A PUBLICATION OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR CANADIAN STUDIES UNE PUBLICATION DE L'ASSOCIATION D'ÉTUDES CANADIENNES

Citizenship and Immigration Canada Citoyenneté et Immigration Canada

CANADIAN DIVERSITÉ CANADIENNE

VOLUME 7:2 SUMMER 2009 ÉTÉ

Editor/Rédacteur :
Jack Jedwab

Holocaust Education & Genocide Awareness in Diverse Societies

L'éducation sur l'Holocauste et la sensibilisation au génocide dans diverses sociétés

ACS • AEC
Association for Canadian Studies • Association d'études canadiennes

The Association for Canandian Studies presents the two latest editions of The Canadian Journal for Social Research: Multicultural Directions, edited by Prof. Will Kymlicka and our inaugural edition, The State of Canada's Linguistic Duality.

For more information, please visit us at: www.acs-aec.ca

L'Association d'études canadiennes présente les deux dernières éditions de la Revue canadienne de recherche sociale : Directions multiculturelles, publiée sous la direction de Will Kymlicka et l'édition inaugurale, L'état de la dualité linguistique du Canada.

Pour plus d'informations, visitez-nous au www.acs-aec.ca.

CANADIAN DIVERSITY CANADIENNE

Volume 7:2 Summer 2009 Été

Canadian Diversity is published by
Diversité canadienne est publié par

ACS • AEC
Association for Canadian Studies • Association d'études canadiennes

CANADIAN DIVERSITY / DIVERSITÉ CANADIENNE

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF / RÉDACTEUR EN CHEF
Jack Jedwab

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS/ASSISTANTS ÉDITORIAUX
Siddharth Bannerjee & Philipp Dressel

MANAGING EDITOR / DIRECTRICE À LA RÉDACTION
Sarah Kooi

DESIGN / GRAPHISME
Bang Marketing : 514 849-2264 • 1-888 942-BANG
info@bang-marketing.com

ADVERTISING / PUBLICITÉ
sarah.kooi@acs-aec.ca
514 925-3099

ACS ADDRESS / ADRESSE AEC
1822, rue Sherbrooke Ouest, Montréal (QC) H3H 1E4
514 925-3096 / general@acs-aec.ca

Patrimoine canadien Canadian Heritage

Citizenship and Immigration Canada Citoyenneté et Immigration Canada

Canadian Diversity is a quarterly publication of the Association for Canadian Studies (ACS). It is distributed free of charge to individual and institutional members of the ACS. Canadian Diversity is a bilingual publication. All material prepared by the ACS is published in both French and English. All other articles are published in the language in which they are written. Opinions expressed in articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the ACS. The Association for Canadian Studies is a voluntary non-profit organization. It seeks to expand and disseminate knowledge about Canada through teaching, research and publications. The ACS is a scholarly society and a member of the Humanities and Social Science Federation of Canada.

Diversité canadienne est une publication trimestrielle de l'Association d'études canadiennes (AEC). Elle est distribuée gratuitement aux membres de l'AEC. Diversité canadienne est une publication bilingue. Tous les textes émanant de l'AEC sont publiés en français et en anglais. Tous les autres textes sont publiés dans la langue d'origine. Les collaborateurs et collaboratrices de Diversité canadienne sont entièrement responsables des idées et opinions exprimées dans leurs articles. L'Association d'études canadiennes et un organisme pancanadien à but non lucratif dont l'objet est de promouvoir l'enseignement, la recherche et les publications sur le Canada. L'AEC est une société savante et membre de la Fédération canadienne des sciences humaines et sociales.

The ACS acknowledges the financial support of the Government of Canada through the Department of Canadian Heritage for this issue.

L'AEC a bénéficié de l'appui financier du Gouvernement du Canada par l'entremise du ministère du Patrimoine canadien pour ce numéro.

LETTERS/COURRIER

Comments on this edition of Canadian Diversity?
We want to hear from you.
Write to Canadian Diversity—Letters, ACS, 1822A, rue Sherbrooke Ouest, Montréal (Québec) H3H 1E4. Or e-mail us at <sarah.kooi@acs-aec.ca>
Your letters may be edited for length and clarity.

Des commentaires sur ce numéro ?
Écrivez-nous à Diversité canadienne
Courrier, AEC, 1822A, rue Sherbrooke Ouest, Montréal (Québec) H3H 1E4.
Ou par courriel au <sarah.kooi@acs-aec.ca> Vos lettres peuvent être modifiées pour des raisons éditoriales.

GREETINGS FROM THE MINISTER

Canadian Diversity Magazine's Holocaust education & genocide awareness issue, to be distributed at the ITF's Oslo plenary session in June.

As Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism, I would like to extend my greetings to readers and offer my congratulations to the Association of Canadian Studies for dedicating this issue of Canadian Diversity to the examination of Holocaust education and genocide awareness.

Our Government takes Holocaust education and the fight against anti-Semitism very seriously. That is why we have dedicated ourselves to becoming full members in the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research. That is also why, when the Association of Canadian Studies approached us to support their special issue, we immediately saw the value of this publication in the work to raise awareness and happily agreed to lend Citizenship and Immigration Canada's support.

This was also underlined by our recent refusal to participate in the Durban Review Conference; taking part in discussions that are underpinned by hateful ideas serves only to validate them. This would do a serious injustice to the memory of the victims of genocide and diminish the lessons we hope to learn about preventing such atrocities. Those lessons are taken seriously by some, as evidenced by the refusal of many nations to participate in the Durban Review Conference.

It is vitally important to recognize that genocide is not just a crime of the distant past. Crimes against humanity perpetrated by Pol Pot or Saddam Hussein or Mengistu, the crimes committed in Rwanda or Liberia or East Timor – these crimes occurred at a time when the world should have recognized genocide and acted with determination to put an end to the atrocities. It is through a renewed commitment to awareness and education that we will be able to stop future acts of genocide.

Earlier this month, in partnership with the American and French governments, we hosted an international conference that brought together educators, academics and officials to discuss Canada's regrettable actions during World War II, such as our refugee policy, our policy on the Berlin Olympics, internment of British Jewish refugees in Canada and the M.S. St. Louis incident.

When I think about the importance of Holocaust education and genocide awareness, I will forever remember two recent visits overseas. Last November, I paid my respects at the Babi Yar Holocaust site in Kiev, a ravine where more than 33,000 Ukrainian Jews were killed over two days in 1941 by Nazi war criminals.

A few days after I visited Babi Yar site, an attack in Mumbai, India left 164 people dead, including Rabbi Gavriel Holzberg and his wife Rivkah at Chabad House. I visited Chabad House, the synagogue and Jewish community centre, in January, and was sickened to think that this peaceful place could be targeted in this manner.

Sixty-eight years and thousands of miles separate the ravine of Babi Yar from the debris of the Chabad House, but those two sites are connected by the same hatred, the same dehumanization of innocent people. As Prime Minister Stephen Harper stated in response to the attack on the Chabad House, anti-Semitism "is a pernicious evil that must be exposed, that must be confronted, that must be repudiated whenever and wherever it appears."

Increasing public awareness of genocide and developing more learning opportunities about the Holocaust will expose, confront and repudiate all forms of racial hatred. Our Government is committed to doing just that.

The Honourable / L'honorable
Jason Kenney, PC, MP / C.P., député
Minister of Citizenship,
Immigration and Multiculturalism
Ministre de la Citoyenneté,
de l'Immigration et du Multiculturalisme

SALUTATIONS DE LA PART DU MINISTRE

Le numéro de la revue Diversité canadienne consacré à l'enseignement de l'Holocauste et à la sensibilisation au génocide sera distribué à la séance plénière de l'ITF à Oslo en juin.

En qualité de ministre de la Citoyenneté, de l'Immigration et du Multiculturalisme, je salue chaleureusement les lecteurs et félicite l'Association d'études canadiennes d'avoir consacré le présent numéro de la revue Diversité canadienne à la question de l'enseignement de l'Holocauste et de la sensibilisation au génocide.

Notre gouvernement prend très au sérieux l'enseignement de l'Holocauste et la lutte contre l'antisémitisme. C'est la raison pour laquelle nous nous sommes employés à devenir des membres à temps plein du groupe de travail pour la coopération internationale sur la recherche, la mémoire et l'enseignement de l'Holocauste (ITF). C'est aussi pour cette raison que nous avons accepté avec plaisir que Citoyenneté et Immigration Canada accorde son appui à ce numéro spécial dirigé par l'Association d'études canadiennes, quand cette dernière nous a demandé de l'appuyer, car nous avons immédiatement vu la valeur de cette publication pour l'amélioration de la sensibilisation vis-à-vis de cette question.

C'est également ce que traduisait notre récent refus de participer à la Conférence d'examen de Durban; en effet, prendre part à des discussions qui reposent sur des idées haineuses ne sert qu'à les valider. Ce serait faire une grave injustice à la mémoire des victimes du génocide et réduire les leçons que nous espérons apprendre sur la prévention de telles atrocités. Certaines nations prennent ces leçons au sérieux, comme le montre le refus de beaucoup d'entre elles de participer à la Conférence d'examen de Durban.

Il est d'une suprême importance de reconnaître que le génocide n'est pas seulement un crime d'un passé lointain. Les crimes contre l'humanité perpétrés par Pol Pot ou Saddam Hussein ou Mengistu, les crimes commis au Rwanda, au Libéria ou au Timor oriental – ces crimes ont eu lieu à une époque où le monde aurait du reconnaître qu'il s'agissait de génocides et agir avec détermination pour mettre fin à ces atrocités. C'est grâce à un engagement renouvelé à l'égard de la sensibilisation et de l'enseignement que nous pourrons empêcher les actes futurs de génocide.

Plus tôt ce mois-ci, en partenariat avec les gouvernements américain et français, nous avons été l'hôte d'une conférence internationale réunissant des enseignants, des universitaires et des fonctionnaires pour discuter des actions regrettables du Canada pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale, comme notre politique à l'égard des réfugiés, notre politique sur les Olympiques de Berlin, l'internement de réfugiés juifs britanniques au Canada et l'incident du M.S. St. Louis.

Quand je pense à l'importance de l'enseignement de l'Holocauste et de la sensibilisation au génocide, il me revient à l'esprit deux visites récentes outre-mer. En novembre dernier, j'ai rendu mes derniers hommages aux victimes de l'Holocauste du site Babi Yar à Kiev, un ravin où, pendant deux jours, plus de 33 000 Juifs d'origine ukrainienne ont été assassinés en 1941 par des criminels de guerre nazis.

Quelques jours après ma visite à Babi Yar, un attentat à Mumbai, en Inde, a fait 164 morts, y compris le rabbin Gavriel Holzberg et son épouse Rivkah à la Chabad House. J'ai visité la Chabad House, la synagogue et le centre communautaire juif, en janvier, et l'idée que cet endroit paisible pouvait être attaqué de cette manière m'a rendu malade.

Soixante-huit années et des milliers de milles séparent le ravin de Babi Yar des débris de la Chabad House, mais ces deux endroits sont liés par la même haine, la même déshumanisation de personnes innocentes. Comme le Premier ministre Stephen Harper l'a déclaré en réponse à l'attentat contre la Chabad House, l'antisémitisme est « un mal pernicieux qui doit être dénoncé, confronté et réprimé là et où il se manifeste ».

Sensibiliser davantage le public au génocide et créer plus de possibilités d'apprentissage sur l'Holocauste permettront de dénoncer, de confronter et de réprimer toutes les formes de haine raciale. C'est exactement ce que notre gouvernement est déterminé à faire.

The Honourable / L'honorable
Jason Kenney, PC, MP / C.P., deputé
Minister of Citizenship,
Immigration and Multiculturalism
Ministre de la Citoyenneté,
de l'Immigration et du Multiculturalisme

INTRODUCTION

Jack Jedwab, Executive Director, Association for Canadian Studies, June 2009

Former director of the Parkes Institute, Tony Kushner, has observed that: "…as we cross the threshold into a new millennium, interest in the Holocaust continues to escalate. At an artistic and cultural level, representations of the Holocaust, especially in film and literature have never been so intense and pervasive". In our information age, there are extraordinary opportunities to exchange and expand knowledge. New technologies make it possible to reach greater numbers of people across the globe. We can engage in dialogue across borders and boundaries in ways not imagined only a decade ago. Education over considerable distances is become increasingly common.

Although opportunities for expanding knowledge of the Holocaust may seem limitless, those so engaged face ongoing obstacles in pursuit of their important objective. As we go forward the global dialogue around holocaust education will become increasingly important if its universal lessons are to be conveyed to a world that struggles with discrimination, racism and anti-Semitism. The hope is that this edition of Canadian Diversity will contribute to this critical global discussion by identifying some of these obstacles. Several essential questions are raised by the experts from various countries that were invited to share research and ideas about holocaust education and awareness of genocide. Ideally the collection of essays will encourage further binational and multinational collaboration in identifying the best practices for expanding knowledge about the Holocaust education and genocide awareness. It is our view that to do this effectively some baseline information will be needed to permit a needed assessment of what is currently known about the Holocaust in various countries. Thereafter it will be important to understand how the Holocaust's universal lessons are understood by those segments of the population that are most informed about it. Before briefly reviewing the texts included in this publication, I want to thank Citizenship and Immigration Canada for supporting the publication.

My essay examines the responses of some 1500 Canadians to a public opinion survey on knowledge of the Holocaust, awareness of genocide and attitudes towards discrimination and diversity. One of most of the detailed surveys conducted to date on Holocaust knowledge, the results show strong correlation between greater reported Holocaust knowledge and concern over genocide and higher recognition of anti-Semitism as a societal problem. But greater reported Holocaust knowledge did not consistently correlate with greater acceptance of diversity.

Eva Fried of the Living History Forum discusses a rare survey of teachers in Sweden in order to assess their attitudes towards work related to the history of the Holocaust, and their views on the prospects of successfully accomplishing such work.

Paula Cowan examines Scotland's engagement with Holocaust Memorial Day and reports on findings from research on public awareness of Holocaust Memorial Day in the UK. She concludes that Scotland's participation in Holocaust Memorial Day has facilitated its teaching in some primary and secondary schools. Jeffrey Allan Ellison points out that rather than viewing the Holocaust as an isolated it has become increasingly integrated into the broader study of genocide or human rights. He contends that despite the abundance of materials on the Holocaust at the secondary level, too often these materials are not congruent with the reality of teaching in today's schools; even more important, there is a paucity of materials that link the Holocaust to the general topic of genocide.

In his essay, Thomas Fallace reviews the research on the extent of Holocaust education in the US at the secondary and higher educational levels and the effects that learning about the event has had on students. This research reveals that, although Holocaust education has made remarkable gains, the potential of teaching about the Holocaust may not yet have been realized. Ian Davies and Paula Mountford offer some practical suggestions for what could be done in universities and schools to help with the development of initial teacher education around the Holocaust.

David Linquist looks at various instructional frameworks that allow the topic to be confronted in ways that are interesting and academically challenging while observing various sensitivities that are inherent in studying

the Holocaust. Thomas Misco explores the issue of curriculum implementation and the ways in which teachers' use of new curricular efforts provides obstacles and pathways to educational change with regard to gaps in historical knowledge and cursory coverage of topics. Carol Clyde examines the result of an experiential learning program, the March of Remembrance and Hope (MORH), on the development of civic leadership.

Daniel Gerson points out that until recently in Switzerland information about the country's role in the Holocaust has either been suppressed or has been the cause for controversy.

Geoffrey Short examines the challenge of teaching the Holocaust in schools with a largely Muslim population. He shares observations from a small-scale investigation involving 15 secondary school teachers that was recently undertaken in Britain. Alice Herscovitch et al. focuses on specific challenges in teaching about the Holocaust and the potential and challenges for Holocaust education within the Quebec education system. Doyle Stevick looks at the Estonian non-implementation of its Holocaust Education policy is examined in order to elucidate the importance of historical and cultural context in attempts to advance Holocaust education in post-communist societies

Richard Freedman points to the need in South Africa to help educators understand the reason for the inclusion of the Holocaust, as a case study of Human rights abuse, into the National Schools curriculum.

Zehavit Gross analyzes a holocaust discourse between a jew and a non jew while visiting the Auschwitz-Birkenau museum. It addresses the issue of ownership when it comes to the memory of Auschwitz. Tine Brondum examines how education in post-genocide Bosnia-Herzegovina is influenced by the nationalistic logic of the war, and how this has resulted in three ethnically based school systems where students are divided according to ethnic or national background. Furthermore, the article shows how the Holocaust, the war in Bosnia and the concept of genocide are dealt with in Bosnian history books. Finally, Yair Auron points out that the struggle about knowing and remembering the acts of genocide has a unique significance in the case of the State of Israel – a country of people who were the victims of the Holocaust. Auron points out that there is little knowledge about the Armenian genocide. He points to some valuable private initiatives in Israel aiming to expand awareness about the Armenian Genocide.

INTRODUCTION

Jack Jedwab, directeur exécutif, Association d'études canadiennes, juin 2009

Ancien directeur de l'Institut Parkes, Tony Kushner a remarqué ceci: « […] comme nous franchisons le seuil d'un nouveau millénium, l'intérêt pour l'holocauste continue à augmenter. À un niveau artistique et culturel, les représentations de l'holocauste, particulièrement dans les films et en littérature, n'ont jamais été si intenses et pervasives ». Dans notre ère d'information, il y a des occasions extraordinaires d'échanger et d'augmenter nos connaissances. Les nouvelles technologies nous permettent d'atteindre un nombre de personnes toujours plus grand à travers le globe. Nous pouvons nous engager dans des dialogues à travers les frontières de manières étant inimaginables il y a une décennie. L'éducation à distance, et même à des distances considérables, est devenue de plus en plus commune.

Bien que les occasions d'agrandir nos connaissances sur l'holocauste puissent sembler sans limites, ceux et celles qui s'y engagent font face à des obstacles constants durant la poursuite de leur objectif. Comme le temps avance, le dialogue global au sujet de l'éducation sur l'holocauste deviendra de plus en plus important puisque ses leçons universelles doivent être enseignées dans un monde luttant contre la discrimination, le racisme et l'antisémitisme. Nous espérons que cette édition de Diversité canadienne contribuera à cette discussion globale critique en identifiant certains de ces obstacles. Plusieurs questions essentielles seront soulevées par des experts des divers pays qui ont été invités à partager leur recherche et leurs idées concernant l'éducation sur l'holocauste et la conscientisation du génocide.

Idéalement, notre collection d'essais encouragera davantage la collaboration binational et multinationale dans l'identification de meilleures pratiques concernant l'éducation sur l'holocauste et la conscientisation du génocide. D'après nous, pour faire cela efficacement, de l'information de base sera nécessaire pour permettre une évaluation de ce qui est actuellement connu au sujet de l'holocauste dans différents pays. Ensuite, il sera important de comprendre comment les leçons universelles de l'holocauste sont comprises par les groupes de la population étant les plus informés sur le sujet. Avant de passer à une révision brève des textes inclus dans cette publication, je veux remercier Citoyenneté et immigration Canada pour soutenir notre publication.

Mon essai examine les réponses d'environ 1500 Canadiens à une enquête d'opinion publique sur la connaissance de l'holocauste, la conscience du génocide et les attitudes envers la discrimination et la diversité. Étant l'une des études les plus détaillées menées jusqu'à maintenant sur la connaissance de l'holocauste, les résultats démontrent une forte corrélation entre une plus grande connaissance de l'holocauste et du souci du génocide et une reconnaissance plus élevée de l'antisémitisme comme problème social. Cependant, une plus grande connaissance rapportée de l'holocauste n'était pas régulièrement corrélée à une plus grande acceptation de la diversité.

Eva Fried, du forum Living History, nous donne ses commentaires sur une étude rare portant sur des enseignants en Suède afin d'évaluer leur attitude envers les travaux concernant l'histoire de l'holocauste et leur opinion sur les chances d'accomplir ce genre de travail avec succès.

Paula Cowan examine les engagements de l'Écosse envers le Jour du souvenir de l'holocauste et commente les résultats de recherche sur la sensibilisation du public au Jour du Souvenir de l'holocauste au Royaume-Uni. Elle conclut que la participation de l'Écosse au Jour du Souvenir d'holocauste a facilité son enseignement dans quelques écoles primaires et secondaires. Jeffrey Allan Ellison précise que, plutôt que de regarder l'holocauste en tant qu'événement isolé, le sujet est devenu de plus en plus intégré dans des études plus larges sur le génocide ou les droits de l'homme. Il affirme qu'en dépit de l'abondance de matériaux sur l'holocauste au niveau secondaire, ces matériaux sont trop souvent non-conformes aux réalités de l'enseignement d'aujourd'hui. Encore plus important à mentionner, il y a un manque de matériaux scolaires qui lient l'holocauste au sujet plus générale du génocide.

Dans son essai, Thomas Fallace passe en revue la recherche sur l'ampleur de l'éducation sur l'holocauste aux États-Unis, aux niveaux du secondaire et post-secondaires,

et aux effets de cet apprentissage sur les étudiants. Cette recherche indique que, bien que l'éducation sur l'holocauste ait fait des gains remarquables, son potentiel n'est pas encore atteint. Ian Davies et Paula Mountford offrent quelques suggestions pratiques au sujet de ce qui pourrait être fait dans les universités et les écoles pour aider le développement de la formation pédagogique des enseignant sur l'holocauste.

David Linquist observe diverses méthodes d'enseignement permettant à cette matière d'être vue de manière intéressante et académiquement stimulante, tout en observant les divers côtés inhérents aux études sur l'holocauste. Thomas Misco explore la question de l'implantation du programme d'études et les façons dont l'utilisation de nouveaux efforts curriculaires par les enseignants fait apparaître des obstacles ainsi que des possibilités au changement dans l'éducation, en ce qui concerne des lacunes dans les connaissances historiques et l'assurance cursive des matières. Carol Clyde examine le résultat d'un programme d'étude empirique, le March of Remembrance andHope (MORH), sur le développement du leadership civique.

Daniel Gerson observe que, jusqu'à récemment, en Suisse, les renseignements sur le rôle de ce pays dans l'holocauste ont soi été supprimées, soi été un sujet de controverse.

Geoffrey Short examine le défi d'enseigner l'holocauste dans les écoles ayant une grande population musulmane. Il partage les observations d'une recherche de petite taille, ayant été conduite en Grande-Bretagne, concernant 15 enseignants d'école secondaires. Alice Herscovitch et son équipe se concentrent sur des défis spécifiques de l'enseignement de l'holocauste et du potentiel et des défis en ce qui à trait à ce sujet dans le système d'éducation québécois. Doyle Stevick commente sur la non-exécution, en Estonie, de sa politique d'éducation sur l'holocauste et l'examine afin d'élucider l'importance du contexte historique et culturel dans les tentatives de progrès de l'éducation sur l'holocauste dans les sociétés post-communistes.

Richard Freedman nous démontre la nécessité d'aider les éducateurs d'Afrique du Sud à comprendre la raison pourquoi l'holocauste est utilisée comme un sujet d'étude de cas d'abus de droits de l'homme dans leur programme d'études national.

Zehavit Gross analyse un discours sur l'holocauste entre un juif et un non-juif en visitant le musée d'Auschwitz-Birkenau. Il aborde la question de la possession quant aux souvenir d'Auschwitz. Tine Brondum examine comment l'éducation en Bosnie-Herzégovine post-génocide est influencée par la logique nationaliste de la guerre et comment ceci a eu comme conséquence trois systèmes scolaires éthniquement divisés où les étudiants sont divisés selon leur origine ethnique ou national. En outre, l'article montre comment l'holocauste, la guerre en Bosnie et le concept du génocide sont traités dans les livres bosniens d'histoire. Finalement, Yair Auron précise que la lutte au sujet du savoir et des souvenirs des actes du génocide a une signification unique dans le cas de l'État de l'Israël - un pays de gens ayant été victimes de l'holocauste. Auron précise qu'il y a peu de connaissances au sujet du génocide arménien. Il indique quelques initiatives privées, digne de mention, en Israël visant à conscientiser les gens sur le génocide arménien.

MEASURING HOLOCAUST KNOWLEDGE AMONGST CANADIANS

Jack Jedwab is Executive Director of the Association for Canadian Studies (ACS). From 1994-1998 he served as Executive Director of the Quebec Branch of the Canadian Jewish Congress. Mr. Jedwab has a BA from McGill University and an MA and Ph.D in Canadian History from Concordia University.

ABSTRACT

The essay examines the responses of some 1500 Canadians to a public opinion survey on knowledge of the Holocaust, awareness of genocide and attitudes towards discrimination and diversity. One of most of the detailed surveys conducted to date on Holocaust knowledge, the results show strong correlation between greater reported Holocaust knowledge and concern over genocide and higher recognition of anti-Semitism as a societal problem. But greater reported Holocaust knowledge did not consistently correlate with greater acceptance of diversity. The author advocates for cooperation in developing global baseline information on knowledge of the Holocaust.

1. INTRODUCTION

Assessing the degree of knowledge that people possess about the killing of six million Jews during the Second World War can be rather complex. By consequence, there have been relatively few efforts to measure the degree of knowledge about the Holocaust across various countries. To do so would require agreement around a common set of questions to provide for some benchmark against which to determine whether level of knowledge is satisfactory. Nonetheless, given the view that when it comes to the Holocaust, "The World Must Know" (Berenbaum) one might expect notwithstanding the obstacles more effort would be directed at some global evaluation.

As education about the Holocaust is intended to carry a universal message aimed at preventing its re-occurrence, it is no surprise that the bar is set very high when it comes to the degree of Holocaust knowledge. Hence, observers are often surprised to learn that many people remain unaware of the Holocaust. To properly evaluate how to reach those without knowledge of the Holocaust it would seem vital to know how many are unaware and in what segments of the population they are concentrated.

There is concern that the dissemination of such knowledge faces a challenge with the passage of time as there will be fewer witnesses to carry the message. At the same time, new technologies provide educators with the means to reach large numbers of people hence potentially raising the bar when it comes to generating widespread awareness (of course such technologies also invite the risk of more individuals of employing similar technologies to distort people's knowledge and understanding of the Holocaust). By consequence, the need to ascertain the level of knowledge and understanding is all the more necessary.

