

Chapter 1 : The Holocaust in American Life (Review)

The Holocaust in American Life and millions of other books are available for Amazon Kindle. Learn more Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App.

This document is part of a periodical Inconvenient History. Use this menu to find more documents that are part of this periodical. Clearly, based on a reading of the book, Novick had grave concerns about the subject. In a word, if I may provide one, Novick disapproved of the uses and interpretations the subject was receiving in America. Both scholars, as it happens, lived in Chicago, and I have no doubt that they met, and perhaps exchanged an idea or two, most-likely after the publication of the book here reviewed. Our author would have none of it. So much for the publishing context. From the perspective of , much more can be gained from a contemplation of what Peter Novick, who died in after publishing no further books, had to say on his subject these fourteen years ago. Novick, like Finkelstein, leaves the meme of the Six Million altogether sacrosanct. Both of these sentries may have the same ultimate goal in view: He was by a respected historian, author, among other things of a book titled That Noble Dream: From the present time, Novick might be tested as to whether he was prescient. But he undertook no prescience, as such. But perhaps the greatest value of his work comes from: His treatment of Holocaust revisionists is brief, and telling. Having erected the straw man, he then correctly stated that the numbers of people fitting the description, as well as their collective influence, is pitifully small. He eschewed actual invective against the cadre he so roundly dismissed, but he even more-assiduously avoided admitting any possibility that the revisionists to revert to the name of a real, and much larger, if embattled, group had either sound motives, valid approaches, or accurate information on anything whatsoever. But his analysis of the phenomenon is conducted in the course of disparaging the counter-denial movement mounted so volubly and profitably by, among others, Deborah Lipstadt. The whole discussion is sure to arouse mixed feelings among revisionists. It is firm, unequivocal, and full-throated. Such a performance would not be notable in itselfâ€”in as in â€”but the attentive reader will be struck, if not outraged, to find the author spiritedly engaging in his own Holocaust revisionism as concerns a group of victims who are not, at least per se, Jewish. Claims by gay activists and their supporters for the number of homosexuals killed by the Third Reich reach as high as one million, and assertions that it was a quarter of a million or half a million are common. The actual number of gays who died or were killed in the camps appears to be around five thousand, conceivably as high as ten thousand. But from Eminent Historian Peter Novick, not the faintest peep as to these. Perhaps our author was a homophobe, but if he was, he demonstrated it by revealing truths such as he would not reveal concerning a larger, more influential group that he more-likely identified with. The double standard is blindingly apparent here. His omission of the ambiguous reception Holocaust victims received in Israel is, again, mercifully excludable because the subjectâ€”right there in the titleâ€”concerns the Holocaust in American life. In , much was known concerning the Holocaust by the people who cared most about it, at least as concerns the mythology and hyperbole that constitutes its popular incarnation to this day. Awareness of the falsity of these has dawned but slowly, if at all, among this initial cohort of curators of the story, but it matters little today, as most of them are dead, or of very advanced age. But the popularization, the discussion, the promotion or whatever the opposite of censorship might be of the tale underwent a succession of metamorphoses during the period â€” that Novick went to great lengths to chronicle and analyze. He was there, and unlike many of the rest of us, he was a historian, at least up to the point where he wrote this book. Even though his analysis cut off fourteen years ago, the trends he adduced are starkly familiar in the world of . Much as it silences the growing numbers of us alive today who might otherwise undertake realistic analyses of it. We are, instead, approaching the end itself. And, on the score of the ever-increasing ferocity of its defenders, it will not be a game. Additional information about this document Property.

Chapter 2 : Project MUSE - The Holocaust in American Life (review)

Peter Novick's The Holocaust in American Life is another book in this fast-expanding genre. Novick, a professor of history (University of Chicago), believes that the Holocaust became ubiquitous in American life because certain events, such as the kidnapping and trial of Adolf Eichmann, gradually led to the realization by American Jews of the.

