifically since the late 1930s." (p. 450)

What Really Happened: Rosen failed to acknowledge that Roosevelt was silent about German anti-Jewish violence prior to the late 1930s. For example, FDR held 82 press conferences in 1933, and the subject of the persecution of the Jews arose only once, and not because Roosevelt raised it. It would be five years and another 348 presidential press conferences before anything about Jewish refugees would be mentioned again (then, too, it was at a reporter's initiative, not Roosevelt's).

| * * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen defends FDR's decision to refrain from making a public statement about the Jewish refugees in the period following the 1938 Kristallnacht pogrom (after his initial expression of dismay at the violence). According to Rosen, Roosevelt's silence was necessary in order "to persuade the American public that the survival of Great Britain was paramount." (p. 79)

What Really Happened: There is no evidence that a presidential statement of sympathy for the refugees would have impeded U.S. public support for England.

| * * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen spends much time praising FDR for the December 1942 Allied statement confirming the Nazis were carrying out the mass murder of Europe's Jews. He also excoriates other historians who, he says, failed to give Roosevelt sufficient credit for the statement. "This declaration is barely quoted and hardly discussed by the Roosevelt critics in academe," he writes. (p. 245)

What Really Happened: In his footnote to the above passage, the only example of such a historian that Rosen offers is David Morrison, author of the book *Heroes, Antiheroes and the Holocaust*. Morrison, however, is not a historian; he is a psychiatrist.

His book is not a serious work of historical scholarship; it is a polemic, published by a small Israeli publishing house. Contrary to Rosen's assertion, all of the major scholarly works on America and the Holocaust do quote the Allied declaration and discuss it at appropriate length, including Monty Penkower's *The Jews Were Expendable* (pp. 81, 88), Henry Feingold's *The Politics of Rescue* (p. 173), David Wyman's *The Abandonment of the Jews*, Richard Breitman and Alan Kraut's *American Refugee Policy* (pp.159-160), Martin Gilbert's *Auschwitz and the Allies* (pp. 99-106) and Saul Friedman's *No Haven for the Oppressed*.

| * * *

What Rosen Claims: Although Rosen repeatedly refers to, and praises, the December 1942 Allied declaration, he simultaneously contends that speaking out about the persecution of the Jews was not only ineffective, but even harmful: "Even though FDR did so, speaking out did not stop or even slow down the Holocaust. In fact, it may have increased Hitler's determination to kill more Jews," he writes. (455) And: "Indeed, FDR's declaration of December 17, 1942, not only failed to deter the Nazis, it also may have spurred the Germans on to even greater efforts at genocide." (p. 456)

What Really Happened: As "evidence" that speaking out led to more killings of Jews, Rosen cites a statement by Nazi propaganda minister Josef Goebbels that the Allied declaration "cannot prevent us from doing what is necessary"; and a statement by playwright-activist Ben Hecht that mere criticism of the Nazis was insufficient to stop the killings. (pp. 456-457) Of course, neither of these quotations proves Rosen's claim.

2. FDR'S IMMIGRATION POLICY:

Rosen repeatedly tries to make it appear as if the Roosevelt administration admitted as many refugees as it could. He acknowledges that U.S. limitations on immigration in 1940 "prevented many Jews from fleeing Germany, Poland, France, and other countries," but he emphasizes that "not all Jews were trying to flee in 1940," as if that justifies the U.S. attitude (p.189). Rosen goes further and defends the extreme arguments made by Assistant Secretary of State Breckinridge Long, who opposed immigration on the grounds that some of the Jewish refugees might be Nazi spies; according to Rosen, Long's claims "had merit." (p.201)

What Rosen Claims: Rosen writes: "From 1933 to 1940 [FDR] worked within the immigration laws – laws he was powerless to change – to provide as much relief as he could to Jewish refugees, consistent with political reality." (p. 435) Rosen emphasizes that "America admitted tens of thousands of German and Austrian Jewish immigrants between 1933 and 1938." (p. 440)

What Really Happened: Rosen omits the most crucial information; that is, the extent to which the German-Austrian quotas were filled – only 5.3 percent in 1933, 13.7 percent in 1934, 20.2 percent in 1935, 24.3 percent in 1936, 42.1 percent in 1937, and 65.3 percent in 1938. A total of 164,220 refugees could have been admitted during those years; but only 46,771 actually were admitted, because of the administration's policy of trying to find any pretext to turn down an immigrant's application. In other words, 117,449 people could have been admitted from Germany and Austria without any tampering with the immigration laws.

What Rosen Claims: Rosen writes (p. 133): “The administration used the immigration quotas to the fullest from September 1939 through July 1940 and the fall of France. The German quota was 95 percent filled; the Hungarian, 100 percent.” As his source, he cites David Wyman’s book *Paper Walls*, p.169.

What Really Happened: What Wyman states, which Rosen omits, was that the Hungarian and Polish quotas were so small, that even if one included all of the quota spaces allowed for both Hungary and Poland, it added only another 7,393 spaces to the total number of quota spaces available each year.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen writes (p. 204): “As late as September 1941 Roosevelt was trying to accommodate refugee advocates as best he could, consistent with national security. He agreed with McDonald, Attorney General Francis Biddle, and Rabbi Wise to modify the screening procedure proposed by Breckinridge Long to allow more protection for refugees’ procedural rights.” His footnote cites Henry Feingold’s *The Politics of Rescue*, pp. 163-164, as his only source.

What Really Happened: Feingold’s book does support Rosen’s point that FDR agreed to modify Long’s procedure. But Feingold then adds an important point which Rosen omits: two months after modifying the procedure, the attorney general backtracked and (with FDR’s approval) agreed to give the Secretary of State the power “to reverse the review board’s decision in exceptional cases.” Feingold notes: “Long was jubilant. His principal objective, control of the visa procedure in the Department, had been obtained ... ‘Thanksgiving Day,’ he wrote in his diary, ‘came at an appropriate time as far as I am concerned’. Indeed, Long had much to be thankful for. Singlehanded, he had halted the flow of refugees to the United States. A soul-chilling account by Varian Fry, European director of the Emergency Rescue Committee, on the effects of the ‘close relatives’ edict [Long’s screening procedure--it kept out anyone with close relatives in Axis territory] in Lisbon told of the kidnapping of prominent anti-Nazi refugees by the Gestapo and the stranding of hundreds of other refugees.”

Thus Rosen used only the first part of Feingold’s text, which made FDR appear helpful to the refugees, but omitted the remainder of the passage, which was extremely unflattering to Roosevelt.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen writes: “After the war began in 1939 and especially after the fall of France in 1940, Roosevelt clamped down on immigration for fear of subversion, spies, and terrorists.” (p. 442)

What Really Happened: Rosen’s statement ignores the fact that immigration was severely restricted during the pre-1939 years as well, even during periods when there was considerably less public fear of “terrorists.” For example, the German quota was only 5.3 percent filled in 1933, 13.7 percent in 1934, and 20.2 percent in 1935.

What Rosen Claims: Rosen writes (p. 442): “The United States accepted about twice as many

refugees as the rest of the world combined, 200,000 out of 300,000.”