A survey commissioned by the American Jewish Committee in 2006 across seven countries (the United States and six European countries) asked "how important is it for 'all people' (our emphasis) in your country to know about and understand the Nazi extermination of the Jews during the Second World War." Overall some 80% of the respondents declared it essential or very important, a figure described by AJC's analyst as a strong majority. Still depending on one's expectation it might be contended that the one in five respondents not sharing that view is a cause

for concern. We shall discuss whether this is attributable to not possessing a strong knowledge of the Holocaust.

Despite the growing distance in time from the Second World War, there is some optimism about the global degree of interest in acquiring knowledge about the Holocaust. Bauer (2006) notes that: "…more and more people show an interest in this particular tragedy…[and that is]…why is there a flood of fiction, theater, films, TV series, art, music, and of course historical, sociological, philosophical, psychological, and other academic research, a flood that has rarely if ever been equaled in dealing with any other historical event…" At the same time there is much concern with the refusal of far too many people to learn the lessons of the Holocaust. Wiesel (2009) remarks that: "…if the civilized world allowed the crimes in Cambodia, Bosnia, Rwanda and Darfur to happen, it is because the lessons of Auschwitz and Treblinka have not been learned. And these lessons have not been learned quite simply because, for many reasons, the civilized world would rather not know." There is of course no contradiction between Bauer and Wiesel, nor is it a contradiction that there exists a growing desire to know about the Holocaust but a growing refusal to learn its lessons. That gap underscores the challenge facing education around the Holocaust. Knowledge about the Holocaust does not operate in a "leaning vacuum" as people's understanding of it is shaped by their overall learning experience.

That which follows attempts to assess the relationship between the estimated level of knowledge about the Holocaust on the part of the Canadian population and their attitude towards genocide, anti-Semitism and diversity. It does so by correlating responses to some 44 questions from a national survey of 1500 individuals conducted by the firm Leger Marketing for the Association for Canadian Studies in the month of October, 2008.

The first of its kind in Canada, the survey represents one of the most comprehensive enquiries conducted globally on this issue. Given the universal message aimed at combating hatred it is widely assumed that holocaust knowledge will result in greater openness to diverse cultures. Insights from the survey will be offered in this regard which in turn are intended to encourage reflection over the impact of holocaust knowledge on multicultural and citizenship education.

2. THE CHALLENGE OF SURVEYING HOLOCAUST KNOWLEDGE

As mentioned there have been relatively few large-scale quantitative studies of knowledge about the Holocaust and even fewer tests of how such knowledge correlates with views on genocide, diversity and multiculturalism and other relevant matters. There can be limits in drawing strong conclusions on the basis of public opinion survey measurement and the formulation of clear questions is crucial. In 1993, media in the United States reported results of a Holocaust-knowledge study conducted by Burns Roper for the American Jewish Committee (AJC) and analyzed by Golub and Cohen (1993). The survey found that 22% of Americans believed it possible that the Holocaust had never happened. Debate ensued over the method employed to arrive at that disturbing conclusion and it was determined that the survey question was constructed with a confusing double negative (1994). The question read as follows: "Does it seem possible or does it seem impossible to you that the Nazi extermination of the Jews never happened?" Simplifying the question, Moore and Newport (1994) found that fewer than fewer than ten percent of the American population appeared to doubt that the Holocaust had occurred. In the aftermath of the controversy, Bischoping (1999) notes that several survey researchers deliberating on the topic of measuring holocaust knowledge concurred that other survey questions could produce more consistent estimates of public ignorance on this important matter.

In 2005, the AJC commissioned a seven country survey on the memory of the Holocaust which gauged opinion in Austria, France, Germany, Poland, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States). Analyzing the findings, respected researcher Tom Smith (2005) observed that: "knowledge of the Holocaust is limited and uneven across these nations." Nonetheless, he contends that the survey demonstrates strong support across the countries for preserving knowledge of and teaching students about the Holocaust.

Smith (2005) suggested that since people presumably learn more about their own history than others do, it might have been assumed that Holocaust knowledge would be greater in countries that were most directly involved. By consequence he expected that Germans and Austrians

"…if the civilized world allowed the crimes in Cambodia, Bosnia, Rwanda and Darfur to happen, it is because the lessons of Auschwitz and Treblinka have not been learned. And these lessons have not been learned quite simply because, for many reasons, the civilized world would rather not know."

would know more than Poles who in turn would know more than France, the United Kingdom and lastly the United States. That was not the case as the survey revealed that knowledge was greatest in Sweden, followed by France, Germany, Austria, the United Kingdom, Poland, and the United States. Smith observed that knowledge in Sweden was greater than expected, and the Germans and, especially, the Polish were less informed than their historical proximity would predict.

The AJC survey asked two types of questions. One set looked at knowledge of events reflected by a question on whether had heard of Auschwitz, Dachau, and Treblinka. Another question asked whether they knew how many Jews were killed during World War II. On the first question, the ability to identify these places as concentration camps or some related facility (such as death camps, extermination camps, or camps) responses ranged from 91 percent in Sweden to just 44 percent in the United States (in Austria it was 88%, Poland 79%, France 78%, Germany 77%, and the UK 53%). The percentage indicating they didn't know ran from 46 percent in the United States to 5 percent in Sweden. A question asking, "Approximately how many Jews in all of Europe were killed by the Nazis during the Second World War?" generated the correct response from some 55 percent in Sweden to 30 percent in Poland (49% in France and Germany, 41% in Austria, 39% in the UK and 33% in the US).

Another set of questions focused on the commitment to preserve and transmit knowledge about the Holocaust. In this regard those agreeing that it essential or very important for all people to know about the Nazi extermination of the Jews ranged from 89% in Austria to 70% in Poland. Respondents were asked whether it was time to put the Nazi extermination of the Jews "behind us" or keep remembrance strong. Responses ranged from 92% in Sweden who felt it was important to keep the memory strong to 70% in Austria. At this point it is worth noting the gap amongst Austrians significant percentage of those saying all should know and the not insignificant share agreeing it was time to put it behind us. As to requiring the teaching of the Holocaust in the schools of the country's surveyed, responses ranged from 92% of Austrians to 69% of Poles (in Sweden it was 91%, in France it was 86%, in the US 80%, Germany 79%, and the UK 76%).

The AJC survey raises important questions about the gap between knowledge of the Holocaust (as defined by the survey criteria) and commitment to preserving its memory. Stronger knowledge of a particular issue more often correlates with support for its transmission. In part, this is because those unaware of the issue presumably do not know what they're being asked to transmit. However looking at the AJC survey, two things need to be borne in mind. First when it comes to testing knowledge transmission the question provided for a preamble which laid out the objective of the Holocaust. The second point relates to Smith's link between proximity and knowledge. Under certain circumstances proximity may result in the desire to create distance with the events where such knowledge undercuts a group's collective sense of belonging. In other words, knowledge and understanding may be affected by a group's capacity to come to terms with painful historic memory. We'll return this issue in the conclusion.

3. ASSESSING CANADIANS KNOWLEDGE OF THE HOLOCAUST

To test the self-estimated knowledge of Canadians about the Holocaust, the ACS-Leger survey put two questions to respondents. First they were asked how often they heard about the Holocaust and second they were asked if they had a good knowledge of the Holocaust. The challenge when it comes to employing self-estimation is the relative character of individual knowledge assessment. Hence the objective of the survey is to see how those self-evaluating Holocaust knowledge respond to various issues relevant to its transmission as well as to understand whether they grasp the universal message that Holocaust awareness aims to attain.

"Knowledge of the Holocaust is limited and uneven across these nations."

According to the ACS-Leger survey, some 82% of respondents say that they had heard about the Holocaust either often (52%) or sometimes (31%) while 17% report that they either rarely (10%) or never (7%) heard of it. As observed below, the older segment of the population was more likely to report having "often" heard about the Holocaust. The youngest cohort, ages 18-24 were most likely to acknowledge "never" having heard about it.

As to the strength of the respondent's knowledge of the Holocaust, some 65% agreed they had a good knowledge. Age was not a significant factor in Canadians self-evaluation of their knowledge about the Holocaust. Amongst Canadians, the gaps in self-estimated knowledge are most pronounced on the basis of one's first language and their level of education. In the case of educational attainment some 52% of those with high school or less reported a good knowledge compared to 68% with a college degree and 74% with a university degree. On the basis of language, some 49% of the Francophone population agreed they possessed a good knowledge compared with 71% of anglophones and 66% amongst those Canadians whose first language was neither English nor French.

Table 1

HEARD ABOUT THE HOLOCAUST?	OFTEN	SOMETIMES	RARELY	NEVER	DK/REFUSED
18-24	42.1	37.6	7.3	12.9	–
25-34	44.5	32.2	13.5	7.8	2.0
35-44	48.5	32.4	14.0	4.4	0.7
45-54	53.5	30.7	8.6	6.9	0.3
55-64	58.9	26.8	8.5	4.5	1.3
65 and over	59.6	25.1	9.4	5.1	0.8

Source: Association for Canadian Studies and Leger Marketing "Survey on Holocaust Knowledge and Genocide Awareness in Canada" October 9-12, 2008

Table 2

	HEARD ABOUT THE HOLOCAUST?		
I HAVE A GOOD KNOWLEDGE OF THE HOLOCAUST	OFTEN	SOMETIMES	RARELY
Strongly agree	30.7%	10.0%	14.8%
Somewhat agree	50.9%	45.8%	27.1%
Somewhat disagree	12.8%	27.1%	24.5%
Strongly disagree	4.4%	12.6%	21.9%
DK/Refused	1.3%	4.6%	11.6%

Source: Association for Canadian Studies and Leger Marketing "Survey on Holocaust Knowledge and Genocide Awareness in Canada" October 9-12, 2008

In the table 2 we correlate the degree to which people report having heard about the Holocaust with their estimated degree of knowledge. Not surprisingly the more often one reported hearing about it, the more likely self-estimated strong knowledge of the Holocaust.

4. GOING TO THE SOURCES: WHERE CANADIANS SECURED INFORMATION ABOUT THE HOLOCAUST

People acquire knowledge about the Holocaust from a variety of sources. And there knowledge consumption habits are interconnected. In other words those more likely to have read a book about the Holocaust are also more likely to have seen a film on the subject. Overall, some 56% have seen a film about the Holocaust, 51% read newspaper articles about it, 36% report having read a book about the Holocaust and 13% acknowledge seeing a museum exhibit. Some 39% reported learning about the Holocaust through a course in school and amongst the 18-24 cohort that figure rises to 60%.

Of those affirming a good knowledge of the Holocaust some 54% have often read a story in the newspaper about it, 42% have often seen a film on the Holocaust, 41% have leaned about it through a course in school and 31% say they have often read a book on the subject.

Some 55% of Canadians surveyed agree that they would like to learn more about the Holocaust. The desire to learn often correlates with age as 72% of the youngest cohort (18-24) expressed further interest in doing so. Such interest also correlates with self-estimated knowledge with 60% of those self-estimating a good knowledge expressing a desire to learn more in contrast with 34% self-estimating weak knowledge. Some 45% of Canadians surveyed expressed interest in participating in a ceremony remembering the victims of the Holocaust. Finally, some 75% of Canadians agree that learning about the Holocaust should be compulsory in school. As observed below, those self-estimating

Table 3

	I HAVE A GOOD KNOWLEDGE OF THE HOLOCAUST			
% AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
I would like to learn more about the Holocaust	59.4	64.4	52.0	34.1
Learning about the Holocaust should be compulsory in our schools	91.0	81.8	75.7	43.5
I would be interested in participating in a ceremony remembering the victims	61.5	51.5	34.1	24.6

Source: Association for Canadian Studies and Leger Marketing "Survey on Holocaust Knowledge and Genocide Awareness in Canada" October 9-12, 2008

Table 4

	HEARD ABOUT THE HOLOCAUST?			
HEARD ABOUT A GENOCIDE TAKING PLACE IN THE WORLD TODAY?	OFTEN	SOMETIMES	RARELY	NEVER
Often	53.4%	21.8%	16.7%	5.1%
Sometimes	36.1%	48.2%	30.8%	22.4%
Rarely	6.3%	17.1%	26.3%	12.2%
Never	3.1%	12.5%	23.1%	59.2%
DK/Refused	1.2%	0.4%	3.2%	1.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Association for Canadian Studies and Leger Marketing "Survey on Holocaust Knowledge and Genocide Awareness in Canada" October 9-12, 2008

strong knowledge were most likely to agree that learning about the Holocaust should be compulsory in schools.

5. HOLOCAUST KNOWLEDGE, GENOCIDE AWARENESS AND ACTION

Wiesel (2009) and Bauer (2006) have expressed similar concerns that the Holocaust not become a precedent that genocides continue to take place suggests to them that too many people have yet to understand the lessons of the Holocaust. A set of questions was included in the ACS-Leger survey that probes awareness of genocide and the desire to take action to prevent it. Responses to these questions were correlated with self-estimated knowledge of the Holocaust to examine the relationship between them. More Canadians report having often heard about the Holocaust (52%) then about whether genocide is currently taking place in the world (36%). As observed below, those respondents saying they often heard about the Holocaust were far more likely to report having heard about genocide taking place than those less likely to have heard about the Holocaust.

The survey of Canadians suggests that the most knowledgeable about the Holocaust tend to be most concerned over genocide. However the percentage identifying genocide as an important global problem and the desire for action to prevent its occurrence operates relatively independently of the level of knowledge of the Holocaust. However those with the very lowest self-estimate of knowledge of the Holocaust include a substantial percentage of persons responding "don't know" (percentage listed in brackets) when asked about their degree of concern over genocide and the desire for preventive action.

6. OPENNESS TO DIVERSITY

Salmons (2003) suggests that teaching the lessons of the Holocaust might inspire youth to work harder towards a fairer, more tolerant society that sees strength in diversity, values multiculturalism and combats racism. He further

Table 5

	I HAVE A GOOD KNOWLEDGE OF THE HOLOCAUST			
% AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
Agree that I am very concerned about genocide occurring in the world	93.2%	91.2%	78.5%	49.0 (38)
Agree that Genocide is an important problem in the world today	93.2%	91.5%	82.9%	56.0(29)
Disagree that we can't do much to prevent genocide from occurring today	70.1%	72.3%	69.2%	43.9(29)
Agree that we should send Canadian troops to areas where genocide is occurring	72.6%	70.7%	61.3%	37.5(26)

Source: Association for Canadian Studies and Leger Marketing "Survey on Holocaust Knowledge and Genocide Awareness in Canada" October 9-12, 2008

contends that as required in the United Kingdom education about the Holocaust is clearly linked with the objectives of intercultural education and the preparation of students for participation in a multicultural society. Maitles, Cowan and Butler (2006) point out that research with secondary students provides evidence that Holocaust education can make an important contribution to human rights awareness and foster appreciation of the harmful effects of stereotyping and scapegoating. Survey research they conducted with primary and secondary school children in Scotland supports the view that while teaching the Holocaust can have some influence, it cannot eradicate all racist attitudes.

In the ACS-Leger survey correlations are provided for self-estimated knowledge of the Holocaust with the extent to which respondents see anti-Semitism as a problem in society. Another set of correlations are offered for self-estimated knowledge of the Holocaust with various statements around diversity. The choice of the statements was made on the basis of identifying the most frequently asked questions by polling firms in Canada in the last decade to gauge the population's opinions on immigrant integration and diversity. It is important to keep in mind that the ACS-Leger survey is not focused on learning outcomes from Holocaust education and therefore does not compare with the study in Scotland. However it does attempt to shed light on the similar operative assumption that Holocaust knowledge leads to greater openness to diversity.

Overall the ACS-Leger survey reveals that some 58% of Canadians regard anti-Semitism as a societal problem (17% strongly agree and 41% somewhat agree). As revealed below the survey does provide evidence that those with higher self-estimates of Holocaust knowledge are more inclined to describe anti-Semitism as a societal problem. In effect therefore it might be concluded that they are more concerned with anti-Semitism. Though the percentage that self-report low Holocaust knowledge are less likely to believe that anti-Semitism is a societal problem (38%) a significant share of that group indicate that they do not know (38%) as illustrated in brackets.

The importance of Holocaust knowledge as a causal factor in favorable views of diversity is borne out to some degree but the gap between the most and least knowledgeable is not as wide as might be assumed. Some 84% of those estimating strong Holocaust knowledge agree that society has been strengthened by the diversity of cultural and religious groups as compared with 75% that self-report low Holocaust knowledge. There is also a 12 point gap on the question of whether society should try harder to accept the customs and traditions of minority religious groups with nearly 69% of those describing themselves as most knowledgeable supporting greater acceptance compared to 56% of those that somewhat disagree when asked to assess whether they possess a good knowledge. Those self-estimating strong holocaust knowledge were just as likely (38%) as other respondents to agree that immigrants should give up their customs and traditions and become more like the majority. Hence Holocaust knowledge had no apparent bearing on responses to that question. On the issue of whether society is threatened by the influx of non-Christian immigrants, those estimating strong Holocaust knowledge were somewhat less likely to agree than other respondents. Clearly strong Holocaust knowledge may correlate with less greater acceptance and less fear of "others" but amongst those that self-estimate strong knowledge are a not insignificant minority that are concerned over diversity and the presence of minority religions. Similar to the observation

Table 6

	I HAVE A GOOD KNOWLEDGE OF THE HOLOCAUST			
% AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
Anti-Semitism is a problem in our society	70.3%	63.5%	53.5%	38.0(38)
Society has been strengthened by the diversity of cultural and religious groups	83.9%	77.6%	74.4%	65(11)
Society should try harder to accept the customs and traditions of minority religious groups	68.7%	60.8%	56.0%	53(15)
Society is threatened by the influx of non-Christian immigrants	26.6%	33.6%	31.1%	34.3(18)
Immigrants should give up their customs and traditions and become more like the majority	38.4%	40.0%	39.8%	40.7(12)

Source: Association for Canadian Studies and Leger Marketing "Survey on Holocaust Knowledge and Genocide Awareness in Canada" October 9-12, 2008

made by Maitles et al. (2006) in research on pupils in Scotland the findings of the ACS-Leger survey suggest that Holocaust knowledge may reduce but by no means eradicates in this concerns around the presence of diversity.

That knowledge of the Holocaust appears to have less bearing on opinion with respect to some questions around societal diversity may have less to do with the impact of Holocaust teaching than the manner in which issues of diversity are learned and understood. In effect knowledge about the Holocaust may not always offer guidance when it comes to matters that are the object of debate in pluralistic society. Educators can't be expected to offer coherent responses to matters that being constantly debated outside the school context. As mentioned therefore the impact of learning about the Holocaust cannot be considered in a vacuum. Both within and outside the classroom young people are exposed to ideas that can modify the impact of education about the Holocaust. Researchers need to consider the broader learning experience to best evaluate the impact of the message conveyed through learning about the Holocaust.

7. CONCLUSION: TOWARDS AN INTERNATIONAL SURVEY ON HOLOCAUST KNOWLEDGE

Establishing the national level of knowledge about the Holocaust is a formidable task. Perhaps the most important element in pursuing such inquiry is the identification of relevant questions which is crucial in providing useful insights into the issue. Questions that permit us to properly assess Holocaust knowledge are essential towards determining how such knowledge influences views on anti-Semitism, racism, discrimination and diversity.

The survey results reviewed above examine the degree to which the Canadian population has heard about the Holocaust and their self-estimated knowledge of the Holocaust. Some will question whether this approach is best suited to assess Holocaust knowledge since one's own evaluation of a "good knowledge" may not translate into varying degrees of awareness of say facts and figures when it comes to the Holocaust. Similarly saying one has "often" heard about the Holocaust may also vary according how one understands often. Still we chose this approach over the top of mind questions that ask for responses to facts and figures about the Holocaust that also possesses limits in understanding an individual's knowledge of the Holocaust.

The essence of our survey however lies in looking at the relationships between the degree to which, on the one hand, they heard about the Holocaust and their estimated knowledge of it and, on the other, their reactions to the lessons around discrimination to which such knowledge purportedly gives rise. The survey results suggest those reporting strong knowledge of the Holocaust are more likely to describe contemporary anti-Semitism as a problem, somewhat more likely to be concerned over genocide but more divided around acceptance of diversity in certain form.

Reactions range from surprise to shock when observers in Western Europe and North America learn that younger people are unaware of the Holocaust. Such

reactions may be based on too strong an expectation of how widespread such knowledge should be. In the absence of reliable information about which segments of the population are unaware it is difficult to develop successful strategies to reach youth that do not know about the Holocaust. International cooperation in educating future generations about the Holocaust requires that the obstacles notwithstanding some comparative instrument is introduced that quantifies knowledge and looks at the substance of what we is being taught across various jurisdictions.

NOTES

Association for Canadian Studies and Leger Marketing "Survey on Holocaust Knowledge and Genocide Awareness in Canada" October 9-12, 2008.

Bauer, Yehuda. "On the Holocaust and its Implications:In the Wake of Holocaust Remembrance Day" Holocaust and the United Nations Discussion Paper Series, Discussion paper 1, January 27, 2006.

Berenbaum, Michael. "The world must know; the history of the Holocaust as told in the United States Holocaust Museum" 2nd. ed. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, United States Holocaust Museum. First published in 1993.

Bischoping, Katherine. "Method and Meaning in Holocaust-Knowledge Surveys" in Holocaust and Genocide Studies 1998 12(3):454-474.

Golub ,Jennifer and Cohen, Renae, "What Do Americans Know about the Holocaust?" in *Working Papers on Contemporary Anti-Semitism* (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1993).

Maitles, Henry, Cowan, Paula and Butler, Eamonn. "Never Again! Does Holocaust Education Have an Effect on Pupils' Citizenship Values and Attitudes?,"Government of Scotland, 2006 http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/09/06133626/0.

Moore , David W. and Newport, Frank. "Misreading the Public: The Case of the Holocaust Poll," *The Public Perspective* (March-April 1994).

New York Daily News, "Holocaust survivor, Nobel Peace Prize winner Elie Wiesel warns against drugs that erase memory" April 12th 2009, http://www.nydailynews.com/opinions/2009/04/12/2009-04.

Salmons, Paul. "Teaching or Preaching? The Holocaust and intercultural education in the UK" *Intercultural Education, Vol. 14, No. 2, June 2003.*

Smith, Tom. "The Holocaust and its Implications: A Seven-Nation Comparative Study".

For the American Jewish Committee, November 2005.

THE EXTENT AND EFFECTS OF HOLOCAUST EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Thomas D. Fallace is an Assistant Professor of education at the University of Mary Washington. He is author of The Emergence of Holocaust Education in American Schools (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008). He has authored articles for *Theory and Research in Social Education, The History Teacher, The Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences, Holocaust and Genocide Studies, Teachers College Record, and Review of Educational Research.*

ABSTRACT

In recent years some scholars have worried that the proliferation of Holocaust education in the United States may be leading to "Holocaust fatigue" or to the dilution of the potential pedagogical impact of learning about the event. This article reviews the research on the extent of Holocaust education in the US at the secondary and higher educational levels and the effects that learning about the event has had on students. This research reveals that, although Holocaust education has made remarkable gains, the potential of teaching about the Holocaust may not yet have been realized.

If we consider Holocaust education as an educational movement or pedagogical innovation, its success in the United States has been remarkable; it has been one of the most successful grassroots educational movements in American history. In 1970 the Holocaust was barely being addressed in any public schools, yet by the 1990s several states had mandated Holocaust and genocide study, and a majority of students were at least being exposed to the event. State legislatures have taken a number of different approaches to demonstrate their support of teaching about the event. Currently, the states of Illinois, New Jersey, and Florida directly mandate the teaching of the Holocaust in their public schools. California, New York, and Massachusetts embed the Holocaust in the broader spectrum of human rights and genocide education, and require that teachers address a list of group atrocities in their classrooms in some manner. Connecticut, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Washington, "encourage" or "recommend" teaching the Holocaust and created commissions to support it. Georgia, Alabama, Maryland, Nevada, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Rhode Island, and West Virginia also appointed Holocaust and genocide and/or human rights commissions to develop resources and support teachers (Fallace, 2008).

Despite the conspicuous success of Holocaust education at the institutional level, it is difficult to determine to what extent the Holocaust has become just a topic to be covered instead of a more broadly-conceived pedagogical and moral intervention. The founders of the movement certainly designed Holocaust education to be a transformative experience (Fallace, 2005). But in recent years, some scholars (Schweber, 2006; Shawn, 1995) have worried that the proliferation of Holocaust education in America may be leading to "Holocaust fatigue" or to the dilution of the potential impact of the event. As we shall see, despite its successes, the potential of teaching about the Holocaust in the US may not yet have been realized.

TEACHING ABOUT THE HOLOCAUST IN US COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

A 1992 study by the American Jewish Committee reported that 36 percent of adults and 59 percent of students in the US listed schools as their primary source of knowledge about the Holocaust (cited in Baron, 2003). So at a basic level, schools have done an adequate job of informing Americans about the event. Intuitively, one would assume that Holocaust education would be more pervasive at the level of higher education, because college professors usually have more autonomy over their course content, they are more likely to address controversial topics in depth, and,

according to Peter Novick (1999), they are more likely to be Jewish, a group for which the event has become a central concern. However, the existing research suggests that Holocaust education in US universities has lagged behind that of secondary and middle schools.

Joel Epstein (1989) surveyed Church-related institutions of higher education to determine to what degree his colleagues were teaching the Holocaust and how their students were responding to the instruction. The professors who responded related how they had little to no institutional support for their Holocaust courses; they were taught as electives and were dependent upon the initiative of the individual professors. All of the respondents believed firmly in what they were doing and reported that their classes had a profound effect on their students. Some expressed that their Christian students often became "defensive," "angry," "perplexed," and "shocked" about the role of Christian anti-Semitism in the Holocaust, and had a difficult time reconciling their faith with the German perpetrators and bystanders. The majority of the respondents reported that most students "had been exposed to familiar stereotypes about Jews and encompassed them in their mind set in varying degrees" (pp. 171-2). One professor reported that a student had suggested that the Jews were paying for deicide, and that many of his students were fascinated with Nazi helmets and gadgets. A similar study by Hubert Locke (1989) surveyed 33 American scholars in the field of public administration and public policy to inquire if and how they address the Holocaust in their courses. Only six professors responded that they did in "any substantial way." When asked if they considered the destruction of the European Jewry during the German Third Reich to have any major significance as a topic for teaching or research in their discipline, only 19 responded affirmatively. From this data, Locke concluded that teaching the Holocaust was not a substantial concern in his field of public administration and policy.