Dear Philip, Advertisement Great question: Is the choice really between any memory and comfortable forgetting? Or can there also be a higher critical standard to which we hold kinds of Holocaust memory accountable? Rather than legislating such memory, what is permitted and what is forbidden, I suggested that we look to see how it has been done, to what ends, and judge it accordingly. This is really to advocate a case-by-case approach, I suppose. But what about everything else? The pope and Willy Brandt both kneel at the foot of the Warsaw Ghetto Monument, while art historians recoil from even looking at it. Here you might rightly argue, again, that aesthetic judgment is one thing, historical judgment another, that there must be some standard for arbitrating between sound and unsound history, between scrupulous and unscrupulous memory. And here I would agree, to some extent, that as critics and historians, we are still arbiters of good and bad history, trivial and profound memory. But only to a point, after which it becomes our jobs not to ask whether or not something is merely great or terrible, but to explore the kinds of historical understanding being created and to what ends such history is being remembered. It was with these thoughts in mind that I enjoyed, somewhat perversely, your other New York Times Magazine article from a few years back on what it was exactly that school groups were "learning" from their visits to the U. If I recall correctly, you found that they basically had confirmed for them what they already knew, or in the case of young students, what their teachers told them it all meant. In some of these young minds, therefore, the Holocaust Museum merely illustrated the terrible wrath of God toward Jewish unbelievers in Christ. With this "lesson" in mind, I have to agree that the whole notion of taking "lessons" from the Holocaust is problematic--even as we continue, for better and worse, to "learn" from such history. And finally on a further "lesson of the Holocaust": In an explicit reference to the mass murder of Jews, a Nazi leader once proclaimed to his officers that "this would remain a glorious but unwritten page of German history. It was to destroy both a people and memory of itself as an event, leaving behind as few traces as possible. In so doing, the Germans hoped to build deniability into the very crime they were perpetrating. Not only did his army and police units work furiously in the last days of the bombing to hide and destroy evidence of their crimes against ethnic Albanian Kosovars, but his propaganda machine sought no less assiduously to deny the crimes altogether. The denial of genocide and the refusal of its memory are two fundamental characteristics of genocide, it seems. You ask whether we should just say "Whatever" to the fact that millions of Americans a year now visit the U. When the German government asked me to serve on a five-member Findungskommission for its proposed national "Memorial for the Murdered Jews of Europe," it was largely because I had explained in several lectures there and op-ed pieces that I was reassured by its national memorial paralysis. When has any nation ever made its own crimes against humanity part of its national reason for being, part of its national memorial landscape? How can it be that on our national Mall, the actual site of slave auctions for many years, there is no sign of our national shame? That the German Bundestag has actually voted to build a gigantic national memorial to the murdered Jews of Europe in the center of its reunited capital is an amazing and unprecedented turn of events. Holocaust Memorial Museum just off the Mall was also taken at least partly to define what it means to be American by graphically illustrating what it means not to be American, enshrining American ideals as they counterpoint those of the Nazi regime. In fact, I believe a national museum of African-American history is now being planned for a site just off the Mall. And while such a museum is clearly justified, it will ultimately celebrate the contribution of African-Americans to American culture and history, thereby celebrating America as a land of opportunity--even for former slaves. But will there be a memorial to the shame of slavery itself, to the millions of lives lost and nearly unrecorded? Stories From Rwanda [click here to buy the book](#). He is the author of *The Texture of Memory* [click here to buy the book](#). [Click here to read an exchange between Young and Novick in E-mail to the Editors.](#)

Chapter 3 : The Meanings of Monuments

*Mr. Novick talked about his book, *The Holocaust in American Life* published by Houghton Mifflin. The book describes the phenomenon of silence about the Holocaust in the first few decades after World War II.*