What Really Happened: Rosen’s statement was derived from the writings of the European historian Gerhard Weinberg. Although Weinberg has used those figures on several occasions, he has never supplied a source for the information. In fact, the total number of refugees taken in by all countries was 565,000, of which 200,000 were accepted by the U.S. In other words, the U.S. took in only about 35% of the refugees, not 65%, as Rosen claims. (This is explained in detail in an essay in the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* [Fall 2003, pp.381-385] by Dr. Alex Grobman, who thoroughly analyzes, country by country, the immigration figures for the entire period of 1933-1945.)

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen asserts that in the spring of 1938, “Despite the laws, the United States was already accepting more Jewish refugees by far than any other country in the world.” (p. 64)

What Really Happened: Rosen does not specify which time period he has in mind, but if he is referring to the previous calendar year, 1937, only 11,552 immigrants entered the U.S. on the German quota that year. That was only slightly greater than the number of registered immigrants to Palestine in 1937, which was 10,536. Thus while it may be technically true that the U.S. accepted more than any other country, it is noteworthy that the huge United States took in only one thousand more immigrants than tiny, and largely undeveloped, Palestine.

One of the sources cited by Rosen in his footnote to the above passage is Henry Feingold’s *The Politics of Rescue*, p. 31. But Rosen did not mention that what Feingold actually writes on that page is that Roosevelt administration officials tried to come up with ways to make it appear (at the 1938 Evian Conference) that the U.S. was taking in more refugees than it really was. Feingold describes it as “sleight-of-hand,” and he adds: “Moreover, while it is true in absolute terms the United States was accepting a greater number of refugees than any other receiving nation, the proportionate burden of the nations bordering the Reich was far greater if one calculated the rate on the ability to absorb immigrants or on the number of immigrants per hundred of native population.”

3. FDR’S RESPONSE TO KRISTALLNACHT

What Rosen Claims: Rosen (p.76) makes much of the fact that, as he puts it, “Roosevelt was the only important world leader to criticize Germany” over the Kristallnacht pogrom. He then (p.78) points out that FDR also extended 12-15,000 visitors’ visas for German Jewish refugees. Rosen adds: “ ‘The gesture,’ Breitman and Kraut noted, ‘was a significant bending of immigration regulations.’ “

Thus Rosen invokes Breitman and Kraut to make it appear as if his point regarding FDR and Kristallnacht is anchored in serious scholarship. Indeed, Rosen names Breitman and Kraut as two of six historians whom he has “relied on” in composing *Saving the Jews*. (p. 548 n4)

But a closer look at Breitman and Kraut's book, *American Refugee Policy and European Refugee Policy 1933-1945*, reveals that Rosen added that period after "regulations." In the Breitman-Kraut book, the sentence does not end with the word "regulations." Rather, they write: "The gesture was a significant bending of immigration regulations, but it paled beside the British response." That British response, which Rosen fails to mention, was to admit 5,000 German Jewish children, a program that was later extended so that "before the outbreak of war some 20,000 Jewish children came to Britain on special transports." (Breitman and Kraut, p.62)

Moreover, on the very same page, in their comment on Roosevelt's verbal criticism of Kristallnacht, Breitman and Kraut emphasize: "That was a condemnation of Nazism, not a concrete form of assistance for its victims."

Thus Rosen manipulated Breitman and Kraut's sentence to make it appear as unqualified praise of FDR, when in fact their full sentence, and their additional comments, were, on balance, rather critical of Roosevelt's response to Kristallnacht.

4. FDR'S RESPONSE TO THE 1939 BRITISH WHITE PAPER

What Rosen Claims: Rosen portrays Roosevelt as actively opposing the British White Paper of May 1939, which almost completely closed off Palestine to Jewish immigration. "[H]is opposition to the British white paper--demonstrate[s] his commitment to help European Jewry," Rosen writes. (p. 485) FDR was so "incensed" by the White Paper, Rosen claims, that "He even pressured the British to adopt a plan to remove two hundred thousand to three hundred thousand Arabs from Palestine and resettle them in Iraq to make room for more Jewish immigrants."

What Really Happened: The population transfer discussion was not a response to the White Paper--it took place more than six months before the White Paper was issued.

Rosen's source for his claim is Peter Grose's book *Israel in the Mind of America*. Grose (p.138) explains that Justice Louis D. Brandeis discussed this population transfer idea with Roosevelt, FDR discussed it with the British and then told "Zionist friends early in 1939" that "as soon as he was somewhat relieved from the pressure of other affairs, he might try to tackle the job" (which he never did). The dates are crucial. Grose clearly places these discussions in "early 1939" --that is, prior to the May 1939 White Paper. Thus, even though Rosen could see from Grose's text that the population transfer idea had no connection to the White Paper, Rosen omitted the date from *Saving the Jews* and made it appear as if Roosevelt responded to the White Paper by seeking to move Arabs out of Palestine.

In fact, Roosevelt's response to the White Paper was tepid. Prof. Howard Sachar (who is also cited in Rosen's footnote) points out that FDR's response was to send a note to Secretary Hull and instruct Ambassador Joseph Kennedy to tell the British of his displeasure. There was no evidence of "pressure" by FDR on the British. On the contrary, Sachar writes, "the president was reduced to writing apologetic letters to Brandeis, Frankfurter, Wise, and other Zionist friends, explaining that he was 'unable to meddle in the decision of the British government.'" (p.518)

Although Rosen praises FDR for supposedly fighting against the White Paper, Rosen himself praises the White Paper for closing off Palestine to nearly all Jewish immigration as of May 1939. He writes: “[U]nrestricted Jewish immigration [to Palestine] would have pushed millions of Nazi-sympathetic Arabs into Hitler’s arms.” (p. 274) Rosen not only supports a policy which left millions of Jews trapped in Axis Europe, but he even argues that the policy was “important to the survival of the Jews of Palestine, the Middle East, and North Africa,” because Britain’s policy of keeping Jewish refugees out of Palestine kept the Arabs from carrying out a Holocaust in the Mideast. (pp.116-117) Rosen does not explain how it could have been morally justified to doom millions of European Jews in order to spare Middle Eastern Jews from harm that he speculates might have ensued.

5. FDR AND THE HOSKINS PLAN

What Rosen Claims: On p. 290, Rosen writes: “Roosevelt also met with Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann, in June 1943. The president was candid about the difficulty of establishing a Jewish state during the war, his fears of a Nazi incursion in Iraq, and the lack of responsible Arab negotiating partners. Relying on a firsthand report from his personal emissary, Colonel Harold Hoskins, Roosevelt was cautious about making promises he could not keep.”