Stephen Haynes (1998) conducted a far more inclusive study of the Holocaust in higher education. Based on 90 responses from all types of colleges and universities, Haynes discovered that departments of history were bearing most of the burden of teaching the event. Most of these history departments offered the course as a regular elective offering. Unsurprisingly, the vast majority of professors reported using teacher-centered methods of instruction such as lecture and discussion. Like their high school and middle school counterparts, these professors regularly showed Holocaust films such as *Night and Fog* and *Shoah*. Elie Wiesel's *Night* was assigned by about 40 percent of the instructors, followed by Primo Levi's *Survival in Auschwitz* and Christopher Browning's *Ordinary Men* as the most-commonly assigned texts.

Leona Kanter (1998) conducted a thorough study of college textbooks in Sociology, Political Science, Western Civilization, and American History. In Sociology textbooks the number of lines devoted to the Holocaust ranged from 0-40. Kanter was appalled by the neglect of the topic in her discipline, which did the poorest job of addressing the implications of the event. "As a group," she reported, "these books failed to take advantage of the Holocaust as a way of understanding the link between social structure and social consciousness." As expected history texts offered far more coverage of the Nazi assault on the European Jews; they included between 0-175 lines. Ultimately Kanter concluded that "college students can complete survey courses in both world and American history with only a minimal confrontation with the Holocaust and then often in the form of a troubling photograph which may or may not gain their attention" (p. 44). Kanter's study, along with the others, confirm that, despite the rise of interdisciplinary Holocaust studies at certain institutions and the interdisciplinary units designed for middle and high school students, at the level of higher education the Holocaust was largely being left to the departments of history to cover.

"Had been exposed to familiar stereotypes about Jews and encompassed them in their mind set in varying degrees."

TEACHING ABOUT THE HOLOCAUST IN US SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Holocaust education at the high and middle school level, at least in certain regions, has been more successful than higher education. A 1987 national history survey found that, although only 32 percent of 17-year-olds could place the Civil War in the correct half-century, 76 percent could identify the term "Holocaust" as reference to the Nazi genocide during WWII (Ravitch and Finn, p. 49, 61). In 1998 the New Jersey Holocaust Commission, which had mandated the teaching of the event four years earlier, reported that 93 percent of it schools had assimilated the topics of Holocaust and genocide into their curriculum (Llorente, 1998). A 2003 follow-up study surveyed 93 school principals about their school's adherence to the New Jersey mandate. However, according to the surveyor, a little over half of the schools demonstrated an "acceptable" level of implementation. New Jersey Teachers reported using

resources and materials from Facing History and Ourselves (FHAO) Foundation of Brookline, Massachusetts, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM), and the New Jersey Commission on Holocaust Education, as well as using popular texts such as *Diary of Anne Frank*. Reading assigned texts and engaging in class discussions were the two most common instructional strategies. Most schools also reported going "beyond teaching only the historical facts to examine the role of prejudice, discrimination, stereotyping, and racism" (Donvito, 2003, p. 196).

Although state mandates, the content of textbooks, and the amount of teacher training all impact the extent to which the Holocaust will be taught, the most influential factor is teacher's Holocaust profile (Mitchell, 2004; Ellison, 2002). In other words, teachers with a personal interest in the event are more likely to do research, track down resources, and enthusiastically attend Holocaust workshops than those have no intrinsic interest in the event. Teachers with personal interest are more likely to attend workshops by educational organizations such the USHMM and FHAO (Mitchell, 2004; Linquist, 2002; Donoho, 1999). FHAO and the USHMM are clearly the two most pervasive forces in Holocaust education in the US at the secondary level. This is interesting because the two organizations offer somewhat conflicting approaches to teaching the event. FHAO supports an agenda of social justice and social activism, and frames the Holocaust in a progressive manner that will further these goals. On the other hand, the USHMM places more emphasis on the particularities of the Holocaust and seeks to impart an appreciation of the historical and definitional uniqueness of the event by focusing on anti-Semitism and engaging directly with survivor testimonies (although the museum also provides materials on other victims). Both organizations receive funding from the federal government, and both support grassroots efforts to improve and spread Holocaust education (Fallace, 2008). Teachers do not seem to be cognizant of these subtle differences between the two organizations, and many ambitious teachers have attended professional developments sessions for both (Mitchell, 2004).

The research suggests that generally Holocaust education at the secondary level in US seems to be most popular in two areas—suburban districts with substantial Jewish populations and urban areas with high nonwhite ethnic populations (Ellison 2002; Holt, 2001). The Holocaust is relevant to both these areas, but for different reasons. Obviously, areas with high Jewish populations are more likely to have teachers with significant Holocaust profiles, who have greater knowledge and interest in the event. Teachers of inner city minority students teach the event as an indirect way to deal with the prejudice and discrimination that their students experience on a daily basis (Ellison, 2002; Schweber, 2004; Fine, 1993a). The context of the school, to a large degree, seems to impact the pedagogical approach. Teachers with large Jewish populations seem to emphasize the particular aspects of the event. On the other hand, teachers with either high minority ethnic populations or with ambition goals of furthering social justice seem to employ a more progressive approach (Ellison, 2002). Of course, there are certainly exceptions to this pattern (see Schweber, 2003; Brabeck, et al, 1994).

Overall, teachers at the university, secondary, and middle school levels all seem to be relying heavily on three resources: Elie Wiesel's *Night, The Diary Anne Frank*, and *Schindler's List* (Mitchell, 2004; Donvito, 2003; Ellison, 2002; Haynes, 1998). So, despite the numerous books, films, and memoirs published on the event and the extensive efforts by local, regional and national Holocaust-related organizations, the major content and lessons of the Holocaust may simply be boiled down to these three major sources.

> "College students can complete survey courses in both world and American history with only a minimal confrontation with the Holocaust and then often in the form of a troubling photograph which may or may not gain their attention."

THE EFFECTS OF HOLOCAUST EDUCATION ON SECONDARY STUDENTS

Due to its proximity to the Harvard Graduate School of Education and its addition to the National Diffusion Network of exemplary educational programs, FHAO has been the most studied Holocaust curriculum in the US. An early study of the curriculum by Lieberman (1981) found that students who were taught the unit increased significantly in their interpersonal understanding as well as factual knowledge about the event. A comparative study by Glynn, Bock and Cohen (1982), which researched the effects of Holocaust curricula in New York City, Philadelphia, Great Neck, NY, and FHAO confirmed these findings. The researchers found FHAO to be the most effective of the four in terms of learning lessons from the event and understanding its factual and historical components.

However, they reported that there was no significant change in students' moral reasoning as a result of the learning about the event. On the other hand, Brabeck et al. (1994) found that FHAO significantly increased eight-grade students' moral reasoning, and a study by Bardige (1981) reported that the curriculum increased students' social awareness and frequency of reflective thinking. In addition, Shultz, et al. (2001) found that students of the curriculum increased relationship maturity and decreased racist attitudes and self-reported fighting behavior. However, there were only minimal gains in moral reasoning.

Melinda Fine (1993a, 1993b) published a pair of ethnographic studies on the implementation of FHAO in inner-city schools. She argued that the curriculum fostered democratic deliberations and created a climate "wherein students were able to recognize that there were a variety of viewpoints, identities, and interests in the world, all of which have some social grounding, and all of which must be understood if not necessarily accepted" (1993a, p. 786). A qualitative study of FHAO by Boix-Mansilla found that most students were able to distinguish between the different historical conditions surrounding the Nazi and Rwandan genocides, the incremental steps involved in both, and actions and dilemmas faced by individual rescuers and victims. However, with few exceptions, "students failed to recognize the constructed nature of the very accounts on which they were grounding their hypotheses and interpretations about contemporary Rwanda" (p. 410). That is, according to Boix-Mansilla, the students failed to appreciate that "narratives are humanly constructed, that they embody particular worldviews, that they are written with a contemporary audience in mind, that that they seek to be faithful to the life of the past" (p. 410). This objective extended beyond (or avoided) a concern for moral development and instead focused on the cognitive development of disciplinary thinking—that is the ability to think like a historian. This reflects a general shift in interest in recent years among American researchers away from the moral outcomes of Holocaust education to a more cognitive focus.

Similarly, Simone Schweber's (2004) study of a California teacher confirmed that the FHAO curriculum failed to convey important aspects of historical context. By focusing on the affective elements of the Holocaust, the teacher left his students ignorant of important historical facts. As a result, Schweber reflected, the Holocaust was "discussed as a symbol rather than understood as events" (p. 57-8). In another case study Schweber (2004) studied an instructor whose main objective was to cover as much information about the Holocaust as he could. This approach, Schweber suggests, effectively transmitted the factual knowledge of the event, but he "razed complex moral/historical terrain" (p. 17). A similar outcome occurred with another teacher, whose Holocaust unit concentrated on a series of dramatic reenactments that Schweber described as "emotionally rich…but intellectually thinner than it might have been" (p. 140).

In another provocative study, Schweber (2007) researched the Holocaust being taught in a third grade classroom. She was weighing in on a debate between Totten (2002) and Sepinwall (1999) about the appropriateness of teaching the event to such young children. Overall, Schweber was impressed by the ability of the students to distinguish between real and fictitious violence and, to an age-appropriate degree, be able to sympathize with the victims. Unlike the many other teachers Schweber studied, this one had depicted the Holocaust accurately by covering the hasher aspects of the event adequately and ending the unit on a non-redemptive note. However, despite the successes of the unit on a factual level, Schweber agreed with Totten that the emotional effects of the Holocaust were too much for these young students to handle.

"Basic understanding of the concept of totalitarianism, conditions present for the concept to occur and strategies used by totalitarians to gain power."

Beyond overall assessments of FHAO and other curricula, researchers have focused on the impact that the teacher has on the framing of the event and its reception by students. A recent ethnographic study by Jeremy Stoddard (2007) depicted a teacher in Michigan who relied heavily of film to teach the Holocaust. After viewing and discussing the films, *In Memory of Millions*, *The Wave, Swing Kids*, and *America and the Holocaust*, the high school students' essays exhibited "basic understanding of the concept of totalitarianism, conditions present for the concept to occur and strategies used by totalitarians to gain power" (p. 208). However, the students fell short of appreciating the complex social and historical issues that surrounded the event. Nevertheless, Stoddard concluded that, "fiction and documentary film act as powerful tools for engaging students in developing historical empathy" (p. 210).

Schewber and Irwin (2003) explored how the Holocaust was taught at a fundamentalist Christian school. Instead of focusing on the role of Christians in orchestrating or tolerating the persecution of German Jews, the teacher used the Holocaust to teach students about persecution

"that we, as Christians may someday face" (p. 1700). Rather than trying to inspire students to take action on behalf of social justice or genocide prevention, the teacher aimed to strengthen her students' Christian identities, an objective she successfully achieved.

Similarly, Schweber's (2008) study of the teaching of the Holocaust at an Orthodox Jewish school for girls confirmed that fundamentalist faith, whether it be Christian or Jewish, prevented open-ended inquiry into the event by providing predetermined answers and/or mystifying the secular events of history. Like the Christian teacher, the Orthodox Jewish instructor taught the Holocaust to reaffirm her students' religious identities, not to convey specific moral lessons or to inspire social action. Over the course of the unit, students directed numerous questions at the teacher, which she deflected with particularist claims about the incomprehensibility of the event. The question of 'why,' Schweber pointed out, so central to the disciplines of history and the social sciences, was considered superfluous.

The effects of religious belief in the framing of the Holocaust was even more pronounced in Spector's (2007) provocative study of students in two Midwestern public schools who had just read Elie Wiesel's *Night*. The majority of these students (69 percent) used religious narratives of supernatural intervention to impose order on the events of the Holocaust in one of three ways. First, some students suggested that both God and Satan were historical actors engaged in a struggle of good an evil; Hitler embodied Satan, and God ultimately saved the Jews by stopping the extermination before it achieved it ultimate goal. Second, students expressed how there were certain ways in which individuals should act, and if they do not, there may be supernatural consequences. Third, students employed narratives of "the cross" in relation to Jesus—that He was either suffering at Auschwitz alongside the Jews, or that the Jews were being punished for their rejection of Him. Overall these narratives, according to Spector, blamed the victims for their suffering, moved cause-and-effect from the natural to the metaphysical realm, and justified God's lack of intervention in the event.

In another study of student responses to the Holocaust, Wegner (1996) analyzed the essays of 200 eight-graders, who responded to the prompt, "What lessons from the Holocaust are there for my generation today?" The vast majority of responses addressed moral prescriptions about what students should not be doing. The most popular response (82 percent) was to not allow the Holocaust to happen again. The second most common lesson (64 percent) was not to dehumanize others. The third most common response (60 percent) was not to be a bystander.

This research suggests that the lessons of the Holocaust are not necessarily obvious or convergent. The teacher can easily shape the content and lessons of the event. Teaching about the Holocaust, even in great depth, can but will not automatically lead to greater tolerance, historical understanding, or civic virtue. Nevertheless, under the right circumstances learning about the Holocaust can have a number of positive and measurable effects on students' moral and cognitive growth.

CONCLUSION

Content about the Holocaust is now firmly embedded in the American curriculum. Nearly every major city has some kind of Holocaust museum that creates and distributes educational materials. For almost two decades, the USHMM has trained hundreds of teachers through its summer internships and teacher workshops, and over the years the FHAO Foundation has trained thousands of teachers and distributed educational materials to many more. In addition textbooks cover more material about the Holocaust than ever before, and those states with history standards often list the Holocaust specifically. Although much of it is dated and local, the research presented above demonstrates that the Holocaust is being taught in a number of creative contexts and through a diverse range of approaches throughout the country.

However, the research also suggests that spending a few days or even weeks teaching the Holocaust may not have a long-lasting impact on students. Spending an entire semester on the Holocaust can be more meaningful, but even then, transforming the embedded cognitive and affective structures of the mind is a long, slow process, and it results from numerous encounters both inside and outside of the classroom. For this reason, Holocaust education needs to be viewed as a component of the overall goals of secondary and higher education, not merely as an end in itself. Ultimately, much more research is needed on the long-term effects of learning about this important event.

REFERENCES

Bardige, B. (1981). "Facing History and Ourselves. Tracing development though analysis of student journals." *Moral Education Forum* 6(2), 42-48.

Baron, L. (2003). "The Holocaust and American public memory, 1945-1960." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 17 (1), 62-88.

Boix-Manilla, V. (2000). "Historical understanding: Beyond the past and into the present." In *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*. Edited by P. Sterns, P. Seixas, and S. Wineburg .New York: New York University Press, 390-418.

Brabeck, M., Kenny, M., Stryker, S., Tottefson T., & Stern-Strom M. (1994). "Human rights education through Facing History and Ourselves Programme." *Journal of Moral Education*, 23 (3), 333-347.

Donoho, G. E. (1999). *The Arkansas Holocaust Education Committee's Professional Development Conferences: The Impact on Classroom Implementation*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Arkansas.

Donvito, C. (2003). *A Descriptive Study: The Implementation of the 1994 New Jersey Holocaust/Genocide Mandate in New Jersey Public Middle Schools*. Unpublished dissertation, Seton Hall University.

Ellison, J. (2002). *From One Generation to the Next: A Case Study of Holocaust Education in Illinois*. Unpublished dissertation, Florida Atlantic University.

Epstein, J. (1989). "Holocaust education in the United States: The church related institution." *In Remembering of the Future, Working Paper and Addenda: Volume II: The Impact of the Holocaust on the Contemporary World*. Edited by Y. Bauer, A. Eckardt, F. H. Littell, E. Maxwell, R. Maxwell, & D. Patterson. New York: Pergamon Press, 1989, 1168-74.

Fallace, T. D. (2008). *The Emergence of Holocaust Education in American Schools*. New York: PalgraveMacmillan.

Fallace, T. (2005). "Origins of Holocaust education in American schools." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 20(1), 80-102.

Fine, M. (1993a). "You can't just say that the only ones who can speak are those who agree with your position': Political discourse in the classroom." *Harvard Educational Review*, 63 (4). Accessed May 21, 2007 from www.edreview.org/harvard93/wi93/w93fin.html.

Fine, M. (1993b). "Collaborative innovations: Documentation of the Facing History and Ourselves program at an essential school." *Teachers College Record*, 94 (4), 771-789.

Glynn, M., Bock, G., and Cohen K. (1982). *American Youth and the Holocaust: A Study of Four Major Holocaust Curricula*. New York: National Jewish Resource Center.

Haynes, S. R. (1998). "Holocaust education at American collages and universities: A report on the current situation." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 12 (2), 282-307.

Holt, E. (2002). *Implementation of Indiana's Resolution to Holocaust Education by Selected Language Arts and Social Studies Teachers in Middle Schools/Junior High and High Schools*. Unpublished dissertation, Indiana State University.

Kanter, L. (1998). "Forgetting to remember: Presenting the Holocaust in American college social science and history textbooks," ERIC-CRESS ED 439 039, 1-59.

Lieberman, M. (1981). "Facing History and Ourselves: A project evaluation." *Moral Education Forum*, 6(2), 36-42.

Lindquist, D. H. (2002). *Towards a Pedagogy of the Holocaust: Perspectives of Exemplary Teachers*. Unpublished dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Llorente, E. "Holocaust taught at nearly all districts, survey finds." *The Record* (Bergen, NJ), 3 April 1998, A03.

Locke, H.G. "The Holocaust and the American University: Observations on the teaching and research in a graduate professional field." In *Remembering of the Future, Working Paper and Addenda: Volume II: The Impact of the Holocaust on the Contemporary World*. Edited by Y. Bauer, A. Eckardt, F. H. Littell, E. Maxwell, R. Maxwell, & D. Patterson. New York: Pergamon Press, 1989, 1188-1193.

Mitchell, J. P. (2004). *Methods of Teaching the Holocaust to Secondary Students as Implemented by Tennessee Recipients of the Betz-Lippman Tennessee Holocaust Educators of the Year Awards*. Unpublished dissertation, East Tennessee University.

Novick, P. *The Holocaust in American Life*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1999.

Ravitch, D., and C. E. Finn (1987). *What Do Our 17-Year Olds Know? A Report on the First National Assessment of History and Literature*. New York: Perennial Library.

Schultz, L. H., Barr, D. and Selman, R. (2001). "The value of a developmental approach to evaluating character development programmes: An outcome study of Facing History and Ourselves." *Journal of Moral Education* 30(1), 3-27.

Schweber, S. (2008). "Here there is no why': Holocaust education at a Lubavitch girls' yeshiva." *Jewish Social Studies* 14(2), 156-185.

Schweber, S. (2007). "What happened to their pets?: Third graders encounter the Holocaust." *Teachers College Record* 110 (10), 2073-2115.

Schweber, S. (2006). "Holocaust Fatigue in Teaching Today" *Social Education*, 70(1): 44-49.

Schweber, S. (2004). *Making Sense of the Holocaust: Lessons from Classroom Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Schweber, S. and Irwin R. (2003). "Especially special': Leaning about Jews in a Fundamentalist Christian school." *Teachers College Record*, 105 (9), 1693-1719.

Sepinwall, H. (1999). "Incorporating Holocaust education into K-4 curriculum and teaching in the United States." *Social Studies and the Young Learner* (Jan/Feb 1999), 5-8.

Shawn, K. (1995). "Current Issues in Holocaust Education." *Commentary*, 96 (2): 15-18.

Spector, K. (2007). "God on the gallows: Reading the Holocaust through narratives of redemption." *Research in the Teaching of English*, 42 (1), 7-55.

Stoddard, J. (2007). "Attempting to understand the lives of others: Film as tool for developing historical empathy." In *Celluloid Blackboard: Teaching History with Film*. Edited by A. Marcus, 187-214.

Totten, S. (2002). *Holocaust Education: Issues and Approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wegner, G. (1998). "What lessons are there from the Holocaust for my generation today? Perspectives on civic virtue from middle school youth." *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 13, 167-183.

SURVEYING TEACHER'S EXPERIENCES AND PERCEPTIONS IN RELATIONS TO HOLOCAUST EDUCATION

From 1999 to 2006, **Eva Fried** worked within the Prime Minister's Offices. She was part of the teams that planned and conducted the four conferences that comprised "The Stockholm International Forum Conferences". Within the Ministry of Culture she also participated in the preparation of the establishment of the government authority the Living History Forum, which was established in 2003. Eva Fried is also the editor of the book *Beyond the 'Never Agains'*, published in 2005.

ABSTRACT

The Living History Forum is a government agency commissioned with the task of promoting issues relating to tolerance, democracy and human rights. Taking the Holocaust as its point of departure, it was established with the objective of initiating and promoting studies of tolerance and human rights. It works under the Ministry of Culture. The basic aim of the agency is to encourage people's readiness to work for the equal value of all human beings.

In 2007, the Living History Forum performed a survey of teachers in order to assess their attitudes towards work related to the history of the Holocaust, and their views on the prospects of accomplishing such work successfully. When the results of this survey were presented, a number of important issues emerged, many of which will be used as guidelines for ongoing work at the Living History Forum. However, when the results were communicated, one specific topic was the focus of attention from the media; in the questionnaire, a number of items were included that were specifically aimed at probing the level of knowledge of the history of the Holocaust among the teachers. Many teachers, led by the Association of History Teachers, felt that through the Living History Forum's survey, they had been identified as ignorant regarding the subject of History in general, and the history of the Holocaust in particular.

The main purpose of the questionnaire was to clarify whether the attitudes of different actors gener-ate reluctance to teaching and learning about the Holocaust, which impairs the efforts put into Holocaust education and jeopardizes the importance of such edu-cation. A discussion about why knowledge issues were given significance in a survey about teachers' attitudes to teaching the Holocaust is presented below.

THE SWEDISH TEACHERS' SURVEY

The survey's principal objective was that of charting whether, and to what extent, the attitudes of different actors in schools—teachers, school management, students and parents—create and maintain opposition to teaching and learning about the Holocaust.

The questionnaire was also intended to measure other relevant factors, such as the time spent on teaching about the Holocaust, training provided for the teachers, the availability of teaching material, and the teacher's own knowledge about the subject.

The questionnaire includes the following themes:

- the training teachers have for the teaching of the subject;
- their own attitude towards the subject;
- how important and interesting they consider the subject to be;
- the time dedicated to Holocaust education;
- the teacher's own level of knowledge;
- the attitudes teachers perceive among students and their parents, among colleagues and school management, and with regard to the subject;
- influences from external factors, such as guilt issues, competing subjects, etc.

In 2004, a proposal was submitted to the ITF (International Taskforce for Co-operation in Holocaust Education, Research and Remembrance) for an investigation into how the presence of Muslim students in a class influences teaching about the Holocaust. This idea was regarded as being more than a little prejudiced by most of the experts at the ITF. However, the proposal led to a discussion about the need for a broader study of how the different member countries teach the Holocaust, as well as the aims of and the obstacles to implementing Holocaust education in the various educational environments within the ITF.

Sweden came to take a leading role in the planning of a project that aimed at getting as many member countries as possible to carry out a survey within their school systems. A dedicated working group was established, which consisted of historians, sociologists and educational experts. When the Swedish study began, in 2007, the thesis was that a declining interest in the Holocaust existed, and that Holocaust fatigue was being experienced and expressed by students, teachers and parents. When the study was complete it was apparent that none of this was correct. Instead, there is a fairly positive picture of this area of teaching.

The data on which the report is based was collected in 2007. The gross sample consisted of 10,000 teachers from different stages of the Swedish school system, beginning with 4th to 6th grade in comprehensive school up to upper secondary school. The survey was conducted by Anders Lange, Professor Em. Stockholm University, and carried out by Statistics Sweden (SCB). The response rate was a rather low one, 51.5% (point) and generated 5081 respondents. The questionnaire was finalized by Anders Lange in co-operation with Christer Mattsson, Project Manager at the Living History Forum, responsible for international contacts in the field of Holocaust education and a member of the Education Working Group within the ITF.

EDUCATION THAT AIMS TO MAKE AN IMPACT

History can provide explanations for the present day and perspectives on the future. Society doesn't exist at the end of history and our time has not achieved perfection. There is no such thing as a value neutral society. Our experience of present society and our time's notions of the future have a significant effect on how we depict our history. In addition, a vision of a future ideal society has the potential to transform people's ideas of equal value into concrete action.

As we all know, the Holocaust, as a historical phenomenon, touches upon a number of deep-seated questions relating to, amongst other things, morality, ethics, guilt, collective and individual responsibility, "human nature" and social conditions that facilitate—or obstruct—systematic mass murder and other crimes against humanity.

It is against this background that we should understand the Living History Forum (FLH) and this authority's commission. As a government authority, like other public authorities in Sweden—including Swedish universities, colleges and most of the Swedish school system—we have a political commission to accomplish. This is clearly defined in the constitution, which states: "The public institutions shall promote the ideals of democracy as guidelines in all sectors of society…". Every year, this is expressed in the appropriation direction that the government, via the Ministry of Culture, sends to our authority.

> "The public institutions shall promote the ideals of democracy as guidelines in all sectors of society…"

Our commission, based on the history of the Holocaust and other crimes against humanity, is to reinforce belief in the equal value of all people. This commission's logic rests on the knowledge that Nazi Germany, the Second World War and the Holocaust have manifestly changed the

conditions for public discussion of racism, anti-Semitism, nationalism, democracy and genocide.

Like many institutions in Europe and other places around the world, the Living History Forum embraces the notion that all those who study this period of history will draw conclusions that influence their personal actions in a way that benefits a tolerant humanism. Two different perspectives can be discerned in this shared fundamental thesis. One aims to try to influence by exposing the recipient to a fairly brutal but short-term depiction of parts of history; this depiction is intended to make a strong impact and provide something of a shock effect. It should show the extreme consequences of an intolerant society. This perspective rests on the belief that the powerful experience to which the student should act as a vaccination against values that are undesirable. The other perspective is focused on arousing the students' interest in more in-depth historical studies. This way of working with Holocaust history places more faith in the individual's ability to see the context, make an analysis and draw his or her own conclusions.