Ich stimme dem Autor allerdings keineswegs in allem zu. Und es blieb nicht dabei. Und der Universalismus der Opfer in den 50ern Jahren war das genaue Gegenteil zu dem Einzigartigkeitsanspruch der heutigen Zeit. Und das ist was dieses Buch im Grunde ist. Es wird nicht jedem gefallen aber es ist dennoch wichtig, egal ob der Autor richtig oder falsch liegt. However, I do not agree with the author in everything. I think that the claim of the uniqueness of the Holocaust, or more precisely the Shoah, is still being used many years later to deny or downplay the Holocaust of the Romani peoples. Either claiming what took place would not fulfill the definition of the words "Holocaust" or "genocide" or that it was less serious than the Shoah. What was new to me, at least in detail, was that not only the Jewish communities in the US did not have the Holocaust large in their papers but in Palestine it was no different even though most of them emigrated from Europe after And it did not stop there. The book also addresses the myths of the "guilt complex" of American Jews which was constructed only years later , says that the founding of Israel was for other reasons and that Ben Gurion once said that Zionism is dead because of the Holocaust. It was ironic that the reason why the Jewish organizations did not make much of a fuss in the s was the fact that most communists there were Jews and one did not want to arouse old stereotypes. In fact, efforts to draw attention to the Holocaust were least successful among American Jews, and there was little public discussion on the subject. According to this book, the Holocaust did not gain its position until the s, when a depressive mood spread in the US. At that time, many of the American Jews were also against Eichmann being trialed in Israel because impartiality was not guaranteed, something that would be extremely controversial today. What is also controversial is the statement in the book that the waning support of Israel from the West has nothing to do with the decline of Holocaust consciousness, but with the fact that after the Six-Day War and because of the policies in Gaza Israel was considered as a European colonial power. Which would also explain the dwindling support in previously friendly African countries. At the time, Jewish organizations in the US suddenly saw an increase in anti-Semitism even though the data for example, Jewish politicians elected in regions with a poor Jewish population showed something different, something that still seems relevant today. The author also argues that the "Righteous Among the Nations" award was institutionally used to discredit the "non-righteous" among the Gentiles, even though many individuals had the opposite in mind when they made the request, not to condemn all non-Jews. It was already clear to me that this title has an exclusive and exclusive side, since Romani are not considered worth mentioning, but I had not heard of this institutionalization yet. And reading about how Jewish organizations reacted to the genocide of the Armenians made me ask two things: He mentions Black Americans and Armenians but never "Gypsies. Then I came to an assertion by the author that was quite upsetting: He claimed the TV series "Shoah" had broken the silence in Germany, as if things like the Auschwitz trials had not existed. And considering how much even today, 16 years after this book was written in the US, is still talked about the Holocaust, I doubt that the predictions of the author in the near future will apply. The end of the book was then very abrupt, and what he had written about the Holocaust and Jim Crow would probably also push many away. A ruthless confrontation with dealing with the Holocaust in the US since the s. It will not please everyone but it is still important, no matter if the author is right or wrong.

By PETER NOVICK Houghton Mifflin Company. Read the Review "We Knew in a General Way" We begin at the beginning, with the response of American gentiles and Jews to the Holocaust while the killing was going on.

