Narrating a Relationship: Holocaust Education in the United States and Early U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel

Abigail Massell
Macalester College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/intlstudies_honors

Part of the International and Area Studies Commons

Recommended Citation
https://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/intlstudies_honors/32
Macalester College

Narrating a Relationship:
Holocaust Education in the United States and Early U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel

Abigail Massell
International Studies Honors Thesis
Advisor – Zeynep Gürsel
April 25, 2018
# Table of Contents

Acknowledgments..................................................................................................................2  
Abstract.......................................................................................................................................3  
Introduction: Holocaust Consciousness in the U.S. and U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel ...........5  
Chapter 1: Illinois Textbook Treatment of the Holocaust.....................................................15  
Chapter 2: News Coverage of 1966 and 1974 U.S. Aid to Israel.................................34  
Chapter 3: Conclusion: A Double Helix of Foreign Aid and Curriculum Development..57  
Bibliography.................................................................................................................................61
Acknowledgments

I owe thanks to many individuals, without whom completion of this project would not have been possible or nearly as enjoyable. First and foremost I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Zeynep Gürsel, for the countless hours of thoughtful care, questions, and critique she put into this project. I thank my committee members, Professors David Blaney and Joe Farag, for lending their expertise and time, making the defense portion of this project a rich and inspiring experience. I am also deeply grateful to both my parents and sisters for their enduring support, writing edits, and genuine interest at every stage of this project. Finally, I thank my dearest friends and housemates, Lucy Shenk, Maude Quinn, and Maddi Cook, for their unending love, listening skills, advice, and cheerleading this year. Your support and patience throughout this entire process has been invaluable.
Abstract

This thesis considers the origins of Holocaust consciousness in the United States and U.S. aid to Israel. Both phenomena’s trajectories are rooted in the publication of English translations of *The Diary of Anne Frank* and *Night*, Adolf Eichmann’s 1961 trial in Jerusalem, and the growth of U.S. strategic interests in Israel after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. This thesis conceptualizes the correlations between growing Holocaust consciousness in the U.S. as reflected in high school history curriculum and evolving U.S. policy towards Israel in the form of foreign aid. Specifically, I analyze the treatment of the Holocaust in world history textbooks published between 1961 and 1995 and used in Illinois secondary public schools, as well as the coverage of the 1966 and 1974 spikes in U.S. military aid to Israel in *The New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal* and *Chicago Tribune*. This thesis regards both textbooks and newspapers as indicators of public opinion and as vehicles for information subject to framing. The relationship between policy maker or textbook editor and the public acts as a positive feedback loop, with both parties influencing and being influenced by how the Holocaust or U.S. aid to Israel are framed. In this way, Holocaust education and U.S. aid to Israel have developed as metaphoric strands of a double helix, growing parallel to one other, connected and propelled forward by particular shared events, and at times, intertwined as textbooks used the Holocaust to frame why the state of Israel was established and was deserving of U.S. fiscal support.
Figure 1. U.S. Aid to Israel, 1951-2017. Created by Abigail Massell. March 2018
Introduction

Holocaust Consciousness and Foreign Aid to Israel

In 1976, Israel became the recipient of the most annual U.S. foreign assistance and has retained that position every year since.¹ The United States currently gives Israel around $3 billion in military aid per year, set to be increased to $3.8 billion a year in 2019.² Though this number has been steadily increasing since it reached $1.5 billion annually in the 1980s, U.S. aid to Israel has not always been anywhere near as high (see Figure 1). The newly established Jewish state received little economic and no military support from the United States until the early 1960s. By the early 1970s, military assistance had settled in at around $300 million, though a dramatic spike of $2.5 billion given in grant form occurred after the October 1973 Arab-Israeli war. The end of the 1970s saw a rise in military aid to $1 billion with the notable increase of $4 billion lent upon the signing of the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty in 1979. The 1980s saw all military aid converted to grant form, which hovered at around $1.5 billion through the decade. In this same decade Memoranda of Understanding began to dictate long-term aid. All aid to Israel through today follows this model – aid is determined for the coming decade, not merely for the next fiscal year. The 1960s and 1970s remain seminal decades in the evolution of U.S. fiscal policy towards Israel and are therefore where this thesis turns to investigate the origins of U.S. aid to Israel.

The same two decades saw a significant increase in Holocaust consciousness in the U.S., lending to the Holocaust’s inclusion in education to a greater extent in the 1970s and 1980s. The Holocaust remained elusive in the United States well through the 1940s and 1950s, even as

² A complete table of economic and military aid to Israel may be found in the Congressional Research Service report of U.S. aid to Israel: Jeremy Sharp. “U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel” (Congressional Research Service, 2016).
images of concentration camps and ghettos exposed the public to their horrors. Reasons for this are debated, but they congregate around the fact that the United States was motivated to enter World War II by Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbor, not the rampant anti-Semitism and mass murder occurring in Europe. The United States also grappled with widespread anti-Semitism, xenophobia, isolationism, and a sustained economic depression well past the end of World War II. Such issues impacted U.S. refugee policy, reinforcing an official and popular unwillingness to expand immigration quotas to admit greater numbers of people endangered by Nazi persecution, as well as stymied Holocaust awareness in the United States.

While many scholars of the Holocaust in a U.S. context explain the lack of Holocaust awareness in the U.S. in the 1940s and 1950s with survivors’ unwillingness or inability to speak about their traumatic experiences with a larger American audience, a notable few begin their inquiries by discrediting this claim. Jewish trauma from the Holocaust, Norman Finkelstein, Peter Novick, and Alan Mintz all agree, did not alone prevent Americans from learning about it. They suggest alternatively that the U.S. public refused to absorb accounts conveyed through many news outlets. The conformist politics of American Jewish leadership at the time also contributed to this silence. Finkelstein argues that Jewish elites, or those prominent in the organizational and cultural life of the mainstream Jewish community, stood parallel to official U.S. policy with traditional goals of assimilation and access to power in mind. Further, the political climate of postwar America’s alliance with West Germany quelled a national conversation about the Holocaust. Both Holocaust remembrance and support of the new state of

---

6 Finkelstein, 14.
Israel remained issues paid little mind by political leaders.

This thesis pivots on discussion of both Holocaust education in the U.S. and U.S. foreign aid to Israel. The emergence of U.S. aid to Israel and Holocaust representations in history curricula were both determined by overlapping historical developments, hailing from both political and popular cultural spheres. From politics came Adolf Eichmann’s 1961 trial in Jerusalem and growing U.S. strategic interests in Israel after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war; from popular culture arrived the English translations of *The Diary of Anne Frank* and Elie Weisel’s *Night*. In what capacity did warming U.S. relations with Israel determine an attempt to increase U.S. understanding of the Holocaust? In the same vein, how might have a growing understanding of the Holocaust signified evolving public opinion of U.S. aid to Israel?

Beyond a scholarly understanding that the overlapping histories of both phenomena can explain their trajectories through modern day, this thesis explores how changes, be they a leap in foreign aid, or more nuanced descriptions of anti-Semitism in a textbook, were perceived by or conveyed to the U.S. public. This thesis considers both textbooks and newspapers as indicators of public opinion and public perception as policies both foreign and domestic were created and played out. Within this consideration of public opinion formation, the actors behind the texts that impose particular frames are crucial to consider. Throughout this investigation, the thesis considers the relationship between policy maker or textbook editor and the public as a positive feedback loop, both parties influencing and being influenced by how information and stories were framed. In this way, Holocaust education and U.S. aid to Israel have developed as metaphoric strands of a double helix, growing parallel to one other, connected and propelled

---

forward by particular shared events, and at times, intertwined as textbooks used the Holocaust to frame why the state of Israel was established and was deserving of U.S. fiscal support.

A definite shift in U.S. public ignorance or avoidance of the Holocaust occurred when Adolf Eichmann, former Nazi transport minister, was tried for crimes against the Jewish people and crimes against humanity in Jerusalem in 1961. Suddenly, Holocaust survivor testimony was broadcasted for the entire world to hear. Notably, until this time, the Nazi genocide of Jews in Europe in the 1940s as an event was not known commonly as the ‘Holocaust.’ Media studies and political theorist, Sharon Sliwinski, posits that one of the catalysts for the word’s popularization was indeed the Eichmann trial where international journalists picked up ‘Holocaust’ as how Israelis translated *shoah* from Hebrew.\(^8\) Notably, Sliwinski dates the nomenclature to the establishment of Israel in 1948, as the official English translation of *shoah* in the Israeli Declaration of Independence is “holocaust.”\(^9\) Certainly, the act of naming and the universal usage of “Holocaust” aided the event’s permeation into public discourse in the United States.

Six years later, the June 1967 Arab-Israeli war marked another watershed moment for Holocaust consciousness in the United States, more particularly this time against the backdrop of U.S.-Israel relations. Many scholars regard this shift as a result of American Jewish fear of a “second Holocaust” if the U.S. did not step in to back Israel. American Jews, Alan Mintz claims, had somewhat of a guilty conscience for not involving themselves early enough to prevent or quell the European Holocaust of the 1940s.\(^10\) Finkelstein makes the case that in fact the power dynamics of the 1967 war were misrepresented in U.S. mainstream political discourse, and there was no chance of a “second Holocaust.” This frame that invoked the Holocaust, however, contextualizes how the U.S. public was consuming news of the war in Israel at the time.

---

\(^8\) Sliwinski, 85.
\(^9\) Ibid.
\(^10\) Mintz, 15.
Israel’s display of military strength in the war made the U.S. see it for the first time as a potential strategic ally. Increased U.S. economic and military assistance ensued and from that year, and Israel became a proxy for U.S. power in the Middle East. Notably, the war occurred a year after the U.S. had made its first significant sale of arms to Israel in 1966. Foreign aid from this point on was no longer charity to a brand new nation. Furthermore, the war marked a shift in U.S. motivation for its fiscal support of Israel, and consequently, a shift in the news frame used; whereas before 1967 the sale of arms to Israel was for the sake of U.S. interest in quelling an arms race with the Soviet Union in the Middle East, after the war, the U.S. viewed Israel as a strategic asset in the region worthy of expansive military aid packages.