What Really Happened: The real story of the Hoskins episode --and FDR’s role-- differs dramatically from Rosen’s version. As detailed by Monty Penkower in *The Holocaust and Israel Reborn* (pp.145-177), Hoskins was sent by FDR to the Middle East in late 1942 to survey Arab opinion and develop intelligence contacts. Upon his return to the U.S. the following spring, Hoskins recommended that the Allies refrain from supporting Jewish statehood and ban their citizens from publicly discussing Palestine for the duration of the war because “Zionist agitation” was riling up the Arab world. FDR endorsed the proposal. In July, the president instructed his aide Samuel Rosenman to “sell” American Jewish leaders on the need for such an Allied declaration and to get Jewish leaders to stop the Bergson Group activists from publishing newspaper ads critical of Allied policy toward European Jewry and Palestine. An array of high-placed Jews -- Morgenthau, Baruch, Frankfurter, and Swope, as well as Wise and Goldmann-- lobbied frantically to stop the Allies from issuing the ban. The combination of Jewish leaders’ pressure and the War Department’s opposition blocked the declaration. FDR’s plan to suppress American citizens’ freedom of speech in order to appease Arab opinion is not mentioned at all by Rosen.

6. FDR’S UNFRIENDLY COMMENTS ABOUT JEWS

Rosen acknowledges that Roosevelt sometimes made “ethnic jokes about Lower East Side Jews,” but argues that such remarks “were out of character” and that Roosevelt was, in fact, “remarkably free of prejudice against Jews.” (pp.10-11)

Rosen acknowledges that administration official Leo Crowley told Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, Jr., in 1941 that FDR had remarked to him, “Leo, you know this is a Protestant country, and the Catholics and Jews are here on sufferance.” (According to Rosen, “It is highly

unlikely that Roosevelt ever said the words Leo Crowley ascribed to him”[(p. 553, n.15] but Rosen offers no evidence to contradict Crowley’s account.)

Rosen quotes a conversation between Roosevelt and Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, Jr. in 1941, in which FDR described his involvement in the imposition of quotas for the admission of Jews to Harvard. (Roosevelt justified his action on the grounds that Morgenthau’s father agreed with him.) Rosen derived the incident from Frank Freidel’s book *Franklin D. Roosevelt: A Rendezvous with Destiny*, p. 296. Curiously, Rosen does not mention another statement by Roosevelt, which is reported on the very same page in Freidel’s book. Freidel writes: “The feelings of Roosevelt [about Jews] were to surface in November, 1941, when he remarked at a cabinet meeting that there were too many Jews among federal employees in Oregon.”

Rosen provides a watered-down version of a 1939 conversation between FDR and U.S. Senator Burton Wheeler in which, according to Wheeler, Roosevelt said, “You and I Burt are old English and Dutch stock. We know who our ancestors are. We know there is no Jewish blood in our veins, but a lot of these people do not know whether there is Jewish blood in their veins or not.” (In the same conversation, according to Wheeler, FDR made reference to “the nigger vote.” For some reason, Rosen, when he paraphrased the conversation [p.13], omitted the racial epithet and instead reported that FDR referred to “the black vote.”³)

Rosen acknowledges that FDR remarked to French officials at the 1943 Casablanca conference that “the number of Jews engaged in the practice of the professions (law, medicine, etc.) should be definitely limited to the percentage that the Jewish population in North Africa bears to the whole North African population ... The President stated that his plan would further eliminate the specific and understandable complaints which the Germans bore towards the Jews in Germany, namely that while they represented a small part of the population, over 50 percent of the lawyers, doctors, schoolteachers, college professors, etc, in Germany were Jews.”

Rosen’s comment seems to almost justify Roosevelt’s statement: “His allusion to the high percentage of lawyers and doctors in Germany was mistaken, but in fact the percentages of Jews in the professions in prewar Berlin and Warsaw, respectively , were 40 percent and 50 percent, and this was Nogues’s perception.” (pp. 259-260)

Rosen does not mention the statement by U.S. Senator Pat Harrison, in 1937, that FDR told Harrison that a particular tax maneuver by the owners of the *New York Times* was “a dirty Jewish trick.”⁴ Rosen also does not mention the 1939 diary entry by Interior Secretary Harold Ickes

³ Rosen’s source is Ted Morgan’s book *FDR: A Biography*, p.509. Morgan’s source was *The Reminiscences of Senator Burton K. Wheeler*, Oral History Research Office, Columbia University, 1981, a collection of interviews with Wheeler conducted by Paul Hopper in 1968 and 1969. Wheeler’s account of FDR’s remark about “Jewish blood” appears on p. 131. On the same page, Wheeler mentions the “nigger vote” statement, and notes that while he (Wheeler) had once been quoted as saying FDR used the word “negro,” in fact, Wheeler emphasized, “he didn’t say Negro and he didn’t say colored, he said ‘the nigger vote.’” Wheeler added: “So here was the man who had not only the Negro vote, the Irish vote, and the Jewish vote in the palm of his hand, telling what his real feelings were about all of them.” Robert Rosen did not quote Wheeler’s comment.

A more detailed description of the “Jewish blood” remark, which appears to have been dictated by Wheeler soon after his conversation with FDR in 1939, was located by Dr. Burton Appleton in the Wheeler Papers. It is titled “Confidential - Memo on conference at the White House with the President – August 4, 1939,” Burton K. Wheeler Papers, Collection 2207, Box 11: File 18, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT.

⁴ Susan E. Tift and Alex S. Jones, *The Trust: The Private and Powerful Family Behind the New York Times* (New York: 1999), p.171.

(published in 1954) that when he complained to FDR about Ambassador Joseph Kennedy's reported statements about Jewish control of America, "The President read this and said to me, 'It is true'." ⁵

7. FDR'S POLICY OF NOT MENTIONING HITLER'S JEWISH VICTIMS:

Rosen defends FDR's policy of rarely mentioning the Jews when speaking about Nazi atrocities. Rosen maintains that mentioning the Jews was what Hitler himself wanted. He writes: "In keeping with Allied strategy and philosophy that Jews were not, as Hitler claimed, a separate nation or race, Jews were not always specifically mentioned but 'the slaughters inflicted on the people of Poland' and 'in the territories of the Soviet republic' that included Polish and Russian Jews were specified." (p. 454) On another occasion, Rosen states: "To agree to the uniqueness of the Jews' predicament was to let Hitler frame the issue ..." (pp. 112-113)

Ultimately, however, this puts Rosen in an awkward position, since, under pressure from the War Refugee Board, Roosevelt later (in 1944) reversed his position and began mentioning the Jews. At that point in the book, Rosen shifts gears and refrains from criticizing FDR for mentioning them.

8. FDR'S REFUSAL TO SEEK THE RELEASE OF JEWISH REFUGEES:

Rosen writes that "While some historians have deplored the callousness of the British and American governments in not asking Hitler to release the Jews in 1943," the Allies' refusal was justified because the mass release by Hitler of "hundreds of thousands or maybe millions of starving refugees would overwhelm them, disrupt military operations, and Hitler's 'war by refugee' would succeed." Although Rosen states this is what the Allies believed, he phrases it in such a way as to strongly suggest that he agrees with their belief. (p. 270)

Five pages later, Rosen offers an additional justification for not seeking the refugees' release: "If they did secure the release of refugees and were then unable or unwilling to provide asylum, the Allies' credibility would be destroyed throughout the world." (p. 275)

⁵ Harold Ickes, *The Secret Diary of Harold L. Ickes, Vol. 2: The Inside Struggle, 1936-1939* (New York: 1954), p. 676.