This latter perspective is undoubtedly the one most closely linked to FLH, though a working method that is based on this perspective presupposes that those working with history are motivated, knowledgeable and working in an environment that provides the necessary resources in the shape of time and other framing factors. This understanding is something that we share with many colleagues from institutions in countries represented in the ITF. Education should be given space that allows the individual student's own analysis of the various processes and the course of events. Our outlook is that this is the only way in which the history of the Holocaust can also serve an instrumental purpose and lead to a deeper understanding of democracy, personal responsibility and, to some extent, general insights as well.

SURVEY DESIGN

When planning the study we assessed that it was essential that it would target more teachers than those teaching History. There were two reasons for this: partly, there was reason to believe that it is not only History teachers who teach the Holocaust, and partly, it was interesting to know what other teachers thought about this subject in order to provide an idea of how the subject is generally perceived by teachers. Additionally, we chose to measure other indirectly influential factors, such as job satisfaction and attitudes to a number of social phenomena. We also chose to measure the teachers' level of knowledge as regards the history of the Holocaust.

Because the FLH emphasises the importance of more in-depth historical expertise in order to be able to undertake meaningful teaching about the Holocaust, we were also interested in the connection between how teachers defined their aims regarding their teaching and the depth of their knowledge. Also of interest was the connection between level of knowledge and motivation, education, continuing education and time allocation.

The study indicates that teachers in general, and History teachers in particular, embrace the thesis that knowledge of the history of the Holocaust can increase understanding of democracy, personal responsibility and, to some extent, offer general insight. However, our opinion is that one condition for achieving this effect is that the teacher has a fundamental understanding of how a terror regime, such as the Nazi regime, can come to power, and the influence and responsibility borne by the individual. On the basis of this approach, a number of questions were formulated with the aim of measuring teachers' knowledge and understanding of the Holocaust's processes and effects.

As the survey was sent directly to the teachers, we ensured that the questions in our study were not readily answerable using reference material. The questions were deliberately designed to be relatively difficult in order to provide a basis for a nuanced analysis. Naturally, simple questions that anyone could answer would not fulfill any function as there would be no difference between the answers from a history professor or a member of the public. This meant the questions had to be designed to show a bedifference, which is fully comprehensible to anyone who has ever graded examinations.

One difficulty in designing knowledge questions is ensuring that the questions are relevant. In this context, relevant means that they should be relevant as regards the history of the Holocaust. But, bearing in mind our approach to this history study and its opportunity for an instrumental purpose, they should also be relevant to the commission to allow history to provide perspectives on general issues, as well as those that can result in conclusions about the processes behind the Holocaust.

ASSESSMENT OF THE KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS

One question in the survey was about the degree of non-compulsion in the soldiers that took part in the mass killings. The question was: "Many Germans took part in the German forces' killing of civilian Jews during the Holocaust. If someone were to refuse to take part in the executions, according to what you know, what would have happened to that person?"

If one believes that a person would, in any circumstances, be executed (which half of the teachers did) one can hardly hold a discussion about this person's moral responsibility. But the reality is that we now know that, in general, nothing particular happened to those who refused to take part in the killing (four percent knew this). The fact that genocide in general, and the Holocaust in particular,

requires voluntary participation from the level of the highest command down to the individual killers, should be considered a basic piece of historical knowledge if the mediation of history is to function in the way we wish.

When designing this type of question for the survey, there was the reasoning that this type of knowledge is something one either possesses or one does not. It is possible to forget or mix facts, without being able to maintain that there is a serious lack of knowledge, but it indicates a lack of insight if one mixes up important causal connections within historiography.

The question referred to above is naturally more important than whether the teacher believes that Bergen-Belsen was a death camp instead of a concentration camp. Thus, in evaluating the answers, we have given the different questions different weightings. The assessment of wrong answers is thus valued differently depending on the nature of the question and its relevance to the teacher's insight in the course of events that comprise the history of the Holocaust. Therefore, we gave a wrong answer to the Bergen-Belsen question a low weighting.

Another question in the survey that gave rise to some discussion when the questionnaire was discussed, particularly from the teachers, was the proportion of Jewish children that were murdered during the Holocaust. The correct figure is 91% to 93%. We believe that it is unimportant to know this exact figure off by heart, as it is easy to look up the figure and get updated before teaching a class. We therefore had broad answer alternatives (0-20%, 21-40%, 41-60%, 61- 80% and 81-100%) and the right alternative would, according to our perspective, provide a good indication of whether someone had adequate understanding of that fact.

The reason that, in most places in Europe, Jewish culture has disappeared is naturally due to the systematic killing of children. If half of the children had survived, the result of this genocide would have had a different historical significance compared with what it is now. This knowledge is thus not marginal, but absolutely fundamental to understanding the extent of the Holocaust.

Another question that was discussed is about which year the first mass arrests of Jews took place; the right answer is 1938 (Krystalnacht). Several critics have protested that it is not important to memorise all the years, as one can look them up before a class. It is true that one updates details before a class, but we can assume that most people are aware that Hitler came to power in 1933, or at the beginning of the 1930s. If one believes that the mass arrests of Jews began then, one doesn't have enough insight into how the Nazis proceeded to change Germany from a democracy to a dictatorship. There were a number of groups who were subject to mass arrest by the Nazis before the Jews, which was a precondition for the Holocaust being able to take place. Even though it is desirable that a teacher is able to answer 1938 without hesitating, as a History teacher one should at least understand that it was at the end of the 1930s and not at the beginning. We have therefore weighted an answer of 1939 as a lesser mistake than answering 1933.

"Many Germans took part in the German forces."

We have weighted a question's importance with the degree of error to a total index of 1-5, where the figures 1 and 2 presume a very wrong answer to several questions and not just mixing up a year or two.

One important experience provided by the study is that teachers are not only absorbed in the history of the Holocaust as a subject, but they express that there exists a neglected need for skills development in this subject. What we can prove is that there is an apparent link between access to education, both basic and further education, and the individual teacher's level of knowledge. This knowledge is not targeting teachers, but instead supports them in their demands for qualitative continuing education in the subject.

SOME IMPORTANT RESULTS

Perhaps the most important thing indicated by this survey is the fact that, in general, teachers believe that education about the Holocaust is very important.

The teachers were asked whether they believe that teaching the Holocaust is different in some regard from areas in subjects such as History and Social Studies. The answers show that half the teachers consider this work to be as important as other areas; 47.2 percent think it is more important.

We have also discovered that most teachers in Sweden believe that teaching the Holocaust functions as an opener for discussions and teaching that touches on broader ethical and moral issues.

A huge majority of the teachers—83.7 percent—believe that teaching the Holocaust arouses more moral and ethical questions than other areas.

Another important lesson—at which we had guessed, but of which we now received clear indications, is that there is a strong connection between knowledge of the Holocaust and how much education on the subject one received at teacher training college.

The survey also shows that students are quite motivated in learning about the Holocaust. More than half the teachers (52.7 percent) report that the students' motivation is high. More than a third state that it is average and only 4.5 percent believe that it is low. 78.8 percent of the respondents have not noticed "Holocaust fatigue" in their students.

As regards the Living History Forum's commission, it is significant that the study indicates that teachers in general, and History teachers in particular, embrace the thesis that knowledge of the history of the Holocaust can increase our understanding of democracy, personal responsibility and, to some extent, general insight. Our conviction that one condition for achieving this effect is that the teacher has a fundamental understanding of the scope of the Holocaust, its effects, and the preconditions which allowed it to take place. The teacher must also have his or her own understanding of how a terror regime, like the Nazi regime, can come to power, as well as the influence and responsibility of the individual. The results of the survey have in no way given cause to reassess this point of view.

One lesson learned from the survey responses is that there is reason for the Living History Forum to increase work targeted at teacher training courses, in order to encourage them to invest more in the area of Holocaust education.

NOTES

This text is based on an article by Eskil Franck, Executive Director of the Living History Forum, and Christer Mattsson. Adapted and edited by Eva Fried, International Relations Co-ordinator at the Living History Forum.

From 1999 to 2006, Eva Fried worked within the Prime Minister's Offices. She was part of the teams that planned and conducted the four conferences that comprised "The Stockholm International Forum Conferences". Within the Ministry of Culture she also participated in the preparation of the establishment of the government authority the Living History Forum, which was established in 2003. Eva Fried is also the editor of the book *Beyond the 'Never Agains,'* published in 2005.

REFLECTIONS ON THE HOLOCAUST AND INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION IN ENGLAND

Ian Davies is based at the University of York, where he is Professor of Education. His publications include *Teaching the Holocaust: educational dimensions, principles and practice* (Continuum, 2000) and *The Sage Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy* (2008). He teaches on a wide variety of programmes including history initial teacher education.

Paula Mountford is based at the University of York where she is Director of Initial Teacher Education and Co-ordinator of the History Post Graduate Certificate in Education. Her wide professional experience includes working on projects with the National College of School Leadership (NCSL) and the national government Department for Education and Skills (DfES). Her publications include *Human Rights in the Curriculum—History* (Amnesty International, 2002) and Working as a team to teach the Holocaust well: a Language-centred approach *(Teaching History, 2001).*

ABSTRACT

This article has three main sections. Firstly, we suggest that despite explicitly stated commitments by key decision makers on the need to provide valid forms of Holocaust education there is some evidence to suggest that there are very many challenges that are still to be faced. Second, we outline some of the principles and main ideas that we feel are relevant to those who are enrolled in programmes of initial teacher education for history. Finally, we provide by illustration of Holocaust education that takes place in one context, some practical suggestions for what could be done in universities and schools to help with the development of initial teacher education.

Holocaust Education is vitally important. It is obviously necessary for all to understand this terrible crime against humanity and it is essential that we consider the connections between the Holocaust and other genocides. It is too simplistic to suggest that knowledge of significant and specific events and issues from the past and establishing connections with other (including contemporary) matters will necessarily lead to a more decent world, but it would seem to us impossible to accept any arguments that would seek to avoid this form of education. In this article we examine the background that may help us to understand the situation in England in relation to the development of successful programmes of Holocaust education; we suggest some principles and issues that need to be considered if we are to develop more of those successful programmes; and, finally we give a specific and practical illustration of what could be done as part of an initial teacher education programme in history.

BACKGROUND

It is both reassuring and disturbing to reflect on the situation concerning Holocaust education in England. Initially, the situation seems positive given the wealth of comment and practical support that is signalled frequently across a wide range of sources. Key individuals have made their support clear for programmes of Holocaust education. Ed Balls (government minister for education) is quoted on the web pages of the Holocaust Educational Trust as follows:

> The Holocaust was one of the most horrific and profound events in world history and I want every young person to have an understanding of it. Over 60 years on there are still lessons that we can all learn from this and the funding we are announcing today is money wisely spent.

> Teaching of the Holocaust is compulsory in all secondary schools between the ages of 11 and 14 and can also be studied in GCSE [for examination of students aged 16] History courses when studying the Second World War. There is also scope to cover it in English, Politics lessons and Citizenship classes. The Holocaust Educational Trust's project is extremely valuable and one I am delighted the Government is able to support." (http://www.het.org.uk/content.php?page_id=263 accessed 23 April 2009)

Further reassurance can be found in the relatively recent establishment of the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust which and there are a large number of organisations which are doing very valuable work by, for example, raising awareness and providing teaching resources (see http://www.hmd.org.uk/resources/cat/4/ accessed 23 April 2009). The Memorial Day takes place on 27 January (the anniversary of the liberation of the Nazi concentration camp Auschwitz-Birkenau) and commemorates the lives of those lost in the Holocaust as a result of Nazi persecution and in more recent genocides. The theme of the 2009 commemoration was 'stand up to hatred'. Some of the organisations involved in Holocaust Memorial Day and other work specifically provide teacher education activities (e.g. the Holocaust Educational Trust took a group of teachers to Yad Veshem in August 2008 for a series of lectures on key issues and workshops on practical pedagogical matters). The UK government funded Teacher Training Resource Bank contains relevant resources and there are very many networks and organisations that work specifically in the field of multicultural education (e.g. Multiverse http://www.multiverse.ac.uk/). Major academic conferences take place to explore complex matters and promote better understanding (e.g. a conference on the histories and cultures of anti-Semitism in England, from the Middle Ages to the present day was held in London in July 2007). European organisations are very active in this field with, for example, 2008 being the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue. The Council of Europe "has developed a wide range of educational tools and works closely with the Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research (ITF)" http://assembly.coe.int/ASP/Press/StopPressView.asp?ID=2119 accessed 23 April 2009).

And yet, there are significant problems. It should be admitted that much of the activity referred to above is prompted by high levels of concern. In other words, initiatives may emerge from a need to challenge injustice as opposed to the need to reinforce an already positive situation. The statement of government minister Ed Balls that has been quoted above was made following comments from some high profile public figures that seemed to suggest that Holocaust education would not be required in schools. The rationale for key publications (e.g. Lecomte 2001) is that teachers lack knowledge and classroom resources (see http://book.coe.int/EN/ficheouvrage.php?PAGEID=36&lang=EN&produit_aliasid=1544, accessed 23 April 2009). Indeed, some evidence about attitudes in society suggests that there are very disturbing levels of ignorance and prejudice (e.g. de Laine 1997). More specifically, Garawal (1999) suggests that a good deal more support is needed for student teachers including greater cultural sensitivity among teacher educators. Teaching the Holocaust is still a very controversial matter (as the recent suspension of 2 drama teachers in England has shown, see http://community.tes.co.uk/ forums/t/308780.aspx accessed 4 May 2009). Furthermore, whereas some research suggests that student teachers are positively inclined to what broadly could be referred to as liberal initiatives and goals (e.g. Robbins, Francis and Elliott 2003) others (e.g. Wilkins 1999) have suggested that the student teachers themselves have attitudes that are incompatible with the realisation of a decent society.

Whether because of the existence of severe problems or because of the need simply to celebrate and reinforce social justice there is some evidence to suggest that education can be effective in dispelling myths and promoting social justice (e.g. Sinott 2003). While not all evidence is in agreement with such an optimistic position (e.g. Washington 1981) we are heartened by Lemos' work (2005) who, following a review of projects that aimed to challenge and change racist attitudes in young people has suggested that most projects were "successful at conveying the message that racism was wrong, and in influencing behaviour and attitudes positively".

PRINCIPLES AND ISSUES RELEVANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMMES OF HOLOCAUST EDUCATION AS PART OF AN INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMME IN HISTORY

What, then, needs to be done? There are three broad areas that beginning teachers need to consider in a programme of initial teacher education that aims at least in part to develop clearer understanding and appropriate teaching and learning about the Holocaust. At the risk of using slightly awkward titles we will refer to these areas as: the intellectual; the representational and the societal.

By 'intellectual' we mean, simply, that student teachers should understand something of the Holocaust and be able to discuss and develop arguments about it. Was it a unique set of circumstances and/or should it be seen as something that is 'merely' another example of genocide. If it is both unique and an example then what frameworks of ideas relate to it? Is it a cognitive or emotional matter? Some might argue that the Holocaust is not to be seen as something that can be understood in rational terms. Perhaps its barbarity puts it beyond academic comprehension and it can only be seen emotionally? Is it, principally, a Jewish matter even if there were many other groups including those with disabilities whose human rights were denied?

By 'representational' we mean that beginning teachers need to consider a range of issues concerning how the Holocaust is presented. There are important debates about where the responsibility lies for characterising the Holocaust. Some have argued fiercely against the actions by national governments and the European Union of declaring certain events to be genocide. In 2006 the French Parliament, for example, adopted a bill that makes it a crime to deny that Armenians suffered genocide by the Turks during world war 1. For some this type of involvement by governments sets a dangerous precedent that takes power from historians and gives it to politicians. In such cases the question of who should decide what happened in the past is a very controversial matter. But there are also other types of representation that are contested. Adorno famously declared that there would be "no poetry after Auschwitz". Is it acceptable for novels, films and plays to portray aspects of the Holocaust?

Finally, the beginning teacher should have a view about the connections between the Holocaust and contemporary society. What do people think about social justice, what do they know about Judaism, what is current policy regarding the fight against discrimination and prejudice? In all of these matters are people more or less likely to be committed to social justice depending on the type of society in which they live. Wilkinson and Pickett (2009) have recently argued that more equal societies almost always do better in almost all ways. Others have argued for a decent society to be seen in terms of trust (e.g. Fukuyama 1995). The search for the precise key to a society where genocide could not occur is necessary as is a general awareness of the various approaches that are possible and the ability to consider the options with a keen sense of humanity.

Following the outline of these rather general matters it is necessary for us to focus a little more on what could be done with student teachers of history. We agree with Lemos' (2005) view that any projects that aim to challenge and change racism should have "well-defined objectives, a clear structure, a range of inputs, sustained activities over a period of time, and a focus on encouraging reflection on personal attitudes and experiences". We also feel that a particular style of history education is likely to be most beneficial. We are very persuaded by Haydn's (2000) arguments to move history education away from a style that is fairly close to preaching. He opposes an unhelpful approach that simply declares 'This is what happened. Wasn't it terrible?' He urges us to go towards a more evaluative stance in which some of the following questions could be posed:

- What happened, and how do we find out about it?
- Why are there different accounts and explanations?
- How do we find out which accounts and explanations are most valid? (Which can we trust?)
- Why does it matter- why is it important/significant?
- In what way does this effect the present and the future; what light does it shed on current problems and issues?

In outlining these questions Haydn is encouraging us to probe the Holocaust principally in relation to the historical concept of significance. By doing this there are opportunities not only to undertake extremely useful historical work but also to ensure that the Holocaust is not seen simplistically and inappropriately as something that is a part of the past. Hunt's (1999) use of Partington's criteria would be very helpful to begin discussions with student teachers. Those criteria are:

1. Importance-how important was it judged to be by people at the time?
2. Profundity- how deeply were people's lives affected?
3. Quantity- how many lives were affected?
4. Durability- for how long have people's lives been affected?
5. Relevance- in terms of the increased understanding of present life.

> "Successful at conveying the message that racism was wrong, and in influencing behaviour and attitudes positively."

If these ideas can be used by student teachers as they learn to work with young people then we believe that there is the potential to achieve a great deal. But, of course, rationales and indications of key issues and content are insufficient by themselves. An illustration of how student teachers could be taught to teach is vital. The process of educational work is often as—or more - important than what is 'covered'. As such the final section of this article gives an illustration of what sort of work could be done in a session that takes place in an initial teacher education programme for history student teachers.

AN EXAMPLE OF AN INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION SESSION FOR HISTORY STUDENT TEACHERS

During the one year Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) programme in England there are opportunities to plan a specific workshop on 'Teaching the Holocaust'. This one session, however, is far from all that is done. It is one of the means by which we develop our thinking about how we approach this topic and build a deeper knowledge and understanding across the year. The development of the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) has enabled us to create an accessible facility that draws

together articles, websites, links to museums and a shared resource section for student teachers to use on and off campus. Student teachers are thus allowed to read, research and reflect upon a number of articles, issues and websites prior to the workshop on 'Teaching the Holocaust'. This provides the background reading for a starter activity within the session and includes reference to sources including Voices of the Holocaust—The British Library ISBN 0712305076; Lessons of the Holocaust—video footage produced by the Spiro Institution and The Holocaust Educational Trust; Anne Frank Internet site—http//www.annefrank.nl/ Small groups of student teachers can engage in discussions focusing on questions such as 'Why teach the Holocaust?' and 'How to teach the Holocaust?' to encourage debate and reflection on whether to teach the holocaust in terms of developing historical knowledge, skills and understanding, to use it as an opportunity to focus in on moral education or to adopt a combined approach.

Jewish in Europe before 1933?' Kate Hammond (2001) has created an excellent card sort or 'washing line' activity to support investigations into this area. Student teachers are invited to take part in the activity, taking on the role of learners. Each card contains a brief summary of an event and the date. The cards are all linked to the persecution of the Jews over a 2000 year period. Learners could be asked to work in pairs and asked to work with flip chart paper on which a two circle Venn diagram has been drawn. One section is labelled 'religious persecution' and another 'racial persecution', with an overlap section between the two circles. Learners are asked to read the cards, discuss the issues and make a decision about where to place the card. On completion of the task, whole group feedback and follow up questioning takes place. A range of useful skills are developed and demonstrated during this activity: pair work/collaboration, speaking and listening, classification skills and discussion. Hammond (2001) then suggests that

> "Well-defined objectives, a clear structure, a range of inputs, sustained activities over a period of time, and a focus on encouraging reflection on personal attitudes and experiences."

Following this preparatory work we develop a second activity which focuses on a robust and rigorous key question that is both challenging and engaging. This links to earlier workshops that focused on planning mini schemes of work and planning key questions to structure enquiries and engage and motivate learners. Kitson (2001) suggests that teachers work with an overarching key question 'How could the Holocaust have happened?' and four smaller enquiry questions:

- What was it like to be Jewish in Europe before 1933?
- How did Hitler change anti-Semitism?
- What was 'the real opinion of the German people?'
- What was the Final Solution?
- Who could have stopped the Holocaust?

In groups of three Student Teachers are asked to discuss and deconstruct these questions, focusing on what skills and historical knowledge school students will be demonstrating and engaging with. They can be asked to discuss whether these questions allow the teacher to challenge stereotypes and avoid a superficial study of the topic. Student teachers are then asked to either use the Kitson questions or to generate their own key questions to work with during the session. This links with Riley's (2000) article in Teaching History where he provides criteria to support the creation of historically rigorous questions that engage and challenge learners.

The third activity of the session focuses on the first of Kitson's smaller enquiry questions: 'What was it like to be

washing lines are set up in the classroom and students given one card each so that they may reflect individually upon their card, discuss with neighbours and make a decision about where to 'peg' the card on the washing line. The ends of the lines indicate 'minor' to 'major' persecution. Again a range of skills are developed in this decision making exercise and demonstrated, with a mini-plenary drawing together key issues and ideas as well as an overview of the chronology of anti-Semitism. Hammond (2001) suggests a number of questions that could be asked during the mini-plenary:

- Is it more serious to persecute for religion or for race?
- Is planned, 'lawful' persecution by the government of a 'civilised' country worse than persecution by criminals or a mob?
- Can emotional suffering be as serious as physical suffering?
- Does motive make an injustice more unjust?
- Is it the number of deaths that makes one massacre more terrible than another?

Student teachers would then be introduced to a further range of useful resources including oral histories, video footage, picture source material, web sites and asked to work in pairs or small groups to plan one of the other key questions generated during activity two. Again a mini-plenary session would allow the whole group to share and engage with discussion and debate. Finally, resources, activities and lesson plans would be shared via the VLE.

CONCLUSION

There is an urgent need to ensure that the Holocaust is commemorated and that teaching and learning takes place that helps young people understand the past and make justifiable connections with contemporary society. We suggest that initial teacher education is one of the key engines of educational reform and that there is a particular opportunity to develop valuable work in the context of history education. The links between this work and the development of improved understandings, attitudes and practices are clear: not to take action in this field would be unprofessional.

REFERENCES

De Laine, M. (1997) Third of Teenagers Deny Holocaust, *Times Educational Supplement*, 4 July.

Fukuyama, F. (1995) Trust: the social virtues and the creation of prosperity. London, Free Press.

Garewal, G. (1999) Experiences of Racism in Initial Teacher Education. *Multicultural Teaching*, 17, 2 pp. 17-23.

Hammond, K. (2001) 'From horror to history: teaching pupils to reflect on significance' *Teaching History, 104, Teaching the Holocaust edition.*

Haydn, T. (2000) Teaching the Holocaust through History. In I. Davies (ed.) *Teaching the Holocaust: educational dimensions, principles and practice* pp. 135-150.

Hunt, M. (1999) Teaching about Significance in History, in J. Arthur and R. Phillips (eds.) *Issues in History Teaching*. London, Routledge.

Kitson, A. (2001) 'Challenging stereotypes and avoiding the superficial: a suggested approach to teaching the Holocaust' *Teaching History, 104, Teaching the Holocaust edition.*

Lecomte, J-M. (2001) *Teaching about the Holocaust in the 21st Century.* Strasbourg, Council of Europe.

Riley, M. (2000) 'Into the Key Stage 3 history garden: choosing and planting your enquiry questions' *Teaching History, 99, Curriculum Planning edition*

Robbins, M., Francis, L. J., and Elliott, E. (2003) Attitudes toward education for global citizenship among trainee teachers. *Research in Education*, 69, pp. 93-98.

Russell, L. (2006) Teaching the Holocaust in School History. London, Continuum.

Sinnott, S. NUT (2003) Anti-Semitism: Still Sleeping Lightly. *Race Equality Teaching*, 22, 1, pp8-11.

The Times (2009) *Schindler's List Teachers Suspended.* 10th April 2009.

The Times Educational Supplement (2009) Drama teachers suspended for improper lesson content. 10 April.

Washington, V. (1981) Impact of Antiracism/Multicultural Education Training on Elementary Teachers' Attitudes and Classroom Behavior. *The Elementary School Journal*, 81, 3, pp. 186-192

Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. (2009) The Spirit Level: why more equal societies almost always do better. London, Allen Lane

REMEMBERING THE HOLOCAUST: UK INITIATIVES ASSOCIATED WITH HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL DAY

Paula Cowan is Senior Lecturer in Education at the University of the West of Scotland. Her fields of research are Holocaust education, Citizenship in Scottish schools and social education and political understanding of pupils. Paula Cowan has over seventeen years experience of teaching in primary schools and was a freelance educational writer from 1994 to 2001. An author of Holocaust educational materials, Paula is a trustee of the (UK) Holocaust Memorial Day Trust and has recently been appointed a member of the Task Force For International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research.