The war also marked a shift in the U.S. public’s understanding of Israel, in particular, American Jews. In Finkelstein’s account, while before the war Israel represented a dual loyalty for American Jews, in that any expression of pro-Israel sentiment did not necessarily place them in line with U.S. politics, after the 1967 war, Jewish support of Israel was a “super-loyalty” that paralleled U.S. interests. Mintz claims that before Israel entered the Holocaust narrative in the U.S., American Jews were reluctant to identify with the European Jew that, in their minds, represented vulnerability and victimhood. For American Jews, identification with the newly constructed concept of the Israeli Jew as the pioneer from a state that “rose from the ashes of the Holocaust” was indeed “ennobling and energizing.” Peter Novick affirms that there were indeed few explicit references to the Holocaust in American Jewish mobilization on behalf of Israel before the 1967 war.

Mintz meanwhile, examines the pivotal role of works of popular culture in establishment of the Holocaust as an object of remembrance in the United States. Mintz identifies *The Diary of*

---

11 Finkelstein, 17.
13 Mintz, 8.
Anne Frank in its film and stage versions and the 1978 television miniseries Holocaust as key markers of change in American understanding of the Holocaust. He also notes that the Israeli struggle for independence was understood against the background of the Holocaust as portrayed in Leon Uris’ 1958 novel, Exodus and its popular 1960 film version. The 1952 English translation of Anne Frank’s *The Diary of a Young Girl*’s power lay in its ability to render American readers with no connection or knowledge of the Anne’s plight empathetic to the fate of European Jewry. Along with Elie Wiesel’s Night first translated into English in 1960, these works became classics for young readers as a first point of contact with the Holocaust.

Norman Finkelstein’s critical scholarship *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering* challenges readers to think about the Holocaust beyond its properties as a historical event and towards understanding its ideological implications, particularly in the United States. Once ideologically recast, he argues, the Holocaust could be used as a tool to deflect criticism of Israel. This concept lays the foundation for what Finkelstein calls the “Holocaust industry.” Finkelstein’s argument rests in proving that the American Jewish elite remembered the Holocaust only when it was politically expedient, through the assertion that in and of itself, the Holocaust does not serve any particular agenda, but once seen through an “ideological prism,” the Holocaust may be used as a tool by political leadership. Part of this thesis’ work aims to understand a step beyond Finkelstein’s assessment, by exploring how the Holocaust as treated by secondary school history textbooks acts as an ideological prism or frame that consequently shapes U.S. perceptions of U.S. fiscal support of Israel.

This thesis also utilizes Robert Entman’s framing theory to trace public opinion formation. There is a significant relationship between foreign policy, public opinion, and media

---

where all three influence each other in foreign policy creation in democracies.\textsuperscript{15} Public opinion and politicians’ perceptions of public opinion influence foreign policy as elected officials would prefer their decisions appear representative of or be considered popular among their electorate.\textsuperscript{16}

Since the public relies on the media for all knowledge of foreign policy, news media influence nearly every aspect of the relationship between public opinion and foreign policy.\textsuperscript{17} There is an expectation, then, that U.S. public opinion of U.S. foreign assistance to Israel is formed largely from the public’s consumption of news coverage of U.S. aid to Israel and how that news is ‘framed.’ This concept may be extrapolated to textbooks’ treatment of the Holocaust as well. Events that inspire Holocaust awareness and treatment of the Holocaust in history textbooks shape public perception of the Holocaust within the frames used by textbooks. The following figure illustrates the particular currents of interest to this thesis.

![Figure 2. Framing and Public Opinion Formation. Created by Abigail Massell. March 2018.](image-url)

\textsuperscript{15} Matthew A. Baum (2003); Richard C. Eichenberg (2016); Robert Entman (2004); David L. Paletz and Robert Entman (1981).

\textsuperscript{16} Scholars Shibley Telhami and Jon Krosnick narrow in on the “trinity” and examine U.S. public opinion as able to influence policy towards Israel specifically. They conclude that the relationship between U.S. policy to Israel and U.S. public opinion of the policy influences public perception of the state of Israel at large. (Jon Krosnick and Shibley Telhami “Public Attitudes toward Israel: A Study of the Attentive and Issue Publics” International Studies Quarterly. Vol. 39, No. 4 (Dec., 1995), 535-554.)

Methodology

My investigation of high school history textbooks’ treatment of the Holocaust began with time in the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Education Library archives in the summer of 2017. I read 63 textbooks’ sections on the 1930s and 1940s persecution and extermination of European Jews and surrounding topics such as the rise of Hitler, Nazi Germany, World War II, and the creation of the state of Israel. The examined textbooks’ publications spanned the years of 1944 to 2005 and included U.S. and world history textbooks, teacher manuals, and curriculum guides. For the scope of this thesis, I performed a textual analysis of 23 world history textbooks published between 1961 and 1995 used in Illinois public school classrooms and their treatment of the Holocaust.

I similarly assessed newspapers’ coverage of the 1966 and 1974 spikes in U.S. aid to Israel in *The New York Times, Wall Street Journal*, and *Chicago Tribune*. I did this by inputting “U.S. aid to Israel” as well as the date range of the year I was examining (e.g. January 1966-December 1966) to the ProQuest Historical Newspaper database. I then filtered for either *The New York Times, Wall Street Journal* or *Chicago Tribune* and filtered for articles under the category of “articles,” “features,” and “front page/cover story.” The news articles I chose to analyze in this essay are representative of both the information relayed and how it was relayed. I received 65 results for *The New York Times*, 18 results for *Wall Street Journal* (none of these articles discussed U.S. aid to Israel specifically), and 21 results from *Chicago Tribune* in 1966. I read all articles that appeared as results for 1966. Meanwhile in 1974, there were 369 results for *The New York Times*, 101 results for *Wall Street Journal*, and 91 results for *Chicago Tribune*. Because of the much larger sampling in 1974, I skimmed the first 60 articles that came up for
Chapter 1 deals with the emergence of Holocaust education in the United States and a case study of Illinois Holocaust curriculum and history textbooks’ coverage of the Holocaust from the 1960s through the 1990s. As education jurisdiction in the United States is left mostly up to each state, the thesis uses Illinois as a case study. Illinois was the first state to mandate Holocaust curriculum in the United States in 1990, and thus occupies a noteworthy place in the narrative of U.S. Holocaust awareness and education.

Frances FitzGerald’s *America Revised* demonstrates generally the importance of textbooks as a source of analysis. The 1960s represented a monumental shift in textbook writing, editing, and publishing culture in the United States. For the first time, widespread lobbying of textbook content occurred. This came out of a greater social and political shift in the United States that demanded the U.S. be taught and recognized as the “multiracial and multicultural country that it was.”  

Textbooks occupy a crucial place in the U.S. education system and set standards for education on a national as well as state basis. Textbook editors, FitzGerald goes so far to say, are the “arbiters of American values.” While the education system of the U.S. is not centralized, educational standards through state and district-wide textbook adoption has, since the 1960s, been the concern of national organizations, be it the federal government or private interest groups.

Chapter 2 examines the evolving U.S. political and fiscal relationship with Israel from the state’s establishment in 1948 through the 1970s. The thesis consults three prominent newspapers, 

---

19 Ibid., 27.
20 In the 1960s, the U.S. federal government was spending large sums for the development of new teaching materials; Ibid. 35, 43.
The New York Times and Wall Street Journal for national coverage, and Chicago Tribune for the Illinois case study. Newspapers relay information of world affairs and media are often the only point of contact with U.S. foreign policy the U.S. public has. Their coverage of the first and third prominent increases in U.S. foreign aid to Israel in 1966, one year prior to an Arab-Israeli war and 1974, one year after an Arab-Israeli war is one of the key objects of analysis here against the political backdrop of U.S. strategic interests as well as domestic groups’ lobbying. Public perception and opinion, the chapter argues, are indeed shaped by how particular events, peoples, and places are framed by news media.

Reflecting on the primary source analysis of the thesis, Chapter 3 argues that Holocaust curriculum and news coverage of U.S. foreign aid to Israel developed as metaphoric strands of a double helix. The chapter provides the opportunity to return to the larger questions driving this thesis’ investigation; the contemporary political implications and consequences of the Holocaust’s invocation in the U.S.’s relationship with Israel.

---

21 Matthew A. Baum (2003); Richard C. Eichenberg (2016); Robert Entman (2004); David L. Paletz and Robert Entman (1981).
Chapter 1

Illinois Textbook Treatment of the Holocaust

A new effort in Illinois during the 1940s to expand real estate business to Jewish communities traditionally excluded from the suburban housing market resulted in rapid migration of Jews to Skokie from Chicago. Through the 1950s to 1970s, an estimated 7,000 Holocaust survivors relocated to this suburb. By 1975, the town of Skokie was 57 percent Jewish, and had the largest percentage of Holocaust survivors in the country. When the National Socialist Party of America, a neo-Nazi group, threatened to march through Skokie in 1977, Holocaust survivors came out in large numbers to protest their presence. As the Holocaust was just beginning to enter U.S. public’s consciousness, survivors in Skokie were making headline news through court cases that would propel their state into the first significant decades of Holocaust education and remembrance. In 1982, the Holocaust survivor population of Skokie opened a small storefront Holocaust museum. A few years later in 1987, the same group erected a Holocaust memorial, depicting a Jewish freedom fighter guarding his family, between Skokie Village Hall and the Skokie Public Library. After another three years of lobbying, the survivor group succeeded in making Illinois the first state in the U.S. to require Holocaust education in 1990.

The first formal Holocaust education predated the efforts of the citizens of Skokie, but like the Chicago suburb’s movement, it began at the local level. Holocaust education in the United States in its earliest form developed in New York Hebrew schools in the 1960s. At this time, 86 percent of American Jewish children and adolescents were enrolled in Hebrew schools.

---

across the country. Motivated by Hebrew schoolteachers who sought to revive Holocaust memory in the classroom, Jewish community leaders and educators in New York City debated and wrote their own Holocaust curriculum in the early 1970s intended for use in Hebrew schools in the surrounding area.

New York itself was very much the center of American Jewish consciousness in the 1960s and organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith (ADL) and the American Jewish Congress (AJC) headquartered in New York advocated for a variety of Jewish interests, particularly early Holocaust recognition in U.S. schools. The ADL contributed early and widely to preliminary Holocaust education in Hebrew schools, from a 1961 published critique of the treatment of minority groups (including Jews) in U.S. textbooks, to a Holocaust-specific publication in 1972. Scholar of social studies education Thomas Fallace notes that while the ADL and AJC published frequently on the topic, they made no attempt at this time to engage in curriculum design or to disseminate educational materials throughout the U.S. This would, of course, change dramatically in the next thirty to forty years.

