In late September of 1944, as the Allied nations inched closer to victory, a major international event took place in Canada. This was the meeting in Montreal of UNRRA, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. At the Montreal conference, essential diplomatic issues were discussed, including how UNRRA would be funded, and—the most urgent matter—how to assist war ravaged peoples.\textsuperscript{1} For the host country, added interest was created by the choice of prominent Canadian diplomat Lester B. Pearson as UNRRA chairman. Pearson also presided over the Administration’s policy committee, which had the crucial task of handling pleas for aid from numerous nations and “persecuted minorities.”\textsuperscript{2}

Jews were, of course, one of these “minorities.” In fact, representatives of Jewish groups from all over the world, including the World Jewish Congress, gathered in Montreal to present evidence of the horrors faced by European Jews and to demand aid for survivors of Nazi persecution. They also requested some kind of representation on the Administration’s major committees.\textsuperscript{3} Other United Nations officials and delegates from various nations were also present to give evidence and discuss the plight of “persecuted minorities” of which, in Pearson’s words, “95% were Jews.”\textsuperscript{4} For anyone interested in investigating and exposing the horrors faced by European Jewry under the Nazis, no greater occasion could be hoped for.

But a sample of the coverage by newspapers and magazines shows that for the mainstream English Canadian media, this was mostly a missed opportunity. The \textit{Globe and Mail} did offer detailed coverage of the meetings, and the \textit{Montreal
Gazette devoted much attention to this important event which was taking place in its own city. The discussions of the “persecuted minority problem” were included in these reports, and through them, information about the Holocaust and the acute refugee problem it had created could be found. But there were no feature reports about the plight of European Jews, no concerted attempts to expose the depth of Nazi crimes—in short, there was no effort to mine the rich resources placed in the lap of the Canadian press. In other newspapers, such as the Toronto Star and the Winnipeg Free Press, coverage of the UNRRA conference—and its treatment of the “persecuted minority problem”—was much less substantial. Some media sources barely noticed the problem at all. The Financial Post, for instance, reported exclusively upon the UNRRA discussions regarding allocation of resources and control of trade, and took no interest in any issues related to assistance to suffering peoples.

Moreover, during the UNRRA meetings, none of the five papers noted above offered any editorial support to organizations attempting to secure refuge and assistance for survivors of the Holocaust. The only paper to offer any comment on the Montreal UNRRA conference was the Globe and Mail. In its 21 September editorial, the Globe and Mail denounced what it called “pressure groups” which sought to affect UNRRA aid policy. “Group pressure,” read the commentary, “has become so effective in getting concessions from weak-kneed politicians that it is not surprising to see it put into operation to influence UNRRA.” The Globe did not mention Jewish “group pressure” specifically. In fact, their editorial singled out for criticism the “strong campaign” by “prominent Italian residents in North America to have Italy [a former enemy nation] included as a beneficiary.”

Nevertheless, there is little doubt that Jewish organizations were among the “partisan bodies” the Globe felt were unduly pressuring the work of the UNRRA Policy Committee. Indeed, in its articles on the Montreal meeting, the Globe reporters made repeated references to the “special fight” of
Jewish groups to have representatives or at least official observers in UNRRA proceedings. The *Globe*’s disapproval of these requests for “special” representation was emphatic. “It must be assumed that the organization [i.e. UNRRA] has means of learning what the requirements (in every situation) are, and will employ them without regard for the pressure from partisan bodies. Any other procedure would throw its operations into dis-repute.”

I

The UNRRA meeting in Montreal would not be the last time the Canadian press failed to offer adequate coverage of the plight of European Jews—nor was it the first. In the five major English Canadian dailies (the *Montreal Gazette*, the *Toronto Star*, the *Globe and Mail*, the *Winnipeg Free Press*, and the *Financial Post*) examined for this article, reports of the Holocaust struggled to make it to the top of news agenda. From May 1944 to June 1945, the Holocaust was *never* the subject of the top headline in the papers. The front pages of these five papers usually featured two (or sometimes more) top stories for the day, which were placed just below the lead headline. The Holocaust was the focus of one of the two main stories only once. Reporting of the Nazi genocide was remarkably inconsistent, and the news was often lost in the back pages in fragmented and vague reports. During certain periods, any coverage of the Holocaust was extremely difficult to find.

In *Maclean’s* and *Liberty*, the two largest English Canadian news magazines, the coverage was little better. The Holocaust was *never* a cover story for either magazine. Their covers also included announcements regarding other major stories to be found inside. Only once was an article on the Nazi genocide announced on the cover. Altogether, there were two feature reports on the Holocaust in *Liberty* and *Maclean’s*.