ABSTRACT

The overall responsibility for the annual national commemoration of Holocaust Memorial Day in UK was handed over to the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust in 2005. The Trust is responsible for the principal commemorative event in England and Wales and the devolved Scottish Parliament (referred to as the Scottish Government) continues to have responsibility for the Scottish equivalent. Scotland has held a national (Scotland) Holocaust Memorial Day event annually since the introduction of the Day in 2001and in 2003 hosted the national UK commemorative event. This paper examines Scotland's engagement with Holocaust Memorial Day as its commemoration is not included in previous research.

This paper further reports on findings from research, commissioned by the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust, into the impact of public awareness of Holocaust Memorial Day in the UK in 2007 (Caplan & Gilham, 2007). This sample comprised individuals throughout the UK and its findings provide information as to the individual impact of this commemoration on individuals who engage with it.

This paper concludes that Scotland's engagement with Holocaust Memorial Day has been significant in education as it has facilitated its teaching in some primary and secondary schools and that its engagement in the wider community has steadily increased. It also concludes that a large number of individuals across the UK engaged with Holocaust Memorial Day for the first time in 2007 and that this affected their attitudes towards the Holocaust and other genocides.

INTRODUCTION

This essay will investigate the impact of Holocaust Memorial Day in the UK. This day of national commemoration was initially organized by the government at Westminster and the Scottish Government at Holyrood in 2001. The Holocaust Memorial Day Trust was given responsibility for the annual national UK event in 2005 and receives funding from the UK government. The form of the commemoration varies from year to year, and the Trust decides on the theme. It also coordinates, compiles and distributes educational resources for schools and communities in preparation for Holocaust Memorial Day, and operates the Holocaust Memorial Day website. The Scottish Government has maintained responsibility for the commemoration in Scotland.

This paper will focus primarily on the commemoration of the Holocaust in Scotland as this part of the UK tends to be overlooked in literature on Holocaust commemoration and /or Holocaust education in the UK (Davies, 2000; Salmons, 2003; Short, 2000 and Short and Reed, 2004). The fact that Scotland has a separate educational system, and a devolved Parliament means that Holocaust education and commemoration are framed

differently north of the border. Secondly, this essay will examine the general impact of Holocaust Memorial Day by examining feedback from individuals in the UK who attended events in 2007. This study will provide insight into the reasons why people engage with this commemorative occasion and explore the nature of their impact.

SCOTLAND AND THE HOLOCAUST

Scotland's direct links with the Holocaust include it being the birthplace of Jane Haining, the only Scottish 'Righteous (Person) Amongst the Nations'. Haining was awarded this title in recognition of the fact that she saved Jewish children in Hungary during the Holocaust. Scotland is also the country where Rudolf Hess, deputy leader of the Nazi Party was captured in 1941. It was the home to Eastern European refugees, and children who had come on the *Kindertransports* 1938; and the location of Camp 165, a (Scottish) Prisoner of War camp in 1945. In addition, Scottish soldiers were involved in the liberation of Bergen-Belsen concentration camp. Hence commemoration of the Holocaust has direct relevance to Scottish people today and can contribute to a broader understanding Scottish history and society.

Unlike England and Wales where Holocaust education has been mandatory in the National Curriculum for 13-14 year olds since 1995 (Russell, 2006), there is no requirement to teach the Holocaust in the Scottish curriculum. Opportunities to teach it include the traditional areas of History, Social Studies and Religious and Moral Education. The notion of responsible citizenship is a key element of the new Scottish curriculum, Curriculum for Excellence (LTS/Scottish Government, 2004). Citizenship education in Scotland is not a separate subject but is taught in a cross-curricular approach to students at all ages (LTS, 2002a). This means that all subjects in the curriculum may have an input into teaching citizenship.

IMPACT OF HMD IN SCOTLAND

The introduction of the national remembrance and commemoration of the Holocaust was not the start of Holocaust education in Scotland (but it heralded its entry into mainstream education (Maitles & Cowan, 1999; Cowan & Maitles, 2000). The Scottish Executive (now the Scottish Government) commissioned an education pack for teaching the Holocaust to primary pupils aged 10-12 years within the context of the (then) Scottish curriculum (LTS, 2000) in preparation for the first national Holocaust Memorial Day. The pack was distributed to every primary school and with the assistance of the (UK) Home Office, the publication 'Remembering Genocides: Lessons for the Future' was distributed to every secondary school (DfEE, 2000). This was followed by an education pack for secondary schools that complemented the (then) Scottish curriculum (LTS, 2002b). This meant that teachers in Scotland had resources to support Holocaust education. Further curricular materials have since been funded by the Scottish Executive and recent initiatives include relevant information from the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust being placed on the website of the national curriculum development agency, Learning and Teaching Scotland (LTS). LTS is a government funded, non-departmental public body that is at the core of all major developments in Scotland's education. Future plans include making similar materials available on Scotland's new schools' intranet. Technological advances, and curricular reform have necessitated the development of new Holocaust resources.

There is little published empirical research that shows the impact of Holocaust education on individuals. Investigation of the initial impact Holocaust Memorial Day on primary and secondary schools in one local authority concluded that it had led to a significant increase in Holocaust education in schools (Cowan & Maitles, 2002). The sample comprised teachers from 24 primary schools in a small authority whose "residents came from a wide range of religious, ethnic and cultural backgrounds" (Cowan & Maitles, 2002:222). The educational initiatives included a one-day teacher continuing professional development course for teachers. This was introduced by the authority's Director of Education to accompany a specially commissioned education resource 'Children's Rights and the Holocaust'. The following events were also organised: an essay/public speaking competition for senior secondary students on 'The Importance of Remembering'; a public meeting with a guest speaker; and student displays of Holocaust art and written work in local libraries and council offices. In addition, local schools appointed a designated Holocaust education co-ordinator. This case study supports Burtonwood's view that Holocaust Memorial Day can facilitate learning about the Holocaust and the lessons from it (2002). While this research provides evidence of the short term impact of Holocaust Memorial Day it does not contribute to its understanding of its long term impact. It is unknown as to whether the commitment of this particular authority was due to the 'new' element of the initiative, the initiative itself; or indeed whether this strong commitment has been maintained over the years.

One project that received a great deal of acclaim was the Anne Frank and You Festival organised by Fife Council in 2007, which concluded with the national Scottish Holocaust Memorial Day event. Prior to this date, Fife Council had not engaged in any activities to commemorate the Holocaust. This three-week Festival involved young people in the planning and organisation of workshops, presentations and creative activities for the general public and for their peers. Nearly three thousand local school students participated in one or more of these events and the

main commemorative event included a candlelight procession for peace and a formal ceremony that were each attended by c. 500 people. The success of this Festival was reliant on the support from nineteen partner organisations, and 72 voluntary positions. It therefore grew into a multi-agency community event and enabled thousands of people to participate in an experience that aimed for greater understanding of equality and tolerance within the chosen theme for Holocaust Memorial Day that year 'Dignity with a Difference'. While the success of this project cannot be overstated, Fife Council has not repeated this exercise. One possible reason for this is that such commitment has funding implications which the Council cannot maintain every year. Another is that repeating the exercise too soon would reduce its general appeal.

The first Scottish national event was hosted by Edinburgh Council in 2001 in its capital city and subsequently by smaller councils across the country. One criticism of this is that the event has remained in the most densely populated area in Scotland in the south of the country, in the area known as the 'central belt'. Unlike in England where several councils have expressed interest to host the national event, the interest in Scotland has not been as widespread. The claim that Holocaust Memorial Day has little impact beyond the 'central belt' is supported by the entries in the 2009 Commemorative Book compiled by the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust (HMDT, 2009). This indicates that only three events from the fifty or more commemorative events organised in Scotland took place outside the 'central belt'. Fifteen individual events were held in Edinburgh alone (HMDT 2009).

Records held by the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust show a significant increase in engagement in Scotland in recent years, from 18 events held in 2006, 40 in 2008, to nearly 60 in 2009. These include individual commemorations held annually by specific councils, e.g. Edinburgh, Glasgow, South Lanarkshire, and East Renfrewshire. As not all schools and organisations notify the Trust of their events /activities, these results must be treated with caution. Further, they do not provide information as to the quality of the activities.

PUBLIC AWARENESS IN THE UK

Research commissioned by the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust gives further indication of the impact of the national day of commemoration (Caplan & Gilham, 2007). Its sample of 364 people included more than 200 from England and a small number from Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, who were of different religions and ethnic origins. Half of the sample were between 10 and 19 years old and two thirds of the sample were female. Respondents completed questionnaires either at commemorative events or afterwards. Forty people were interviewed and twenty five participated in focus group discussions. This research therefore provided data about those who engaged with the national day of commemoration in 2007 and examined the ways in which their participation had impacted upon them.

Sixty-five per cent of respondents had attended a commemorative event for the first time in 2007 and 5 per cent had been regular attendees at such events since the inception of Holocaust Memorial Day. This challenges the notion that the same people attend year after year. Further, around 30 per cent of respondents had previously visited a Holocaust commemorative site. When asked for the reason for their involvement, the largest group in the sample, 43 per cent indicated 'personal interest', 21 per cent indicated that it was a compulsory part of their (school) coursework and 6 per cent had a personal connection with the Holocaust or genocide. This shows that a significant number of people who attended events had some prior knowledge of the Holocaust and/or Holocaust related issues. It also raises the question as to whether those who engage with Holocaust Memorial Day are the people who would most benefit from greater understanding of these issues. Feedback showed that the range of events organised as part of Holocaust Memorial Day was very diverse: 45 per cent attended educational events such as a workshop organised by a school; 16 per cent attended civic events such as a function organised in a town hall; 12 per cent attended artistic events such as a musical performance; and 4 per cent attended religious events such as a religious service.

It is likely that this wide range of experiences makes it easier for people to engage with Holocaust Memorial Day and is a factor in attracting a significant number of newcomers each year.

Data obtained in response to the nature of the impact of Holocaust Memorial Day on individuals revealed that two-thirds of the sample perceived that the national day of commemoration had impacted on them personally. Seventy-two per cent indicated that they had reflected on the Holocaust or other genocides since attending a commemorative event. There was evidence of a heightened commitment to challenge discrimination and a heightened consciousness about the rise of anti-Semitism, incidences of genocide and increased Islamophobia. Sixty-four per cent of respondents considered that their attendance at a Holocaust Memorial Day event had changed their attitudes to the Holocaust and 38 per cent felt that this change applied to their attitudes towards other genocides and acts of discrimination. This suggests that Holocaust Memorial Day in the UK is more than an act of remembrance as it contributes to individuals' understanding of the Holocaust and its associated contemporary issues. It is therefore of benefit to the individual and thus of potential benefit to society as a whole. While attitudinal changes are

encouraging, one cannot be certain that these attitudes are permanent. Even if they were, it is not clear whether their attitudes lead to less discriminatory behaviour.

This research, however, is restricted to the perceptions of people supporting, organising and attending events associated with Holocaust Memorial Day and it does not consider those who engaged in alternative ways, e.g. using educational resources issued by Trust or referring to the website. Neither does it consider the impact of the day of national commemoration in Scotland as the sample contained a relatively small number of Scottish participants. In addition, other quantifiable aspects of impact, such as overall attendance figures at Holocaust Memorial Day events, the number of events across the UK, or the volume of comment generated in the press and public media are not included, although they too would contribute further to evaluating the impact of Holocaust Memorial Day. However, the data indicates the potential of HMD to raise individual awareness and change attitudes towards the Holocaust, genocides and discrimination.

CONCLUSION

This paper began by examining the impact of Holocaust Memorial Day on the people of Scotland. It looked at how the Scottish Government has supported the event in Scotland and discussed the challenges ahead. These include spreading the impact beyond the 'central belt' and the 'one-off' commitments to Holocaust Memorial Day by some local authorities, and to meeting the resource needs of teachers in today's Scottish classrooms.

Research commissioned by the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust showed that respondents who engaged in a range of commemorative events perceived that it had led to a change of attitudes towards acts of discrimination in general. In their study of British born Asian and black, and overseas student teachers in England, Cole and Stuart (2005) expressed deep concern 'about the failure of schools to develop proactive strategies to counter racism, xenophobia and ignorance in schools in this area' (p.363). Engaging with Holocaust Memorial Day is inevitably one such proactive approach that contributes to a fuller understanding of race equality. The fact that the majority of respondents in the research commissioned by the Trust were young people indicates the potential of Holocaust Memorial Day to impact significantly on the development of anti-racist and anti-discriminatory attitudes, given the recurrence of genocides in various parts of the world, the rise of anti-Semitism (Community Security Trust, 2009) and the existence of Islamophobia in Scotland (LTS, 2007) and throughout the UK. The high proportion of females suggests that the Trust should consider ways of engaging males. One of the limitations of this research is that it does not consider those individuals who do not engage with Holocaust Memorial Day and this is worthy of future study.

REFERENCES

Burtonwood, N. (2002) Holocaust Memorial Day in Schools-context, process and content: a review of research into Holocaust Education, *Educational Research*, 44(1), 69-82.

Caplan, A. & Gilham, J. (2007) *Evaluating the Impact on Public Awareness of Holocaust Memorial Day 2007: Holocaust Memorial Day Trust Report*, (unpublished, HMDT).

Cole, M. & Stuart, J.S. (2005) 'Do you ride on elephants' and 'never tell them you're German':the experiences of British Asian and black, and overseas student teachers in South-east England, *British Educational Research Journal*, 31(3), 349-366.

Community Security Trust (2009) *Antisemitic Incidents Report 2008*, London: The Community Security Trust.

Cowan, P. & Maitles, H. (2000) Feature or footnote:teachers' attitudes towards the teaching of the Holocaust in primary schools in Scotland, *Scottish Educational Review*, 32(1), 78-87.

Cowan, P. & Maitles, H. (2002) Developing Positive Values: a case study of Holocaust Memorial Day in the primary schools of one local authority in Scotland, *Educational Review*, 54(3),219-229.

Davies, I. (ed.)(2000) Teaching the Holocaust: educational dimensions and practice, London: Continuum.

DfEE (2000) *Remembering Genocides: Lessons for the Future*, London:DfEE.

HMDT (2009) Commemorative Book 2009 www.hmd.org.uk/files/1238062406-file.pdf (acessed 28 April 2009).

LTS (2000) *The Holocaust: a teaching pack for primary schools*, Dundee: Learning and Teaching Scotland.

LTS (2002a) *Education for Citizenship in Scotland*, Dundee: Learning and Teaching Scotland.

LTS (2002b) *The Holocaust: a teaching pack for secondary schools*, Dundee: Learning and Teaching Scotland.

LTS/Scottish Government (2004) *Purposes and Principles for the Curriculum 3-18*, Dundee: Learning and Teaching Scotland.

LTS (2007)Experience of Islamophobia in Scotland www.ltscotland.org.uk/antisectarian/whatIsSectarianism/aboutsectarianism/Islam/02100510islamophobia.asp (accessed 4 May 2009).

Maitles, H. & Cowan, P. (1999) Teaching the Holocaust in Primary Schools in Scotland:modes, methodology and content, *Educational Review*, 51(3), 263-271.

Russell, L. (2006) *Teaching the Holocaust in School History*, London: Continuum.

Salmons, P. (2003) Teaching or Preaching? The Holocaust and intercultural education in the UK. *Journal of Intercultural Education*, 14(2), 139-149.

Short, G. (1997) Holocaust Education and Citizenship: A view from the United Kingdom, *New Community,* Vol.23, (1:97), 75-88.

Short, G. & Reed, C.A. (2004) *Issues in Holocaust Education*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

SHIFTING PARADIGMS IN HOLOCAUST EDUCATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR CURRICULAR DESIGN

Mr. Ellison completed his doctorate in educational leadership in 2002 at Florida Atlantic University. The focus of his program and dissertation was in the field of Holocaust education. Currently, he lives in the Chicago area where he serves as the head of the humanities program at the Bernard Zell Anshe Emet Day School. He is blessed with two beautiful daughters.

ABSTRACT

Within the scholarly community, a paradigmatic shift has taken place in relation to the study of the Holocaust: rather than viewing the Holocaust as an isolated or sui generis event, it has become increasingly integrated into the broader study of genocide or human rights. Though a plethora of materials exist on the Holocaust at the secondary level, too often these materials are not congruent with the reality of teaching in today's schools; even more important, there is a paucity of materials that link the Holocaust to the general topic of genocide. In the future, there will be a greater need to develop curricula that firmly place the Holocaust within genocide studies.

Within the scholarly community, a paradigmatic shift has taken place in relation to the study of the Holocaust: rather than viewing the Holocaust as an isolated or sui generis event, it has become increasingly integrated into the broader study of genocide or human rights. However, as often happens, what starts at the scholarly/ university level is only now trickling down to the secondary school level, meaning that the paradigmatic shift is still in the process of "becoming" within the curricula of American schools. Though a plethora of materials exist on the Holocaust at the secondary level, too often these materials are not congruent with the reality of teaching in today's schools; even more important, there is a paucity of materials that link the Holocaust to the general topic of genocide. In the future, there will be a greater need to develop curricula that firmly place the Holocaust within genocide studies. The curricula will need to adhere to the most recent trends in best practices and contemporary scholarship and be cost effective, as well as, student and teacher friendly.

In the aftermath of World War II, historians tended to view the Holocaust as an aberration, a unique event in history. However, with the passage of time, greater objectivity, and additional research, a growing number of scholars have softened their viewpoint about the uniqueness of the Holocaust. Though it may be true that the Holocaust represents the most extreme example of genocide, being that the goal, as stated by Yehuda Bauer, was 'total and global genocide' (Bauer, 2001, p. g. 48-49), it certainly did not stand-alone. The Holocaust was only one of many genocides that occurred during the modern era and should be viewed at the end of a continuum rather than being a completely unique and isolated event. During the twentieth century, genocides also occurred in Armenia, Indonesia, East Timor, Bangladesh, Burundi, Cambodia, Iraq, Bosnia, and Rwanda, not to mention the millions killed under the totalitarian regimes of Mao and Stalin. It is for this reason that Alfred Leslie Rowse, an English historian, once quipped: "This filthy twentieth century. I hate its guts" (January, 2007, p. 134). If genocides of the twentieth century are combined with those in the nineteenth century, when native populations were exterminated worldwide, virtually every continent, nation, religion, and racial group has, in some

way, been touched by genocide. During the modern era, far from being viewed as an aberration, Holocaust-like events might be better viewed as the norm.

In recent years, the reclassification of the Holocaust as but 'one out of many', which began at the university level, has slowly trickled down to the secondary level of education. The language of the more recent legislative mandates and educational standards reflects this shifting paradigm. In the 90's, the majority of legislative mandates and standards passed by Boards of Education required that educators teach solely about the Holocaust. However, an examination of mandates and guidelines passed during the last five years reveals a change in focus and language. Four states including Maryland, Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois either expanded the educational language of their mandates or created new mandates. Three of the four states, Maryland, Kentucky and Illinois, now require not just the teaching of the Holocaust, but other genocides as well. Indiana was the only recent state to pass a mandate where the mandate focused solely on Holocaust education (http://www.ushmm.org/education/foreducators/states/).

Changes in Illinois's mandate may be seen as typical of the paradigmatic shift that has taken place in state mandates. The first Illinois mandate, passed in 1990, required that "Every public elementary school and high school…include in its curriculum a unit of instruction studying the events of Nazi atrocities of 1933-1946. This period in world history is known as the Holocaust…" However, the expanded mandate, entitled the Illinois and Genocide Mandate, passed in 2005, required that along with the Holocaust:

> "…curriculum shall include an additional unit of instruction studying other acts of genocide across the globe. This unit shall include, but not be limited to, the Armenian Genocide, the Famine-Genocide in Ukraine, and more recent atrocities in Cambodia, Bosnia, Rwanda, and Sudan."

Undoubtedly, future state mandates and educational guidelines also will place the Holocaust firmly within the context of genocide studies, rather than the study of the Holocaust being an end onto itself.

Because of the long-standing research on the Holocaust, a plethora of Holocaust curricular guides geared to the secondary elementary level of education is available in the marketplace. However, few of these guides address the topic within the collective, in ways that are conducive and financially viable for teachers and schools, and that adhere to the most recent trends in curricula design that have emerged over the past ten years. First, the majority of secondary school curricular guides do not place the Holocaust within the context of genocide studies. For example, one of the most utilized and comprehensive school curricula, which was created by Facing History and Ourselves, focuses on only two genocidesthe Holocaust and the Armenian genocides. Information about other genocides may be found on their website, but, for students and teachers, connections between and among genocides are implicit rather than explicit.

"…curriculum shall include an additional unit of instruction studying other acts of genocide across the globe. This unit shall include, but not be limited to, the Armenian Genocide, the Famine-Genocide in Ukraine, and more recent atrocities in Cambodia, Bosnia, Rwanda, and Sudan."

Also, the majority of Holocaust curricular guides simply are not geared to the real world of teaching. The Holocaust curricula are too lengthy to be covered within the school-year time frame. Based upon state-wide and national studies, on average, teachers at the high school level spend, at most, one to two weeks, teaching a unit of study on the Holocaust (SRI-National Study of Secondary Teaching Practices in Holocaust Education: Final Report, August 2004; Ellison, Jeffrey and Pisapia, John, "The State of Holocaust Education in Illinois," 2006, Sept. 7. IDEA, a journal of Social Issues, Volume 11. No.1, from http://www.ideajournal.com/articles.php?id=41). Since a large percentage of high school teachers show films such as "Schindler's List," the actual teaching time devoted to the Holocaust at the secondary level probably averages closer to 5-6 days. Most of the available Holocaust curricula require teachers to devote not days, but weeks or months, to the teaching of the Holocaust. It is unrealistic to expect teachers who have the responsibility to teach survey courses on American or European histories, especially those at the AP level, to spend weeks or months focusing on one topic for such an extended period of time.

Moreover, the majority of Holocaust curricular guides is specialized and involves costly training. Universities and colleges must do a better job preparing students to teach about genocide studies because teacher emphasis about these subjects in the classroom is directly correlated with teacher preparation (Ellison, 2002). Because of insufficient training, too often, organizations and museums have made

a "business" out of teaching the Shoah. They create curricular guides, distribute the guides, and then charge for expensive seminars about how to use the guides, reinforcing the cynical notion: "There is no business like Shoah business". The reality is, if genocide was properly taught at the university level, and, if the curricular materials were more teacher-friendly, there would be little need for such specialized and costly training, especially important because of the economic constraints felt by many public schools today. Why should the teaching of the genocide require more training and be more costly than teaching any other subject in history?

Finally, and most important, the design of the majority of curricular guides is not congruent with the curricula mapping designs used in schools today. Too often, the guides or resource books are content driven as opposed to process oriented. They value coverage of material over understanding of the material. They view the teaching of the particular genocide as an end unto itself rather than serving as the means to approach more meaningful philosophical and behavior essential questions.

A new design for genocide curriculum is required that is grounded in the real needs of educators and best teaching practices. How would it be done? Experts in the field of genocide study would write a series of case studies. Each case study would be short, readable and concise (no more than 40 pages), so teachers could cover the material within the allotted one or two weeks. The studies would not be laden with footnotes, rather annotated bibliographies would be placed at the back of each study for students interested in locating additional research sources. The studies would be available in paperback or published on the Internet in order to make them affordable and available to the largest possible number of educators. For schools that offer electives on the Holocaust or genocide, or for teachers who have more time to address the subject, CD's and workbooks could be created to accompany each text.

Case studies would begin with the 'genocides' that took place in the Americas towards Native peoples beginning with Columbus.[1] It is particularly important to have case studies linking American history to genocide. In many states, the only required history course is that of American history. An examination of the genocidal actions towards the native people in an American history class would assure that all graduates would have some exposure to such an important and weighty topic. Moreover, because of state mandates to teach the Holocaust, oftentimes, the Holocaust is usually studied within the context of America's involvement in World War II (Ellison, Jeffrey and Pisapia, John, "The State of Holocaust Education in Illinois," 2006, Sept. 7. IDEA, a journal of Social Issues, Volume 11. No.1, from http://www.ideajournal.com/articles.php?id=41; taskforce.ushmm.org/teachers/educational_reports/country/usa.pdf). But American history is not the natural home for a study of the Holocaust; it more correctly fits into a course on European history. An examination of genocide within the Americas creates a more natural connection between the topic of genocide and a traditional American history course. Later in the year, important distinctions also could be made between genocide and slavery.

Additional case studies could then be written to address the genocides in the 20th century including those in: Armenia, the Ukraine, Europe during World War II (including separate studies on the Jews, Poles, Gypsies, the disabled, and Russian prisoners of war), Cambodia, Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Iraq. The final study would concern the most recent case of genocide taking place in Darfur. Teachers, administrators, and school districts would then decide which case study to use based on parental concerns, needs of their student body, and the knowledge base of their teachers.[2]

The framework for each case study would be based upon Understanding by Design (UBD), the design used by many progressive public schools today. The purpose of UBD is to prepare students for the world beyond school by requiring students to apply their understanding to issues and problems they will face in the future. As stated by Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe (2008):

> "…learning for understanding requires that curriculum and instruction addresses three different but interrelated academic goals: (1) acquire important information and skills, (2) make meaning of the content, and (3) effectively transfer their learning to new situations both within school and beyond it" (p. 37).

At the heart of UBD is thinking backwards from a stated objective, creating essential questions, emphasizing enduring understanding, and aligning assessments with the stated objects.

In UBD, the goal for the unit is critical, otherwise, to quote Lewis Carroll, "if you don't know where you are going, any road will lead you there." Oftentimes, the goal of genocide education has been focused upon the oft-repeated phrase

"There is no business like Shoah business".

"never again," That is, through an understanding of past genocide, future genocide might be prevented. However noble the goal of 'never again' is as a goal for a unit of study on genocide, should this be the most important goal of genocide education at the secondary level? The causes for each case of genocide, whether fundamental or immediate, are complex, hard even for professional scholars in the area to grasp. Given that students are spending less than one or two weeks on genocide study, can we really expect students to grasp the complex issues involved in genocidal actions? Moreover, even assuming that the most accelerated students do grasp all the motivations, issues, methodology, and lessons surrounding a particular genocide, what are they to do with that understanding? Students at the high school level have limited means to effect major social and political change.