Integration of Holocaust curriculum into mainstream public schools was slow going, as educators across the U.S. remained reluctant. Fallace identifies three primary reasons for this:

---

23 Fallace, 16.
24 Ibid, 19.
25 The ADL, established in 1913, is a U.S. organization that seeks to stop defamation of the Jewish people and advocate for justice for all people. The AJC was founded in 1918 as leaders of civil liberties work within Jewish, Zionist, and immigrant communities in the United States. Both, notably, have been staunch supporters of favorable U.S. policy towards Israel.
26 Ibid, 16.
27 In 1974, the ADL published a textbook on the Holocaust with an introduction by historian Yehuda Bauer. The textbook was written with a Jewish student audience in mind and emphasized aspects of Jewish resistance during the Holocaust as well as framing the event as distinctly Jewish. In conjunction with the University of California Shoah Foundation, the institute that has compiled video testimony that expounds on the Holocaust, and Yad Vashem, Israel’s center of Holocaust study in Jerusalem, ADL founded “Echoes and Reflections” in 2005 which is considered a cornerstone of Holocaust curriculum in the United States. (Rachel Ragland and Daniel Rosenstein. “Holocaust Education: Analysis of Curricula and Frameworks: A Case Study of Illinois.” The Social Studies (2014) 105, 175–183 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC, 177.)
students; the Holocaust was, in educators’ and textbook editors’ minds, perhaps too recent a phenomenon to properly judge; and in light of the Cold War, an averseness by textbook editing companies to recall the crimes against humanity committed by West Germany, which had then become a key U.S. ally. Nonetheless, the Holocaust’s emergence as a significant piece of history had begun in American schools due in part, Fallace claims, to Elie Wiesel’s 1972 op-ed in *The New York Times.* The piece, entitled “Exploring the War,” communicated the significance of a new generation of children of Holocaust survivors and increased willingness of survivors to share their stories. Holocaust education at the secondary level could be recognized finally, Weisel claims, due to a growing overall U.S. interest in Jewish history. To note, Norman Finkelstein would reject Weisel’s reasoning and argue instead that the growing interest in developing Holocaust curriculum came as a direct result of U.S. policy makers and political elites calculating U.S. interest in Israel vis-à-vis Cold War strategy.

With all these factors in mind, the mid 1970s saw a deliberate shift in American conceptions of the Holocaust, and the event was consequently welcomed into classrooms and transmitted through history textbooks. The first Holocaust curriculum intended for public school distribution entitled *The Holocaust: A Case Study of Genocide* appeared in New York City in 1973. The curriculum highlighted both the unique nature of the Nazi genocide and the universality of genocide as a phenomenon. Notably, the last unit of the curriculum is titled, “Israel: The Great Homecoming” framing the end to Jewish suffering by way of protection by a Jewish state.

---

28 Fallace, 19.
31 Albert Post, the curriculum’s author, even attempted to frame understanding of the Holocaust by asking whether or not the U.S. was guilty of genocide in North Vietnam.
32 Fallace, 32, 33.
What began as localized movements eventually took on national importance. On November 1, 1978, President Jimmy Carter created the President's Commission on the Holocaust and charged it with the responsibility to submit a report “with respect to the establishment and maintenance of an appropriate memorial to those who perished in the Holocaust.” The commission called for a foundation dedicated to educational work surrounding issues raised by the Holocaust, with the commission as the “clearinghouse for the exchange of information.”\(^3\) It sought to encourage standard history textbooks to deal with the Holocaust as a substantive part of their treatment of World War II. While the commission was established in 1978, it would take another decade for state legislation to mandate the teaching of the Holocaust as an “essentially Jewish” event with universal interpretation, invoking what 1970s writers of curriculum like Albert Post defined early on – a unique event with a capability to be studied through the universal phenomenon of genocide.\(^4\)

**Illinois’ Holocaust Curriculum**

While the very nature of the U.S. public education system allows for individual districts to create and implement their own curricula, state mandates must be interpreted and followed by all districts. Within the United States, mandated Holocaust education at the primary and secondary school levels accelerated through the 1990s. Currently in 2018, sixteen states in the U.S. have passed some type of legislation regarding Holocaust education, either by creating a commission on the Holocaust that surveys curriculum and promotes Holocaust educational programs, or actually requiring that education about the Holocaust be a part of state curriculum. Florida, Illinois, and New Jersey require that all elementary and secondary schools instruct students on the Holocaust specifically and have a state commission or task force to keep all

\(^3\) Holocaust Commission, 13.

\(^4\) Holocaust Commission
genocide education other than Holocaust education comprehensive and up to date. In Illinois and Washington, the state superintendent of education is responsible for developing curriculum materials and guidelines for schools to use during instruction of the Holocaust. Meanwhile, in Connecticut and Massachusetts the same responsibility falls on the state board of education and in Rhode Island and New Jersey, the respective departments of education handle the task of curriculum and guidelines development.

Illinois may be considered a leader in Holocaust education. In 1990, Illinois became the first state to mandate study of Holocaust history in each public elementary and high school. Moreover, the Illinois Holocaust Museum & Education Center’s (ILHMEC) had established Holocaust curriculum well before state legislation was passed. This was due to the density and mobilization of Holocaust survivors in Illinois suburbs in the 1970s and 80s. In short, while the 1961 Eichmann trial and coverage of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war inspired awareness at the national level, at the state level the driver was growing concern over neo-Nazis in Illinois. The lobbying of the Holocaust Memorial Foundation of Illinois, composed mainly of survivors and descendants of survivors living in Chicago suburbs, particularly Skokie, succeeded in passing a mandate for instruction of the Holocaust in Illinois in 1990. The effort of Illinois to understand and incorporate other acts of genocide apart from the Holocaust into education began in the early 2000s. Ultimately, the genocide and Holocaust curriculum in the state include discussion of other genocides, with the Nazi Holocaust preeminent.

A 2007 study conducted by historian Jeffrey Ellison and political scientist John Pisapia assessed Holocaust education in Illinois in 1999, nine years after the curriculum mandate passed.

37 In 1968, a neo-Nazi named Frank Collin founded the National Socialist Party of America in Chicago.
38 Ragland and Rosenstein, 177.
Among other questions, the study examined what about the Holocaust was being taught and how was it being delivered. Two key findings that inform this chapter’s inquiry were that 65 percent of teachers said they relied on the course textbook to convey the lessons and 86 percent of teachers in Illinois were teaching the creation of the state of Israel in conjunction with the Holocaust.³⁹ The former finding suggests that a textual analysis of history textbooks in Illinois is an appropriate method to use in understanding public learning about the Holocaust. The latter finding moreover supports this thesis’ question of public understanding of the Holocaust and U.S.-Israel relations as interconnected by way of curriculum.

**Textbook Analysis**

The 1960s through the 1990s was a critical period for the development of Holocaust coverage in U.S.-published history textbooks. This chapter seeks to understand this coverage in textbooks used in Illinois public schools as a contributing piece in the development of Holocaust consciousness in the United States. The chronological analysis that follows assesses tone of textbook passages devoted to topics surrounding the Holocaust such as anti-Semitism, concentration camps, the Nuremberg Laws, and migration of European Jews to Israel.

Alongside the textual analysis that follows, Figure 2 visualizes the use of some keywords associated with the Holocaust by textbooks through this time period.⁴⁰ A line indicates the presence of the keyword in the textbook, and no line indicates the absence. The keywords include, “Holocaust,” “Nuremburg Trials,” “Mein Kampf,” “anti-Semitism,” “genocide,” “Final

---

⁴⁰ These keywords were determined based on my own examination of the archived textbooks’ treatment of the Holocaust over time as well as a 2013 study that examined representations of the Holocaust in textbooks in the 1940s and 1950s by way of keywords. (Christopher Witschonke, “A ‘Curtain of Ignorance’: An Analysis of Holocaust Portrayal in Textbooks from 1943 through 1959” The Social Studies (2013) 104, Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.)
Solution,” and then the presence of an image related to the Holocaust in the text as well as if the state of Israel is discussed in relation to the Holocaust.
Figure 3. Keyword presence in U.S.-published history textbooks’ descriptions of the Holocaust.
The 1960s textbook coverage of the Holocaust reflects Thomas Fallace’s claim that U.S. public understanding of the Holocaust at this time as relatively indistinct from Germany’s military assault on Europe and even World War II at large.\cite{Fallace1960} In texts of the early to mid 1960s, index terms such as “Hitler”, “Jews”, and “Nazis” yield war-centric renditions of the 1930s and 1940s concerned largely with Hitler’s military and economic endeavors. Still, small portions of text devote time to explaining that Jews suffered under Hitler’s regime and why they were targeted in particular. *The Record of Mankind*, published in 1961 claims,

> The Nazis also taught that the Germans belonged to the Aryan, or “superrace.” They claimed that the “blue-eyed, blond Aryans” had been weakened by contact with the “mongrel” races; in particular, by the Jews and Poles…This “Aryan superrace” idea led to frightful deeds. Jews were persecuted, dismissed from schools and government services, and not permitted to practice the professions. Later, when Hitler controlled all Europe, his Nazi officials cold-bloodedly murdered six million Jews!\cite{Roehm1961}

The same textbook frames anti-Semitism and the ensuing annihilation of Jews by the Nazi regime as Hitler’s personal issue with Jewish people.

> He [Hitler] had some artistic ability and applied for admission to the Vienna Art Academy. But he was turned down. Perhaps the world might have been spared from world war had the directors of the academy accepted young Adolf. But they did not. His pride bitterly hurt, Adolf, like many other people, looked around for someone to blame. He decided that the Jews were responsible for all his troubles.\cite{Roehm1961}

This textbook’s editors did not convey the accurate origins of anti-Semitism in Europe to their readers. Similarly, *32 Problems in World History* from 1964 claims that Hitler’s unabated hatred of Jews was the reason for their persecution: “The Jews, against whom Hitler nursed a pathological hatred, were specially singled out for punishment and systematic extermination.”\cite{Fenton1964}

For textbooks to explain anti-Semitism and the Holocaust through this lens demonstrates an

\begin{itemize}
  \item \cite{Fallace1960} Fallace, 25.
  \item \cite{Roehm1961} Ibid, 621.
\end{itemize}
oversimplified understanding of these phenomena and suggests a more general misunderstanding among the U.S. public of this history at this time.