It is now apparent that Mr. However, by the s and s the Holocaust had become a shocking, massive, and distinctive thing clearly marked off, qualitatively and quantitatively, from other Nazi atrocities and from previous Jewish persecutions, singular in its scope, its symbolism, and its historical significance. This way of looking at it is nowadays regarded as both proper and natural, the "normal human response. The murderous actions of the Nazi regime, which killed between five and six million European Jews, were all too real. But "the Holocaust," as we speak of it today, was largely a retrospective construction, something that would not have been recognizable to most people at the time. To speak of "the Holocaust" as a distinct entity, which Americans failed to respond to, is to introduce an anachronism that stands in the way of understanding contemporary responses. The sheer number of victims of the Holocaust continues to dumbfound. There were about six million. But the Holocaust took place in the midst of a global war that eventually killed between fifty and sixty million people. There are those for whom any such contextualization is a trivializing of the Holocaust, a tacit denial of the special circumstances surrounding the destruction of European Jewry. Certainly such focus can be used for these purposes, as when the French rightist Jean-Marie Le Pen dismisses the Holocaust as a mere "detail" of the history of the Second World War. But it was the overall course of the war that dominated the minds of Americans in the early forties. Unless we keep that in mind, we will never understand how the Holocaust came to be swallowed up in the larger carnage surrounding it. What is perhaps of some importance is that insofar as the word holocaust was employed during the war, as it occasionally was, it was almost always applied to the totality of the destruction wrought by the Axis powers, not to the special fate of the Jews. This usage is emblematic of wartime perceptions of what we now single out as the Holocaust. There are many different dimensions to the wartime marginality of the Holocaust in the American mind: In principle these questions are separable; in practice they were inextricably entwined. Prewar Nazi actions against Jews, from early discriminatory measures to the enactment of the Nuremberg Laws in and culminating in Kristallnacht in , were widely reported in the American press and repeatedly denounced at all levels of American society. No one doubted that Jews were high on the list of actual and potential victims of Nazism, but it was a long list, and Jews, by some measures, were not at the top. Despite Nazi attempts to keep secret what went on in concentration camps in the thirties, their horrors were known in the West, and were the main symbol of Nazi brutality. But until late there were few Jews, as Jews, among those imprisoned, tortured, and murdered in the camps. The victims were overwhelmingly Communists, socialists, trade unionists, and other political opponents of the Hitler regime. And it was to be another four years before the special fate that Hitler had reserved for the Jews of Europe became known in the West. From early to late Jews were being systematically singled out and victimized by the Nazi regime. By the time the news of the mass murder of Jews emerged in the middle of the war, those who had been following the news of Nazi crimes for ten years readily and naturally assimilated it to the already-existing framework. Clearly, it was following Kristallnacht that large numbers of Jews were rounded up placed in concentration camps and their property confiscated by Hitler. Up to that point, German Jewish deaths were a tiny fraction of those inflicted on Jews by murderous bands of Ukrainian anti-Soviet forces twenty years earlier. Though American Jews responded with deeper dismay and horror to prewar Nazi anti-Semitism than did gentile Americans, their reaction was not unmixed with a weary fatalism. In the West, the onset of the war resulted in less rather than more attention being paid to the fate of the Jews. Kristallnacht, in which dozens of Jews were killed, had been on the front page of the New York Times for more than a week; as the wartime Jewish death toll passed through thousands and into millions, it was never again featured so prominently. The deportation of German and Austrian Jews to Polish ghettos had brought enormous suffering no one doubted. Beyond this, little was known with any certainty, and the fragmentary reports reaching the West were often contradictory. Thus in December a press agency first estimated that a quarter of a million Jews had been killed; two weeks later the agency reported

that losses were about one tenth that number. Similar wildly differing estimates recurred throughout the war, no doubt leading many to suspend judgment on the facts and suspect exaggeration. In March The Nation wrote of seven thousand Jews being massacred each week, while The New Republic used the same figure as a conservative daily estimate. In the course of , , and reports of atrocities against Jews began to accumulate. But these, like the numbers cited, were often contradictory. In the nature of the situation, there were no firsthand reports from Western journalists. Rather, they came from a handful of Jews who had escaped, from underground sources, from anonymous German informants, and, perhaps most unreliable of all, from the Soviet government. If, as many suspected, the Soviets were lying about the Katyn Forest massacre, why not preserve a healthy skepticism when they spoke of Nazi atrocities against Soviet Jews? Thus, after the Soviet recapture of Kiev, the New York Times correspondent traveling with the Red Army underlined that while Soviet officials claimed that tens of thousands of Jews had been killed at Babi Yar, "no witnesses to the shooting But Riegner forwarded the report "with due reserve" concerning its truth. State Department memorandum concluded that the reports were "essentially correct. Who, after all, would want to think that such things were true? Who would not welcome an opportunity to believe that while terrible things were happening, their scale was being exaggerated; that much of what was being said was war propaganda that the prudent reader should discount? One British diplomat, skeptical of the Soviet story about Babi Yar, observed that "we ourselves put out rumours of atrocities and horrors for various purposes, and I have no doubt this game is widely played. Office of War Information and the British Ministry of Information ultimately concluded that though the facts of the Holocaust appeared to be confirmed, they were so likely to be thought exaggerated that the agencies would lose credibility by disseminating them. News is event oriented - bombing raids, invasions, and naval battles are the stuff of news, not delayed, often hearsay accounts of the wheels of the murder machine grinding relentlessly on. This is not a decadent aestheticism but is in the very nature of "the interesting": We are interested in the televangelist caught with the bimbo, the gangster who is devout in his religious observance: To a generation that was not witness to the apparently limitless depravity of the Nazi regime, the Holocaust may tell us something about what mankind is capable of. But Americans in the early forties took it for granted that Nazism was the embodiment of absolute evil, even if the sheer scale of its crimes was not appreciated. The repetition of examples was not, as a result, "interesting. Throughout the war few Americans were aware of the scale of the European Jewish catastrophe. By late three quarters of the American population believed that the Germans had "murdered many people in concentration camps," but of those willing to estimate how many had been killed, most thought it was , or fewer. By May , at the end of the war in Europe, most people guessed that about a million including, it should be noted, both Jews and non-Jews had been killed in the camps. That the man in the street was ill informed about the Holocaust, as about so much else, is hardly shocking. But lack of awareness was common among the highly placed and generally knowledgeable as well: Shirer, the best-selling author of Berlin Diary, who during the war was a European correspondent for CBS, reported that it was only at the end of that he learned "for sure" about the Holocaust; the news burst upon him "like a thunderbolt. There is surely a good deal to this, but perhaps at least as often, the gradually emerging and gradually worsening news from Europe produced a kind of immunity to shock. A final point on disbelief. Accounts of the persecution of Jews between the fall of and the summer of often spoke of "extermination" and "annihilation. By the following years, when such words were all too accurate, they had been somewhat debased by premature invocation. For most Americans, the Pacific conflict was a matter of much greater concern than the war in Europe. Working fourteen hours a day in the Brooklyn Navy Yard, the future playwright Arthur Miller observed "the near absence among the men I worked with It was not until the last year of the war, after the Normandy invasion, that there was equal attention given to the European theater. For all of these reasons, the murder of European Jewry, insofar as it was understood or acknowledged, was just one among the countless dimensions of a conflict that was consuming the lives of tens of millions around the globe. It was not "the Holocaust"; it was simply the underestimated Jewish fraction of the holocaust then engulfing the world.

LibraryThing Review User Review - FPdC - LibraryThing. This is an outstanding book about the uses (and abuses) of the Holocaust in American life. The author, an American Jew and professor of history at the University of Chicago, traces the way the murder.

Reviewed by Greg Raven Promotion of Holocaust claims has been a boom industry of late, considering the run-away best-seller by Daniel Goldhagen which claimed that all Germans were responsible for mass executions of Jews, the financial extortion of the Swiss banks and German businesses, the legal travails of anyone outside of the U. Even so, there is also a counter-trend, in which a few non-revisionist authors are questioning -- if not the details -- the implications of the Holocaust in contemporary life. Novick, a professor of history University of Chicago, believes that the Holocaust became ubiquitous in American life because certain events, such as the kidnapping and trial of Adolf Eichmann, gradually led to the realization by American Jews of the importance of the Holocaust, and its value as a lesson for mankind. He presents Jewish immigrants to America after the Second World War as wanting to tell of their experiences during the war, but holding off, in an attempt to fit in p. In the course of presenting his case, Novick, like Finkelstein, offers page after page of amazing acknowledgements regarding, among other things, the massive public relations campaign that turned the Jewish experience in Europe during the Second World War into "the Holocaust," and the uses to which it has been put by Jewish leaders and others. But where Finkelstein brings passion to his subject, Novick presents himself throughout as the calm, rational scholar, ever-sensitive to nuance and alternate viewpoints. So does Novick p. Holocaust survivors or their descendants are a small fraction of 1 percent of the American population, and a small fraction of American Jewry as well Americans, including many American Jews, were largely unaware of what we now call the Holocaust while it was going on So, in addition to "why now? Novick disingenuously writes p. Jews have taken the initiative in focusing attention on the Holocaust in this country. This has happened, Novick explains p. How did this European event come to loom so large in American consciousness? A good part of the answer is the fact Jews in politics played their role p. What were, de jure, government initiatives were often, de facto, those of Jewish aides, simultaneously promoting projects in which they believed and helping their employers score points with Jewish constituents. As Novick makes clear p. According to Novick p. Pyramid Power Novick also deals pp. American Jews were by far the wealthiest, best-educated, most influential, in-every-way-most-successful group in American society -- a group that, compared to most other identifiable minority groups, suffered no measurable discrimination and no disadvantages on account of that minority status. But insofar as Jewish identity could be anchored in the agony of European Jewry, certification as vicarious victims could be claimed, with all the moral privilege accompanying such certification. Novick acknowledges that Jews are atop the victimization pyramid, and notes p. Their inclusion, moreover, could be seen as a contribution to the cause of combating homophobia. And many of their spokesmen, who press for inclusion, are Jewish. By being "more equal" than others, one gains "moral capital. Holocaust deniers, according to David Singer of the American Jewish Committee [in], seek to "rob the Jewish people and the state of Israel of the moral capital. The answer, which Novick acknowledges without examining it too closely, lies in the dominant power of American Jewry. Jews and Communism In the U. Jews, she found, often made up 75 percent or more of the totals. By the late forties, a time when Novick points out that Jewish leaders were promoting the "sameness" of European Jews and Americans, communists were invoking Holocaust claims to drive a wedge between the U. The Holocaust was also a pretext used by Julius Rosenberg to justify his espionage for the Soviet Union p. Communist Party policy", is the most intriguing section of the book. The story that the corpses of Jews were turned into soap is " About Babi Yar, he writes p. Thus, after the Soviet recapture of Kiev, the New York Times correspondent traveling with the Red Army underlined that while Soviet officials claimed that tens of thousands of Jews had been killed at Babi Yar, "no witnesses to the shooting One of his approaches If the alleged extermination did not happen as we have been told, then there is no paradox, and the statement seems self-explanatory. Novick points out p. The assertion that the Holocaust is unique -- like the claim that it is singularly incomprehensible

or unrepresentable -- is, in practice, deeply offensive. Novick seems unconcerned p. The Survivors Virtually all the Holocaust presentations being pushed on Americans are built on the testimony and statements of Jewish "survivors. This "precious legacy" is now reaping untold benefits pp. Novick has noticed this, too p. In fact, those memories are not a very useful historical source. Part of the reason memories are faulty has to do with the passage of time, intensity of emotion, and many other factors. Novick goes even farther pp. Samuel Lubell wrote in the Saturday Evening Post: Six years of systematic extermination It was a survival not of the fittest, not of the most high-minded or reasonable and certainly not of the meekest, but of the toughest. The peaks of monetary contributions to Israel were in and when the Jews of Israel were thought to be on the eve of another Holocaust. Jewish fund-raisers in America were quick to note this, and soon p. He even goes one step farther, though, to show p. The millionaire who provided most of the original funding for the Simon Wiesenthal Center told a reporter that it was "a sad fact that Israel and Jewish education and all the other familiar buzzwords no longer seem to rally Jews behind the community. The Holocaust, though, works every time. The Holocaust framework allowed one to put aside as irrelevant any legitimate grounds for criticizing Israel, to avoid even considering the possibility that the rights and wrongs were complex. He also recognizes that powerful Jewish interests in America will do anything to get their way p. So here we have Novick, who believes that the image of Israel as "embattled" lead to the rise of Holocaust awareness, has acknowledged that the Holocaust is used as a weapon to deflect criticism as well as gain advantages otherwise unavailable , and knows that pro-Israel lobbying groups are very effective in persuading members of Congress and others? Lessons of the Holocaust Novick implies p. After a couple of false starts at coming up with his "lesson of the Holocaust," Novick weakly offers pp. There was a disposition, before the Holocaust, to think of the most barbarous deeds as being the work of the most barbarous folk -- the least cultured, the least advanced. Perhaps there are other lessons, but nothing that will fit on a bumper sticker, and nothing to inspire. Nowhere does Novick, who lists some "good" reasons for remembering the Holocaust pp. Novick mischaracterizes revisionists as "deniers" who are a "tiny band of malicious or deluded fruitcakes" p. Because many of his points are couched so obscurely that trying to determine what Novick actually thinks often exasperates, what stands out most are individual statements. With regards to Holocaust claims, this is exactly what Novick has failed to do, aside from granting that it is and should be compared to other historical events. His lip service to historiography ends quickly, however, as he then writes p. It is not -- least of all when it comes to the Holocaust -- a matter of approaching the past in a neutral or value-free fashion, or of abstaining from moral judgment. Will one approach be deemed better than another because it is more subjective? We can only wonder what Novick had in mind in juxtaposing these two statements. Even though he claims to be searching for reasons why the Holocaust came to inhabit such a vaunted position in American life, he completely fails to notice that Jews were essentially silent about Holocaust claims when they were relatively powerless in American society, and increasingly vocal about these claims as their power grew. Novick is blind to this phenomenon, which has given rise to the characterization of Jews as being "at your feet or at your throat. Novick nowhere even hints that some of the problems between Jews and non-Jews might be due to actions of the Jews themselves. For Novick, there is no need for Jews to change any of their behaviors, and in fact, Jews must remain separate p. Novick seemingly accepts this, and offers p. Whether the goal was fund-raising, political power, Jewish unification, or all-purpose warrant and extenuation, "the Holocaust" was seen as merely the means to the end. To be fair, this is little different from American Jews raising money for Israel, even though they themselves have no intention of going there. This book is not important because it reveals new details about Holocaust claims, or because it cites heretofore unknown documents, or because it breaks new ground in interpreting contemporaneous evidence. Revisionists have long since gone more than halfway in bridging the gap between what we know about the Holocaust and what we have been told.

Chapter 6 : The Holocaust in American Life: Peter Novick: racedaydvl.com: Books

The Holocaust in American Life - Kindle edition by Peter Novick. Download it once and read it on your Kindle device, PC, phones or tablets. Use features like bookmarks, note taking and highlighting while reading The Holocaust in

American Life.

Chapter 7 : Holocaust in American Life - Issues Section

The Holocaust, Nazi Germany's destruction of the European Jews, took place far away from the United States where the Jewish population "about 3 percent" is a relatively small part of the total.

Chapter 8 : The Holocaust in American Life - Wikipedia

Holocaust in American Life has ratings and 19 reviews. Andre said: 1) Deutsche Rezension2) English Review 1) Deutsche Rezension "Für viele ist di.

Chapter 9 : The Holocaust in American Life - Peter Novick - Google Books

The Holocaust in American Life is a book by historian Peter Novick. The subject is not the Holocaust, but rather how it has been acknowledged, defined, and spread as an event which requires public remembrance.