IV. WAS RESCUE POSSIBLE?

Throughout *Saving the Jews*, Rosen argues strenuously that there was nothing, or virtually nothing, that the Roosevelt administration could have done to save Jews from the Holocaust. He makes his case by repeatedly resorting to red herrings --he insists that a particular course of action was impossible, even though it was not a course of action that serious scholars have suggested:

What Rosen Claims: “From Roosevelt’s perspective, everything was done that could reasonably be done for European Jewry ... Amending the immigration laws was an impossibility.” (241-242) And again: “[H]is inability to change the immigration law now seems inexplicable. But even Franklin Roosevelt could not accomplish the impossible.” (443) And: “Was fiddling with immigration regulations more important than getting war materiel to Churchill or building the arsenal of democracy that led to Hitler’s downfall?” (p. 484)

What Really Happened: It was not necessary to amend, or "fiddle with," the immigration laws, since the existing immigration quotas were almost always largely unfilled. An additional 190,000 Jewish refugees could have been brought to the United States on the existing unfilled quotas.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: “If the Allies could barely send men and war materiel across the Atlantic Ocean [in April 1943], they had no prospect of landing an army near Germany or Poland.” (p. 272)

What Really Happened: No historian has proposed that the Allies had the ability in April 1943 to land an army in Germany or Poland and rescue the Jews. There were many steps short of “landing an army near Germany” that the Allies could have taken to aid Jewish refugees. (See p.20 below)

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: “In April 1943 they possessed no airplanes capable of reaching the concentration camps from their most forward bases. There was nothing that could be done militarily to rescue the Nazis’ Jewish prisoners.” (p. 272)

What Really Happened: That may have been true in the spring of 1943, but by the spring of 1944, Allied planes were indeed capable of reaching Auschwitz.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: According to Rosen, historians have portrayed the voyage of the *St. Louis* as a case in which “the antisemitic Franklin D. Roosevelt failed to help the victims of Nazism.” (p. 447)

What Really Happened: None of the major historians claim that FDR's response to the *St. Louis* was due to his being antisemitic.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: To buttress his claim that nothing could have been done and that the Allies' "rescue through victory" policy was the only realistic option, Rosen quotes Nahum Goldmann, co-chairman of the World Jewish Congress, as saying "Nothing can be done to check them [the Nazis]. We can only work for victory." Rosen does not state when Goldmann said it.

What Really Happened: Rosen's footnote refers the reader to *The Holocaust in American Life*, by Peter Novick. Novick's footnote reveals that Goldmann made the statement in October 1942 --i.e., two months before the Allies publicly confirmed that genocide was underway. Goldmann's position changed in 1943 and his statements and actions during 1943-1944 clearly reflect his rejection of the rescue-through-victory notion, but Rosen does not acknowledge that fact. (p. 480)

|* * *

Contrary to Rosen's claims, there were many opportunities for rescue. For example, it was not until 1944 that the Allies' Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees only belatedly provided funds to the Joint Distribution Committee to facilitate rescue; the funds should have been sent sooner. More than 600 Jewish refugees were given haven in an Allied camp in North Africa in 1944 after almost a year of unnecessary delays; more refugees should have been brought to such camps, and sooner. Empty supply ships returning from Europe to the U.S. could have been used to bring refugees to temporary havens in America or elsewhere. The doors of Palestine should have been opened to refugees.

The Roosevelt administration's creation of the War Refugee Board in January 1944 in effect conceded that "rescue through victory" was not the only way to save the Jews. Nonetheless, Rosen writes: "Even in 1944, rescue proved to be nearly impossible." (p. 461) Yet David Wyman found that "the WRB played an important role in bringing about the rescue of an estimated 200,000 Jews in Hitler Europe. These included 48,000 Jews in Transnistria who were moved to safe areas in Rumania as a result of the WRB's diplomatic pressure; the 120,000 Jews in Budapest whose lives were saved when the Hungarian deportations to Auschwitz were halted by the WRB's pressure; some 15,000 Jewish refugees who were evacuated from Axis controlled territory by the WRB; and the protection of more than 10,000 Jewish refugees within Hitler Europe by rescuers such as Raoul Wallenberg, whose work was financed and facilitated by the WRB." (*The Abandonment of the Jews*, p. 285)

Rosen is thus left with two arguments regarding the Board:

What Rosen Claims: Rosen alleges that among "Revisionist historians," Raoul Wallenberg "is revered as "a Swedish diplomat," not as an agent of the War Refugee Board

and the Roosevelt administration. He alleges that the historians do not want to give the Roosevelt administration credit for what Wallenberg achieved. His footnotes cite Henry Feingold's *The Politics of Rescue*, pp. 257-9, Arthur Morse's *While Six Million Died*, pp. 362-71, 378-9, and David Wyman's *The Abandonment of the Jews*, pp. 240-41.

What Really Happened: Feingold, Morse, and Wyman all clearly acknowledge that Wallenberg was sponsored by the WRB and the U.S. government.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen (p.632 n70) alleges that the WRB could not have done any more than it did. He then quotes Breitman and Kraut as writing (in a footnote) that "Even if the War Refugee Board had been created earlier, it would not have led to successful negotiations with Germany".

What Really Happened: Perhaps there would not have been such negotiations. But Rosen should also have acknowledged what Breitman and Kraut added: "The board, however, made a major impact upon Axis satellites and upon neutral nations in Europe. The governments of Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary adjusted their behavior to the likely outcome of the war earlier than the Nazi ideologues in Germany, and American expressions of concern for the fate of European Jewry resonated into Eastern Europe. Neutral nations such as Spain, Turkey, and Switzerland showed greater willingness to provide temporary accommodations or transit rights to Jews fleeing from Nazi murderers once the Allies stressed the importance of rescue policies and provided financial assistance." (p. 203)

V. THE FAILURE TO BOMB AUSCHWITZ

Rosen contends that the Roosevelt administration should not be criticized for its refusal to bomb the Auschwitz death camp, since, he claims, (a) no major Jewish leader ever asked for a bombing of the camp and Jewish leaders opposed such bombing; and (b) the administration decided not to bomb because it might have resulted in casualties among the Auschwitz inmates.

He writes: “Nor did notable or important Jewish leaders or organizations in America or Palestine request that American forces bomb Auschwitz at a time when bombing might have accomplished something.” (p. 404)

What he means is that the requests the administration received for bombing came either from smaller organizations (such as the Bergson Group and Agudath Israel), or were received so late (such as from the War Refugee Board, in November 1944) that they would not have had significant impact, since by then Auschwitz was about to be dismantled by the Germans.

1. THE JEWISH AGENCY

What Rosen Claims: According to Rosen, the Jewish Agency in Palestine (the main self-governing body for Palestine Jewry) did not support bombing Auschwitz. He points out that at a meeting of the Jewish Agency (JA) Executive in Jerusalem on June 11, 1944, most of the members, including David Ben-Gurion, opposed bombing “of sites in which Jews are located.” (pp. 383-384) He notes that the JA Executive did not take any subsequent votes on the issue. “Thus the Jewish Agency never went on record in favor of the bombing and never asked FDR or the American government to bomb Auschwitz,” he writes (p. 384)

What Really Happened: Rosen fails to explain that, according to the transcript of the June 11 meeting, the participants believed that Auschwitz was “a labor camp,” not a death camp.

Nor does Rosen explain the crucial events that happened next: eight days later, on June 19, 1944, Richard Lichtheim, in the Agency’s Geneva office, sent the JA leadership in Jerusalem a detailed summary of the first eyewitness account of the mass-murder process (known as the Vrba-Wetzler report) and specifically noted that this information was drastically different from what the Agency leaders previously believed. After previously hearing of deportations to Auschwitz, the Agency leaders “believed that it was done to exploit more Jewish labour in the industrial centres of Upper-Silesia,” while the new information revealed that in addition to the “labour camp in Birkenau,” there were also “large-scale killings” in Birkenau carried out in “specially constructed buildings with gas-chambers in crematoriums ... The total number of Jews killed in or near Birkenau is estimated at over one and a half million.”

In the weeks following receipt of Lichtheim’s message, JA representatives in numerous countries met with Allied diplomats and urged that Auschwitz be bombed. Chaim Weizmann and Moshe Shertok, in London, lobbied British government officials. When they received what seemed to be a positive response from Foreign Minister Anthony Eden, Shertok sent cables to Ben-Gurion about his and Weizmann’s lobbying of the British to bomb the camps, and Ben-Gurion (at the July 16, 1944 Agency executive meeting) relayed the news, approvingly, to his colleagues. Also lobbying for

bombing were Yitzhak Gruenbaum, chairman of the Agency's Rescue Committee, in Jerusalem; Moshe Krausz, the Jewish Agency's representative in Budapest⁶; Richard Lichtheim, the Jewish Agency's representative in Geneva⁷; and Eliahu Epstein, chief of the Jewish Agency's Middle and Near East Division, who lobbied Soviet officials in Cairo. In fact, Epstein reported on his efforts directly to Ben-Gurion.⁸

As Dr. Michael Berenbaum has pointed out (*New York Sun*, July 6, 2005), Ben-Gurion and several other Jewish Agency officials opposed such bombings only for a period of a few weeks at most, in early June 1944, when they mistakenly believed that Auschwitz was a labor camp.

Moreover, Rescue Committee chair Greenbaum reported in detail to the Rescue Committee's September 29, 1944, meeting about his lobbying for bombing. Rosen does not mention this important fact. The notion that all of these senior Agency officials who were lobbying in all these different countries, and informing the Agency executive in Jerusalem about it, were doing so in defiance of the Agency executive, is simply inconceivable – especially when there are no statements from any Agency executive committee minutes after June 11 disagreeing with their colleagues' lobbying for bombing.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen alleges (p. 635 n87) that Rafael Medoff "asserted that the [Jewish Agency Executive] did in fact change its mind [on bombing], but he failed to quote from any minutes or documents demonstrating that the JAE did so ... " As proof, Rosen cites a 1996 essay by Medoff in the journal *American Jewish History*.

What Really Happened: Rosen writes as if the 1996 essay was Medoff's last article on the subject. But Rosen's own bibliography (p. 545) lists a later essay on the subject that Medoff wrote in the same journal in 2001. Titled "New Evidence Concerning the Allies and Auschwitz," Medoff presented newly-discovered documents regarding the Jewish Agency's actions (and other issues). The documents showed that numerous Jewish Agency officials in Europe and the Middle East lobbied Allied officials to bomb Auschwitz; that one of those officials reported on his efforts to David Ben-Gurion; and that Yitzhak Gruenbaum reported on his lobbying efforts to the JA Rescue Committee on September 29, 1944 without any expressions of opposition --all of which adds up to significant documentary evidence that the Agency changed its mind (after June 11) and supported bombing.

|* * *

What Rosen Claims: Regarding the efficacy of bombing the railways leading to Auschwitz, Rosen writes: "Even Wyman acknowledged that it is unlikely to have saved any lives." (p.635 n85) He cites Wyman's *The Abandonment of the Jews*, p.300.

What Really Happened: Rosen's statement is a severe misrepresentation of Wyman's position. This is what Wyman actually writes (on pp.300-301 of *The*

⁶ Gruenbaum to Barlas, June 20, 1944, A127/544, Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem.

⁷ Lichtheim to Jewish Agency, June 26, 1944, L22/56, Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem.

⁸ Epstein to Ben-Gurion, September 3, 1944, S25/486, Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem.

Abandonment of the Jews): "Successful cutting of railways necessitated close observation of the severed lines and frequent rebombing, since repairs took only a few days ... It might also be argued that railroad bombing would not have helped after July 8, 1944--the day on which the last mass deportations from Hungary to Auschwitz took place. The argument is convincing with regard to the three deportation railways farthest from Budapest, because most Jews outside the capital were gone by then. But more than 200,000 remained in Budapest. And they faced constant danger because the transports to Auschwitz might be resumed. This threat meant that the other two deportation railways, which would have been used to carry Jews from Budapest to Auschwitz, remained critically important. Deportation of the Budapest Jews would have taken roughly three weeks, in addition to several days of preparations. An alarm would have reached the outside world in time for cuts in those railroads to have been of some help, even if the bombing had to be sporadic."

* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen writes (p.616 n23): "While [Yitzhak] Gruenbaum claimed in 1961 that he had sent telegrams to Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt to bomb Auschwitz, no such documentary evidence existed, nor did Gruenbaum have the authority of the JAE to do so."

What Really Happened: Rosen offers no evidence that Gruenbaum did not have the Jewish Agency's authority. His citation is an article by retired engineer Richard Levy who speculates that "Any such telegrams would have been sent over the objections of the JAE." Levy, in turn, offers no evidence to support that statement.⁹

In fact, in Rafael's Medoff aforementioned 2001 essay, which is included in Rosen's bibliography, Medoff quotes from Gruenbaum's report at the September 29, 1944 meeting of the Jewish Agency Rescue Committee, in which Gruenbaum tells his colleagues: "Since June, we have sent emergency telegrams to all the countries regarding the fate of the Jews remaining Poland in labor camps and we made a number of demands. We demanded, first of all, that they bomb Oswiecim, that they should destroy the death camps."

If Gruenbaum truly had no authority from the Jewish Agency to send such telegrams --as Rosen claims-- it is hardly likely that he would have announced to his Agency colleagues that he had done so.¹⁰

2. NAHUM GOLDMANN AND THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

Nahum Goldmann was both co-chairman (with Stephen Wise) of the World Jewish Congress, and the American representative of the Jewish Agency. As Rosen himself notes (p. 614 n11), the WJCongress was "a centrist organization with a substantial membership and following among American Jews."

⁹ Richard H. Levy, "The Bombing of Auschwitz Revisited: A Critical Analysis," in Michael J. Neufeld and Michael Berenbaum, eds. *The Bombing of Auschwitz: Should the Allies Have Attempted It?* (New York: 2000), p.106.

¹⁰ Rafael Medoff, "New Evidence Concerning the Allies and Auschwitz," *American Jewish History* 89:1 (March 2001), pp.91-104.

What Rosen Claims: Rosen alleges (p.384) that “the JA never took an opportunity to lobby the U.S. government to act,” and argues that Goldmann never asked the Roosevelt administration to bomb the camps. He emphasizes that another WJC official, Rescue Committee chairman A. Leon Kubowitzki, asked the War Refugee Board to send ground troops, rather than bombing from the air, to attack the camp, lest the bombs harm some of the inmates.

Rosen acknowledges that in later interviews, Goldmann recalled that he did lobby for bombing. But Rosen puts it this way: “Goldmann claimed thirty-six years later that he visited McCloy to urge that the camps be bombed, even though this request was in conflict with WJC policy.” (p. 399) The emphasis on the late date of the interview seemed to be intended to cast doubt on the veracity of Goldmann’s recollections. Rosen clearly disbelieves Goldmann's recollection, because to believe it would shatter Rosen's claim that no major Jewish leader or group asked for bombing

What Really Happened: This was not merely a much later claim by Goldmann. In a letter to the Czech leader in exile, Jan Masaryk, on July 3, 1944, Goldmann wrote: “We have discussed with the War Refugee Board the idea that the Russian and American governments be asked to look for a way to destroy these camps by bombing or any other means.”¹¹

It is clear that Rosen is aware of Goldmann’s letter to Masaryk, because that letter is cited in Rosen’s footnote 11, p. 614. Yet Rosen refrained from acknowledging this information, which completely undermines his claim that Goldmann did not lobby for bombing.

The notion that Goldmann’s lobbying would have been “in conflict with WJC policy,” as Rosen claims, is implausible, since Goldmann was co-chair of the WJC, while Kubowitzki his subordinate, as chair of the Rescue Committee.

3. JACOB FISHMAN

What Rosen Claims: Rosen attempts to increase his list of Jews who had doubts about the wisdom of bombing the camps, by referring to Jacob Fishman, columnist for the Yiddish newspaper *Morgen Zhurnal* and Zionist activist (Rosen inflates his i.d. to “Zionist leader and columnist.”) In his June 27, 1944 column, Fishman included one paragraph about the bombing idea. Rosen wrote: “ ‘I am still thinking about the idea,’ he concluded. Thus by the end of June 1944 most Jewish public and private opinion either opposed bombing Auschwitz or was divided on the issue.” (pp.386-387)

What Really Happened: Fishman’s paragraph *began*, “I am still thinking about the idea of the Allies bombing the death camp at Oswiecim...” Then he proceeded to outline the hazards, arguing that the advantages outweighed the risks. But Rosen transformed the text to make it appear as if the “thinking about it” line was the paragraph’s conclusion, when exactly the opposite was true.

As for Rosen’s claim that Jewish opinion was “divided,” the list of Jewish organizations and leaders who endorsed the idea of bombing Auschwitz included, in addition to the aforementioned leaders of the World Jewish Congress and the Jewish Agency: the Labor Zionists of America; the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe (the Bergson Group); Slovak Jewish leaders Gisi Fleischmann and Rabbi Michael Dov Weissmandel; Czech Jewish leader Ernest Frischer; and Swiss Jewish businessman and rescue activist Robert Goldschmidt. The American Jewish Conference, a

¹¹ Goldmann to Masaryk, 3 July 1944, World Jewish Congress Papers, American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati.

coalition of all major U.S. Jewish organizations, publicly called for “all measures” to be taken by the Allies to destroy the death camps--clearly not ruling out bombing. The editors of the Independent Jewish Press Service urged the bombing of the death camps. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency reported sympathetically on the bombing idea, as did the editors of the *National Jewish Ledger*. A columnist for *Opinion* (edited by Stephen S. Wise) also endorsed bombing the camps. A. Leon Kubowitzki of the World Jewish Congress, who urged the Allies to use paratroopers rather than airplanes to attack Auschwitz, repeatedly forwarded to the War Refugee Board the appeals he received from European sources urging the bombing of Auschwitz.

4. THE REASONS FOR THE ROOSEVELT ADMINISTRATION’S REFUSAL TO BOMB

What Rosen Claims: According to Rosen, “the chief reason” that the Roosevelt administration rejected requests to bomb Auschwitz was “the moral dilemma of deliberately killing hundreds or thousands of innocent men, women, and children.” (p.478)

What Really Happened: In fact, the War Department officials who handled the bombing requests did not cite that as their reason for rejecting them.

In June 1944, the War Department turned down requests to bomb the railways to Auschwitz on the grounds that it would require “diversion of considerable air support essential to the success of our forces now engaged in decisive operations.” This position was not based on a study of the proposal’s feasibility; it was based on an earlier War Department decision to refrain from using military resources to aid refugees.

Later in the summer, the administration received requests to bomb not just the railways but the camps themselves. One of these requests came from the Czech Government-in-Exile and was forwarded to the War Department by A. Leon Kubowitzki of the WJCongress on August 9. On August 14, Assistant Secretary John McCloy replied that the War Department conducted “a study” which had found that it would require “diversion of considerable air support essential to the success of our forces now engaged in decisive operations elsewhere...”

McCloy added the incredible claim that “such an effort, even if practicable, might provoke even more vindictive action by the Germans.” What could be more “vindictive” than mass murder in gas chambers was not clear.

Rosen quotes from McCloy’s letter about a “study” having been conducted, but only vaguely acknowledges (p.388) that there has been a debate about the “truthfulness of this and later letters” from U.S. officials rejecting bombing requests. He fails to explain that no evidence has ever been discovered to support the claim that the War Department conducted “a study.” McCloy made no mention of the danger of civilian casualties from the bombings. Other War Department letters about the bombing proposal likewise did not cite civilian casualties as the reason for refraining from bombing.

VI. ROSEN'S ATTACKS ON THE BERGSON GROUP

Rosen devotes most of Chapter 17 to denouncing the Bergson Group, the political action committee led by Hillel Kook (Peter Bergson) and a handful of other militant Zionists who came to the United States from Europe and British Mandatory Palestine in 1939-1940.

When Kook and his colleagues first arrived in the United States, they were officially emissaries of the Irgun Zvai Leumi, a Jewish underground militia in Palestine that opposed British rule. However, upon the outbreak of World War II in September 1939, the Irgun declared a truce with the British and remained almost completely inactive until 1944. During this period, Kook --using the name Bergson-- operated independently from the Irgun. He established the Committee for a Jewish Army of Stateless and Palestinian Jews, which from 1941 to 1942 lobbied for creation of a Jewish armed force to fight against the Nazis. Then he created the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe, which in 1943-1944 lobbied for U.S. intervention to rescue Jews from the Nazis. (Later, after the Irgun launched its revolt against the British in 1944, Bergson publicly supported its fight for Jewish independence.)