It is in a 1964 text that a photograph of concentration camp prisoners at Buchenwald appears. This visual aid expands on what had hitherto been depicted with a textual description. The photograph’s caption reads, “Bewildered and starving prisoners stare blankly from behind barbed wire at Buchenwald, a Nazi concentration camp in Germany. Millions of prisoners like these were cruelly “exterminated” during the war. Some lived to be freed by the Allies.”

Legal discrimination against Jews is described in more detail and even named in *A World History*, published in 1963.

In 1935 the so-called Nuremberg Laws defined a Jew as any person with one Jewish grandparent and deprived all such persons of citizenship. Jews were forbidden to marry non-Jews. They might not teach in

---

any educational institution, write or publish, sell books or antiques, act on state or screen, exhibit paintings
or give concerts, work in a bank or hospital, or belong to labor unions. They could not collect
unemployment insurance and were not eligible for charity.46

This description of the Nuremberg Laws is paired with the violent persecution of Jews leading to
annihilation in the same 1963 textbook:

In the vast concentration camps to which Jews were herded like cattle during the war, they found the gas
ovens in which millions of lives had been taken, the bodies of slave laborers who had evidently starved to
death, and living dead who had been tortured or used as the victims of medical experiments…a horrified
world accused the followers of Adolf Hitler with murdering more than six million Jews.47

One fairly consistent Holocaust-centered theme in texts beginning in the 1960s through
the 1990s is the Holocaust in relation to Israel. The Record of Mankind published in 1961 claims,

Jewish immigration [to Palestine] was steady but not heavy until the Nazi persecution of the Jews made
millions homeless, millions of whom tried to settle in Palestine. The Arabs’ efforts to stop the Jewish
immigration failed. The Jews, because they were skilled, energetic, and received much help from the
Western World, prospered.48

This passage introduces the establishment of the state of Israel by way of the Holocaust. The
“much help” received is in reference to the foreign aid given to Israel by the Allied Powers,
including the U.S. A 1963 text, The World Story, explains that Western and in particular U.S.
sympathy for the new state of Israel and its Holocaust survivor population propelled financial
support of the Jewish state in its early years.49

One of the earliest studies of Holocaust coverage in U.S. textbooks nationwide,

sponsored by the ADL in 1961, concluded that the majority of textbooks did not present a

47 Ibid., 505.
48 The Record of Mankind (1961), 715.
49 The World Story (1963), 626.
satisfactory overview of how the Nazis victimized and murdered millions.\textsuperscript{50} The textbooks from the early 1960s reflect this to a large extent. In the mid to late 1960s, however, more detailed descriptions of the brutality of the Holocaust begin to appear in the pages of textbooks. Descriptions of violence against Jews in 1930s Germany such as the looting of Jewish stores, breaking into Jewish homes and beating of occupants, and the burning of synagogues illustrate the violence perpetrated by the Nazis. Textbooks go on to describe gas ovens, slave labor, and torturous medical experiments that occurred in concentration camps, as well as noting the figure of six million Jews killed.\textsuperscript{51}

In 1967, the textbook \textit{The History of Our World} presents a longer explanation for the anti-Semitism occurring in 1930s Germany.

Hitler made the absurd claim that the Germans were no merely a \textit{nation}, like France or England or Italy, but a \textit{race}. All Germany’s troubles, he said, stemmed from the fact that “pure” Germany blood had been mixed with other strains such as that of the Jews. So he took away German citizenship from all persons of Jewish descent. They could no longer vote, hold office, edit newspapers, or hold positions in business and the professions. They could not even marry “pure” Germans. Many Jews fled the country. Those who remained were subject to ill treatment and persecution. Then during World War II Hitler’s government decided to do away with them. Millions of Jews, along with other prisoners, were sent to concentration campus and systematically and brutally murdered.\textsuperscript{52}

By the late 1960s, texts also exhibited a more detailed understanding of Nazi annihilation programs:

The persecution of racial minorities had always been an aspect of Nazi policy. In 1941, Hitler ordered the annihilation of the entire Jewish population of Europe. The Nazis called this program, the “Final Solution” of the “Jewish problem.” This unbelievably barbaric goal was possible in Hitler’s Germany because so

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{The World Story} (1963), 505; \textit{The History of Our World} (1967), 713; \textit{Men and Nations} (1968), 699, 761.
many people had accepted the insane Nazi theories about “Aryan” racial superiority. Jews by the thousands from Germany and from countries occupied by the Germans were transported to Eastern Germany and Poland, where they were herded together in concentration camps. Among the most infamous were Dachau and Buchenwald in Germany, and Treblinka and Auschwitz in Poland. Some inmates were used as slave laborers. Most, however, were murdered by poison gas, or shot, sometimes hundreds at a time.\textsuperscript{53}

The late 1960s also sees a continuation of Israel’s origin story framed by the Holocaust.

In the 1967 \textit{The History of Our World}, the passage states,

During the 1920’s and 1930’s Jewish immigrated arrived in Palestine in growing numbers, especially after Hitler began persecuting Jews. They bought Arab lands and competed with Arabs for jobs. When World War II brought suffering and death to millions of Jews in countries under Axis control, Palestine seemed the only refuge. Zionists pushed their program for unrestricted Jewish immigration to Palestine and the formation of a Jewish republic.\textsuperscript{54}

\textit{The Human Achievement} of 1967 also claims,

Those who survived the horrors of the Nazi concentration camps were now more than ever determined to have their own country. The Zionists recruited soldiers and raised money in Western Europe and in the United States.\textsuperscript{55}

\textit{Men and Nations}, published in 1968 places Allies’ support of Israel and German reparations in relation to the Holocaust:

In spite of all these difficulties, the new state of Israel made much progress. Considerable economic aid came from American grants and loans and from German reparations in compensation for the mass destruction of Jewish lives and property during World War II. Jewish refugees from every continent were welcomed and provided for.\textsuperscript{56}

For textbooks to introduce the establishment of Israel by way of the Holocaust is key to understanding the greater interaction of the two explored in this thesis. Readers would be

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 760.
\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Men and Nations}, 788.
expected to associate, then, the displaced survivors of Nazi Germany’s annihilation of European Jews with Israel’s creation.

The 1970s represented the watershed decade for “Holocaust consciousness” and its establishment in U.S. classrooms. By the 1970s, the events of the late 1930s were increasingly referred to as “genocide.” Photos of mass graves more frequently appear in chapters that devote one or two pages towards the discussion of ghettos, concentration camps, and anti-Semitism. *The Record of Mankind* published in 1970 begins to reconstruct how anti-Semitism was used to advance Hitler’s political agenda as Jews were described as “the special enemies of Germany” and used as scapegoats for society. Notably, this text highlights how this persecution touched “the world’s most talented writers, musicians, and scientists such as Albert Einstein” who had to escape from Germany.\(^{57}\) The individual naming of Jewish survivors of the Holocaust in these textbooks has so far not appeared. *A World History* published in 1971 defines anti-Semitism for the first time and describes the event of Holocaust as "extermination " and "genocide." This text also portrays the resentment and hatred of Jews as a result of historical and social conditions in Germany.

Nazi racism took its most deadly form in *anti-semitism*, hatred of the Jews…To them [Nazis], the Jews were a foreign, inferior, and dangerous “race” that threatened Germany…”Death to the Jews,” became a Nazi slogan. Instead of quarreling among themselves, the Germans could direct their anger at the Jews.\(^{58}\) The trend of using the term anti-Semitism\(^{59}\) continues throughout the 1970s revealing a more nuanced understanding in the U.S. of why persecution of Jews in Nazi Germany occurred. A 1974 textbook brings up Anne Frank and the publishing of her diary over two decades after it

---

\(^{57}\) *The Record of Mankind* (1970), 537.


\(^{59}\) The U.S. Department of State defines anti-Semitism as “a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.”
had been translated into English that again individualizes Jewish victims of the Holocaust for the American student.⁶⁰

Textbooks of the 1970s continue to invoke the Holocaust alongside the establishment of Israel. A photograph’s caption that appears in such a passage in *Europe and the Modern World* states,

Until 1948, the British had the thankless task of regulating the flow of Jewish refugees into the “Promised Land,” a political necessary demanded by the attitudes of the uneasy Arab inhabitants of Palestine and the surrounding states. Because of the Second World War, however, there were thousands of “displaced persons” and concentration camp survivors who desperately sought to enter Palestine by any means…These unlucky immigrants were shipped to detention camps on Cyprus, there to await the end of the British mandate and the independent of the Jewish state of Israel.⁶¹

---

It is not until 1983 in the textbook, *Chronicles of Time* does the word “Holocaust” appear for the first time in this study. Used alongside the term “genocide,” the text presents much of the same information about the Holocaust as texts of the 1970s. The term Holocaust is almost always capitalized. In 1985’s *Achievement Through the Ages*, the Holocaust is not capitalized: “Between 1 million and 4 million people are estimated to have been killed at Auschwitz alone. The totally number of Jewish people killed by the Nazis in what is known as the Holocaust is thought to be about 6 million.”\(^6\) The issue of capitalization remains significant to an understanding of the word’s etymology. According to *Oxford English Dictionary*, historians introduced the specific application of the word in the 1950s as an equivalent to the Hebrew *shoah* ‘catastrophe.’ It had been foreshadowed by contemporary references to the Nazi atrocities as a ‘holocaust’, or “complete consumption by fire, or that which is so consumed; complete destruction, especially of a large number of persons; a great slaughter or massacre.”\(^6\) Sharon Slewinski dates the popular usage of the word slightly later, with Adolf Eichmann’s trial in 1961.\(^6\)

In 1985’s *Human Heritage*, “Holocaust” is capitalized and remains so in all textbooks through the 1990s: “For the Nazis the “final solution” was genocide, the murder of entire people. This systematic murder has come to be called the Holocaust.”\(^6\) Jewish emigration to Palestine as a result of Hitler’s regime continues to be discussed in textbook coverage of the Holocaust as well as in Middle East history sections of the texts. In 1985’s *Human Heritage*, a section is headed, “The Founding of Israel,” followed immediately by the subheading “Jews flee Nazi persecution,” and the text,

\(^{6}\) Slewinski, 85.
The Zionist movement of the late 1980s proposed the creation of a state where Jews could escape the anti-Semitism that was common in Europe...Nazi persecution of the Jews caused growing numbers to seek refuge in Palestine. Soon resentment of the growing Jewish population sprang up among the Arabs, who saw the European Jews as foreign intruders. Violence often erupted.66

The text continues from this delivery of Israel’s history to claim that subsequent U.S. and Soviet involvement in the region have complicated the “Arab-Israeli problem,” in which the U.S. has continued to back Israel in an effort to combat Soviet influence in the Arab world.67

Exploring World History of 1983 contributes to framing Israel’s inception with the Holocaust.