While this small sample of press sources is clearly not enough to permit decisive conclusions, it does grant some
insight not only into what the Canadian public would have known about the Holocaust and when, but into some of the causes of the media’s neglect of the genocide. In particular, it allows us to address the two principal explanations for the poverty of the coverage that have been offered by scholars of the wartime press in United States. The first is that reporters and editors were unwilling to accept the truthfulness of the accounts of mass killings because the reports were, as the title of Deborah Lipstadt’s study of the American media suggests, simply *Beyond Belief*.\(^{13}\) The second is antisemitism on the part of both Allied newspeople and the public, prejudice that made the media reluctant to publish stories about the murder of Jews.

One factor which undoubtedly had an impact on the press’ attention to the Holocaust was the vast amount of news in 1944 and 1945. Indeed, Canadians had a lot on their minds. People at home had husbands, sons, fathers, relatives, and neighbours on the front lines, in a conflict whose outcome did not seem absolutely certain until the Allies had broken through the German border in early 1945. Even when victory appeared secure, the fighting remained intense—and Canadian casualties remained high—up until the final surrender. Almost every day, newspapers listed new names of Canadians lost or wounded in battle. Often these lists would take up more than an entire page.\(^{14}\)

As German defenses began to falter in late 1944, concerns about the result of the conflict quickly gave way to worries about the shape of the post-war world. Concerns were regularly expressed about the long-term stability of the alliance between the major Western democracies and the Soviet Union. Lasting peace in Europe appeared an unlikely prospect to many reporters and columnists.\(^{15}\) Moreover, there was anxiety about whether Canada could gain the international stature which reflected its importance in the war effort.\(^{16}\)

Above all, Canadians seemed preoccupied with the nature of the post-war economy. Indeed, the media was obsessed with the possibility of a return to the depressed economic conditions of the 1930s, once massive military produc-
tion was no longer needed. As early as the summer of 1944, some of the top stories of the Financial Post had titles such as “A New Wave of Unemployment?” and “Making Canada Depression Proof.”

This preoccupation with the post-war economy also had an impact on Canadian politics. 1945 was a federal election year, with the vote taking place on June 11th, little more than a month after victory in Europe was declared. Insecurity about future standards of living attracted many Canadians to the social-democratic C.C.F., who promised a full social security network and the nationalization of key industries. A fundamental shift in Canada’s social and political landscape seemed a distinct possibility. Throughout early 1945, Prime Minister Mackenzie King and his Liberals, the opposition Conservatives, and most of Canada’s editors and reporters engaged in an intense effort to keep, as the Prime Minister put it, “the Socialist hoards at bay.” Throughout 1944 and 1945, the news of the greatest mass genocide in history competed with these events for the media’s attention—and almost always lost.

As Irving Abella and Harold Troper note in None is Too Many, the first substantial report on the genocide appeared in the November 1943 edition of Liberty. This edition not only offered eye witness accounts of Babi Yar—the massacre of 33,771 Jews which had occurred near Kiev in September, 1941—but also allowed Canadians, as Troper and Abella state, to “read for the first time of technologically advanced and scientifically efficient death camps.” However, by the late spring of 1944, whatever media interest was created by this news had dissipated and reports on the genocide were notably scarce. The first detailed story on the Holocaust during the period under review appeared in early July 1944. This was a story by Daniel Brigham for the New York Times about Auschwitz-Birkenau. Brigham wrote that over 1.5 million Jews had been killed at the camp, and outlined the Nazi’s methods of gassing their victims and cremating their bodies. Although the report was carried by
many major American dailies, the only Canadian paper to reprint Brigham’s piece was the *Montreal Gazette.* But the story did not generate any sustained effort to cover the Nazi genocide and none of the sources would offer much editorial comment on the atrocities until much later.

In fact, throughout the summer of 1944, the press remained almost totally silent on the Holocaust. One exception was a brief report of a “factory of death” in Poland on the front page of the *Toronto Star.* While the article was too short to offer many details of the ghastliness of the crimes, some of the importance of the “discovery” was finally conveyed. *Star* reporter Natalia Rene wrote that “a gigantic concentration camp where atrocities and executions were carried out in a manner paling into insignificance all previous horrors of this war was disclosed today by two Russian journalists.” But once again, no further elaboration or comments (aside from one reference in a *Star* editorial) could be found on these seemingly fantastic reports.