Would not a more meaningful and pragmatic goal be for students to transfer their understanding of genocide to their own classrooms, schools, and lives? Would it not be more beneficial if instead of focusing on the problems "over there", students used the lessons of genocide to explore the issues "over here", that is, in their own schools and their own communities—issues about bullying, harassment, and isolation? Would it not be more meaningful if genocide study resulted in changes in students behavior: by encouraging students to become more humane, accepting of differences, and less prone to seek violence as a method of settling differences, in short, to encourage students to become upstanders, not bystanders, in their own communities? Though teachers could certainly highlight important factual information about a given genocide, and the need for action to prevent future genocide, within this curricular design, the most important goal of genocide studies would be about doing acts of kindness within their own communities. The goals for teaching genocide would be a change in cognition and behavior.

A school principal expressed this idea most eloquently in a letter he sent a letter to his teachers on the first day of school:

> "Dear Teacher:
> I am a survivor of a concentration camp.
> My eyes saw what no man should witness:
> Gas chambers built by learned engineers.
> Children poisoned by educated physicians.
> Infants killed by trained nurses.
> Women and babies shot and burned by high school and college graduates.
> So I am suspicious of education.
> My request is: Help your students become human. Your efforts must never produce learned monsters, skilled psychopaths, educated Eichmanns.
> Reading, writing, arithmetic are important only if they serve to make our children more humane" (Facing History and Ourselves, 1994, p. XV).

Imagine a unit on genocide study, whose objective was to change student thinking and behavior on a local, rather than a global level. Imagine that, as a hook, students were given the reading from Christopher Browning's book on Reserve Police Battalion 101 where German soldiers were given the opportunity by their Captain to avoid participation in mass shootings without there being any repercussions, but only a handful of soldiers chose not to participate. Students would then be asked why only a handful of "ordinary men" chose to step out, whereas the majority of soldiers decided to be complicit in the mass shooting of thousands of men, women and children (Browning, 1998). To aid students in answering this question, the teacher then would pose essential questions.[3] Examples of essential questions might include:

1. Why do people willingly choose to do evil?
2. How is evil spread?
3. Is evil inherent, or is it learned behavior, and
4. What factors in the modern age might contribute to the spread of genocide?

In our imaginary scenario, students would then be required to read one of the genocide case studies to provide the factual basis upon which to address those essential questions. The particular case study to be chosen would depend upon the power and connection of that case study relative to a school's needs. In the ensuing discussions about the case study, the teacher would accentuate important and enduring understandings tied to the essential questions and goals for the unit. Examples of enduring understandings might include:

1) Each individual has within him or herself the capacity to do good and evil.
2) Evil is spread by good people/bystanders doing nothing.
3) The need for obedience and belonging play important roles in why people choose to do evil. And
4) The nature of the modern age, with its intrinsic compartmentalization, alienation, mass communication, and bureaucracy are important factors in contributing to genocide.

In short, through reading and subsequent discussions, the teacher would require students to make meaning of genocide, rather than focusing on the specific facts surrounding a particular genocide.

Finally, in this imaginary scenario, teachers would create authentic assessments to ascertain student understanding of what it means to become more humane. The assessment would be both cognitive and performance based. Students might be asked to write a paper in which they consider which of the essential questions or enduring understanding is most critical in making people more humane. Or they could be asked which of the enduring

understandings is the most compelling explanation for the spread of evil, or most relevant to their own lives. But, cognitive understanding would only serve as part of the assessment. For the unit to have genuine meaning, behavioral changes would also have to be assessed. To accomplish this task, students could be required to describe an instance of evil that occurred within their own school or community, analyze its causes, and propose changes to be made within the community to combat such actions. Or they could be asked to create institutions within their school community to lessen hate and promote acceptance and tolerance.

In conclusion, in higher education, the study of the Holocaust has become increasingly inculcated into the study of genocide. However, the paradigm shift has outdistanced curricular designs at the secondary level. There is a need to fill this vacuum by creating materials that are cost effective, teacher friendly, and promote the best practices available to educators today. Such a curriculum should aid in the acquisition of knowledge, make meaning of the knowledge and then apply that knowledge to the real world in which we live.

NOTES

[1] It would be beyond the scope of this paper to enter into a debate about whether the mass killing of Indians in the Americas truly meets the criteria for the definition of genocide as defined by the Genocide Convention. However, even if the actions of governments did not meet the formal criteria of genocide, few would argue that many governmental actions were genocidal in nature.

[2] Aligning a genocide to the particular audience does not mean a 'pandering to tastes', rather, it reflects the reality of the public school world, in which such concerns are greater than in the world of academia or higher education.

[3] In no way is this author suggesting that the teacher require students to identify or put themselves in the shoes of the perpetrators or victims in genocide. However, when questions and discussions are framed within the context of choices made by perpetrators and victims, it is impossible for a student, indeed the teacher, not to ponder their own moral stance on those decisions.

REFERENCES

Bauer, Yehuda. 2001. Rethinking the Holocaust. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Browning, Christopher R. 1998. Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Ellison, Jeffrey A. (2002). From one generation to the next: A case study of Holocaust education in Illinois. (Doctoral dissertation: Florida Atlantic University). UMI Dissertation Services, 3041190.

Ellison, Jeffrey and Pisapia, John, "The State of Holocaust Education in Illinois," 2006, Sept. 7. IDEA, a journal of Social Issues, Volume 11. No.1, from http://www.ideajournal.com/articles.php?id=41.

http://www.ushmm.org/education/foreducators/states/.

January, Brendan. 2007. Genocide: Modern Crimes Against Humanity. Minneapolis: Twenty-first Century Books.

SRI-National Study of Secondary Teaching Practices in Holocaust Education: Final Report, August 2004.

Strom, Margot Stern. 1994. Facing History and Ourselves: Holocaust and Human Behavior. Brookline: Facing History and Ourselves National Foundation, Inc.

taskforce.ushmm.org/teachers/educational_reports/country/usa.pdf.

Wiggins, Grant and Jay McTighe. "Put Understanding First," Educational Leadership, May 2008, Volume 65, Number 8, pgs. 36-41.

THE DEPICTION OF AUSCHWITZ IN SWIZERLAND

Dr. Phil Daniel Gerson was born 1963 in Zürich, Switzerland. He studied history and German studies at Basel University from 1982 to 1989. From 1990 to 1991, he was editor at the Basel "Juice Rundschau" (Jewish Review). From 1991-1995, he was a fellowship holder at the Centre for studies on Anti-Semitism of the TU Berlin and he did his PhD. under Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Benz. From 1996 to 2007, Daniel Gerson was research assistant at the Documentation Centre for Contemporary History at the "Archiv für Zeitgeschichte at ETH Zurich. Since 2007, he has been leading the project "How Jewish life in Switzerland is changing." This is a project in the course of the national research program 58 with the title "religious communities, state and society" at Basel University. In Cooperation with Jaques Picard Schweizer he represents the Academic Working Group of the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research (ITF). He is also board member of the Swiss Society for Judaist Research (Schweizerischen Gesellschaft für Judaistische Forschung (SGJF).

ABSTRACT

The Holocaust has either been a source for strong controversies or suppression in Switzerland. In terms of patterns of remembrance, views have ranged from anti-Semitic intolerance from authorities to victim solidarity from civil society. It has only been deemed acceptable to discuss this topic in light of Swiss history in recent years. The testimony of Holocaust Survivors in Switzerland has played a crucial role (particularly that of the contemporary witnesses and "Gymnasiasten, or college graduates, on Holocaust Remembrance Day on the 27th of January) in sensitizing the younger Swiss generation to the atrocities of this genocide."

1. INTRODUCTION

Relating "Auschwitz" to Swiss history caused a huge controversial discussion in the 1990s. When Jean-Pascal Delamuraz, a Memeber of Parliament, stated that "Auschwitz is not in Switzerland", it provoked the prominent Germanist and literature critic Adolf Muschg to do a counterstatement with the title "if Auschwitz is in Switzerland." [1]

In this context, the following essay describes the significance of Holocaust Survivors in Switzerland in order to broader the perception of genocide as a part of a general history which includes Switzerland. In the introduction, I will outline the historic connection of Switzerland to the Holocaust (Anti-Semitism of authorities, refugee policy and collaboration with the Third Reich regime), as well as explain how Switzerland in the post-war era dealt with these complex entanglements in politics and society. The second section will reveal the presence of Holocaust Survivors in Switzerland and their manifestation, such as compensation claims, autobiographies, media presence/coverage, public appearance and will outline the perception of survivors in Swiss society. In this context, I will discuss the paradigmatic relevance of testimony as a basis for diverse perceptions of Switzerland as a country with a complex and often controversial culture of remembrance. It is these multifaceted people who can pass on important experiences about racism, anti-Semitism and their consequences, especially to younger generations of this country.

2. SWITZERLAND AND THE HOLOCAUST

Though Switzerland was never under direct control of the Third Reich, the country was confronted in many ways with the consequences of National Socialist anti-Semitism and Hitler's policy of extermination. When Hitler was appointed to *Reichskanzler* in spring 1933, thousands of German Jews fled to Switzerland. This lasted till 1945 when still 30,000 Jewish refugees were situated on Swiss soil.

The refugee policy of Switzerland turned out to be the most controversial issue of Swiss politics from the Nazi period until today. The fact that several thousand Jews could

"Though Switzerland was never under direct control of the Third Reich, the country was confronted in many ways with the consequences of National Socialist anti-Semitism and Hitler's policy of extermination. When Hitler was appointed to *Reichskanzler* in spring 1933, thousands of German Jews fled to Switzerland. This lasted till 1945 when still 30,000 Jewish refugees were situated on Swiss soil.

The refugee policy of Switzerland turned out to be the most controversial issue of Swiss politics from the Nazi period until today. The fact that several thousand Jews could save their lives by fleeing to Switzerland is contradicted by the long suppressed reality which shows that Swiss authorities practised an open anti-Semitism refugee policy."

save their lives by fleeing to Switzerland is contradicted by the long suppressed reality which shows that Swiss authorities practised an open anti-Semitism refugee policy. On Swiss initiative, the infamous "J-Stamp" in passports for German or Austrian Jews was introduced. Jews were also rejected and deported to Nazi occupied areas, and in some cases they were handed over directly to Nazi authorities. Until 1944, racial persecution was not even taken as a reason for valid grant of asylum. These decisions were made by the authorities in full awareness of the increasing homicidal persecution measurements of the Nazis and their Allies.[2] Some single regional authorities did oppose the official policy and used their power or even exceeded their competences to allow refugees in. Also numerous civilians—mainly exponents of protestant church and the political left—supported refugees in many ways and saved many of them. This controversial image of a society, which saved Jews on the one hand and handed them over to their certain death on the other hand, has characterized the discourse about Switzerland and the Holocaust right up to the present.[3]

Up to the late 1980s, this debate tended to have a narrow focus for concerned participants, though debates were intense. This radically changed in the 1990's. The debate about "nachrichtenloses Vermögen" (non-traceable capital) in the context of refugee policy during the Holocaust dominated the media for months. Numerous public discussions in all media - radio, papers and television—arose between 1996 and 2000 because of payment requests by Jewish American Institutions towards Swiss Banks. This strongly changed public awareness about the involvement of Switzerland in the Holocaust. The statements of the beginning of this article where Auschwitz is set in "local" relation to Switzerland, reveal the meaning of this controversy. Holocaust Survivors who either were relatives of killed Jews whose property was still Swiss Bank accounts or survivors who could help to improve the understanding of these negative historic events played an important and eminent role.[4]

3. HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS AND THEIR TESTIMONY IN THE PERCEPTION OF SWISS PEOPLE

Because of their central position in Europe, many testimonies about the extinction policies of the European Jews reached Switzerland directly after the "Endlösung" (Final Solution) decision was made in October 1941. In the summer of 1942, Swiss authorities and agents of Jewish as well as Christian religion communities were informed about this genocide taking place in Europe. Individual eye-witnesses of the genocide in Poland and Hungary arrived in Switzerland by the summer of 1944. Large numbers of Concentration- and Death-Camp survivors were transported from Buchenwald to Switzerland in the spring of 1945. Most of these people were forced to leave the country due to Switzerland's anti-Semitic population policy, which dominated Swiss immigration policy until the 1950s. Nevertheless, a few of these refugees succeeded in establishing themselves in Switzerland. Several hundred Holocaust Survivors arrived with their families in Switzerland as a result of the emigration of Hungarian Jewish refugees in 1956 and 1968. They were then granted them and allowed to settle down in Switzerland for long term.

The presence of contemporary witnesses of the Shoah had almost no impact on public life. There were only a few publications which cited statements of Holocaust Survivors concerning Switzerland. These were studies on Swiss refugee policy during the Second World War, called "Ludwig-Bericht" (Ludwig Report), initiated by the Swiss government in 1956 and the "Bonjour-Bericht" (Bonjour Report) of 1970. There were also a few popular scientific books, like "Das Boot ist voll" (The Boat is Full) by the writer Alfred A. Häsler in 1967. The survivors themselves only recorded their stories if it was for compensation demands. With very few exceptions these stories did not find wide acceptance nor resonance in public life. For example, the fact that Anne Franks father, Otto Frank, lived as a respected citizen in Basel in the after war period until his death in 1980 did not affect the Swiss perception of the Holocaust as a phenomenon which also happened in their very own country.

The survivors themselves barely wanted to appear in public until the 1980s. They were concerned with building up families and careers and had little urge to preserve the memory of the Shoah for the world after the war. Autobiographies of Jewish Holocaust Survivors concerning Switzerland were hardly known. Finally, the TV-series "Holocaust" brought the issue into wider public attention in 1979. Very slowly were the Swiss people sensitized to the issue even if most Swiss people could still not relate genocide directly to their own country. A decisive change did not take place until the middle of the 1990s, when the controversy about "nachrichtenloses Vermögen" (non-traceable capital) and the closely related refugee policy put the Holocaust into context for Switzerland. Descendants of former account holders told their family stories of the Nazi era to the media. Books by Holocaust Survivors living now in Switzerland or who once came as refugees to the country were published.[5] Even the extensive „Bergier" Report on the Swiss role during the second World War took the oral statements of Holocaust Survivors into account.[6] Contemporary witnesses founded the support-group „Kontaktstelle für Überlebende des Holocaust"(contact centre for Holocaust Survivors), which developed soon to an important contact point for authorities and civil society to discuss questions about the Shoah. Almost at the same time "Tamach" (www.tamach.org) emerged to become a psychological information centre for Survivors and their relatives.

Due to the Swiss membership to the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education Remembrance and Research (ITF), authorities started to address Holocaust witnesses directly. Members of the Swiss ITF delegation visited meetings of the Survivors. Also the courageous engagement of individual Swiss people who saved Jews was reviewed and fully reported.[7] The *Fund for Needy Holocaust-Victims*, brought into being during the debate about Switzerland's role in the Second World War symbolizes the collective responsibility of Switzerland for the surviving victims of the Shoah.

With introducing the official Holocaust Remembrance Day on January 27th 2006, the Holocaust gained symbolic relevance for the pedagogical sector as well. The annual speech of the Swiss Federal President expressed the responsibility of official Switzerland to remember the Holocaust. Today, contemporary witnesses take an important role in the task of ongoing communication about the complex issue of Holocaust in the classroom ("Mittelschulen").

4. CONTEMPORARY WITNESSES AND HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

Until the Holocaust Remembrance Day was introduced on January 27th, the Jewish genocide was either brought up in history class, as well as sometimes in German classes on the basis of literary texts. All in all, the reference to Switzerland remained few. Some very engaged teachers focused on explaining the anti-Semitic character of the Swiss refugee policy. In some cases there were field trips to Concentration Camps in Germany like Dachau (near Munich) or Netzweuler-Struthof (in Elsass). Contact with real witnesses who were possibly neighbours and from the same village as oneself was never seriously considered. On initiative of the European Council the 27th of January, the liberation Day of Auschwitz Concentration Camp, became Holocaust Remembrance Day in all its member countries. This also led to a new cultural understanding about dealing with the remembrance on the Shoah. Numerous pedagogical publications emerged putting the Jewish genocide by the Nazis and their international collaborators into universal and actual interrelation.[8]

Scientists and creative artists noticed the eminent importance to preserve as many memories of contemporary witnesses as possible. In some Swiss provinces (and depending on financial resources) some small and some large video and DVD projects were initiated which recorded life stories of men and women who were prosecuted in the Holocaust. Also, interview collections of Jewish and non-Jewish witnesses were conducted in Switzerland.[9] Parallel developments lead to the result of witnesses having more and more the urge to share their individual history with the world and to preserve their story from oblivion. That is why Holocaust Survivors were willing to cooperate with private and public initiatives that accumulated at Holocaust Remembrance Day. In Switzerland the "staatliches Archiv für Zeitgeschichte/ Dokumentationsstelle Jüdische Zeitgeschichte der ETH Zürich" (National Archive for Contemporary History/ Documentation Centre for Jewish Contemporary History at ETH Zurich) tried together with the contact centre for Holocaust Survivors and the Institute

of Pedagogic at Zurich University to let contemporary witnesses of the Holocaust meet with school classes in the best way possible on January 27th. At the same time, the stories told at the meeting of Survivors and classes were to be recorded on film and tape. Since 2005, men and women repeatedly consented to provide their stories about their life during the Holocaust to the public. For some of them, their appearance in school at Holocaust Remembrance Day was a premier; they never have talked in public before. The audience usually consisted of around 30 "Maturanten" (Swiss college graduates). The teachers prepared them beforehand in class in an intense discussion about Holocaust, so the pupils could come well prepared to the meetings with the Holocaust witnesses. Subsequent to the reports of the witnesses, an interesting discussion almost always followed the interview. This usually included the witnesses' life in relation to specific experiences (anti-Semitism, societal integration, the children's relation to their parents Holocaust history) that the Survivor has learned about in his home-country Switzerland. The presence of radio and TV-stations at many of these meetings of contemporary witnesses and pupils shows the public interest in the stories of Holocaust Survivors. The media coverage also made it possible for a wider audience to remember the genocide to millions of people by simple concrete stories of Swiss citizens. In a few years there won't be any witnesses of that era left to report on their experiences. That is why it was necessary to review these reports in order to make them accessible and useful for pedagogic purposes in long term conditions. With this in mind, the "Patronat des Schweizerischen Israelitischen Gemeindebundes (SIG)" (Swiss Israeli Community) developed a teaching unit professionally designed for Jewish Holocaust Survivors telling their stories about the Holocaust to schools.[10]

By now, every teacher who wants to educate about the Holocaust has access to the pedagogically reviewed resources of these witness interviews which are a very useful and practical teaching method. And with this pool of knowledge the testimony of contemporary witnesses is no longer only accessible to "elite" pupils as it has been before. The project movie is available in the French and German languages with accompanying brochures in both languages. In this way can the material be used in almost all Swiss schools.

5. CONCLUSION

At the beginning of the 21st century, Switzerland possesses one of the most qualitative, quantitative and pedagogically supervised documentations of Holocaust Survivors life histories due to different factors:

- The wish of the Holocaust Survivors to record their unique life histories according to their wish to give the victims and murdered a lasting testimonial;
- The realisation for today's civil society (schools, universities) that even future generations have to bear a responsibility to deal with difficult aspects of their history;
- The intention of Swiss authorities that modern Switzerland should stand for a country which took responsibility for mistakes in the past and a country which today promotes a pluralist and open society;
- The knowledge that out of the specific bitter Jewish fate during the Holocaust, experiences of universal meaning and consequence emerged.

It might be that the Swiss model of how to deal with Holocaust Survivors proves to be a paradigmatic method for integrating pluralistic and conflictual remembrance cultures.

NOTES

[1] Adolf Muschg, Wenn Auschwitz in der Schweiz liegt, Frankfurt 1997.

[2] See also: Georg Kreis, Die Rückkehr des J-Stempels. Zur Geschichte einer schwierigen Vergangenheitsbewältigung, Zürich 2000, Stefan Mächler, Hilfe und Ohnmacht, Der Schweizerische Israelitische Gemeindebund und die nationalsozialistische Verfolgung 1933-1945, Zürich 2005 und Jacques Picard, Die Schweiz und die Juden 1933-1945, Schweizerischer Antisemitismus, jüdische Abwehr und internationale Migrations- und Flüchtlingspolitik, Zürich 1994.

[3] See also: Stefan Keller, Grüningers Fall. Geschichten von Flucht und Hilfe", Zürich 1993 (French translation: „Délit d'humanité", Lausanne 1994) und Wacker, Jean Claude, Humaner als Bern! Schweizer und Basler Asylpraxis gegenüber den jüdischen Flüchtlingen von 1933-1945 im Vergleich, Basel 1992.

[4] Siehe dazu: Barbara Bonhage, Hans-Peter Lussy u. Marc Perrenoud, Nachrichtenlose Vermögen bei Schweizer Banken: Depots, Konten und Safes von Opfern des nationalsozialistischen Regimes und Restituionsprobleme in der Nachkriegszeit, hrsg. Von der Unabhängigen Expertenkommission Schweiz-Zweiter Weltkrieg, Zürich 2001 und Thomas Maissen, Verweigerte Erinnerung, Nachrichtenlose Vermögen und die Schweizer Weltkriegsdebatte 1989-2004, Zürich 2005.

[5] See also: Raphael Gross, Eva Lezzi und Marc R. Richter, „Eine Welt, die ihre Wirklichkeit verloren hatte..." Jüdische Überlebende des Holocaust in der Schweiz, Zürich 1999 and Max Perkal, Schön war draussen...Aufzeichnungen eines 19jährigen Juden aus dem Jahre 1945, Zürich 1995.

[6] Unabhängige Expertenkommission Schweiz - Zweiter Weltkrieg: Die Schweiz, der Nationalsozialismus und der Zweite Weltkrieg, Zürich 2002.

[7] See also: François Wisard, Les Justes suisses, Des actes de courage méconnus au temps de la Shoah, Genf 2008.

[8] See also: Barbara Bonhage, Peter Gautschi, Jan Hodel, und Gregor Spuhler: Hinschauen und Nachfragen. Die Schweiz und die Zeit des Nationalsozialismus im Licht aktueller Fragen, Zürich 2006, Monique Eckmann und Michèle Fleury, Racisme et citoyenneté: un outil pour la réflexion et l'action, Genève 2005 und Kurt Messmer (Hrsg.). Holocaust-Gedenktag: Erinnern statt vergessen—Handeln statt schweigen, Luzern 2005.

[9] That is when in 1995 the society Memoriav was founded, which detains films about Holocaust and conducts interviews with contemporary witnesses

[10] Schweizerischer Israelitischer Gemeindebund, Eva Pruschy (Hrsg.): ÜberLebenErzählen - Holocaust-Überlebende in der Schweiz/ Survivre et témoigner. Rescapés de la Shoah en Suisse, Zürich 2007.

INSTRUCTIONAL FRAMEWORKS IN TEACHING THE HOLOCAUST

Dr. David Lindquist is an assistant professor and coordinator of the undergraduate secondary education program in the School of Education at Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne (IPFW). He is also co-director of IPFW's Institute for Holocaust and Genocide Studies. Formerly a high school social studies department chair, Dr. Lindquist is a Fellow of the Teacher Fellowship Program and a Regional Museum Educator for the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. He has participated in the Poland/Israel Holocaust study program sponsored by the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors and has been named a Distinguished Teacher by the White House Commission on Presidential Scholars.

ABSTRACT

Meaningful Holocaust curricula must be based on an awareness of the unique dynamics involved in teaching the subject including the need to develop instructional frameworks that allow the topic to be confronted inways that are interesting and academically challenging while observing various sensitivities that are inherent in studying the event. This article considers five such instructional frameworks.

IDENTIFYING THE PROBLEM

Three components may be seen as critical to the development of any instructional unit. First, instructional frameworks provide multiple perspectives through which curricula are developed. Next, content-related decisions determine what information will be presented in employing the frameworks. Finally, pedagogical decision making involves selecting instructional activities that allow the frameworks and content to be presented successfully, Thus leading to student learning, comprehension, and understanding. As such, the approaches used in teaching any subject must evolve from the instructional frameworks and content on which a unit is founded.

This article focuses on the first of these components as it affects Holocaust education. While selecting appropriate instructional frameworks is vital to any instructional unit's success, the unique dynamics and potential pitfalls inherent in Holocaust education make a careful consideration of this component especially critical when planning units about the Shoah.1 Five frameworks are discussed: 1) a paradigm of evil; 2) introducing the topic; 3) the power of language; 4) contextualization; and 5) personalization. Paying careful attention to each framework leads to the development of interesting, effective, and appropriate Holocaust units while acknowledging various issues that influence the teaching of the subject.
Instructional Frameworks

A PARADIGM OF EVIL

Hopefully, a positive paradigm is central to most educational practices. Teachers encourage good behavior and study habits in their students and suggest efficient ways to do mathematics problems or conduct science experiments. In doing so, they are telling their students "This is how it should be done. Do likewise."

Conversely, Holocaust education is based on a paradigm of evil because it focuses on the premise that "Here is supreme evil, something awful that someone did." Thus, a negative model is established, and studying the Shoah becomes a lesson about what should not occur. Identifying this negative paradigm explains why the event has become the defining element in the contemporary world view of human behavior because, as Berenbaum states, "In a world of relativism, we don't know what's bad, and we don't know what's good, but the one thing we can agree upon is that this is absolute evil. It's become the standard by which we judge evil and, therefore, the standard by which we begin to establish values" (Anker, 2006).

INTRODUCING THE TOPIC

Ravitch (2004) notes that most history textbooks used in American schools are bland and non-critical, and Lindquist (2006) holds that the factual and inferential accuracy of such books is marginal, at best. Given that textbooks drive social studies instruction (Martorella, 2005), it is not surprising that most students bring superficial experiences in studying history to their first encounters with the Shoah. Thus, an initial challenge in Holocaust teaching involves introducing unprecedented historical events to students who have not studied history intensively during previous academic experiences. Totten and Feinberg extend this situation, stating that "Opening and closing lessons in a study of the Holocaust are important because they set the tone for the entire course" (1995, p. 327). They continue by giving several examples of problems that can be avoided if a unit's opening lessons are designed carefully, with special attention being paid to establishing clearly-defined rationales for Holocaust education. Similarly, positive outcomes result from opening lessons that preview the Holocaust's complexity for students who are beginning their study of the event.