...World War II had made the Zionists more determined than ever to build a Jewish state in Palestine. The Nazi period had been a nightmare for the Jews of Europe. Its survivors were scattered in refugee camps throughout Europe. Most wanted to emigrate to Palestine.68

The passage continues on to describe early fiscal support from the U.S. “More and more, Israel depended on foreign aid. Besides loans from friendly nations, particularly the United States, it received generous contributions from Jews throughout the world.”69

Textbooks coverage of the Holocaust remained fairly unchanged over the 1990s. Descriptions of concentration camps, anti-Semitism as a doctrine of racial supremacy, the Final Solution, and Jewish emigration to Palestine as result of Hitler’s regime remain similar to the previous decade’s discussions. The texts define the Holocaust as the policy of genocide, which, resulted in the murder of six million Jews by 1945.

In a 1990 textbook, History of the World, the following passage transitions from historical details of the Holocaust to the establishment of Israel:

67 Human Heritage (1985), 805-808.
68 Ibid, 703.
The horrors of World War II and the Holocaust in which six million European Jews were systematically and ruthlessly murdered in concentration camps, vividly dramatized the need for Jews to have a homeland. Jews had suffered prejudice and persecution, but never before had there been an attempt to completely eradicate them. European Jews who survived the Holocaust were convinced that, in order to survive as a people, they had to have a Jewish state.⁷⁰

A 1992 textbook, *A History of Civilization* displays the following photograph alongside its descriptions of Nazi persecution of Jews and the concentration camps. It is captioned, “At Belsen the liberating troops discovered a mass grave, a scene they would encounter again at each of the German concentration camps.”⁷¹


The accompanying text states,

The effects of the Holocaust were devastating. Efforts to cover up, account for, or explain away such monstrous behavior would corrode political and social life for generations. The nations that had received Jewish immigrants—Britain, the United States, Canada, and others—benefitted enormously. Displaced Jews, and Zionists who had long dreamed of a homeland in Palestine, would create a new Jewish state, Israel, in the hear of land intransigently and persistently claimed by Arab populations, leading to a state of almost constant undeclared war in the Near and Middle East. The diaspora of the Jews would enrich new societies in ways the racist theories of Hitler could never have imagined.\textsuperscript{72}

By the late 1990s, organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League had contributed entire binders of Holocaust curriculum to the nation for middle and high school classroom use. English translations of \textit{The Diary of Anne Frank} and Elie Weisel’s \textit{Night} commonly supplemented the course textbook when teaching the Holocaust.\textsuperscript{73} Indeed, the Ellison and Pisapia’s study of Illinois public high schools found that 43 percent of teachers in the state used \textit{The Diary of Anne Frank} and 39.3 percent used \textit{Night} to teach the Holocaust in 1999.

Understanding such a constellation of how and when the Holocaust was remembered in political and social settings frames how through education, particularly history textbooks from the 1960s to the 1990s, the Holocaust entered the consciousness of the U.S. public. This chapter laid out the development of Holocaust curriculum in the U.S. and in particular Illinois in the second half of the twentieth century. The next step to filling out this thesis’ operating frame is to examine two particular increases of U.S. foreign aid to Israel in 1966 and 1974 and their coverage in major U.S. newspapers.

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid, 825.
\textsuperscript{73} The first translation of \textit{The Diary of Anne Frank} appeared in German in 1950, with the English translations for Britain and the United States following in 1952. The diary has been translated into 70 languages, and published in over 60 countries. Elie Weisel’s childhood survival of Auschwitz resulted in a nearly 900-page personal account, \textit{And the World Remained Silent}, written in Yiddish and published in 1956. Two years later, a compressed French version \textit{La Nuit (Night)} was published. In 1960, the first English translation was published. Since then, \textit{Night} has been translated into more than 30 languages.
Chapter 2

News Coverage of 1966 and 1974 U.S. Aid to Israel

From its creation in 1948, well into the 1960s, Israel was dependent on several nations, namely France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States for its economic survival. The scholarship explores the reasons behind the U.S.’s role as Israel’s largest aid provider long after the initial period of economic dependency ended by looking at U.S. foreign interests, the Israel lobby, and U.S. public opinion of Israel.74

This chapter explores the interlocking nature of foreign policy, public opinion, and media in the pivotal years of 1966 and 1974 for U.S.-Israel relations. The way in which the media covered these two particular spikes in foreign aid reveals the dominant political concerns of the period. Understanding this allows one to see how the public was informed about these issues and how opinions of U.S. foreign aid to Israel were formed. This chapter analyzes news articles from The New York Times, Wall Street Journal, and Chicago Tribune75 that cover U.S. aid to Israel in 1966 and 1974 as one way to understand the decisive shifts in U.S.-Israel policy and public opinion of policy in the post war period.76 1966 and 1974 represent respectively the first and


75 For many Americans, The New York Times, founded in 1851, is known as “the newspaper of record.” Both The New York Times and Wall Street Journal’s coverage of domestic and international affairs is held in high opinion in the United States. As this project uses the case study of Illinois to examine Holocaust coverage in textbooks, I also include Chicago Tribune in my analysis. Moreover, since one or two staff reporters dominated the coverage of U.S. aid to Israel in both years of examination, including multiple newspapers in the study assuaged concern over the personal bias of a single reporter.

76 The methodology was to assess news articles from The New York Times, Wall Street Journal, and Chicago Tribune for their relevance to U.S. aid to Israel. I did this by inputting “U.S. aid to Israel” as well as the date range of the year I was examining (e.g. January 1966-December 1966) to the ProQuest Historical Newspaper database. I then filtered for either The New York Times, Wall Street Journal or Chicago Tribune and filtered for articles under the category of “articles,” “features,” and “front page/cover story.” The news articles I chose to analyze in this essay are representative of both the information relayed and how it was relayed. I received 65 results for The New York Times, 18 results for Wall Street Journal (none of these articles discussed U.S. aid to Israel specifically), and 21 results from Chicago Tribune in 1966. There were 369 results for The New York Times, 101 results for Wall Street Journal, and 91 results for Chicago Tribune in 1974. Because of the much larger sampling in 1974, I skimmed the first 60 articles that came up for The New York Times that were ordered according to their relevance to the key terms.
third significant increases in U.S. military aid to Israel. 1966 also precedes a major Arab-Israeli war by one year and 1974 follows another major Arab-Israeli war by one year. In both, U.S. arms bought by Israel were used. Using media and foreign policy scholar Robert Entman’s concept of framing in regards to foreign policy, the chapter highlights significant differences between the news frames used in 1966 and 1974. While 1966 stressed the United States’ balancing role amongst heightening Middle East regional tensions and Soviet influence, 1974 portrayed an innately partisan U.S. with invested interest in a strategic alliance with Israel.

**The Trinity of Foreign Policy, Public Opinion, and Media**

There is a significant relationship between foreign policy, public opinion, and media where all three influence each other in foreign policy creation in democracies.\(^77\) Public opinion and politicians’ perceptions of public opinion influence foreign policy as elected officials would prefer their decisions appear representative of or be considered popular among their electorate.\(^78\) Political scientists, Matthew Baum and Philip Potter, argue that news media influence nearly every aspect of the relationship between public opinion and foreign policy, since the public relies on the media for all knowledge of foreign policy.\(^79\) There is an expectation, then, that U.S. public opinion of U.S. foreign assistance to Israel is formed largely from the public’s consumption of news coverage of U.S. aid to Israel and how that news is ‘framed.’

---

\(^77\) Matthew A. Baum (2003); Richard C. Eichenberg (2016); Robert Entman (2004); David L. Paletz and Robert Entman (1981).

\(^78\) Scholars Shibley Telhami and Jon Krosnick narrow in on the “trinity” and examine U.S. public opinion as able to influence policy towards Israel specifically. They conclude that the relationship between U.S. policy to Israel and U.S. public opinion of the policy influences public perception of the state of Israel at large. (Jon Krosnick and Shibley Telhami “Public Attitudes toward Israel: A Study of the Attentive and Issue Publics” International Studies Quarterly. Vol. 39, No. 4 (Dec., 1995), 535-554.)

Framing aims to make a story more communicable to an audience.\textsuperscript{80} Robert Entman claims that because framing has important implications for those in elite positions, competition over what news frames are used plays a key role in the exertion of political power. In his book, \textit{Projections of Power}, Entman posits that media represent the identity of actors or interests that competed to dominate the text. Thus it is crucial to understand who or what might be vying for a say in what news frames are used. Further, those who write outside the politically and financially determined frames for a certain issue will not get their pieces published as they’ve “breached the bounds of acceptable discourse.”\textsuperscript{81}

Entman lays out four functions for frames. They define problems by determining what strategic actors are doing, diagnose causes by identifying the forces creating the problem, make moral judgments of the actors and their actions, and they suggest remedies. A single sentence may perform more than one of these four framing functions, although many sentences in a text may perform none of them.\textsuperscript{82} These functions play out in each of the news articles analyzed in this chapter. The problem in 1966 was subduing an arms race in the Middle East and in 1974 securing Israel against the military power of neighboring Arab states. The 1966 cause is Soviet arms sales to Egypt and Syria, and the 1974 cause is still Soviet involvement with increased Arab hostility towards Israel. The frames make moral judgments of both Soviet and Arab states’ actions in 1966 and 1974, situating the United States as mediator in 1966 and then protector in 1974. The solution suggested is increased U.S. involvement in both years, though at different capacities. Since the focus of analysis is the content of news articles, this thesis looks to what

\textsuperscript{82} Entman (1993) provides an example of the “cold war” frame that highlighted certain foreign events, for example, civil wars (as problems), identified their source (communist rebels), offered moral judgments (atheistic aggression), and commended particular solutions (U.S. support for the other side).
Entman calls rhetorical frames. These manifest by “the presence or absence of certain keywords, stock phrases, stereotyped images, sources of information, and sentences that provide thematically reinforcing clusters of facts or judgments.”