**II**

The event which finally brought the Holocaust to the attention of most media sources was the capture in mid-August of the Majdanek death camp near Lublin, in Poland. On August 30, the *Star,* the *Globe and Mail* and the *Free Press* all carried major articles on their front pages of the “discovery” of the camp by advancing Russian armies. Each of the reports outlined clearly the elaborate process the Nazis had established of transporting the “prisoners” to the camp, leading them to a building they were told was for bathing, taking their valuables, killing them in gas chambers, cremating their bodies, and sorting their possessions for distribution within the Reich. These articles also conveyed in graphic detail some of the grisliness of the murders, and the coldness with which many of the Nazi guards in the camp approached their jobs.

In the following days, the *Globe and Mail* and the *Free*
Press produced editorials expressing their revulsion at the crimes, and pondering the implications of the killings for humanity in general, and for Germany in particular. But once again, despite the editorialists’ profound musings on the meaning of these “discoveries,” the murder of the Jews was submerged once again in an ocean of reports on other foreign and domestic events.

However, this renewed silence was not quite as complete as it was before the “discovery” of the Majdanek camp. A few brief articles can be found on the murder of the Jews, and references were made to the genocide in several editorials. Moreover, as noted above, discussions of the “persecuted minority problem” at the UNRRA conference in September did receive coverage, particularly from the Globe and the Gazette. Nevertheless, most of the information that could be gleaned from these papers could be found not among the news from Europe, but from reports on local affairs. Winnipeg, Toronto, and Montreal all had sizable Jewish populations, and each of the papers often reported on their city’s Jewish community events. In particular, the Gazette featured numerous articles on the activities of Canada’s largest Jewish community in Montreal. Not surprisingly, much of the Jewish organizations’ actions at this time focussed on the fate of their coreligionists in Europe. Papers often quoted from public speeches about the genocide by local rabbis and other community leaders. But the press never offered any confirmation of the claims of local Jews—they simply reprinted them as the views of people prominent in the local community. Hence these reports might not have been read by Canadians as “authentic” news.

In fact, from the fall of 1944 until the final weeks of the war, as the Red Army liberated more death camps, including Auschwitz-Birkenau, details of the Holocaust remained extremely scarce in the sources under review. Remarkably, in one editorial at the end of the war, the Winnipeg Free Press seemed to openly admit its failure to publish information made available by the Red Army and Soviet Officials. “The Russians
indeed,” read the *Free Press*’s 21 April 1945 commentary,

who have been on the offensive for more than two years have been publishing the tale of the Nazi atrocities now ever since they began to regain ground they had once lost. The file of these official Russian stories contains nothing more frightful than the file we are now collecting ourselves. There has been no exaggeration in the Russian claims.30

If the *Free Press* was suspicious of “exaggeration” on the part of the Russians, they could have reported the Russian claims with some kind of appropriate qualification or warning to Canadian readers. But the *Free Press* and the other media sources almost never told their readers that these reports from the eastern front even existed.

From the fall of 1944 to late March 1945, the lone major breaks in the media’s silence—aside from the reporting on the UNRRA conference—were also the only feature-length magazine articles on the Holocaust. In the 1 September 1944 edition of *Maclean’s*, Anna Louise Strong described at length the attempt by the Nazis to systematically annihilate European Jewry. Strong traced the persecution of Jews from the mistreatment they suffered in prewar Germany, through the creation of the ghettos and their exploitation as slave labour, to camps such as Auschwitz-Birkenau where thousands were murdered every day.31 The 28 October 1944 edition of *Liberty* featured the most vivid description of the operations of a Nazi death camp that could be found in the Canadian press during the final year of the war. This report on Majdanek, by Canadian journalist Ralph Parker, emphasized the ruthless efficiency of the Germans and presented lengthy, vivid accounts by camp survivors of their experiences.32 However, following the pattern set by the newspapers two months earlier, *Liberty* expressed its disgust with the atrocities and pondered their implications in its editorial in the following issue,33 and then dropped the story entirely. *Maclean’s* for its part, offered no editorial comment on
the genocide.

Indeed, it was not until April 1945 that the murder of the Jews became the focus of regular reports in the Canadian press. Articles on the Holocaust could often be found on the front pages of Canadian dailies, although never as one of the lead stories. Coverage of the genocide was not nearly as consistent or as in depth as the reporting from the battle front, or from the negotiations—mostly in the San Francisco convention—on the formation of the United Nations. Other events, such as the election campaign (which was now in full swing), and even the celebrations from liberated areas and the Victory Loan campaign, usually received at least as much attention.