One introductory challenge involves taking students into a complicated world they are not prepared to encounter. To overcome this reality, teachers should ease their students into the study of the topic by taking measured steps, perhaps opening their units without making specific references to the Holocaust or by suggesting general connections to it. This approach may involve having students consider how they evaluate historical events, how they examine the human experience in general, or how historical events illustrate complex issues of human behavior. Using this format, students address the Holocaust initially along broad historical lines, enabling them to see the Shoah's relevancy to both historical and contemporary situations.

A discussion of the Holocaust's structure should be an integral part of introducing the subject. For this reason, a detailed definition of the Holocaust should be developed in order to establish the historical context of what occurred. This definition should consider such factors as the event's: 1) what; 2) when; 3) where; 4) how; 5) by whom; 6) against whom; 7) why; and 8) to what extent (USHMM, 2001). Hilberg's (1985) destruction process should also be considered early in any unit, thereby establishing the systematic nature of Nazi Germany's actions.

The Shoah may also be introduced by considering the question "Why are we studying this?" Tying this approach to a K-W-L session (Ogle, 1986) can help students develop an initial interest in the topic, although it should be noted that any misconceptions that students bring to their study of the event must be corrected as they surface (Totten, 2002).

Sensitivity, a critical factor in teaching the Holocaust, should be observed during a unit's early stages as students work into the study at a controlled pace. Thus, teachers should "err on the side of caution," especially in developing the opening lessons of a unit. The "horrors of the event" must be controlled as "a continuum of exposure" to the event's starkness is allowed to evolve during the unit.

THE POWER OF LANGUAGE

Teachers must also consider the power of language in general and the power of Holocaust language in particular. Langer notes this imperative, stating that examining language allows readers' to "raise with such concise fervor two key issues that vex our imagination: the inner state of the murderers and the inner state of the victims" (1995, p. 5). Thus, teachers should consider both the event and its language as they help students "confront behavior that cannot be explained by prior notions of why we do what we do" (Langer, 1995, p. 5).

To confront that behavior, studying both the meaning and the dynamics of Holocaust language should be an essential factor in teaching the subject. In that regard, language must be used accurately, and the misuse of language must be avoided (USHMM, 2001, p. 3). The subtle nuances inherent in Holocaust language require that precise vocabulary be used to assure that the event's reality is transmitted accurately through the language used to describe what occurred.

The Nazis' skillful use of language must also be considered. Nazi-Deutsch (Michael and Doerr, 2002) was used to keep victims uninformed while providing psychological shields for perpetrators and bystanders. For example, it is one thing to say "We are relocating you to the

East" (a neutral statement) and quite another to state "We are sending you to a ghetto in Poland" (a statement implying disastrous consequences for people being transported). McGuinn (2000) holds that the Nazis' use of language led to "a fundamental assault on the integrity of words. … It is here, on the territory of language, that English teachers must initiate the counterattack against the forces which created the Holocaust" (pp. 119, 122). Therefore, Holocaust language must be used with great attention to accuracy and clarity (USHMM, 2001, p. 3), allowing students to understand the role language played in the Holocaust's evolution.

Survivors' use of language should also be stressed in teaching the Shoah, especially given its impact on students as they listen to oral histories. A survivor's testimony often hinges on one word or phrase that brings a sense of reality to students as they listen; that reality is often so strong that it may seem that the students are being carried back in time and place along with the survivor. Care must be taken, however, in using such terms as "unimaginable" and "unbelievable," words often used by survivors in describing the Shoah, because "What does it mean to say that an event is beyond the imagination? It was not beyond the imagination of the men who authorized it; or those who executed it; or those who suffered it. Once an event occurs, can it any longer be said to be 'beyond the imagination' " (Langer, 1978, p. 5)?

Describing concepts by using original German words can also be an effective teaching approach, especially in establishing the perpetrators' motivations. For example, the title *Scheismeister*, which translates as latrine master, was applied to orderlies who recorded how often prisoners used the latrine and how long it took them to do so (Epstein and Rosen, 1997). Such actions beg the question, "What implications can be drawn about a bureaucracy that records such minutiae?" Similarly, students can analyze how the Nazis applied their own connotations to every day words while developing complex euphemisms that cloaked what was happening behind carefully designed linguistic deceptions (Totten, 2001b). Studying the implications of Holocaust language provides a way for students to conceptualize the event's complex levels because "Words that describe human behavior often have multiple meanings" (USHMM, 2001, p. 4). As a result, students' understanding of the Shoah is enriched. In addition, studying Holocaust language helps students increase the sophistication with which they use and comprehend language in general.

CONTEXTUALIZATION

A failure to contextualize the event (i.e., decontextualization) occurs in many Holocaust units. Contextualization must be developed on three levels. First, the Shoah should be viewed as part of Western history's general continuum. Students must realize that antisemitism, racism, social Darwinism, extreme nationalism, industrialism, totalitarianism, and the nature of modern war all led to Nazism's rise and the Holocaust (Niewyk, 1995). Conversely, care must be taken to avoid implying that the Holocaust was inevitable (USHMM, 2001). While certain long-standing conditions made the event possible, students must understand that the event happened at a given time and in a given place because the perpetrators made conscious decisions to implement it (Crowe, 2001).

> "Raise with such concise fervor two key issues that vex our imagination: the inner state of the murderers and the inner state of the victims."

Second, contextualization must place the Holocaust within the framework of World War II, thereby avoiding the perspective that sees the Holocaust as tangential to the war (Dawidowicz, 1990). In that view, the war and Holocaust are seen as being loosely connected to each other, at best (Weinberg, 1998), a view that runs contrary to Bergen's (2003) thesis that "Without the war, the Holocaust would not - and could not - have happened" (p. ix). Conversely, situating the Shoah within the war's evolution avoids the myopia that sometimes occurs in teaching the Holocaust. This approach also allows students to study what happened to non-Jewish victims and to see the event "… as part of the greater moral, political, and social decadence that swept Europe at the time" (Crowe, 2001, p. 54).

Third, each individual situation that occurred during the Shoah must be placed into its proper context within the event's cumulative story. For example, a survivor's account of a particular occurrence must be considered in terms of that individual's situation when the circumstance occurred in addition to the general dynamics of the particular time and location involved because "Most [Holocaust] survivors reconstruct their experiences into very narrow terms, usually without reference to any larger historical contexts and with little attention to the larger events around them" (Edelheit, 1998, p. 2).

Using *The Diary of Anne Frank* (Frank, 1997) to teach the Holocaust illustrates problems that occur when

individual occurrences are not viewed in relation to the event as a whole, thus leading to two factors that make teaching the diary problematic. First, students often lack the general knowledge of Holocaust history that is necessary for developing a historically-rooted understanding of the diary. Second, the events described in the diary were atypical of what happened to most victims, resulting in a distorted view for students for whom the diary is *the* Holocaust (Culbertson, 2001). Conversely, effective curricula establish the event's context on multiple levels as a precondition for all other aspects involved in studying the topic.

Contextualization is especially critical when the topic is taught through literature. Literature-based units should begin by discussing Holocaust history because "… it is imperative that teachers undergird the use of literature with a substantial amount of history" (Totten, 2001a, p. 27) for "Only when read within an historical context, with some knowledge and scope of the magnitude of the Holocaust, is the reader able to put the individual story into a more universal perspective" (Drew, 1989, p. 21).

Decontextualization also occurs in history-based curricula. Because many students have "little sense of historical time" (Drew, 1991, p. 128), an approach that stresses the event's chronology is often necessary. Feinberg advocates this format when he suggests that teachers should continually ask "Where does it [a given occurrence] belong?" in the Holocaust's overall history (Wieser, 2001, p 78).

PERSONALIZATION

Personalization of the event is the fifth instructional framework to consider in developing Holocaust units. Discussing what happened to individuals is vital if the event is to be transformed "from a welter of statistics, remote places, and events, to one that is immersed in the 'personal' and the 'particular' " (Totten, 1987, p. 63). Wilkins (1996) discusses this imperative, noting:

> The magnitude of the Holocaust … is beyond the comprehension of most of us. It is difficult to grasp the meaning of such enormous numbers. One tends to become detached, void of any kind of personal connection, with six million, or ten million, of anything. … And it is compounded by textbooks and photographs about the Holocaust, which often fail to convey the individual, personalized experiences of the victim—presenting the event instead in the aggregate. (p. 159)

Personalization thus becomes the key element in overcoming *the problem of numbers*, that is, the fact that the toll in human life that occurred during the Shoah was so large that it is beyond most people's ability to comprehend the magnitude of the losses that occurred.

Personalization is best achieved by using first-person accounts given by those who experienced the event, thereby developing history "from the inside" (Totten, 2001b, p. 107). Several types of resources, including various literary genre and survivor and rescuer testimony (often presented on film), may be used to implement this approach.

"The power of the individual human story within a persecutive or genocidal situation may thus engage students in a way no other type of information can, in part because of the deeply human aspects—including the passions and emotions—that are communicated."

Employing literature can be one of the most effective ways to personalize the event because it fosters a direct relationship between students and the people who experienced the Shoah. Diaries and memoirs provide insights into the depths of human emotions, establishing a lens that has the power to address humankind itself. Totten proposes this when he states, "The power of the individual human story within a persecutive or genocidal situation may thus engage students in a way no other type of information can, in part because of the deeply human aspects—including the passions and emotions—that are communicated" (Totten, 2001b, p. 111). Doing so allows students to begin to appreciate the Holocaust "as a human drama [that they] can [possibly begin] to understand" (Bauman, 1992, p. 21).

Several factors that complicate the use of first-person accounts should be noted. Decontextualization, which must be avoided, occurs for three reasons (Totten, 2001b). First, because each survivor's story is unique, it is often difficult to see how one person's story fits within a given situation's context. Second, when described by multiple individuals, each such occurrence will be described differently because each person's experience was unique even within the structure of a specific event. Third, each situation must be located within the Holocaust's overall context. Thus, personalization established through first-person accounts must be placed into ever-expanding contexts if those accounts are to be historically accurate and conducive to students' understanding of the Shoah.

In addition, concerns about historical accuracy are critical when using first-person accounts because "Human memory is a marvelous but fallacious instrument. … The memories which lie within us are not carved in stove. … Nevertheless, even under normal conditions a slow degradation is at work, an obfuscation of outlines, a so to speak psychological oblivion, which few memories resist" (Levi, 1986, pp. 23-24). For this reason, distinctions between significant and insignificant inaccuracies must be discussed.

Regardless of the limitations involved in their use, first-person accounts should be central to any meaningful Holocaust curricula because they establish the critical link between the event and the individuals whose lives were changed forever by it. As such, using first-hand accounts moves students past the tendency to view the Holocaust in stereotypical terms because each participant's story involves unique elements that can be examined.

Introducing students to persons who were involved in the Holocaust is critical if studying the Shoah is to achieve its maximum impact on those students. Doing so appropriately engenders an engaged empathy "… insofar as they help us build a bridge across the intervening abyss" (Langer, 1989, p. 296) between participants in the event and students who study it. Unless students understand that abyss, their study of the Holocaust is limited in comprehension and meaning. Bridging that fissure through the use of first-person accounts becomes a key component in any successful Holocaust curricula.

Personalization also accelerates the process of engaging students' moral sensitivities (Coles, 1989). Students learn that most victims, rescuers, and bystanders were ordinary people trying to live as normally as possible given the disruption caused by the war. Understanding this reality allows teachers to avoid asking students the trivializing question "What would you have done?" Instead, students begin to view the Holocaust as an event in which real people were forced to make life-or-death decisions, situating those decisions within historical, moral, and ethical frames of reference. Pondering those decisions moves each student's encounter with the Shoah to a uniquely personal level. This approach leads students to understand that no finite conclusions can be drawn about the experiences of those who were engulfed by the Holocaust, thereby demonstrating that each circumstance must be seen in terms of what each individual experienced.

Survivor and poetess Sonia Schreiber Weitz invites students of the Holocaust to join her in another time and place in order to view "the eclipse of humanity" (Facing History and Ourselves, 1994). Personalizing the Holocaust by examining the stories of individuals who experienced the event allows students to make that leap of time and place, thus beginning the process of understanding that the Holocaust is, above all, the story of an ultimate human catastrophe.

CONCLUSION

At an early stage of developing any curricula, teachers must consider what perspectives they want to present to students. Determining appropriate instructional frameworks provides those perspectives, thus establishing a conceptual grounding on which decisions regarding content to be included and pedagogies to be used can be based. The complex dynamics inherent in Holocaust education make it critical that carefully considered instructional frameworks are chosen as instructional units are being developed. Thus, considering the instructional frameworks discussed in this article can help educators conceptualize their Holocaust curricula so that they can make content and pedagogical decisions that will result in meaningful education about this vital topic.

NOTE

[1] The term *Shoah* is a Hebrew word meaning catastrophe. Many Holocaust scholars prefer to use Shoah instead of Holocaust, a Greek term meaning totally burnt offering or sacrifice (Nicosia and Niewyk, 2000). The terms are used interchangeably in this paper.

REFERENCES

Anker, D. (Director) (2006). *Imaginary witness: Hollywood and the Holocaust* [Film]. New York: Anker Productions.

Bauman, J. (1992). Entering the world of a Holocaust victim: Schoolchildren discuss a memoir. *The British Journal of Holocaust Education 1*(1), 14-24.

Bergen, D. L. (2003). *War and genocide: A concise history of the Holocaust.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Coles, R. (1989). *The call of stories: Teaching and the moral imagination*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Crowe, D. M. (2001). The Holocaust, historiography, and history. In S. Totten and S. Feinberg (Eds.), *Teaching and studying the Holocaust* (pp. 24-61). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Culbertson, E. (2001). *The diary of Anne Frank*: Why I don't teach it. In S. Totten (Ed.), *Teaching Holocaust literature* (pp. 63-69). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Dawidowicz, L. (1990). How they teach the Holocaust. *Commentary 90*(6), 25-32.

Drew, M. (1989/Fall). Holocaust literature and young people: Another look. *Facing History and Ourselves News*, 20-21.

Drew, M. (1991). Merging history and literature in teaching about genocide. *Social Education* 55(2), 128-129.

Edelheit, A. (1988). Review of "I shall not." *Martyrdom and Resistance 14*(5), 2.

Epstein, E. J., and Rosen, P. (1997). *Dictionary of the Holocaust: Biography, geography, and terminology*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Facing History and Ourselves (Producer) (1994). *Remembering the past: Sonia Weitz's history* [Film]. Brookline, MA: Author.

Frank, A. (1997). *The diary of Anne Frank: The definitive edition*. New York: Bantam Books.

Hilberg, R. (1985). *The destruction of the European Jews*. New York: Holmes and Meier.

Langer, L. (1978). *The age of atrocity: Death in modern literature*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Langer, L. (1989). Preliminary reflections on using videotaped interviews in Holocaust education. In M. Johnson and M. S. Strom (Eds.), *Elements of time: Holocaust testimonies* (pp. 291-297). Brookline, MA: Facing History and Ourselves.

Lawrence L. (1995). Opening locked doors: Reflections on teaching the Holocaust, *Dimensions: A Journal of Holocaust Studies* 9(2), 3-7.

Levi, P. (1986). *The damned and the drowned*. New York: Summit Books.

Lindquist, D. H. (2006). *Coverage of the Holocaust in high school United States history and world history textbooks*. Washington, DC: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (Institutional Report)

Martorella, P. H., Beal, C. M., & Bolick, C. M. (2005). *Teaching social studies in middle and secondary schools*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

McGuinn, M. (2000). Teaching the Holocaust through English. In I. Davies (Ed.), T*eaching the Holocaust: Educational dimensions, principles and practice* (pp. 119-133). New York: Continuum Press.

Michael, R., and Doerr, K. (2002). *Nazi-Deutsch/Nazi German: An English lexicon of the language of the Third Reich*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Niewyk, D. L. (1995). Holocaust: The genocide of the Jews," in S. Totten, W. Parsons, and I. W. Charny (Eds.), *Genocide in the twentieth century: Critical essays and eyewitness* (pp. 167-207). New York: Garland Press.

Ogle, D. (1986). The K-W-L: A Teaching model that develops active reading of expository test. *The Reading Teacher 39*(6), 564-570.

Ravitch, D. (2004). *A consumer's guide to high school history textbooks*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute. (Accessed September 20, 2007: www.edexcellence.net)

Totten, S. (2002). *Holocaust Education: Issues and Approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Totten, S. (2001a). Incorporating fiction and poetry into a study of the Holocaust. In S. Totten (Ed.), *Teaching Holocaust literature* (pp. 24-62). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Totten, S. (2001b). Incorporating first-person accounts in a study of the Holocaust. In S. Totten and S. Feinberg (Eds.), *Teaching and studying the Holocaust* (pp. 107-138). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Totten, S. (1987). The personal face of genocide: Words and witnesses in the classroom. *Social Science Record (Special Issue)* 24(2), 63-67.

Totten, S., and Feinberg, S. (1995). Teaching about the Holocaust: Rationale, content, methodology, and resources. *Social Education 59*(6), 323-327, 329, 331-333.

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (2001). *Teaching about the Holocaust: A resource book for educators*. Washington, DC: Author.

Weinberg, G. L. (1998). The Holocaust and World War II: A dilemma in teaching. In D. G. Schilling (Ed.), Lessons and legacies, Volume II: Teaching the Holocaust in a changing world (pp. 26-40). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Wieser, P. (2001). Instructional issues/strategies in teaching the Holocaust. In S. Totten and S. Feinberg (Eds.), *Teaching and studying the Holocaust* (pp. 62-80). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wilkins, S. L. (1996). Witness to the Holocaust: History from a first-hand perspective. In R. L. Millen (Ed.), *New perspectives on the Holocaust: A guide for teachers and scholars* (pp. 159-165). New York: New York University Press.

TEACHING THE HOLOCAUST TO MUSLIM STUDENTS: A BRITISH PERSPECTIVE

Geoffrey Short has been involved in Holocaust education for more than 15 years and in the 1990s acted as a consultant to the Council of Europe. He has published widely in the field and in 2004 co-authored (with Carole Ann Reed) *Issues in Holocaust Education* (Ashgate). He recently retired from the University of Hertfordshire in the UK where he was Reader in Educational Research.

ABSTRACT

It can be argued on *a priori* grounds that teaching the Holocaust might be especially difficult in schools with a largely Muslim catchment area. Problems are likely to arise partly from the on-going conflict between Israel and the Palestinians and partly from what is, on balance, an unflattering portrayal of Jews in the Koran. The impact of these factors on students learning about the Holocaust is unknown but clearly gives cause for concern. To assess the seriousness of the concern, a small-scale investigation involving 15 secondary school teachers was recently undertaken in Britain. This article provides the background to the investigation and addresses its main findings and conclusions.

INTRODUCTION

There are several reasons for thinking that in Britain, as elsewhere, predominantly Muslim schools will experience particular difficulties when teaching about the Holocaust (see, for example, Friedman, 2004; Miller, 2004). In the first instance, there appears to be a widespread awareness within Britain's Muslim population of the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. Muslim students, whose sympathies, one assumes, lie overwhelmingly with the Palestinians, may be reluctant to learn about Jewish suffering when the injustice (as they see it) that befell their co-religionists is effectively ignored both by Israel and by much of the international community. This reluctance to come to terms with Jewish suffering under the Nazis is arguably reinforced by media coverage of the conflict that is not only constant but which inflames passions by portraying Israel as a brutal occupier of Palestinian land, an occupier that will not hesitate, for example, to use disproportionate force when it deems it necessary. That said, an unwillingness on the part of Muslim students to learn about the Holocaust is likely to reflect more than just anger at the current situation, for it is frequently asserted and not only by Muslims, that the Holocaust is actually the cause of the conflict (e.g. Freedland 2003) and that it provides Israel, in Zygmunt Bauman's (1989) words, with the 'certificate of its political legitimacy.' This oversimplification, not to say fundamental misconception, has led some Muslim politicians and Islamic extremists to seek to delegitimise Israel by denying the Holocaust. It was thus no surprise when in December 2005 President Ahmadinejad of Iran referred to the attempted annihilation of European Jewry as a 'myth.' In Arab countries too, denial is widespread (Fisk, 1996). While its impact on Britain's Muslim population is unknown, the importance of Iran on the world stage ensures that the incendiary rhetoric of its leader will be aired internationally. Moreover, as the report of the British All-Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism (2006:27) pointed out, anti-Semitic sentiments generated in the Middle East can easily 'be imported into Britain via satellite television, the internet and the Arabic press.' It is therefore unlikely that outlandish views will be held only by an extremist minority. Indeed, the Parliamentary Inquiry claimed that the views of radical Islamists are currently 'entering mainstream discourse.' For these reasons Holocaust denial may well be one of the problems that teachers in predominantly Muslim schools have to contend with.

Politics aside, there is another reason why Muslim students might not be eager to learn about the Holocaust and it relates to the role that religion plays in determining the attitudes of Muslims towards Jews. Specifically, it has been suggested that while there are some favourable comments about Jews in the Koran, overall they are depicted in a negative light. They are, for example, deemed guilty of "falsehood" (Sura 3:71) and "distortion" (Sura 4:46); assumed to have been cursed by Allah, as well as by David and Jesus (Sura 2:61/58, Sura 5:78/82) and further assumed to have been transformed into apes and pigs because of the contempt that Allah felt for them (Sura 5:60/65, 2:65 and 7:166). Despite these blatant calumnies, there has been much debate over the extent to which the Koran can fairly be accused of anti-Semitism, not just because the sacred text, as already stated, contains positive references to Jews, but also because it can be argued that the hostile comments do not refer to *all* Jews but only to those who have transgressed in some way. The fact remains, however, that the Koran is open to an anti-Semitic interpretation and younger members of the Muslim community might have been exposed to this point of view either at home or in the mosque.

In light of the above, there has to be a degree of concern over the way the Holocaust is taught in schools with a largely Muslim catchment area. In order to discover whether this concern is justified, the following small-scale study was undertaken in 2007.

METHODOLOGY

The sample comprised fifteen history teachers, six male and nine female. They were selected at random from publicly funded secondary schools with a predominantly Muslim student body. The schools were all located in south-east England and were predominantly Muslim in the sense that either the majority of students were Muslim or, where this was not the case, Muslims constituted the largest single ethno-religious group within the school. Two of the teachers were of South Asian descent; the rest were white. Each of them participated in a semi-structured interview consisting of 12 questions the first of which was 'How old are the students to whom you teach the Holocaust? The remaining questions were categorised under the following headings: (1) Basic information relating to the school's commitment to Holocaust education (2) Attitudes towards the value of Holocaust education (3) Factors influencing the approach to teaching about the Holocaust within each school and (4) The impact of anti-Semitism on students' willingness to learn about it.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Teachers showed no reluctance to engage with the Holocaust. On the contrary, the average length of time allocated to it in Year 9 (where it was taught in every school to students aged 13 to 15) was considerably longer than in two comparable studies conducted in Britain in the 1990s in which Muslim pupils were not the primary focus (Short, 1995; Brown and Davies, 1998). Further evidence that schools in the study took the Holocaust seriously can be seen in the willingness of teachers in curricular areas other than History to include it in their syllabus even though they were under no legal obligation to do so. It was taught most often in Religious Education and Citizenship, less often in English. In only four schools was it taught exclusively as History.

In Britain, January 27th is nationally recognised as Holocaust Memorial Day (HMD). Arguably, a school's response to this commemorative event will reflect its commitment to Holocaust education more generally. Some of the schools in the study did nothing to mark HMD, but the majority (two-thirds of the total) either held an assembly, placed posters around the school or attempted something more ambitious.

In respect of teachers' attitudes towards Holocaust education, those who commented saw its value in much the same way as their counterparts in schools with very different catchment areas. A handful of teachers, however, alluded to the opportunity the subject offers to engage with and, if necessary, challenge their pupils' perceptions of Jews. In the words of one teacher:

> [Studying the Holocaust helps develop] an understanding of hate, of how it could happen in this area in particular; how lack of tolerance can get out of hand and be manipulated …. Also the conversations that arise as a result of teaching [the Holocaust] are about the Palestinian question and the prejudices and misinformation that some of the kids have received. We can address and tackle some of the specific anti-Jewish racism…

Just over half the sample said that working in a largely Muslim environment had influenced their approach to teaching the Holocaust. As illustrated in the following statements, some were keen to ensure that students saw the Holocaust as relevant to their own lives.

> I make a point of highlighting tabloid newspaper headlines related to Islamophobia to make [the Holocaust] more personal for those students.
>
> It's made us search for resources like the school version of *Schindler's List* where Spielberg introduces the Holocaust and mentions Bosnia.

Others appeared to believe that misconceptions about Jews and the on-going conflict in the Middle East were likely to affect adversely their students' ability to understand the Holocaust. Cognisant of the power of existing knowledge to

distort the acquisition of new information, these teachers structured their lessons accordingly. Thus:

> Obviously, you can't help putting emphasis on the conflict that goes on between Muslims and Jews and so you do refer back to that probably more frequently than if it was a more Christian or more mixed group of students.
>
> I am very conscious [of the need] to hammer home the distinction between being Jewish and the perception of Israel in the Middle East.

At the time of the study the Muslim Council of Britain was opposed to participating in Holocaust Memorial Day. It was thought necessary to probe the teachers' awareness of this decision because they might be tempted to devote more or less time to the Holocaust depending on whether they wanted to counter the negativity or go along with it. In the event, just seven teachers were conscious of the Council having consistently opposed HMD but in only one case did this consciousness have implications for teaching. A male respondent said, 'It makes us more committed to ensuring that the [students] leave here knowing something about [the Holocaust].'

Certain facts relating to the Holocaust are particularly pertinent for Muslim students in the sense that they highlight the role that Muslims played both as persecutors and as rescuers of Jews. These roles were largely overlooked by teachers because of their unfamiliarity with the history. None was aware of the protection offered by Muslims to their Jewish neighbours either in Europe or in North Africa and only a couple knew of the formation of a Muslim SS unit in the Balkans in 1943. Neither mentioned it to their students.