---

83 Entman (1993), 52.
Data source: Jeremy Sharp. “U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel”
1966 Context

In 1966, the U.S. provided $126.8 million in assistance to Israel, $90 million of which was in military aid. This represented a near fourfold leap in assistance from the previous year 1965 ($12.9 million in military aid and $20 million in economic aid). It was also, by far, the largest military aid package the U.S. had given Israel in the history of the two states’ relationship. The Congressional Research Service report on the history of U.S. aid to Israel points to 1966 as the first in a period of turning point years for U.S. public and private interests in Israel. The report states, “Congress, supported by broad U.S. public opinion, committed to strengthening Israel’s military and economy through large increases in foreign aid over the next several years.” The available polling information and scholarly analysis of influential factors on U.S. aid to Israel in 1966 suggest such a possible correlation.

Amnon Cavari, a scholar of diplomacy, asserts that when Americans view Israel in favorable terms, they sympathize more with Israel than with Arab states or with Palestinians. They see Israel as an ally of the United States and are willing to follow up on their support for Israel with economic and military aid. In fact a Gallup poll, conducted during the three days before the outbreak of the 1967 war and extending through the first three days of the fighting, found 45% of Americans sympathized more with Israel than with the Arab states, 4%

---

84 Sharp, 36.
This sum includes economic and military loans as well as food grants and loans through the Food for Peace Program, Export-Import Bank aid, Housing Loans, and Cooperative Development aid.
85 Large-scale U.S. assistance for Israel increased considerably after several consecutive Arab-Israeli wars in the late 1960s and early 1970s created an apparent sense among many Americans that Israel was continually under siege. Though coverage of 1966 aid to Israel could not have known of the impending 1967 war, scholars and government officials include 1966 as the beginning this new era of aid.
86 Sharp, 32.
sympathized more with the Arab states, and 26% with neither. Another 24% had no opinion. It is possible to posit, then, that coming out of 1966, a year that had seen a significant increase in U.S. aid to Israel and positive public opinion of Israel, that public opinion was informing foreign policy and that frames of foreign policy had in fact influenced public opinion. In other words, there was not an apparent disconnect between the U.S. government’s relationship with Israel and American public opinion of Israel – both were positive. But by 1966, relations between the United States and Israel were just beginning to warm and military aid had just come on the scene.

President Harry Truman was wary of the communist influence among certain Jewish groups immigrating to Israel in the 1940s and it was unclear to his administration if Israel’s mainly Eastern European population would side with the Soviet Union or the United States. Thus, initially the U.S. maintained an embargo on selling arms in the region. Nonetheless, Truman’s early recognition and vocal support of Israel in spite of his State Department’s protests won over support of Zionist Jews in the U.S. and Israel. This preliminary warmth though quickly dissipated with the arrival of Dwight Eisenhower in the White House in 1953. He announced that his new administration's policy in the Middle East would be one of “friendly impartiality” with Arab states and Israel. During Eisenhower’s two terms in office, Israel was treated with at best, indifference by the U.S. government.

---

89 Entman draws attention to what sometimes becomes a circular process in which government officials respond to polling opinions that many of them helped to create through their influence on what frames the news used – nuance key to keep in mind when examining the case study of this relationship between foreign policy, media, and public opinion.
This neutrality or even ambivalence of the U.S. government towards Israel shifted quite dramatically upon John F. Kennedy’s election to office in 1960. Though at first judged to be uncertain when it came to policy towards Israel, Kennedy quickly developed a rapport with prominent Jewish American organizations such as the Zionist Organization of America and influential advisors such as Philip Klutznick, then national president of B'nai B'rith. JFK’s administration was the first to break the fifteen-year precedent of no arms sales to regional players in the Middle East. This involved breaking the 1950 Tripartite Declaration; France, Britain, and the United States agreed to not sell arms to any Middle Eastern country intending an act of aggression. France had already broken the treaty in the early 1950s as it saw Israel as a natural ally against its revolting North African colonies. But when Egypt reached an arms deal with Czechoslovakia in 1955, the near decade effort by the United States and Britain to keep the Soviet Union out of the Middle East crumbled. With what now was believed to be an inevitable arms race in the region defined within a Cold War framework, the United States eventually broke rank.

In 1962, Kennedy sold an unspecified number of Hawk anti-aircraft missiles to Israel. After JFK’s assassination in 1962, Lyndon B. Johnson became the most sympathetic president Israel had seen yet in the White House. What LBJ lacked in foreign policy experience, he made up in friends and connections on which he relied for political advising. As it turned out, many of LBJ’s connections were avid supporters of Israel. He famously became the first U.S. president to

---

92 B’nai B’rith International is the oldest Jewish service organization in the world and a right wing supporting body of Israel.
93 Neff, 169.
94 Ibid., 170.
receive the prime minister of Israel at the White House, doing away with the back-door negotiations long used by U.S. officials.\textsuperscript{95}

In 1964, the U.S. government made a sale of more than two hundred armored tanks to Israel and by 1966, the two countries had finished year and a half-long negotiations regarding the sale of forty-eight Skyhawk jet bombers – the first offensive weapons sold to Israel by the United States. Gilbert Achcar argues that the U.S. decision to ramp up military aid was for the U.S. to ready Israel to inflict a “decisive military defeat” of Soviet-orbit Egyptian and Syrian regimes if needed.\textsuperscript{96} Using this assertion, the 1966 military aid to Israel could be seen as the first major step the United States took to use Israel in order to carry out its greater interests in the region against Soviet influence and control.

This relatively quick change in foreign policy – no arms sales in 1959 to $90 million in military loans in 1966 – came as a result of several developing strategic considerations, including a U.S. desire to balance Soviet arms sales to Egypt, suppress Israel’s developing nuclear program, and tempt Israeli officials to agree to regional peace talks hosted by the United States.\textsuperscript{97} 1966 was also the year West Germany’s Holocaust reparations to the state of Israel ended. Just months after the war ended, the Jewish Agency made its first formal claim for reparations and property reimbursement to the four Allied powers that controlled Germany: the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union. The agency proposed that a certain amount of Germany's money be allotted for the settlement of Jewish claims for reparations and the resettlement of Holocaust survivors in Palestine. In 1951, prominent Zionist leaders in the United States and Israel lobbied that Israel, the newly founded Jewish State, be the formal recipient of

\textsuperscript{95} Tivnan, 60.
\textsuperscript{97} Mearsheimer and Walt, 25.
the money. Advocates of the policy claimed the financial burden of absorbing Jewish refugees into Israel and justified that war reparations be rewarded to the new state. The Western Allied powers arranged for Israeli and German delegations to sit around the negotiating table in 1952. The resulting document states,

Whereas unspeakable criminal acts were perpetrated against the Jewish people during the National-Socialist regime of terror...And Whereas the State of Israel has assumed the heavy burden of resettling so great a number of uprooted and destitute Jewish refugees from Germany and from territories formerly under German rule and has on this basis advanced a claim against the Federal Republic of Germany for global recompense for the cost of the integration of these refugees.98

Direct compensation was paid to the Israeli government in annual installments over a period of 14 years between April 1, 1953, and March 31, 1966. Over this time, Israel received $800 million from West Germany.99 This sum laid the foundation for the Israeli economy, notably at a time when U.S. assistance to Israel was minimal.

1966 Frame: Righting a Balance

1966 was the last year that an annual payment to Israel from Germany arrived. The Israeli government was concerned with the economic consequences of this disappearance in payments and included this as a reason for the United States to increase its fiscal assistance to Israel. Two New York Times articles from February and April of 1966 that discuss U.S. aid to Israel in that year consider the end of German reparations to Israel as a factor for Israel’s economic insecurity and reason to request higher U.S. assistance. One article entitled “U.S. Jewish Funds Sought for Israel” depicts Israel’s concern for the end of this aid on behalf of the Israeli economy and foresees Israel’s greater reliance on the American Jewish community to fuel the state’s economic

growth.100 “U.S. Tells Israel it will Renew Aid: $52-Million Offer is Below Total Request” discusses the 1966 economic aid package of $52 million in food aid, economic development loans, and Export-Import Bank credits to Israel. The article notes, “Among foreign officials, there was considerable skepticism that Israel, which has a per capita income approaching that of the Netherlands, needed any further economic aid from the United States.” Counter to this, the article conveys, Israeli officials invoked the end to Holocaust reparations as a serious economic concern worthy of U.S. involvement.101

The articles communicate that an end to reparations meant a weaker Israeli economy. This concerned both the U.S. and Israel over the sustainability of Israel’s regional military superiority. The United States saw filling this fiscal and strategic void with food and economic aid similarly to its role in providing offensive arms to Israel for the first time – and effort to “balance” military might in the region. The New York Times staff writer and frequent commentator on Middle East affairs and U.S. aid, John Finney, suggested in one 1966 article that the surplus-food issue “has an indirect bearing on the Middle East military situation, for to the extent that Israel is able to purchase the food with her own currency, she will have more foreign reserves available to purchase arms.”102

In regards to renewing both the Egyptian and Israeli surplus-food agreements and awareness of their military impact in the region, the article claims, “the Administration is thus not hasty in renewing the agreements.” The decision to make a deal with Israel was an indication

---

“that the Administration was now relenting, partly to help Israel finance the purchase of arms and partly to protect itself against charges that more favorable terms were granted to the United Arab Republic.” Neff explains that while Arab states felt no particular affinity to the Soviet Union and merely bought arms where they could, Israel’s effort to paint its conflict with Arab neighbors in Cold War terms prevailed. Given the U.S.’s previous political aversion to the USSR, the conflation of fiscally supporting Israel and winning the Cold War found its way into U.S. news discourse.  

In a May Chicago Tribune article, a State Department statement describes that U.S. had agreed to extend military sales to Israel including a number of tactical aircrafts. The sale “reflected American regard for security in the middle east.” According to the author, an imbalance in military strength was developing because of Russian arms sales to Arab states. The article also includes that an Egyptian newspaper condemns the sale as aid of “dangerous proportions,” adding that this Egyptian newspaper’s editor is a close friend of President Nasser, who was an opponent of the U.S. government.

Another Chicago Tribune article discusses a State Department’s policy statement publically announcing that the U.S. had sold arms to both Israel and Arab neighboring countries to help them meet “legitimate defense needs.” “United States military sales have been on a selective basis and in support of our objectives of maintaining friendly relations with all the states of the area while seeking to advance peace, progress and stability.” This DOS statement came as a response to a U.S. senator’s complaint over arm sale restrictions to Israel. DOS reasserted the Department’s position to “avoid becoming a major supplier of arms to any country in the near east,” adding “massive Soviet arms sales into the area have been a major factor in
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feeding the arms race.” Both Chicago Tribune articles reaffirm the operating frame of these newspapers in 1966, namely, the United States’ role as mediator amongst growing tension between Arab states and Israel, all the while blaming the Soviet Union for its contribution to the arms race.