Moreover, some of the most basic information about the genocide was usually missing in the stories. Readers must have been left with an incomplete picture of the scope of the Nazi campaign, as the number of camps, and the total number of victims, were especially lacking in the coverage. There were some notable exceptions, such as Anna Strong’s report for *Maclean’s*, which emphasized that the Nazis had come close to wiping out the Jewish populations of the countries they occupied. One of the few newspaper reports that attempted to outline just how many “murder factories” existed, and how many people were killed in each, was released by the Associated Press on 12 April 1945. Both the *Montreal Gazette* and the *Winnipeg Free Press* published the piece on their front pages, although the *Free Press* trimmed the report somewhat. The *Toronto Star* also printed an edited version of the report in its 12 April edition, but where it chose to place the article is as profound a statement about the priorities of the Canadian press as one could hope to find. The report was squeezed onto page 31, the last page of the paper but one, just to the left of the daily crossword puzzle. Most of the rest of the page was covered with fashion advertisements for local department stores.

**III**

What accounts for the failure of the Canadian press to give the
Holocaust adequate coverage? One of the principal explanations offered by both Deborah Lipstadt and David Wyman is an unwillingness on the part of journalists to trust the “sensational” reports emanating from Europe. Lipstadt characterizes the American press’ response to the stories as one of “grudging belief, often bordering on disbelief.”

In the Canadian press, one can find a great deal of evidence of a similar reluctance to believe the reports of Nazi genocide. In fact, this mistrust was discussed frequently by Canadian journalists and editors. For instance, the Globe and Mail commented after the “discovery” of the Majdanek camp that

if there were not available the personal testimony of reliable eyewitnesses like Mr. W.H. Lawrence, a correspondent of that admirable paper the New York Times, and Mr. Maurice Hindus, the well-known writer and authority on Russia, who have visited the gruesome spot, most people would receive with a certain incredulity that appalling story of the mass murder of a million and a half people in a concentration camp ... near the captured city of Lublin, in Poland.

Similarly, the Winnipeg Free Press editorialized about Majdanek that

decent men and women everywhere are mistrustful of evidence that mass atrocities have taken place and that scores of thousands of our fellow creatures have been put to death in circumstances of the utmost cruelty and horror....The failure to believe is usually expressed in terms of a refusal to accept the evidence, bolstered by a belief that no men could behave as these Nazified Germans have behaved.

While these comments do not quite constitute an open admission by journalists that they, themselves, had been unwilling to trust reports of Nazi atrocities, they clearly articulate the press’ perception of a climate of disbelief in Canada about the Holocaust. In fact, articles and commentary about the murder of
David Goutor

the Jews were marked by a constant preoccupation with reassuring readers of the reliability of the news. References were consistently made to “well authenticated” sources, “reliable witnesses,” and “irrefutable evidence,” to persuade readers of the reality of the systematic annihilation of millions.42

*Liberty* promised Canadians that “the evidence is there. It is told in a thousand eye-witness accounts. It is substantiated by sober men of science who have documented their findings.”43 Similarly, *the Winnipeg Free Press* assured its readers that today the news is coming out not from underground or second-hand sources. It is flowing in over the wires, day by day—eye-witness stories of trained newspapermen and honourable and competent Canadian, British, and American officers and men who have seen the enormities and witnessed these horrors with their own eyes.”44

At times, this wider climate of disbelief seemed to attract the attention of press editorials almost as much as the genocide itself. For instance, the *Winnipeg Free Press* claimed it had been the victim of the skepticism of Canadians. In an editorial two weeks before the end of the war, the *Free Press* contended that it had reported in great detail the first attacks on Jews by the Nazis in 1933—and consequently faced a huge public backlash. “The reaction,” according to the *Free Press* commentary, was one of complete incredulity, coupled with a deep and honest regret in many people’s minds that such lies should be printed in a newspaper which, up to that time, they had respected. The *Free Press* was regarded as an unhappy and misguided mischief maker and war-monger, trying to stir up trouble where none existed.45

The *Free Press* thus stopped just short of explicitly blaming this wider climate of disbelief in Canada for its lack of coverage of Nazi atrocities.

The *Free Press* was not the only paper to argue that
there were negative consequences from this climate of disbelief. A *Liberty* editorial claimed that the skepticism on the part of the Canadian public served to help the Nazis in their murderous agenda. In his editorial for the 4 November 1944 issue, *Liberty* publisher J.L. Rutledge told the story of how Canadians had become mistrustful of stories of atrocities after the First World War. In that war, Rutledge claimed, Canadians were barraged by stories and “propaganda” of utter savagery on the part of the Germans. “Perhaps some of those stories,” Rutledge lamented, “were coloured by the passion of the moment, and would not stand up ... under investigation.” The result was that “since that war a whole generation has grown up, a generation inoculated with a skepticism toward all atrocity stories.” Rutledge claimed that this doubt was “played on...miraculously well” by Goebbels and the Nazis, allowing them to commit their crimes for years without arousing the anger of the rest of the world.46

Was the lack of coverage of the Holocaust indeed a function of this disbelief (of either journalists or the wider public), this kind of innocent—or even historically well-grounded—unwillingness to accept that such barbarism was possible? Several considerations should make us suspicious of this explanation. First, when information was published on the genocide, the articles tended *not* to be “sober” and “scientific” expositions of the “well authenticated” evidence that Canadians might have been inclined to believe. Rather, the press displayed a marked tendency to focus on the most sensational, horrific and seemingly incredible aspects of the story.