Turning to the impact of anti-Semitism on students' willingness to learn about the Holocaust, the data show, contrary to expectation, that they tended to respond very favourably. Students were variously described as 'really interested', 'very receptive' and as 'reacting with horror (and) repugnance.' There was no objection of any kind from parents and roughly half the sample reported no anti-Semitism at all when discussing the subject with students despite the fact that in a couple of schools negative stereotyping of Jews was thought to be rife. One teacher was recorded as saying: '[There's been no] denial or any form of anti-Semitism even though I think anti-Semitism is quite prevalent in this school. I've had resistance to teaching Judaism in [Religious Education] but not when teaching the Holocaust.' According to another:

> Because of the television they watch at home etc, the Bangladeshi pupils get exposed to quite a lot of information about the Middle East, about Palestine especially, so there's quite a lot of anti-Jewish sentiment that is expressed but not usually when we're teaching the Holocaust. When learning about the Holocaust they do realise that it's racism and they've been taught since they were very little that racism is wrong.

For two of the teachers, however, their students' attitude towards Jews posed a major problem and, in the words of one of them, the Holocaust had, at one stage, proved 'a hugely difficult topic to teach.' The problem appears to have been the preaching that went on in local mosques that many of the boys attended.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study confounded the main prediction in that the majority of teachers had no difficulty broaching the Holocaust with their Muslim students. On the contrary, the students generally responded very well and in some cases enthusiastically, notwithstanding the allegedly anti-Semitic culture that prevailed in two schools and which is likely to have been present in others, though maybe to a lesser degree. It would appear from this paradoxical situation that such anti-Semitism as there is in the schools stems from and is restricted to the Middle East conflict and should, perhaps, more accurately be described as anti-Zionism. In other words, whilst there may well be ill-will on the part of many of the students towards Israel, there is little towards Jews qua Jews and thus no serious opposition to learning about the Holocaust. Circumstantial evidence in support of this contention is to be found in press reports that surface from time to time about Jews and Muslims co-operating on a range of issues including, most recently, the need to combat Holocaust denial in the Arab world. (See, for example, Lehrer, 2009; Rocker, 2009). Clearly, situations can arise that make it very difficult for predominantly Muslim schools to teach about the Holocaust, but if the study is at all representative, it would seem that situations of this kind are far from the norm.

"It makes us more committed to ensuring that the [students] leave here knowing something about [the Holocaust]."

The majority of schools were genuinely committed to Holocaust education as evidenced by the amount of time they devoted to it in history lessons and in other subject areas and by their involvement in Holocaust Memorial Day. That said, there are grounds for thinking that the pedagogy in some schools was not as effective as it might have been. Specifically, only a few teachers took advantage of the opportunity the Holocaust affords to probe their students' beliefs about Jews, an essential preliminary undertaking if students are to be left in no doubt as to the abhorrent nature of Nazism. For this lesson to be learnt the murdered Jews of Europe have to be seen as entirely innocent of the charges laid against them and thus in no way deserving of their fate. However, if students subscribe to pejorative stereotypes of Jews and these stereotypes are left unchallenged, Nazi persecution becomes understandable and quite possibly acceptable, a 'lesson' wholly at variance with the aims of Holocaust education.

Another respect in which the teaching could have been improved relates to the failure to discuss the role of Muslims during the Holocaust. Providing information about those who rescued Jews is important because of the likely impact of such knowledge on anti-Semitic students who are inclined to think of Muslims as implacably hostile to Jews. These students may well come to reflect on their prejudice and even abandon it in order to make sense of the rescue. Alerting students to the formation of an SS division in Bosnia is, of course, likely to have the opposite effect, but they should nonetheless be made aware of the fact partly in the interests of historical truth, but also because students should know that the Muslim population of Europe was not at the time (as it is not now) a monolithic entity in terms of its attitude towards Jews. In addition, all students should know that collaborators were to be found across Europe and came from a variety of religious and other backgrounds.

Finally, it was noted that approximately half the sample was unfamiliar with the long-standing opposition of the Muslim Council of Britain to Holocaust Memorial Day. The Council has recently ended its boycott and thus the issue itself is no longer important. All the same, the lack of familiarity is worrying because it suggests that some teachers in schools with a substantial Muslim presence do not keep themselves abreast of developments in the wider Muslim community that may be relevant to teaching the Holocaust (and possibly other topics) in such schools.

In conclusion, it is tempting to argue on the basis of this study that any concern as to how the Holocaust is taught in predominantly Muslim schools is largely unwarranted. The study, however, was small-scale and highly localised and had it been conducted in another part of Britain, or in another part of the world, the results might have been very different.

REFERENCES

All-Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism (2006) R*eport of the All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism* (London, The Stationery Office).

Bauman, Z. (1989) *Modernity and the Holocaust*, (Cambridge, Polity Press).

Brown, M. and Davies, I. (1998) The Holocaust and education for citizenship; the teaching of history, religion and human rights in England, *Educational Review*, 50, 1, pp. 75-83.

Fisk, R. (1996) Turning a blind eye to history, *The Independent*, 30 August.

Freedland, J. (2003) Is anti-Zionism anti-Semitism? In: P. Iganski and B.Kosmin (Eds.) *A New Antisemitism? Debating Judeophobia in 21st-Century Britain* (London, Profile).

Friedman, (2004) It Began with Students Denying the Holocaust, *The Jerusalem Report*, 13 December, p.48.

Lehrer, (2009) Muslims back Holocaust website, *Jewish Chronicle*, 17 April, p.5.

Miller, J. (2004) Community Cohesion, www.insted.co.uk/bradford.pdf.

Rocker, S. (2009) How Jewish and Muslim kids can get together, *Jewish Chronicle*, 1 May, p.31.

Short, G. (1995) The Holocaust in the National Curriculum: A survey of teachers' attitudes and practices, *Journal of Holocaust Education* 4, 2, pp. 167-188.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Geoffrey Short has been involved in Holocaust education for more than 15 years and in the 1990s acted as a consultant to the Council of Europe. He has published widely in the field and in 2004 co-authored (with Carole Ann Reed) *Issues in Holocaust Education* (Ashgate). He recently retired from the University of Hertfordshire in the UK where he was Reader in Educational Research.

OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES: DEVELOPING THE QUEBEC TOUCH IN HOLOCAUST EDUCATION

Alice Herscovitch joined the Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre as Executive Director in October 2007. She is the former Director of Social Development at the Conférence régionale des élus, a regional planning structure, and was previously the Executive Director of Project Genesis, a community organisation working on issues of social rights and social justice. She lectured for nine years at the McGill University School of Social Work in social policy.

Julie Guinard graduated from the Political Sciences Institute of Grenoble and holds a M.A in Museology. As a project manager, she developed exhibitions and educational tools for museums and science centres. Working for the MHMC since December 2007, she is in charge of the collection and the development of educational activities for the museum's diverse audiences.

Brunhilde Khandanpour holds an M.A. in History, German language and literature studies and Archaeology from the Ruhr-University in Bochum, Germany. Since 2003 she has working in several museums, with responsibilities for acquisition and cataloguing of artefacts and development of temporary exhibits. She joined the Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre in 2007 to work in the Museum and is currently Coordinator, Remembrance

Emmanuelle Sonntag studied History and Information Sciences. She has been working since 1996 for several organizations as a communications specialist. She joined the MHMC in 2008 as Education Coordinator to contribute to the development of programs and pedagogical activities. She is pursuing a Ph.D. in Sociology.

ABSTRACT

Montreal became home to over 9,000 Holocaust survivors after the Second World War, the third largest survivor refugee community after Israel and New York. Survivors arrived in a culture quite foreign to them and in particular in a city and province where the francophone majority perceived itself as a minority community in Canada and North America. This phenomenon has had repercussions on issues of acceptance and integration, on the educational system and on the potential and challenges for Holocaust education within this system and in Quebec society at large. This paper speaks to these issues, identifies some of the specificities relating to Holocaust education in Quebec and outlines some of the guidelines and means developed by the Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre to address Quebec history and current context. It situates the role of the Centre as a central actor in supporting and influencing Holocaust education in the Quebec school system.

Montreal became home to over 9,000 Holocaust survivors after the Second World War, the third largest survivor refugee community after Israel and New York. Survivors arrived in a culture quite foreign to them and in particular in a city and province where the francophone majority perceived itself as a minority community in Canada and North America. This phenomenon has had repercussions on issues of acceptance and integration, on the educational system and on the potential and challenges for Holocaust education within this system and in Quebec society at large. This paper speaks to these issues, identifies some of the specificities relating to Holocaust education in Quebec and outlines some of the guidelines and means developed by the Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre to address Quebec history and current context.

Founded in Montreal in 1979 by survivors of the Holocaust and members of the Jewish community, the Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre has as its mission "to educate people of all ages and backgrounds about the Holocaust while sensitizing the public to the universal perils of antisemitism, racism, hate and indifference. Through its museum, commemorative programmes and educational initiatives, the MHMC is committed to promoting respect for diversity and the sanctity of all human life.[1]

The significance of the addition of over 9,000 survivors to the Montreal Jewish community cannot be underestimated. The Jewish community, in 1941, counted 63, 578 members.[2] Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe (excluding the former Soviet Union) Austria, Germany, Belgium and Holland peaked in the period from 1950-1959.[3] It is estimated that over 30,000 Holocaust survivors and their descendants lived in Montreal in the early 1980's, representing almost a third of the Jewish community.[4]

CONTEXTUAL ELEMENTS

Much as Canada was arguably one of the least welcoming countries during the period immediately preceding and during the Holocaust (5,000 Jews were admitted from 1933 to 1945), Quebec posed particular problems.[5] Considerable lobbying to keep Jewish refugees from Quebec and Canada was launched by groups such as the St-Jean Baptiste Society[6] at the time. Challenges equally existed in the welcoming and integration of Montreal Holocaust survivors by both the Jewish[7] and broader communities. Though some Holocaust survivors learned French for work related purposes on their arrival, they found that the existing Jewish community had integrated largely into the English-speaking community for reasons related to economics and ease. In Quebec, most immigrants were integrated into the English speaking and Protestant school system, until the adoption in1976 of Bill 101, the law developed to promote and protect the French language. Immigrants, even those who were French-speaking, largely went to Protestant schools.[8] Schools and school boards, unlike those in other parts of Canada, were confessional in nature (according to religious affiliation), and had been organized along these lines since before the founding of Canada. This changed only with legislation providing for the advent of a linguistically based secular school system in 2000 in Quebec.

As social services and schools had been highly developed by the Catholic Church in Quebec until the modernization of the State in the 1960s, the Jewish community had developed a parallel system of social services and eventually schools. Jews and other minority religious groups did not have access to services offered to the majority community. A case in point is cited by the Jewish General Hospital in its history:

> "Unfortunately, when freedom seeking Jewish immigrants arrived in Montreal, they were shocked to discover that religious prejudice predominated in the city's leading healthcare institutions, and this prevented patients from receiving the prompt and reliable medical care that they desperately required. Jewish doctors encountered the same dilemma: It was exceptionally rare for a Jewish physician to obtain a staff membership or internship at Montreal's French-language hospitals. Even at the English language hospitals, restrictions were severe."[9]

Despite a large influx of Sephardi Jewish immigrants to Montreal from French-speaking North Africa from the late 1950's until 1973[10] the Montreal Jewish community remains largely English speaking. According to 2001 census data, 55.8% of Montreal Jews declared English as a mother tongue, as compared to 18.2% who declared it to be French.[11]

These contextual elements historically posed particular challenges both for the integration of the Montreal survivor community and the Jewish community in general. The Quebec context, given the concerns of French- speaking Quebecers about assimilation into the North American majority, preservation of language and culture and distinction and autonomy from the rest of Canada created a certain introspectiveness, and this was mirrored somewhat in the Jewish community.

Secularization of Quebec life, of school boards and health and social services, efforts to attract immigrants and integrate them into the francophone majority and the revamping of the Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (MELS) curricular requirements present opportunities for greater understanding between the Jewish and majority community, a greater respect for diversity and an openness to Holocaust education.

THE QUEBEC EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre and its Museum has a particular role to play in defining Quebec Holocaust education. Since its inception, the Centre has outreached to Quebec schools and offered education and sensitization through survivor testimony, exhibits and eventually, a museum (recognized as a museum by both the provincial and federal governments since 2003) as well as programs and tools for educators. These are the means which continue to be used today; with the addition of recorded survivor testimony. Our educational work frames the central role of the organization.

Education in Canada is under provincial jurisdiction. In Quebec, as well as in other provinces of Canada, Holocaust education is not state-mandated or obligatory. Opportunities to introduce both the history of the Holocaust and to use documentation and discussion based on the Holocaust to reflect on values and current day situations are nonetheless plentiful and several new opportunities have emerged with an educational reform gradually introduced since 2001.

The Quebec Education Program, developed in a socio-constructivist perspective, emphasizes the development of competencies and encourages students to actively participate in their learning." ...Many aspects of the Québec Education Program, particularly those related to the development of competencies and the mastery of complex knowledges, call for practices that are based on the constructivist approach to learning. This approach sees learning as a process and the student as the principal agent in that process. The situations that are seen as most conducive to learning are those that present a real challenge to students by obliging them to reexamine their learnings and personal representations."[12]

> "To educate people of all ages and backgrounds about the Holocaust while sensitizing the public to the universal perils of antisemitism, racism, hate and indifference."

The Centre defines its pedagogical work in the framework of the MELS Quebec Education Program and assures that teachers are aware of the relevance of the Museum experience and our educational tools to this Program. Over the years, the Centre has built relationships with a wide variety of schools both in Montreal and throughout the province. This is reflected in the interest and good will of many educators who make a visit to the Museum as well as the use of educational tools part of their teaching on an annual basis. To assure the ongoing relevance of our programs, the Centre creates new tools and adapts visits and tools to both the pedagogical norms of the MELS and the social and cultural environments of students, anchoring them in Montreal today, with its increasing ethnocultural diversity. We assist teachers in meeting the challenges they face in justifying the relevance and appropriateness of Holocaust education and its pertinence to the Quebec Education Program.

As an example, the Contemporary World program (to be instituted in September 2009 for students in grades 9 and 10), has the following objectives:

- Help students grasp the complexity of the world today and be open to the diversity of the societies that make it up;
- Help students develop their critical faculties by studying problems and issues in the contemporary world;
- Prepare students to participate as responsible citizens in social debate.[13]

Competencies to be developed include interpretation of a contemporary world problem and secondly, taking a position on a contemporary world problem. Furthermore, educators are encouraged to develop *Learning and Evaluation Situations,* or structured pedagogical scenarios in which there are three phases: preparation, implementation and reinvestment and integration. The last phase is of particular interest to a Centre such as ours. Beyond the informational and education role the Centre and Museum play, it is essential that students reinvest their learning in their lives, in their environment, in society. Students are encouraged to be actors, to be engaged in being open to diversity and in assuring respect for human dignity and human rights.

Other opportunities for Holocaust and human rights education exist in the Geography, History and Citizenship Program for primary schools, which aim to develop an understanding of territory, society and more pointedly, the diversity of societies. In the same vein, and particularly relevant given the confessional school system which existed until very recently, is a program introduced in 2008: Ethics and Religious Culture. This program is compulsory throughout primary and secondary school. In particular, the stated goals of the Ethics portion of the program are perfectly in tune with our mission and our educational objectives. Students are expected to:

- recognize different ways of viewing life, relationships with others, and the place and role of human beings in the world;

- reflect on values (freedom, equity, equality, justice, respect, integrity, etc.) and social prescriptions (laws, rules, regulations, etc.);
- take a reflective position with respect to problem situations in which different values are at stake or choices have to be made;
- make choices based on the common good, get involved and act toward others autonomously and responsibly.[14]

Clearly, there is convergence between elements of the Quebec Education Program and the mission and mandate of the Centre.

The Quebec Education Program and the secularization of schools, though both contested by some Quebecers, facilitate the outreach done by the Centre and confirm the approach the organization has developed. The Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre strives, through its educational work, to assure relevance to the particularities of Quebec and a diverse Montreal society, counts on the experiences, testimonies and artifacts of a large survivor community and builds on the interest and commitment of educators who understand the power of Holocaust education to teach history and its link with contemporary values and universal challenges to these values. The following are a few examples of how this work is done.

POINTS OF JUNCTURE

The Museum serves as a major repository in Canada of the Holocaust experience. The Museum's exhibition follows a chronological order, beginning with the diversity in Jewish cultural, religious and social life before the war. The Museum visit is organized around survivor testimony[15]. Over 400 artifacts, many of them personal belongings of survivors and of those murdered, are also displayed in the permanent exhibit. Memory is constructed about moments of discrimination, horror and humiliation, but also about hope and resistance. Visitors see and feel the human face and the human cost of the Holocaust. Well over 6,000 students visited the Museum through guided tours last year. The witnesses also recount their arrival and their integration in Montreal and Canada. Several displays in the Museum speak to antisemitism in Montreal, Quebec and Canada and the refusal to help Jews escape Europe. Visitors quickly understand, the relevance of the Holocaust to Montrealers, as aptly illustrated by a recent La Presse article titled "These Holocaust survivors, our neighbours."[16]

Teachers express two main objectives in bringing students to visit the Museum. They wish to teach history and make a link to issues studied in the classroom through the artifacts, photographs, testimony. They wish to confront their students with the reality of the Holocaust so "*that student's gain understanding of the full magnitude of the Holocaust. The atrocities, courage and the determination of people.*"[17] *Or "give the children a basic background in what the Holocaust was and the context in which it happened—then to relate it to present day genocide.*"[18]

Beyond the teaching of history, teachers choose to bring their students to the Museum to sensitize them to consequences of prejudice and discrimination. They wish to connect the lessons of the Museum to the students' daily lives and to current examples of discrimination and human rights violations and help them understand the scope of crimes caused by racism and antisemitism. Here, the goal is often to help students understand prejudice and influence their values and attitudes. "*Our students know little about diversity. (our objectives were) To teach them about tolerance and human kindness*"[19] Or again, "*To better enable the students to understand the subject of prejudice, intolerance, racism and their responsibility as citizens and human beings*[20]" These objectives are reached as students visit a Museum, often far from their community and listen to witnesses whose lives were forever transformed by anti-semitism and prejudice. In 2008, 48% of students visiting the Museum through a guided school tour attended school in English, 46% in French. Only 6% of these visitors attended a Jewish day school.

In response to these objectives, and in keeping with the Quebec Education Program, the Centre has created a new workshop in partnership with the Tolerance Foundation, aimed at highschool students. This workshop helps students link the past and the present, and develops understanding and a sense of individual responsibility in relation to issues of current-day discrimination and genocide. It begins with a Museum visit focusing on the escalation of prejudice, discriminatory policies and laws and hate crimes prior to the Holocaust. The workshop begins with a review of the Museum tour so that students may express feelings, reactions, and questions. The group then looks at examples from the Museum. What would students define as prejudice, discriminatory actions, hate crimes, genocide? Students place these definitions and events on a ladder, demonstrating the increasing levels of violence before and during the Holocaust. Students are then encouraged to speak of their knowledge of other examples of discrimination, human

"To better enable the students to understand the subject of prejudice, intolerance, racism and their responsibility as citizens and human beings."

rights violations and of other genocides. How are these related to the Holocaust? Where would they place Canada on the ladder from prejudice to genocide? The students, then divided into two teams "play" a game of *Snakes and Ladders*, in which they must find ways to react and transform situations of prejudice and discrimination in school situations and in current events. They find ways to de-escalate prejudice and racism.

The workshop, in linking the Holocaust and experiences in the students' lives is a call to action and to responsibility. The example of the Righteous among the Nations, seen in the Museum, is presented to illustrate that each person can and must fight intolerance, bigotry and racism, in the past as in the present.

Most often immediately following a Museum visit, groups have the opportunity to meet a survivor and listen to his or her testimony. Over10,000 Montrealers and Quebecers heard live testimony through the Centre last year. Students understand the significance of these encounters. These witnesses to history personalize the numbers of those murdered and the losses sustained by those who survived. History becomes part of the present. The consequences of antisemitism are tangible and human. Situations described on the news in far away lands become closer as well.

According to French philosopher Jean Baudrillard "Forgetting extermination is part of extermination, because it is also the extermination of memory, of history…"[21]. Living memory refutes denial and assures transmission of memory and the responsibility of remembrance to future generations. The Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre takes this responsibility seriously. Listening to live testimony is a rapidly vanishing opportunity. However, since 1994, the Centre has collected recorded video life stories of Montreal survivors. Over 3,000 hours of testimony, almost 500 interviews have been collected to date through the "Witness-to-History" Program.

These testimonies are being digitized, with the assistance of a Community University Research Alliance project, *Life Stories of Montrealers Displaced by War, Genocide, and other Human Rights Violations* based at Concordia University. Educational projects are being developed with the Cambodian, Rwandan and Haitian communities with a focus on life stories. At the same time, our data base is being updated and thematic video clips of Holocaust survivor testimony are now available on both the Centre's website, and on a National Film Board's Citizen-Shift, a participatory Web platform exploring the lives of Canadians. Again, there is recognition of the inter-relationship between survivors and Quebec society. We have undertaken projects with the Faculties of Education of three Montreal universities, who are using recorded survivor testimony with students in their graduating year. These future teachers are developing pedagogical tools, in keeping with MELS guidelines, to teach about antisemitism, racism and respect for diversity.

All projects using survivor testimony clearly reflect our mission and respond particularly to the Ethics and Religious Culture Program objectives mentioned earlier. Issues of moral responsibility, human relationships, values and links with contemporary world issues are addressed by survivor testimony and will continue to educate generations to come.

The Hana's Suitcase Educational Project is based on the award-winning book, *Hana's Suitcase*, written by Karen Levine. It relates the story of young Hana Brady, who was murdered in Auschwitz, as it was discovered by the students and Director of the Tokyo Holocaust Education Resource Centre. The Project, developed by the Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre, was created as a tool to promote student reflection on the Holocaust and the subjects of human rights and human dignity, develop their abilities to connect the past to the present and influence their understanding and attitudes about living with other cultures.

Teachers receive, on loan, a replica of Hana's suitcase, which includes a copy of the book (in English or French) for each student, a pedagogical guide with 10 lesson plans, a reference document on the history of the Holocaust, a CBC documentary film, a copy of Hana's family photo album and reproductions of Hana's drawings, maps and Museum artifacts. The proposed activities stimulate students to make the connection between Hana's story and their own experiences and to take position for the respect of diversity and understanding of other cultures. Introduced in 2007, the Project has reached over 5,000 students in Quebec and many others across Canada and in the United States. The Project is aimed at grade 6 students, and has had a dramatic effect on visits by this younger age group to the Museum.[22] In addition, following their visit, they often take the opportunity to hear testimony from a survivor speaker.

Quebec teachers see this easy to use kit as an excellent response to the Geography, History and Citizenship Education and Ethics and Religious Culture Programs. In addition, the kit is used in the study of English and French. The Teacher's Guide, slated for an update in 2009 as to be more closely aligned with these programs, presents why and how to teach about the Holocaust. Students immediately identify with Hana, a young girl whose rights were taken away one by one and they understand in an appropriate and real way the consequences of stereotypes and prejudice. The suitcase is an excellent means to visually and concretely bring teaching of the Holocaust into the classroom. Again, two Montreal universities have used the project through their Faculties of Education and through a Peace Studies program.

Other tools, some being tested as pilot projects and each addressing a different school level have recently been developed by the Centre. They can be found on the Centre's website: www.mhmc.ca.

TOWARDS A "QUEBEC TOUCH" IN HOLOCAUST EDUCATION

The Centre has a central role to play in Holocaust education as well as in support and guidance of the educational system in regard to Holocaust education in Quebec. We see our role as beginning with the sensitization of student teachers in faculties of education in universities. We are committed to informing and training educators and offering materials and tools so that they can invest in Holocaust education.

The following are some of the guidelines we have developed to help connect our programs, tools and activities to the Quebec and Montreal contexts:

- Tools are developed in keeping with the spirit of the Quebec Education Program.
- They are based on Museum artifacts and survivor testimony where possible, in an effort to promote understanding of the Holocaust as a human story connected to Montrealers and to assure more complete understanding of the Holocaust through the use of multiple tools and contact points.
- Our pedagogical tools address, where possible, Quebec and Canadian history in relation to antisemitism and the Holocaust. These are highlighted in the Museum.
- All tools are offered in both French and English.
- Programs are created from the perspective of helping students learn from their emotional responses. Students are encouraged to formulate opinions, take position and interpret according to their understanding. Values are not imposed, but are developed through a pedagogical process.
- Tools and programs should assist students in taking action in favour of respect for human dignity and human rights.
- Educational tools are developed, where possible, in partnership with universities and organizations committed to human rights.
- Activities should help students address the cultural and religious diversity of Montreal. They encourage harmonious social relationships in Quebec and Montreal today, and students as actors in the development of these relationships.
- Tools must be tested in cooperation with teachers and in integrating their feedback. Holocaust education is seen as a partnership between the Centre and educators.
- Activities, tools and programs must be adaptable and seen as a mutable, as social realities change.

CONCLUSION

As Holocaust Centres and museums focus on history and transmission of this history as well as memory and values, the Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre has found means to use both the city's and Quebec's past to shape programs which are relevant to the present and can impact on the future. The leitmotif of the Museum is *To learn, to feel, to remember*. Increasingly, our educational efforts aim to encourage students to go further and act, in their own environment and on issues of universal concern. As the Centre moves in this direction, it strives to walk the talk of the theme of its Holocaust Education Series 2008: *Looking back, reaching forward*, both in terms of the Holocaust and the approach which defines a Quebec touch.

NOTE

[1] Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre, *Mission Statement*, 2007.

[2] Statistics Canada, *Census 2001*, Special Order. Figures extracted by Charles Shahar, Research Coordinator, Federation CJA, Montreal.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre Museum.

[5] Bialystok, F. *Delayed Impact: The Holocaust and the Canadian Jewish Community*, pp. 19-21, Montreal 2000.

[6] Several letters from these sources, dated from 1933 to 1939, are displayed in the Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre Museum.

[7] Ibid, pp. 57-59.

[8] