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Introduction

On April 1, 1933, three months after the Nazis came to power, the executive leadership of Germany decided to stage a nationwide economic boycott of Jewish owned businesses. In many ways, this boycott—and the propaganda generated to legitimize it—can be considered the start of organized administrative and cultural actions against Jews that progressed to, and culminated in, the “Final Solution.”¹

Given the grievous legacy that emerged from this event, this work returns to April 1, 1933 and re-examines the propaganda used by Germany to justify the action. Specifically, I reconnoiter American newspapers which described the event. As Allen and Sieczkiewicz write, “newspapers have long been rich research for historians. In the past several years many historical newspapers have been digitized, offering the promise of improved access and powerful searching.”² Using the digital newspaper database Newspapers.com, I was able to search U.S. state papers in an effort to construct a social history of the event. Here, I collect (that is, “digitally clip”) stories, editorials, images/illustrations and photographs for a review of themes and explanations of Nazi-Germany’s political intent and action.³ I query American papers as I am interested in how Nazi propaganda and anti-Jewish falsehoods became presented as part of a “global discourse” and a global “mythology”⁴ used by the Nazis to encourage the international acceptance of a fabricated reality. Finally, examining American newspapers also follows in the research tradition established by the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, wherein they call for “citizen historians” to research how local newspapers reported on Holocaust-related events during the 1930s and 1940s.⁵

³ See the methodology section for a more detailed explanation of my data collection procedure.
Outline of Paper

My analysis of Nazi propaganda themes is guided by classic as well as contemporary investigations into the Techniques of Neutralization. These techniques are specific social-psychological strategies used to minimize or suppress cognitive resistance to criminal behavior (this is, actions that would- in most situations-be labeled immoral). The techniques (to be explicitly identified in the analysis section) repackage values in order to “resolve disjunctions between beliefs and actions [and] which help to explain the widespread participation of ‘ordinary’ civilized people in atrocities and their selective, situational application of compassion and mercy.” With the aid of neutralizing techniques, people can define situations in such a way as to cause the suspension of conventional values that they believe in and that would normally prevent them from engaging in actions that are injurious to others.

In the sections that follow I briefly describe: (1) the Jewish led Anti-Nazi Boycott of 1933—an international boycott of German products in response to violence against Jews by members of Hitler’s Nazi Party following his appointment as Chancellor of Germany. After this, (2) the German counter-boycott of Jewish business is detailed and then (3) the core focus of this paper – an analysis of the propaganda created to justify anti-Semitic attitudes and action—are presented.

The Boycotts

The Anti-Nazi Boycott of 1933

Violence against Germany’s Jews began immediately after the German federal election of March 5, 1933—which ensured a Nazi party victory and facilitated the naming of Adolf Hitler as Chancellor. During this period of political transition, individuals and groups aligned with the National Socialist party took action to harass Jews across the country by attacking persons presumed to be Jewish and even breaking into and searching persons’ homes for evidence of “Jewishness” in order to justify their continued persecution. As news of these abuses were published, various German and International Jewish organizations appealed to governmental officials in Germany to speak out against this mistreatment and prosecute attackers. In response, German officials stated that “communists dressed as Nazis were responsible for these outrages, in an effort to embarrass the Hitler government.”

In reaction to this deliberate disinformation, a Polish boycott of German products was organized and the American Jewish Congress as well as representatives of Jewish War 6
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Veterans meet to propose a boycott. Herman Goering (then, Hitler’s Chief Aid and “Minister Without Portfolio”) responded to these boycotts by stating:

[Though] there have been a few Jews and others have been dragged from their homes and beaten… [but this was] for reasons which in the United States would have led to lynching… there has not been a single case where even a person’s fingernail was hacked off or the lobe or his ear severed. [And regarding boycotts of Jewish stores] some chain stores have been closed because the middle classes of Germany hate the chain store system but nobody has been persecuted because he was a Jew.

When these techniques of neutralization did not appease boycott talk or reverse economic sanctions, officials responded by imposing a one-day counter-boycott of all Jewish-owned businesses in Germany. Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels threatened to keep the boycott going if the anti-German boycotts were not dropped, and to maintain it, he said, “until German Jewry has been annihilated.”

