

Erin Chapman
Supplemental Essay

500-750 word essay describing research strategies and application of library tools and resources in completion of the paper

In order to complete my research paper, “The Dreadful Chasm”: American Recognition and Response to the Armenian Genocide of 1915-1916 and the Holocaust, I relied heavily on a wide range of Indiana University library tools and resources. The secondary literature that I found in the library, combined with the library’s online databases and newspaper archives not only made this type of research possible, but all of the resources available through the library system allowed me to delve further into the question of American response than I ever imagined when I started out.

My original research strategy was to rely on secondary literature to compare what historians and analysts had written about the American response to genocide in Armenia and Germany. I had envisioned a paper that took a historiographical look at how genocide had been treated in each case, and I found enough sources to make my argument through the Research Collection Stacks at the Herman B Wells Library and also through IU’s interlibrary loan system.

After I had written the first draft of my paper, my professor, Mark Roseman, challenged me to do more research. He mentioned that through the Indiana University Libraries, all IU students had access to Proquest’s catalogue of historical newspapers. He suggested that I look at the actual American newspaper coverage of each atrocity. Instead of relying solely on the conclusions of other historians, he

thought that I could use the newspaper sources available through the library to decide for myself how informed the American people were of the destruction.

I heeded his recommendation and decided to compare the *New York Times* coverage of both the Armenian genocide of 1915-1916 and the Holocaust. Through the Proquest Historical Newspapers resource I was able to find more than 700 articles that referenced the massacres.

My research strategy was to do a keyword search in the *New York Times* archives for certain phrases related to genocide. For Armenia, a simple search for “Armenia” from January 1, 1914-January 1, 1917 yielded 373 results, most of which concerned the massacres. I looked through these first for relevance, and then chronologically so I could get a sense of both when the story was getting the most prominent coverage and also how that coverage evolved over time.

The strategy I used to search for stories about the Holocaust differed slightly. Because both “Germany” and “Jews” appeared frequently in the *New York Times* outside of the context of the Nazis, I entered a series of keywords, including combinations of the words “Holocaust,” “concentration camp,” “Auschwitz,” “massacre,” “Germany” and “Jews” and then filtered them by relevance. I perused articles published from January 1, 1939 to January 1, 1946 in order to get a sense of the evolution of the coverage.

It was through my exposure to these newspaper articles that my sense of the limited framework that Americans had to understand genocide evolved. Without

these resources, I could never have completed research of this nature, and my final paper is the product of the resources made available to me by the Indiana University Libraries.