Four years after the U.S. first sold Israel arms, the decision to sell Israel A-4 Skyhawk jet bombers represented a shift in American policy that went from propping Israel up defensively to equipping it offensively. Widely reported contemporary journalism focused on the sale of these forty-eight Skyhawk bombers. The sale not coincidentally came at the time of a renewed and larger effort by Israel to “use” the American Jewish community as a quasi public relations committee to lobby for stronger U.S. support of Israel.

One New York Times article “Israel Denies Using U.S. Tanks in Jordan Raid: Assurance Is Seen as Effort to Forestall Any Reduction in American Arms Aid” discusses the Israeli and U.S. response to Jordanians allegations that Israel used U.S.-provided tanks in a recent attack on a Jordanian village. It was reported that Israeli officials offered “assurances [that] were intended to forestall any action by the United States to curtail military aid to Israel in reprisal for misuse of American-supplied military equipment.” “The [U.S.] Administration is inclined to accept the Israeli assurance,” the article continues, referring to Israel’s claim to the U.S. that they had not in fact used U.S. tanks in the raid. Accepting the Jordanian allegations, the article explains, would obstruct the impending military aid package to Israel, including the much-anticipated sale of
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Skyhawk jets.\textsuperscript{108} Within the Cold War context, it was in the U.S.’s perceived interest to make this sale to not allow Arab states the upper hand militarily. It therefore makes sense the U.S. would be reluctant to back out of a sale due to what was an easily deniable accusation by Jordan.

Another article entitled “U.S. Officials Hopeful” states “Administration officials were hopeful today that the sale of some attack jet bombers to Israel would at least temporarily halt American involvement in the Middle Eastern arms race.” This seemingly contradictory statement was in fact official U.S. policy in the region in the 1960s. U.S. government concern over the power and influence of the Soviet Union justified these arms sales to Israel. The article concludes with reiterating the reluctance of U.S. involvement and the U.S.’s lack of choice in using “its military aid as a lever for putting a damper on the arms race” – one started, the article emphasizes, by the Soviet Union. The DOS explanation of the Skyhawk sale that’s cited in the article involves a regard for security in the region and a “wish to avoid serious arm imbalances that would jeopardize area stability and our general restraint as to military equipment supplied to that area.”\textsuperscript{109} The article points out that this same justification was offered when the U.S. sale of tanks to Israel had been announced the previous year, though this most recent sale had introduced a first of its kind, strictly offensive weapon in the region. The persistent mentioning the Cold War context in the news articles reflects societal concern over the ideological, military, and political threat of the Soviet Union. The frame of 1966 once again presents the Soviet Union as the aggressor and the U.S. as the balancer in the region.

While many key events that would affect U.S. military and economic aid to Israel still lay ahead, 1966 represented a stark increase in U.S. assistance to Israel in response to decades-old

foreign policy concerns about the Soviet Union conveyed to the U.S. public via journalism. As a year that marks the start to significant military, political, and economic exchange, 1966 news coverage of aid to Israel was key to establishing U.S. public opinion of aid to Israel. Such coverage was certainly contained within the dominant frame that portrayed the U.S. as a neutral actor amongst heightening regional conflict. This frame would change within a 55 decade.

1974 Context

The 1967 Arab-Israeli war, also known as the Six Day War, set American Jews’ support of Israel into high gear. After the war, the United Nations adopted Resolution 242, outlining principles for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. The resolution stipulated,

1) Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict; and 2) termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force.¹¹⁰

The U.S. was eager to de-escalate regional tensions and balance the ever quickening arms race. This effort was headed by the State Department. The administration’s inclination to curb U.S. military support of Israel came much to the dismay of American Jews who had grown in their support of Israel by the media’s portrayal of the 1967 war as a second attempt at Holocaust.¹¹¹ The adamant support by American Jews for Israel coming out of the 1967 war established the power of the American Jewish electorate in the United States. Mearsheimer and Walt explain that large campaign donations from American Jews and high voter turnout rate concentrated in key states (California, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) increases their weight in presidential elections.¹¹² Though the Jewish vote was not necessarily equated with
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support of Israel, now if a president expressed doubts about the aid the U.S. was now on a trajectory to supply Israel with, they had to answer to six million Jewish voters and their funding.

By 1970, the United States government, and in particular, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger noted the significance of Israel as an ally in a strategic location, thus deserving of U.S. economic and military support. On December 22, 1970 the U.S. signed a far-reaching Master Defense Development Data Exchange Agreement that provided for the largest transfer of technology to Israel ever initiated thus far in the two states’ relationship. President Nixon also pledged $500 million supplemental support for Israel on January 11, 1971.113

The draping of Cold War context atop regional tensions distorted the reality of Israel’s military regional superiority in the minds of policymakers and voters alike. Golda Meir, then Prime Minister of Israel convinced President Nixon that the Soviet Union was the biggest obstacle to peace in the region, and Nixon embraced this talking point to defend further increase in military support of Israel. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger also played into this frame, as he believed in Israel’s capability to act on U.S. anti-Soviet interests in the region as demonstrated in the 1970 Black September civil war in Jordan.114

1974 marked a year of huge aid increase and lobbying efforts on behalf of Israel by American Jews. The nature of the U.S. government structure offers many possibilities for influencing the policy process including lobbying elected representatives and members of the Executive Branch, making campaign contributions, voting in elections, and molding public
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opinion. How U.S. public opinion of Israel is formed may be understood by looking at the Israel lobby – a coalition of individuals and organizations that aim to shape U.S. foreign policy favorable towards Israel. These efforts result in military and economic aid for Israel, favorable foreign policy decisions, and the shaping of positive American opinion of the state of Israel. More specifically, it works to ensure that discourse reflects the strategic and moral reasoning used with Congress and the federal bureaucracy. The Israel lobby maintains efforts to shape public opinion in favor of Israel by encouraging news coverage that portrays Israel is a positive light, establishing prominent DC-based think tanks, and, increasingly in recent decades, “policing” academia across the U.S. Public digestion of information through frames created and advocated for by the lobby consequently helps shape opinion of Israel.

Preceding the October 1973 Arab-Israeli war, also known as the Yom Kippur War, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) began its largest campaign yet to grow U.S. aid to Israel and U.S. public favor of Israel. The former was done by securing relationships with U.S. Senators and the latter was done with the publishing of the Near East Report, a newsletter on U.S. Middle East policy, the publication of which consumed half of AIPAC’s then quite small annual budget of $20,000. Along with other pro-Israel organizations, including the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, AIPAC began its campaign to counter pushback against their goal to increase aid.

This increasingly powerful pro-Israel influence in the U.S. government soon began to erode U.S. relations with Egypt and Syria. Arab states’ resentment of the lack of evenhanded Mideast policy combined with decades of heightened tension and several wars with Israel led to
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Egypt’s invasion of the Sinai Peninsula on October 6, 1973. U.S. news media conveyed to the public that Israel was under siege and demands rose immediately for massive supply effort by the U.S. to Israel.\textsuperscript{120} Lobbying efforts were directed toward Secretary Henry Kissinger. Rather than deal with an angry pro-Israel American public and further weaken the reputation of the already scandal-saturated Nixon administration, at the urging of Kissinger, the administration decided to ignore a joint memorandum from U.S. oilmen that expressed concern over steep oil production cuts by oil-rich Arab states frustrated with the U.S.’s perceived pro-Israel policies.\textsuperscript{121} The U.S. launched a large air operation to supply Israel on October 13, 1973 and requested $2.2 billion in emergency aid for Israel from Congress.\textsuperscript{122} In response to what was perceived as an offensive act, Saudi Arabia, followed by Abu Dhabi, Algeria, Bahrain, Kuwait and Qatar imposed a total oil boycott against the U.S.

After the crises of 1973, Neff claims, Israel was regarded as a solid U.S. ally having stood side by side the United States in the face of Soviet-supported Arab aggression and tactic. Generous aid packages to Israel followed suit. By the next decade, annual aid had reached $3 billion, all in grants with no repayment. This number does not account for special arrangements on loans, such as favorable depreciation allowances that gave Israel its funds early so that it could earn interest payments.\textsuperscript{123}

\textbf{1974 Frame: Ensuring Israel’s Survival}

1974 saw the development of a new news frame, one clear of the United States’ partisanship and determination to ensure Israel’s security by way of arms sales. U.S. aid to Israel skyrocketed in 1974 – the $2.5 billion in military aid alone given to Israel in this year was twice
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as much as Israel had received in U.S. military assistance from 1949 to 1972 combined.\textsuperscript{124} U.S. public opinion of Israel, however, remained consistent with what it had been in 1966 – in a Gallup poll from October 1973, 45\% of Americans were sympathetic to Israel while 5\% were sympathetic to Arab states; 23\% sympathized with neither and 27\% had no opinion.\textsuperscript{125}

An article published in the \textit{Wall Street Journal} on June 19, 1974 entitled “Nixon Links Long-Range Aid for Israel To Continued Peace Efforts in Mideast” describes Nixon’s efforts to convince Israel to entertain peace negotiations with Arab states in terms of U.S. fiscal commitment to Israel.\textsuperscript{126} A joint U.S.-Israel statement given in Jerusalem “reiterated the U.S. commitment to supply modern weapons to Israel.” President Nixon is reported to have emphasized the “continuing and long-term nature” of U.S. modern arms sales to Israel as well as that “American officials believe these firm, if costly promises [of aid] are necessary to reassure Israel that peace negotiations, which involve territorial and political concessions, won’t endanger the state’s survival.” The article claims that by acknowledging its agreements with Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Syria in the joint statement, the United States is exerting “another effort to reassure Israel that America’s new friendship with Arab states doesn’t mean the Jewish nation will be slighted.”

Once again, news stories of peace talks are framed around reminders that the United States has allied itself with Israel with no plans to abandon that policy nor the funding that comes with it. \textit{The New York Times} article entitled “Rabin is Assured by Ford of Help: Israel’s Premier
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This survey was conducted immediately before the start of the 1973 Arab-Israeli war and during the conflict’s first three days.
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Welcomed with Pledge U.S. Supports ‘Survival and Security’” discusses a visit to Washington by Israel’s Premier Yitzhak Rabin where “Mr. Ford wanted to make certain the Israelis felt assured of the continuing United States support even as they were being urged by the United States to join in further negotiations with the Arabs.” In response to Rabin’s emphasis on Israel’s military strength as a prerequisite to peace, Nixon is quoted saying, “The United States has been proud of its association with the state of Israel. We are committed to Israel’s survival and security.”

*The New York Times* article, “U.S. is Ready to Put Arms Aid to Israel on Longer Basis” reported Israeli “concern over their security at a time when they were being asked to give up occupied territory to Egypt and Syria” and their need for the U.S. to provide, for the first time, a multi-year arms program. Having agreed to develop a process for such a program, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger emphasized, “would be a significant demonstration of our steadfast support for Israel’s security.”

The article clarifies that Kissinger’s statement was presented as an apparent U.S. concession to Israel as the part of the troop-disengagement deal from the October 1973 war.

Finally, *The New York Times* article entitled “Israel Counts on U.S. To Bar U.N. Sanctions” discusses U.S. military assistance to Israel in conjunction with an Israeli expectation that the U.S. “pledge to block—with its veto if necessary—any punishment sanctions the United Nations Security Council might attempt to apply against Israel in the wake of an Israeli anti-guerilla operation.” Notably, the article states that in the past, the U.S. has condemned both “Arab guerilla action” as well as Israeli response, but in recent meetings between
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Premier Golda Meir and Secretary Kissinger, the U.S. agreed to understand Israel’s “right of self-defense, [and that it] may act to prevent such actions by all available means. The United States will not consider such actions by Israel as violations of the cease-fire, and will support them politically.”

A *Chicago Tribune* article reaffirms this solidarity as it discusses the U.S. government response to an Israeli request for 200 additional tanks. While the article makes clear the concern over possible equipment shortages for U.S. troops, Secretary Kissinger states that further delivery of weapons can be expected “as part of the commitment of the new administration of President Ford to the survival of Israel.” The article also includes a discussion of long-term aid to Israel occurring over a five-year period. No deal would be made, Secretary Kissinger assures the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, without congressional approval.

Additionally, in *Chicago Tribune*, an article reminds readers that the U.S. provides Israel with armed forces, funds its treasury, and “protects its flank in the United Nations Security Council.” This support is talked about in the context of Israeli discomfort at the high level of dependence on the U.S. though Israeli citizens see “no practical alternative in their present predicament.” The article continues on to claim, “The extent and diversity of the links between Israel and the U.S. are extraordinary. They go far beyond government-to-government assistance and even the vast contributions of American Jewry. Official U.S. aid to Israel over the 26 years has totaled $5.2 billion…This figure includes the $2.2 billion approved by Congress shortly after war last October. The aid is the highest per capita, the U.S. has extended to any country.”

Though Americans participate in the most amount of trade and aid to Israel, the author notes
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immigration from the U.S. to Israel has remained low. Directly following the 1967 war, the most Americans ever immigrated to Israel in a year, namely 7,364.¹³¹

Chicago Tribune’s “The plan to defuse the Mideast” addresses the politics of the Middle East as managed by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. The author points out that while neighboring Arab countries to Israel do not yet depend on the U.S. for arms, their desire for U.S. financial assistance and technology is so much that Egypt, for example, is being made to tailor its policies towards Israel “to fit the American model.” If Egypt stays in line with this messaging, it will receive “all [its] economy can absorb.”¹³² For U.S. foreign aid to other countries to be dictated by their foreign policy towards Israel captures the strong alliance between Israel and the U.S. in 1974.

The news coverage of aid in 1974 reflects some of the foreign policy concerns seen in 1966 coverage surrounding the Arab states of Syria, Jordan, and Egypt and Soviet involvement in the arms race. But the dominant frame of 1974 demonstrates new interests and motives of the United States, namely less concern with slowing an arms race in the Middle East and more interest in maintaining Israel as any ally. The U.S. demonstrated this interest by defending Israel in the arena of international politics as well as significant, long-term military assistance for the sake of Israel’s “security.”

Through how they are framed, 1966 and 1974 newspaper articles provide insight into the political concerns of the time of those able to construct and insert their news frames into mainstream discourse. Provided that between 1966 and 1974, the U.S.-Israel relationship experienced a dramatic change, this chapter asserted that both the political developments of the
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Cold War, two Arab-Israeli wars, and growing activity of domestic interest groups such as the Israel lobby and the Jewish voting bloc influenced news frames and were in turn influenced by news frames. The trajectory of U.S. aid to Israel paralleling the trajectory of Holocaust curriculum development in the U.S.
Chapter 3

Conclusion: A Double Helix of Foreign Aid and Curriculum Development

On May 24, 2011 the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, addressed a joint meeting of Congress in Washington, declaring “if history has taught the Jewish people anything, it is that we must take calls for our destruction seriously. We are a nation that rose from the ashes of the Holocaust. When we say never again, we mean never again.”

This common representation of Israel and the 1940s genocide by politicians as inextricable concretizes a relationship between the two in the minds of the public. Importantly, this thesis does not seek to question the necessitation of the establishment of Israel after the Nazi Holocaust. It does, however, encourage any representation of an existing relationship in U.S. political and social life to be parsed apart. This thesis set out to answer questions regarding U.S. public opinion of Israel, Holocaust curriculum in the United States, and U.S. fiscal policy towards Israel by way of investigating the role of education and media in shaping U.S. citizens’ perception of the Holocaust and aid to Israel as knit together.

This thesis concludes that the relationship between Holocaust curriculum and U.S. aid to Israel in the seminal decades of 1960 and 1970 exists as a sort of double helix. The political and popular cultural events that scholars argue informed the U.S. public of Holocaust and of Israel’s place within that narrative are indeed the same that catalyzed Holocaust curriculum development on the local, state, and eventually national level as well as developing U.S. government interests in Israel that were conveyed to the public via a shift in news framing. Further, this project’s primary sources interact with one other’s object of analysis as well as exemplified by the consistent use of the Holocaust to frame a high school reader’s understanding of how and why
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the state of Israel was established and 1966 newspaper articles cover U.S. aid to Israel within the framework of Holocaust reparations.

The primary source analysis demonstrated the possibility of using Norman Finkelstein’s notion of the Holocaust as an ideology able to defend ever-growing U.S. military aid to Israel. To use or invoke the Holocaust in support of U.S. fiscal policy towards Israel is a problem for three main reasons: firstly, one should always be critical of relatively unconditional flows of money when residing and participating in a representational democracy. Secondly, the atrocity of the Holocaust should not be used to further political agenda in or outside the United States. Thirdly, Israel as a state was founded upon the violent dispossession and displacement of those indigenous to that land. Israel’s settler colonialism has played out at the expense of Palestinians lives and livelihood for over half a century, and U.S. political and fiscal support for Israel ensures these discriminatory policies’ endurance.

Most of the scholarship that addresses these topics has been published in the twenty-first century, making it a relatively new as well as difficult topic to broach with the U.S. public. By way of textbooks’ coverage of the Holocaust over time and newspaper coverage of U.S. aid to Israel, this thesis was able to identify particular patterns in textual analysis alongside the political and cultural backdrop of U.S. society in the second half of the 20th century. In asserting that certain political events were watershed moments for U.S.-Israel relations and Holocaust consciousness, this thesis argued that these phenomena form a constellation with one another.

A few key limitations of this study are important to note. First, my investigation began broadly, reading U.S. and world history textbooks, teachers’ manuals and lesson plan development, from the 1940s to the 2000s. I ultimately honed in on world history textbooks used in Illinois public schools from the 1960 to the 1990s. This scope offered important conclusions,
though I remain curious about U.S. history textbooks’ treatment of the Holocaust. A 1999 study done of Holocaust education in Illinois found that 88% of high school teachers taught the Holocaust in a U.S. history class, as opposed to 54% who reported teaching it as a part of their world history curriculum. Understanding to what capacity the Holocaust was taught through the lens of U.S. history and its treatment in U.S. history textbooks would be a noteworthy extension of this study.

Secondly, because my study of Holocaust education used actual textbooks as the object of analysis, besides contextualizing it with how Holocaust curriculum developed across the U.S. and Illinois, the thesis is limited in its understanding of what actually goes on inside the classroom. Teacher pedagogy diverging from the history textbook could not be assessed within in this scope.

Finally, the “other half” of these narratives, one shrouded all too often from textbooks and media alike, are Arabs and Palestinians. These populations’ representations remain crucial to how the U.S. public has formed their perceptions of the U.S.’s relationship with Israel. The necessary next step of this project would be to dig into textbook and newspaper representations of Arab states and the indigenous population of Palestine in relation to how the U.S. public learns about the Holocaust and consequently, their perceptions of Israel.

As there are such strong ties between understanding U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East and U.S. news coverage of that policy, comprehending how the news is covered digs deeply into the question of citizen responsibility and participation in democratic governments. Analyzing coverage of U.S. aid to Israel in two particularly significant years opens up a larger inquiry of the rhetorical trajectory. The distinct patterns that emerged in the examination of 1966
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and 1974 begs the question of how other years of significant aid increase also have contributed to
common U.S. understanding of this country’s relationship with Israel.

This prompts larger questions of how society goes about changing a frame and a
perceived notion of a people and place. If this thesis was an investigation of the origins of U.S.
public opinion and understanding of the U.S.’s fiscal relationship with Israel, is one to
understand that these opinions might so easily evolve as they did between 1960 and 1990? In the
case of the Holocaust, despite efforts by scholars such as Peter Novick and Norman Finkelstein,
the public’s understanding remains relatively consistent with how it was learned in the 1990s.
The topic of U.S. political and fiscal support for Israel, rather, is facing a turning point. Now
more than ever Palestinian solidarity groups along with the progressive Jewish left demand a
change in the traditional narrative. It is now possible to read extensively on U.S. complicity in
the Israeli occupation on mainstream news sites such as Al Jazeera and Israel’s Haaretz. This
turning point is also a conflict for policy makers in the United States. As discussed, elected
representatives must answer to their populace, even on issues of foreign policy. But they also
answer to private interest groups who fund their campaigns. When an issue such as U.S. fiscal
support of Israel is seen differently by the electorate and interest groups, framing theory is
complicated. It is this complication that drives evolution of foreign policy and is vital to the
safeguarding of true democracy. Ultimately, this thesis challenges what stories and histories are
made visible and which remain invisible. It encourages a critical eye to be cast on assumed
relationships often constructed by political interests that act slightly beyond the sightline of a
newspaper article or a high school history textbook.
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