The April 1st Counter-Boycott and the Employment of Anti-Jewish Propaganda

On March 31, Goebbels stated, “Tomorrow not a German man nor German woman shall enter a Jewish store. Jewish trade throughout Germany must remain paralyzed tomorrow.” And indeed, the Saturday boycott, which lasted from 10:00am to 7:00pm, had a powerful symbolic impact. As Marion Kaplan writes:

On April 1, 1933, on one of the best business days of the year, on the Saturday before Easter’ the regime declared a national boycott of Jewish businesses. In announcing this first national boycott, Hitler called it a ‘defensive measure’ against anti-Nazi propaganda abroad for which he blamed the Jews… The boycott had taken a large toll among Jews in fear and intimidation.

---

14 “Minister Without Portfolio” refers to a position of power allowing one to sit in on Cabinet meetings without being given a specific brief or department of state to run. However, during Hitler’s reign, Goring held many titles, namely: Interior Minister and later Prime Minister of Prussia. He also served as Hitler’s Minister of Economic Affairs (including Commissioner for the War Economy) and existed broadly as a “roving ambassador.” See: Holocaust Encyclopedia “USHMM Hermann Goring: Key dates.” [https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/hermann-goering-key-dates].
16 The Wisconsin Jewish Chronicle. “Germany, victim of Mad Blunder.” April 7 (1933), 4.
17 The Wisconsin Jewish Chronicle. “Germany, Victim of Mad Blunder.” April 7 (1933), 4.
During the boycott, Nazi brown shirts and storm troopers stood at entrances to Jewish shops. They drew Jewish caricatures on shop windows and held posters which reading various slogans, including: “Danger, Jew Store (with quarantine and skull and crossbones logos) and “Germans, defend yourselves against the Jewish atrocity propaganda, buy only at German shops!” Other actions included targeting non-Jewish Germans for perceived disloyalty. For example, some placards read: “If a traitor you would be, purchase from the Jewry.” Further, reports from the town of Annaberg, Germany noted that shoppers leaving Jewish stores were stopped by Nazis who pasted stamps on their foreheads that read: “We traitors bought from Jews.” At Kassel, Nazis strung a barbed wire fence around a Jewish warehouse and hung up a sign that read: “Internment camp for bad citizens who buy from Jews.” Inside the fence they had tethered a donkey.

In the end, while the boycott was noteworthy for the fear it produced among German-Jews it is most significant historically for the propaganda and anti-Semitic tropes it made concrete and consumable. And this is what I turn to next—an injury into and analysis of the series of arguments and justifications ultimately used to target, dehumanize, and destroy Jews.

Presentation of Data and Analysis of Themes

Before I present my findings and themes for analysis, I detail my methodology and the Techniques of Neutralization that served both as this paper’s theoretical guide and inspired the scaffolding structure of this work.

Methodology

To create a social history of the boycott as well as gain access to statements describing the event I relied predominantly on local and national newspapers which described the event. As previously noted, I specifically used the digital newspaper database Newspapers.com. Here, my search parameters within this database were set for 1933 and included the terms: “Boycott,” “Nazi,” and “Jew.” After a broad search was completed using this technique, I then narrowed my search highlighting individual days. Here, I started with a specific date, May 31 (the day before the event) and then I progressed day by day, until I was two weeks out from the initiation of the conflict. Finally, I narrowed further still – I used the same date format, but searched, one at a time solely by specific city newspapers with the 10 largest cities by population in 1933. I grounded this portion of my methodological process in the assumption that the largest cities would contain the most relevant information regarding the event. These cities included: New York City, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Los Angeles, Cleveland, St. Louis, Baltimore, Pittsburg, and San Francisco.

20 The Plain Speaker. “Nazis Smear up Jewish stores.” April 1 (1933), 2.
21 The Eugene Guard. “German Jews Again Feel “Nazi” Grudge.” March 31 (1933), 1.
In constructing a social history of the event, I collected stories, editorials, images/illustrations, and photographs. All of these items were “digitally clipped” and later reviewed for themes and explanations of violent intent and action.

The Neutralizing Techniques

The Neutralizing Techniques are typically described as being a collection of five social-cognitive frameworks that allow a perpetrator to “drift” into deviance and/or rationalize their offenses both during and after the commission of “immoral” behavior. The use of quotations around the term immoral is done to emphasize another critical aspect of neutralization techniques—which is specifically, that these rationalizations are used to turn thoughts and behaviors (once previously held as immoral) into moral actions. For example, most consider murder to be immoral— but when processed and rationalized through select neutralization techniques, murder may come to be seen as not only justified, but necessary.