Rosen, although writing about the period when the Irgun was almost nonexistent, consistently refers to the Bergson group as “the Irgunists.” In one 17-page section, Rosen refers to them as “Irgunists” no less than twenty-five times, almost completely eschewing the terms that historians normally use, such as Bergson Group or Bergsonites. He refers to the Committee for a Jewish Army as “the Irgunist Committee for a Jewish Army” (300), the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe as “the Irgunist Emergency Committee” (390), and even Ben Hecht as “Irgunist Ben Hecht” (456).

What Rosen Claims: Rosen’s intent seems to be to discredit the Bergson committees through guilt by association – that is, branding these groups with the controversial label “Irgun” on the basis of Bergson’s pre-1940 or post-1943 relationship with the Irgun.

What Really Happened: Neither the Jewish Army committee nor the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe had any relationship with the Irgun. Jewish establishment groups that criticized the Bergson group during 1941-1943 typically refrained from accusing it of being a front for the Irgun (as Rosen does), since there was no basis for the charge. Moreover, because of the Irgun’s inactivity, it is likely that relatively few American Jews would have even recognized its name.

* * *

Rosen goes back and forth between claiming that Bergson had few supporters because most people realized he was a dangerous extremist, to saying that Bergson had many supporters because he was good at fooling people about his agenda and goals.

He writes that that “many Americans, Jewish and non-Jewish, viewed [Bergson’s newspaper ads] as crackpot, wild-eyed, and utterly impractical.” (p.274) Therefore, he insists, Bergson attracted only “a few naive Americans.” (pp. 274-5) Bergson “fooled few people,” he writes. “American Jews knew

what Bergson was up to.” (p/ 322) “American Jews were well aware that money raised by Bergson ... would likely end up buying weapons for the Irgun to use against the British in Palestine,” he claims, without documentation.

At the same time, however, Rosen must acknowledge that Bergson did build up “a coalition of Jews and non-Jews [that] agitated for rescue.” (p.322) He cannot deny that Bergson succeeded in attracting “famous supporters, celebrities, intellectuals, Hollywood personalities, and Park Avenue sponsors.” How does he explain this phenomenon? “[M]ost of [them] did not understand his real goals,” he claims. (p.320)

* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen portrays Bergson as anti-American: “The defeat of Japan and Germany, the welfare of American servicemen, and the interests of the United States were of no concern to Hillel Kook, aka Peter Bergson. Those were somebody else’s problems.” (p.334) He even goes so far as to accuse Bergson and his colleagues of ducking the draft: “But not every Jew living in the safety of America wanted to fight in the armed services against Nazi Germany. A group of young Palestinian Jews stranded in the United States sat out the war in America, preferring to agitate for the overthrow of the British in Palestine rather than enlist and fight Nazis themselves.” (p.303)

What Really Happened: Two of the Bergson Group’s leaders, Yitshaq Ben-Ami and Alexander Rafaeli, did serve in the United States armed forces during World War II. Ben-Ami fought in the Battle of the Bulge. Rafaeli fought on the beaches at Normandy and took part in the liberation of Paris and the Battle of the Ruhr. Other Bergson Group leaders were found physically unfit to serve.

Rosen’s statement is all the more surprising because Ben-Ami describes his military service on p.338 of his autobiography, *Years of Wrath, Days of Glory*. Rosen himself quotes from a passage on p.336 of Ben-Ami’s book, and it is listed in Rosen’s bibliography, implying that Rosen read it. Likewise, Rafaeli’s military service is mentioned on pp.20-21 of *A Race Against Death*, by Wyman and Medoff, a book which Rosen quotes and attacks elsewhere in his book. Thus, although he had easy access to the facts about Ben-Ami and Rafaeli’s military service, Rosen wrote otherwise.

* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen writes (p.334): "The defeat of Japan and Germany, the welfare of American servicemen, and the interests of the United States were of no concern to Hillel Kook, aka Peter Bergson. Those were somebody else's problems. Bergson had a different mission. Indeed, two of the Irgunists who had worked with Bergson and criticized FDR, Arieh Ben Eliezer and Eri Jabotinsky, left the United States immediately [after the February 1944 Irgun declaration of revolt] for Palestine to join Begin."

What Really Happened: Ben-Eliezer went to Palestine in October 1943, four months before the Irgun's revolt was launched. Jabotinsky did not go to Palestine, but to Turkey, with the assistance of the War Refugee Board, to facilitate the rescue of Jewish

refugees. He stayed there until November 1944, when the Turks detained him and handed him over to the British, who arrested him for his connections to the Irgun.

* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen misrepresents the Bergson group's religious orientation. It had a "strong undercurrent ... of condemnation of secular and Reform Jews," he writes (p. 315). Rosen also claims that "anti-FDR" historians believe that Reform Jews "did evil to believe in traditional American and Jewish emancipationist values of Jewish acculturation." (p. 332)

What Really Happened: There was no such "undercurrent"; most of the Bergson Group's leaders and members were secular Jews, including Bergson himself, who later resigned from Israeli politics after failing to persuade his colleagues in the Knesset to maintain a strictly secular State of Israel.

* * *

What Rosen Claims: Rosen derides the 400 rabbis whom the Bergson group brought to Washington, D.C. in 1943 to plead for rescue. He describes the rabbis as "foreign-looking" with "their long black velvet coats, big hats, and Hasidic garb." (p. 329) Rosen strongly defends President Roosevelt's refusal to meet with them. It was natural, according to Rosen, that FDR was not interested in "seeing a group of Orthodox rabbis sent by an unpopular, unrepresentative Palestinian terrorist front group." (p. 603 n47) FDR spurned them because "he did want to raise the stature of the Irgun." (p.330)

What Really Happened: Rosen provides no evidence that FDR had even heard of the Irgun (which in October 1943 had been almost completely inactive for more than four years), much less that Roosevelt declined to see the rabbis because it would raise the Irgun's stature.

VII. ROSEN'S QUESTIONABLE USE OF OTHERS' WORK

In *Saving the Jews*, Rosen frequently quotes other published authors. He quotes 135 statements by other authors, by name, in his 498 pages of text (excluding the front matter, footnotes, bibliography and index). On average, he cites another author every three to four pages. This heavy reliance on other authors underscores the extent to which *Saving the Jews* is not a work of original scholarship but is rather derivative of others' work.

Rosen's use of other authors' work is actually more extensive than Rosen reveals to the reader. In at least twenty-one separate passages in *Saving the Jews*, Rosen uses language identical, or virtually identical, to that which previously appeared in other published works, without quotation marks to indicate that they are another author's words rather than his.

The American Historical Association's official Statement on Plagiarism defines plagiarism as "the use of another's language without quotation marks and citation." The Statement also notes: "Plagiarism includes more subtle and perhaps pernicious abuses than simply expropriating the exact wording of another author without attribution ... a historian should never simply borrow and rephrase the findings of other scholars."¹²

1. Burns, *Roosevelt: The Soldier of Freedom*, p.67: Hitler as a boy had hated and feared his father and loved his mother, had moved repeatedly from place to place and from school to school, had a sense of self that was at once overblown and empty.