Intimate details of Nazi torture methods, or of the actions of the most savage guards at the concentration camps, were regular features of Canadian press reports. For instance, one *Toronto Star* article focused exclusively on a 22 year old guard at Majdanek who related “the story of what he had seen and done...as dispassionately as you or I might describe a sports meeting which we had found somewhat dull.”47 The 1 March 1945 edition of the *Globe and Mail* included a lengthy
description of the most disgusting instances of “Nazi vivisec-
tion of human beings.” Similarly, an Associated Press report
carried by both the Winnipeg Free Press and the Montreal
Gazette, detailed how “the prison courtyards of the German tor-
ture camps were torture arenas, rivaling those of the days of
Nero, where dogs were turned in to rip clothes from defenseless
prisoners and naked men and women were paraded together in
the bitter cold.” The headline for this article in the Gazette
read, “Nazis Set Dogs on Jewish Prisoners.” The only article
which dealt with the camp in Treblinka offered little description
of the operations of the camp, no accounts of the survivors’
experiences, and only a cursory reference to “several million
people” being gassed there. The focus of the report was on the
Germans’ “use of a mixture of human ashes and bones instead
of asphalt to pave local roads.”

Reporters tended to latch onto specific instances of
shocking barbarism on the part of the Nazis. The use by sever-
al “prominent German women” of human skin for lamp shades
and purses was one favourite theme. In fact, one Star report on
the Buchenwald camp began not with details on the number of
people killed, or with a description of the systematic nature of
the murders, but with the story that “Frau Koch had a hobby...it
was collecting tattooed skins... (Out) of one nice set of matched
skins she fashioned a lampshade with her own hands.” Similarly, articles on the Majdanek camp put considerable
emphasis on the use of the victims’ ashes to fertilize the vegetable
gardens around the crematoria. All of the reports on Majdanek
also devoted much attention to the story of one particularly
cruel guard at the camp crematoria, who once forced a woman
directly into one of the furnaces where she was burned alive.

There is no doubt that it was important that the savagery
of the Nazis was exposed to Canadians. But it is remarkable
that the Canadian press showed such a voyeuristic interest in
the genocide while ignoring many basic aspects of the story.
More importantly, the question must be asked: If the media did
in fact face a mood of skepticism toward atrocity reports, then
why would they choose to focus on the most seemingly unbeliev-
uble facets of the stories of the Holocaust?

The Canadian media, in fact, seems to have a taste for atrocity stories in general. Indeed, throughout the final years of the war in Europe, reports of Nazi crimes against people besides those in the concentration and death camps received as much media attention as the Holocaust. At some times, particularly in late 1944 and early 1945, these crimes got even more press. For instance, numerous articles were devoted to the “torture chambers” built in Paris and other major occupied cities to deal with resisters to Nazi rule.54

Mass killings by retreating German armies were especially well publicized.55 For example, in late June 1944, Gestapo officers, before retreating from the French town of Gorlitz, shot fifty captured Allied flyers, including six officers of the Royal Canadian Air Force. The incident at Gorlitz was a major story in Canada, and editorials seethed with rage over the killings.56 In fact, the Globe and Mail went so far as to assert that the “mass murder at Gorlitz…sets a crown upon the many infamies perpetrated against mankind by the German people since 1933…It places them beyond the pale of humanity.”57

Atrocities committed by the Japanese also attracted a great deal of media attention. Indeed, provocative, detailed and grotesque reports on mass killings and tortures by the enemy in the Pacific appeared regularly in the Canadian press, often on the front page.58

Once again, the media was attracted to the most sensational aspects of enemy outrages. Consider, for instance, the title of atrocity stories that could be found in the Toronto Star: “Hand Prints of Death in Nazi Torture Chamber,”59 “32 He Flogged to Death With His Own Hands, Now He Sits Like a Caged Ape,”60 “Nazis Operated on Him 22 Times, More to Come,”61 or “Two Buried Alive by Nazis While Trying to Get Out.”62

If the Canadian press was willing, if not eager, to publicize these crimes in the most graphic detail, why was it so reluctant to provide a more clear, comprehensive picture of the Nazi murder of Jews? Furthermore, if Canadian journalists were
preoccupied with the popular perception of reports of the Holocaust, they hardly seemed concerned about the credibility of their coverage of other parts of the war. In particular, the five newspapers under review consistently published outrageous rumours during the final year of the war. To be sure, the papers usually noted that their information had not been confirmed, that these were merely “reports” from Europe. Nevertheless, pure gossip was a regular feature of Canadian newspapers in this period, with hearsay often appearing on the front page. For instance, throughout the final year of the war, there were a variety of reports (including some in the lead headlines) that the Nazis had secret weapons of last resort, which they might use now that the war was turning against them. Canadians read all about super rockets, secret bombs, and robot bombers that might be launched.63

There were also constant reports on the activities and whereabouts of Adolph Hitler. In one week in July 1944, readers of the Winnipeg Free Press read that Hitler was planning an escape route to Sweden, then that he was on the verge of agreeing to an unconditional surrender.64 In late April 1945, the Free Press reported word that Hitler might have been killed by an Allied bombing on his home, then—in the top headline on April 26—that he was leading his personal “Elite Guard” in the final stand against the Allies. This was followed by news that he had “suffered a cerebral hemorrhage and was near death,” and finally that “a fanatical Nazi double for Hitler would die in Berlin’s defense to perpetuate the Nazi hero legend.”65 In the same period, the Toronto Star printed speculation that Hitler was planning his “last stand” in his “Bavarian redoubt” in Berchtesgaden, and that he was “contemplating death in battle at the head of a suicide battalion” in Berlin.66 Apparently reveling in the guessing game, on 24 April the Star reported a number of rumours of the Fuhrer’s whereabouts in an article entitled “Hitler Here, There, Everywhere.”67
Altogether, it seems that more than a supposed climate of disbelief lay behind the media’s neglect of the Holocaust. An obvious possible cause of the inadequate coverage would be prejudice against Jews on the part of Canadian reporters and editors. Indeed, Abella and Troper expose in great detail the determination of Canadians and their government to keep Jewish refugees out of Canada from 1933 to well after the war. In *Beyond Belief*, Lipstadt detects a large amount of antisemitism in American reporting and editorials on a variety of events, and suggests that this prejudice might have been a major reason for the press’ neglect of the Holocaust. However, open expressions of antisemitism are not to be found in Canadian media sources during the last year of the war. If anything, the press tended to speak out against manifestations of bigotry and against antisemitic organizations. For instance, the first page of the 10 June 1944 edition of *Liberty* magazine included a photograph of Jews being paraded through the streets by S.S. officers, with a caption reading “In Europe Racial Intolerance Led To This.” Underneath was an editorial in which *Liberty* publisher J.L. Rutledge urged Canadians to make a concerted effort to eliminate racial and ethnic prejudice. In late September 1944, the *Globe and Mail* reported that several Jews were unable to rent cottages on the Toronto Island because of intolerant property owners. In an editorial entitled “Race Hatred Deplorable,” the *Globe* conceded that “unfortunately, it cannot be denied that prejudice exists.” In the most dramatic terms, the *Globe* exhorted Canadians to take decisive action against the problem:

Liberal minded people who believe that racial prejudice and religious intolerance are characteristics of the uncivilized must deplore evidence of anti-Semitism in Toronto island....We have surely learned from the experience of Europe that Canada is no place for race or creed baiters. Hitlerism offers a terrifying example of the evils of anti-Semitism. The sinful effects of ignorance,
ill-will and racial prejudice must be combated in a Christian country.\textsuperscript{73}

*Maclean’s*, for its part, commissioned Rabbi Abraham Feinberg of Holy Blossom Temple in Toronto to write a feature-length article on the extent of antisemitism in Canada. The subtitle to Feinberg’s piece read, “We Fight Hitler’s Creed Overseas, But We Have a Seedling Of It Right Here At Home, Says This Rabbi.”\textsuperscript{74} The *Toronto Star* also warned readers of the dangerous potential of antisemitism in Canada. In a commentary entitled “a Christian Problem,” the *Star* declared that the failure of Canadians to eradicate anti-Jewish discrimination could have disastrous consequences:

> The experience in Nazi controlled countries has shown that an attack on Jews is but a prelude to assaults on the democratic rights of every decent citizen. Scientists, teachers, writers, workers and humanitarian persons of all religious and racial groups have been imprisoned, slaughtered, and exiled by the Nazis.\textsuperscript{75}

Like several of the commentaries noted above, the *Toronto Star* was clearly expressing concern that Canadians were at least susceptible to antisemitism.\textsuperscript{76}

Nevertheless, this editorial hinted at a more subtle form of discrimination against Jews on the part of the *Star* and other Canadian media sources. A distinction was undoubtedly made by the *Star* between Jews and other people, and between antisemitism and the oppression of other groups. Indeed, the *Star*’s emphasis was not on antisemitism as a crime in itself, but as a first step to other, larger injustices. Hence antisemitism is described as “but a prelude” to greater problems. In fact, the main point that the commentary went on to make was that anti-Jewish hatred was a tool of the enemy, a “weapon of the Nazi revolution.”\textsuperscript{77} The *Star* claimed that Hitler planned to “sow the seeds of anti-Semitism” in Allied countries to create social upheavals and weaken his enemies. “Anti-Semitism is indeed the most cunning of [the Nazis’] methods to undermine demo-
ocratic nations," the editorial concluded.\textsuperscript{78}

The primary reason for Canadians to be concerned about antisemitism, then, was not the welfare of Jews, but the future of the country. This shifting of focus away from Jews themselves when discussing antisemitism can be seen in other sources. Note that much of the \textit{Globe}'s objection to "race hatred" was that it was "characteristic of the uncivilized." The terms of Rutledge's plea for racial tolerance in the \textit{Liberty} editorial mentioned above were also revealing: "...if we want a better Canada where intolerance and sectional difference may cease to exist, we had better be about our personal business ...of making our convictions work."\textsuperscript{79}

This unwillingness to focus on the suffering of Jews might have been subtle when the media dealt with tensions within Canada, but it was shockingly obvious in much of the coverage of the Holocaust. One of the most remarkable characteristics of many reports on the genocide was how little attention was paid to Jews as the principal targets of Nazi barbarism. In fact, in a host of articles on the Holocaust, from feature stories to tiny reports, the word "Jew" did not appear at all. For example, between 20 April and 1 May 1945, more than a dozen reports appeared on the genocide (not on "atrocities" in general but on the systematic killings specifically), which did not make any reference to Jewish victims.\textsuperscript{80}

Jews were also not mentioned at all in a significant proportion of the editorials on Nazi mass murders. Journalists and editors wrote eloquently of the gravity of Nazi crimes, and of their contempt for all Germans for allowing such travesties to take place. A loud voice was raised by the press for stern punishment of Germans for the massacres "they did not raise a hand to stop."\textsuperscript{81} But while the editorialists paid much attention to the crimes and their perpetrators and accomplices, it often ignored the victims. For instance, in one week in April 1945, both the \textit{Free Press} and the \textit{Globe} published commentaries which demanded severe penalties for the German people for the "atrocities." The word "Jew" was completely missing
from both of these commentaries. Similarly, not a single mention of Jews was made in a Star editorial which ridiculed German civilians who pleaded their innocence about the “extermination camps.”

In other reports and editorials, only cursory references to the number of Jewish victims were made. For instance, all of the 30 August 1944 feature reports on the Majdanek camp in the Globe, the Free Press, and the Star, made only passing reference to Jews being killed. Similarly, in a lengthy story on the Buchenwald and Auschwitz-Birkenau camps in the Gazette, one sentence was committed to the fact that “of the people murdered, 90% were said to have been Jews who were gassed thousands at a time.”

There can be little doubt that Canadian readers must have been aware in the final year of the war that most of the victims of the Nazi camps were Jewish. There were certainly enough references to the number of Jews in the camps to assure at least that much. And there were reports (Anna Strong’s feature for Maclean’s is one good example) which did emphasize that the Nazis had attempted to annihilate European Jewry. On the whole, however, the press often made such an effort to avoid the fact that the primary victims of the Holocaust were Jews that the public was given a highly distorted image of Nazi genocide.

Furthermore, the media utterly failed to inform Canadians of the centrality of antisemitism in Nazi ideology, although they did draw attention to Nazi racism. One can find frequent references to the Nazis’ view that their victims belonged to “inferior races.” Furthermore, many reports and editorials argued that the genocide was not the work of a fringe group within the Reich, but a reflection of the nature of Hitler’s Germany. For instance, the Winnipeg-Free Press editorial on 21 April 1945 identified the mass killings as “an essential part of Nazism.” However, the fact that Jews were the key targets of the Nazis’ racism was almost never clearly expressed by the
media. In fact, journalists sometimes suggested other explanations for the mass killings. In particular, readers were told that the Holocaust should be seen as merely the most extreme manifestation of a German militarism with which Canadians should already have been familiar. In that same editorial of 21 April 1945, the *Free Press* argued that “what we are reading now is the same kind of horror, intensified and on a larger scale, that marked the path of the German army from 1914 to 1918.”90 In one of their commentaries on the genocide, *Globe and Mail* editors made the astonishing claim that “it is established beyond question that inconceivable savagery was in the German race as a prelude to the type of warfare now being experienced—and the blueprints for which were under consideration before the war of 1914-1918 was ended.”91 Altogether, the Canadian press conveyed a misleading image of Nazi ideology and the critical place of antisemitism within it.

Another aspect of the story which received scant attention were the refugee policies of Allied nations—and Canada in particular. When the issue arose at the United Nations or other diplomatic meetings, the press would usually report the results of the discussions.92 Newspapers also frequently reprinted comments by local Jewish leaders regarding the need to provide assistance and refuge to European Jewry.93 But the issue of Jewish refugees was never a significant story in itself. Reports on the Holocaust were devoid of any references to the restrictive immigration policies of Canada or any other Allied nation.

Moreover, throughout the final year of the war in Europe, the media sources under review offered almost no official support to the pleas of Jewish organizations for some kind of asylum for refugees. The lone exception was the *Toronto Star*, which made reference to the issue in several editorials and columns.94 The *Star* argued strongly—although with a remarkable ignorance of Canada’s refugee record—for the allowance of Jews to settle in Palestine. “It is an amazing fact,” read the *Star* editorial of 29 January 1945, “that under the Jewish White Paper on Palestine, adopted in 1939, Palestine is the only country
outside of Nazi controlled territory which restricts the immigration of Jews because they are Jews.” The Star called upon the United Nations to take control of the issue, and urged the Canadian government to “lend its weight in the U. N. Council towards effecting a just decision on the Palestine question.”95 The Star also offered some praise for the work of Jewish organizations seeking a homeland in Palestine. For instance, Star columnist Charles Herbert Heustis asserted that “while the Zionists are doing all in their power to hasten the time when Palestine will be, indeed and in truth, their national home, their patience and tolerance is beyond praise.”96

Not coincidentally, the Star was the only paper which took any notice of the refugee policies of Allied nations, and their impact on European Jews. The Star distinguished itself among the Canadian media by offering one solitary comment on the subject, albeit one which did not mention Canada’s policy specifically. In its April 5 editorial, the Star declared:

The persecution of the Jewish people by the Nazis...constitutes a moral challenge to all who are concerned about tolerance, justice, and mercy in human affairs....Throughout the war years...the doors of other countries were closed to the tortured people of Nazi-controlled Europe...97

Paradoxically, then, while the media could hardly be accused of ignoring the Holocaust during the final year of the war, it often avoided publicizing the suffering of European Jews under the Nazis. This unwillingness to expose their plight, or to emphasize the centrality of anti-Jewish hatred in Hitler’s ideology reveals, at the very least, some covert antisemitism in the Canadian media. This prejudice, in turn, serves as a compelling explanation for the inadequate overall coverage of the Nazi genocide.

***
To be sure, this latent antisemitism should not be seen as the sole determinant of the media coverage of the Holocaust. To arrive at solid conclusions about the reasons for the inadequate coverage, it will be necessary to examine the process by which reporters and editors investigated and assessed news stories. A number of factors such as government and military influence on the media, the political climate, and budget limitations of media organizations will have to be carefully considered. A more comprehensive survey of the media, starting from the Nazi seizure of power in 1933, is also needed.

It is also likely that a widespread unwillingness to believe that such barbarism was possible was indeed a significant factor. However, it clearly cannot be accepted as a complete explanation. In fact, this skepticism does not account for many of the characteristics of the reports that were published. It does not explain, for instance, why the victimization of Jews was so dramatically downplayed. Moreover, the sensational nature of much of the coverage not only of the Holocaust, but of other crimes committed by the Axis, is inconsistent with the notion of a climate of doubt in Canada toward atrocity stories. Also incongruent with a supposed mood of skepticism was the constant publication of rumours about a variety of events in Europe.

Finally, an inclination toward disbelief does not explain—in fact is incompatible with—the marked decline in coverage that took place once hostilities ceased in Europe. Indeed, once the Germans were defeated, the reporting of the Holocaust dropped dramatically. There was some interest in the pursuit and prosecution of war criminals, but little effort was made to investigate further the crimes they committed. However, the media continued to publish reports of Japanese atrocities. In fact, Liberty magazine published a feature-length article on a “Japanese massacre” in August 1945. This, of course, was as many articles as Liberty had published on German mass murders. The subtitle to the piece was provocative: “The Japs manage to top even Buchenwald and Dachau
when it comes to sheer horror. Here is a story of the bestiality of the war in the East.” 99 This sudden shift in the media’s attention suggests once again that the press felt it had higher priorities—such as arousing hatred of Canada’s current enemies—than dealing with the horrors suffered by both victims and survivors of Nazi antisemitism.
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