In its original conception, Sykes and Matza identified the following techniques associated with neutralizing guilt related to deviant behavior. The first technique is termed the denial of responsibility. Here, individuals (or organizations and even governments) who applied this technique of neutralization refused to accept responsibility for their actions and extended their explanation into a belief that factors beyond their control were responsible for their behavior. The second technique, termed the denial of injury, holds simply that the individual (or again government) believes there was “no real” injury or harm caused to the person who was affected by the delinquent behavior. The third technique of neutralization, the denial of victim, accepted that there was a victim to the crime, but believed that the injury was justified because the victim was deserving of punishment or retaliation. The fourth technique of neutralization is termed the condemnation of the condemners. Here, actions are justified on the basis that those who were victimized were not real victims because they were hypocrites, or that the victims would have engaged in the same activities if they were provided the opportunity. The final technique of neutralization is termed the appeal to higher loyalties. This technique is used when an admission of problematic behavior is made but is “moved by a higher power” and individuals feel they must break the laws of to benefit the greater good. Here violence, or problematic deeds are seen as necessary to prevent an even greater delinquent act from taking place (e.g., I did it for god, or country or to ‘save the kids’).

Propaganda Theme One: Denial of Responsibility

Here, German officials argued vociferously that they didn’t order harassment and that any harms committed against Jews were done by agitators beyond their control. “Those who participated in the attacks are for the most part irresponsible elements working in the dark. We know that the government disapproves of maltreatment accorded Jews.” This technique of neutralization is generally encapsulated as the refusal to accept responsibility for one’s actions—including, in this case, responsibility for one’s rhetoric and expressions of hate which

motivated people to action (and indeed, research suggests that violent political rhetoric primes and incites aggressive behavior in people who are predisposed to it).

Additionally, select Nazi officials also denied that the events of this day were organized as an embargo on Jewish shop owners. Instead they argued, it was intended as a community gathering (full of marching bands, singing, and public gatherings) for the purpose of celebrating the unique cultural heritage of German folkdom. Further, any of the individuals who got carried away in their celebration of German-Aryan identity were merely “blowing off steam.”

It was a great day for the Nazi guards. The streets were filled with troopers, pistols on hip, swaggering through the streets… in the town a Nazi band …headed a parade… As the day wore on the streets became crowded with curious sightseers.

An official of the Nazi foreign Office stated:

We Germans] find it hard to believe that Hitler could possibly have consented to [violence against Jews] … It is no doubt true that most of the cruelties… were the work of individual gangsters and sadists.

Thus, in this way, the Nazi government could affix blame for atrocities to an amorphous criminal element or an overindulgent festival goer, of a community radical, rather than on government agents and citizens inspired by Nazi ideologies.

Propaganda Themes Two and Three: Denial of Injury and Denial of Victimhood

Another technique used by the Nazis to distance themselves psychologically from the terroristic reality of their actions (as well as to influence and manipulate the beliefs and emotions of an international audience) was to deny that their actions were actually harmful. And by extension, if there was harm, the injury is to be considered negated by the fact that the victim “deserves it.” For example, please recall the earlier quote by Herman Goering who stated that some Jews were beaten (though not severely) and only because they had committed significant offensive acts for which Americans would have organized a lynching party.

Consider also this statement from a Nazi Police Official, which bends the two techniques:

No National Socialist Attacks a Jew because the Nazi knows a Jew is inferior… we repudiate Judaism because we know the destructive influence and contagious effect that his inferiority has on the German soul…

Such words, while denying attack, also propagate inferiority and a denial of “sameness” (in other words, Jews become the “Other”). The scholar Anthonie Holslag argues that genocide is always preceded by the “Othering” of the group one wishes to disenfranchise and/or destroy. Here “Othering” is defined as efforts to define a person or group as alien, different, unworthy, and inferior. Of core importance to this process are the identity entrepreneurs who “construct identities, imagery, mental frameworks, ideologies and scientific theories [and use] literature, popular theories, and folklore to buttress the notion of their in-group as superior [or as victims] and the outgroup as inferior or as offenders and enemies of the state.” Indeed, as Broun writes, “The Jew [in 1933] has become a synonym for ‘outlander’ or ‘foreigner.'”