Rosen, p. 1: Hitler hated and feared his father, and his mother moved from place to place.

2. Sachar, *A History of the Jews in America*, p.474: By 1936, emigrating Jews were left with 35 percent of their capital; by 1938, with 10 percent; and by June 1938, with nothing.

Rosen, p.16: Jews could leave Germany with 35 percent of their capital in 1936, 10 percent in 1938, and by June 1938, nothing.

3. Burns, *Roosevelt: The Lion and the Fox*, p.247: But even after Roosevelt was safely in office he cautiously skirted foreign policy shoals on which he feared his political popularity and domestic program might be wrecked.

Rosen, p.15: The new president had no mandate to do anything about foreign affairs, and he was not about to wreck his critical domestic agenda on the shoals of foreign policy.

4. Gellman, *Secret Affairs*, pp.16-17: The American chief executive ultimately came to despise everything the Nazis represented, especially their renewed efforts at rearmament and the brutality that they unleashed upon their opponents.

Rosen, p.18: He despised Nazi brutality against Jews and political opponents and their hatred for democracy. Indeed, he despised everything about them.

¹² *AHA Perspectives*, March 2002, p.40.

5. Sachar, *A History of the Jews in America*, p. 469: Zionist and labor groups also favored the notion. So did the *Morgen Djurnal* and *Tog*. So did Brandeis.

Rosen, p.23: Jewish New Yorkers, the Yiddish-speaking leadership, Jewish War Veterans, Zionist and labor groups, and other Jewish organizations supported the boycott. So did the *Yiddish Press* and Justice Brandeis.

6. Rubinstein, *The Myth of Rescue*, pp.34-36: Between 1 July 1933 and 30 June 1942 a total of 161,051 Jews migrated to the United States, comprising 35.5 percent of all migrants ... settling in America ... In both 1938-9 and 1939-40 Jews comprised more than one-half of *all* immigrants admitted to the United States ... until Kristallnacht, many fewer German Jews actually wished to enter the United States than one would assume.

Rosen, p.7: Between July 1, 1933, and June 30, 1942, 161,051 Jews immigrated to the United States--35.5 percent of *all* immigrants to America. Jews comprised more than half of all immigrants to the United States between 1938 and 1940 ... until Kristallnacht, fewer German Jews wished to enter the United States than one would assume.

7. Breitman and Kraut, *American Refugee Policy*, p.28: Called by one historian "the epitome of the bureaucrat," Wilbur Carr was ...

Rosen pp.27-28: The epitome of a bureaucrat, he used his position ...

8. Sachar, *A History of the Jews in America*, p.324: In the fiscal year 1924-25 barely ten thousand Jews entered the United States from all countries.

Rosen, p.40: In 1924 and 1925 barely 10,000 Jewish immigrants entered the United States.

9. Feingold, *The Politics of Rescue*, p.67: The internal political situation in the Reich was simply too unstable to offer any assurances.

Rosen, p. 111: The internal political situation in Germany was unstable.

10. Burns, *Roosevelt: The Soldier of Freedom*, p.453: One report had reached Roosevelt that in New York City only the Jews were solid for him.

Rosen, p.149: One report had reached him that in New York only the Jews were solidly for him.

11. Breitman (in Newton, *FDR and the Holocaust*, pp.135-6): First, there were now hundreds of thousands of non-Jewish refugees (as well as additional Jewish refugees) in flight from Poland, Finland, Belgium, the Netherlands, and (for different reasons) Spain.

Rosen, p. 185: There were hundreds of thousands of non-Jewish refugees in flight from Poland, Finland, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands.

12. Lipstadt, *Beyond Belief*, p.140: As soon as Germany crossed the Polish border, news of the persecution of European Jewry began to be crowded out of the press by news of the war.

Rosen, p.224: After Germany invaded Poland in 1939 ... So many events crowded out news of the persecution of the Jews.

13. Burns, *Roosevelt: The Soldier of Freedom*, p.397: Any time the President touched the issue – even by merely receiving Zionists – he triggered explosive reactions in Egypt or Syria or Saudi Arabia.

Rosen, p.296: Any time the president touched the issue – even by merely receiving Zionists – he triggered explosive reactions in Egypt, Syria, and Saudi Arabia.

14. Burns, *Roosevelt: The Soldier of Freedom*, pp. 40-441: [T]he Joint Chiefs of Staff asked the President to retreat from his uncompromising stand [on German surrender] ... The President's harsh attitude toward Germany was not unaffected by a growing burden on the world's conscience. This was the agony of the Jews.

Rosen, pp. 367-368: The Joint Chiefs of Staff asked him to retreat from his stand on unconditional surrender ...To some degree, Roosevelt's harsh attitude may have been affected by the agony of Jews.

15. Gerhard Weinberg, "The Allies and the Holocaust," in Neufeld and Berenbaum, *The Bombing of Auschwitz*, p. 16: The United States accepted about twice as many Jewish refugees as the rest of the world put together: about 200,000 out of 300,000.

Rosen, p. 442: The United States accepted about twice as many refugees as the rest of the world combined, 200,000 out of 300,000.

16. Breitman and Kraut, *American Refugee Policy*, p.58: By encouraging the full use of the German-Austrian quota, the administration could actually increase immigration to the United States--a move that was well in advance of American public opinion.

Rosen, p. 62: FDR's use of the full German-Austrian quota was well in advance of American public opinion.

17. Feingold, *The Politics of Rescue*, p123: ...a growing segment of the community, where Zionist sentiment had become strong, considered resettlement outside Palestine something in the nature of a betrayal.

Rosen, p.132: Zionist sentiment was growing, and to propose Jewish settlement elsewhere was a betrayal.

18. Kennedy, *Freedom from Fear*, pp.284-5: In the immigrant wards of the great industrial cities ... turnout rose nearly a third over 1932, and voters went overwhelmingly for Roosevelt and the Democrats.
- Rosen, p.52: Roosevelt won a resounding victory in the immigrant wards of the big cities, where turnout increased a third over 1932, and the vote for FDR was overwhelming.
19. Fehrenbach, *FDR's Undeclared War 1939-1941*, p.213: On April 1, 1941, the Gallup poll showed fully 79 percent of the people opposed to sending of American troops overseas, for any reason.
- Rosen, p.160: A Gordon Gallup public poll on April 1, 1941, showed 79 percent of citizens opposed sending American troops overseas, for any reason.
20. Grose, *Israel in the Mind of America*, p.138: Roosevelt was incensed ... For all his dismay, Roosevelt's hands were tied. He wanted to avoid any action that would weaken Britain's strategic position in the Arab world on the eve of war. (138)
- Rosen, p. 116: FDR was incensed ... But Roosevelt could only do so much. He could not undermine Britain's strategic position in the Arab world on the eve of war.
21. Freidel, *Franklin D. Roosevelt: A Rendezvous with Destiny*, p.321: At ten minutes to three on the morning of September 1, William Bullitt called the president from Paris with the news of the German invasion.
- Rosen, p. 121: At ten minutes to three on the morning of September 1, William Bullitt called the president from Paris with the news of the German invasion.