Such propaganda, served to eventually render Jews as “Second Rate-Humans,” and “Parasitic Aliens” and continuing the discussion of language use as a precursor to genocide, Cohen writes that “when people are denounced [and made] to be unassailably Other… they become contaminating, even toxic”. The concern of such language is that when we define people as less than human it becomes more “legitimate, imaginatively and politically, to consider exterminating them.”

Before moving on to the next section, it is important to note that injurious actions and death did occur on this day. In one particularly heinous act, George Schumm (a Jewish Lawyer) was lynched by a mob in retaliation for attacking a Nazi who prevented him from entering his father’s store. Further, various improvised explosive devices were thrown at both Jewish shops and restaurants known to be patronized by Brown Shirts. And Christian Gieschel reports that the boycott lead hundreds of suicides of German Jews.

Propaganda Theme Four: Condemning the Condemners

When employing the neutralization technique known as the condemnation of the condemners, persons justify and propagandize their behavior on the basis that those who “claim victimization” are not real victims, but rather hypocrites who have engaged (or would engage) in the same offensive activities if they were provided the opportunity.

The Nazis perpetuated this practice by specifically labeling Jews as war mongers. In particular, Hitler and the Nazis spread the idea that international Jewry were the forces responsible for WWI (in their mind, Jews were the literal and symbolic figureheads of a global power-elite who designed and manipulated conflict in order profit from its outcomes, i.e., war
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profiteering and demographic and political realignment). Further, they promoted the fear that if international Jewry wasn’t stamped out the mere existence of the German people (and the global security of the world) was threatened. As Manne writes:

The war against the Jews was the primary mobilizing myth of the Nazi regime. From this moment, until the downfall of his regime, Hitler [expressed a] ferocious redemptive anti-Semitism that lay at the center of his thought – [that] the Jew as the source of Bolshevism, plutocracy, cultural corruption… the Jew as the malicious wire-puller behind Stalin, Churchill, Roosevelt; about the struggle being waged between the Aryan and the Jew for domination of the world…In destroying the Jew, the Germans were fighting on behalf of all mankind. 39

Consider the following quotes which embody this notion:

Chancellor Hitler called the [initial] boycott [against Germany] the work of the internal conspiracy of Jewry…Jews and the stock exchanges started the World War…[He 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. 40

Jews are mostly communists and socialists… and Jewry have achieved positions of influence [in [German society] which it has grossly misused morally, financially and politically in an unheard of manner, with the result that the German people crumbled morally financially and politically. 41

The Nazi Women’s Federation urged every German woman to join the movement for the destruction of Jewry… Personal feelings must be disregarded… the Jewish atrocity propaganda is also responsible for the result of the World War for two million war dead, for starved old men, women and children, for the lie about Germany’s war guilt… Jews want [the] destruction of the German people…The Jew must forever be eliminated from our people and our state. German women you are fighting a holy war. 42

Contemplate further these quotes from high-ranking Nazi leaders, which did urge and justify citizenry attacks against Jews:

40 The Eugene Guard. “German Jews Again Feel “Nazi” Grudge.” March 31 (1933), 1.
41 Middletown Times Herald. “Nazis Propose Ousting Jews Holding Power.” March 27 (1933), 1
Close advisor of Hitler, Dr. Otto Wagener stated: [Our] anti-Semitism is necessary because... Jews weaken German blood [believed to mean, they don’t assimilate and retain an independent ethno-religious cultural identity] ... The Nazis expect the native German[s] ... to cooperate in ridding the country of ... Jews who immigrated from Poland and who merely came here to live parasitic lives.  

Goebbels read a government pronouncement last night (March 31 1933) at a packed meeting of Nazis. He accused Jews of robbing German workers by inciting the anti-German boycott [and stated] when American and English Jews attack the German government we cannot hinder German people from attacking Jews.  

One will notice that as we progress thought these “techniques,” they transform from a language of outright denial of injury, to the admittance of injury (with the caveat that is was necessary or even justified). As presented in the quotes above, the Nazis move from lying about violence being organized against Jews to noting it and claiming it “virtuous” —meaning, they defined it as self-defensive, retaliatory (not initiative), legitimate, and necessary.  

**Propaganda Themes Five: Appealing to Higher Loyalties**

By portraying the Jews as a serious threat to the German people, the Nazis made it possible for the perpetrators who helped bring about the Final Solution to assert they were doing so for their people and their country.  

Indeed, such powerful appeals are those of politics, nationalism, and of course, religion. As noted in the previous section, Germans were told that fighting the Jews was a “holy war” —and Nazi officials often stated they were fighting to save faith and belief in (a German-Christian) God. For example:  

Anti-semitism is not based strictly religious grounds... However, all German Christians resent and denounce the fact that the Jews have been the chief advocates of atheism. They have influenced the worker’s children through communist organizations... to abstain from divine service in Christian schools. Briefly the Jews methodically have destroyed [all that is considered] holy to the Germans.  

---
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As Perry and Frederick note, German-Christians historically associated Jews with atheism and “deicide” – or the crime of “murdering” God. In particular, these social and religious interpretive practices held by German-Christians defined Jews as “Christ-killers” and as the embodiment of “an evil and criminal people.” And Hitler and the Nazis made abuse use of these cultural notions. In 1922, Hitler made the following public statement at a rally for National Socialism, “[W]e have to confront those who want to rob use of our Christianity… we may be small, but a man once stood up in Galilee and today his teachings dominate the whole world. I cannot imagine Christ but blond and blue-eyed [and] the devil I can only imagine with the Jewish grimace.”

Summary and Conclusion

In this paper, I worked to identify the various ideologies and frameworks of anti-Semitic propaganda that the Nazis were made public and culturally institutionalized via the boycott of April 1 1933. In an effort to highlight these ideologies, I applied the Techniques of Neutralization to analyze Nazi propaganda statements uttered on that day.

In summary, these techniques are specific social-psychological strategies used to minimize or suppress cognitive resistance to criminal behavior (this is, actions that would- in most situations-be labeled immoral). The techniques repackage values in order to “resolve disjunctions between beliefs and actions [and] which help to explain the widespread participation of ‘ordinary’ civilized people in atrocities and their selective, situational application of compassion and mercy.” With the aid of neutralizing techniques, people can define situations in such a way as to cause the suspension of conventional values that they believe in and that would normally prevent them from engaging in actions that are injurious to others. I found specifically that the Nazis: (1) Denied Responsibility and affixed blame for atrocities against Jews to an amorphous criminal element or over-excited community members, rather than on government agents and citizens inspired by Nazi ideologies, (2) Denied Injury to Jews as they noted that Jews were “beneath them” and not worthy of assault—which in term also denied them their humanity (thus, in reality, making Jews more vulnerable to assault). Further, when injury or attack was admitted, the Nazis, (3) Denied Victimhood as the serious of injuries to Jews were to be considered negated by the fact that they “deserved it.” Here, propaganda abounded with ideological statements and conspiracy theories blaming Jews for all of the contemporary ills befalling German society—thus to attack them was legitimate and righteous. Which leads to, (4) Condemning the Condemners, or the belief that those who “claim victimization” are not real victims, but rather hypocrites who have engaged (or would engage) in the same offensive activities if they were provided the opportunity (meaning, propaganda promoted the belief that Jews were actively working to supplant and eliminate Aryan-German identities and value systems). Finally, (5) Appealing to Higher Loyalties propagated the idea of antisemitism as a

47 Marvin Perry and Frederick Schweitzer, Antisemitism, myth and hate from antiquity to the present, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).
48 Ibid., 18.
divine mission and a holy war—the god and nature itself wanted Nazism to prevail over (the imagined constructions of evil) Jewry.

The ultimate importance of the propagandized language used during the April 1 1933 boycott is that it helped formulize “a cultural script”50 and establish the cognitive-processes that encouraged Nazi soldiers and ordinary German citizens to legitimize, and participate in, (or at least overlook) the actions leading to the Final Solution. Now, this is not to say that the mental imagery propagated that day immediately transformed a citizenry into genocidaires—but as the proceedings of the event were published over and over again, the Nazi “justifications” and vocabularies of motive became reified and allowed these destructive ideologies to take root in (and eventually enculturate and produce) people who would go on to commit terrible acts of destruction.
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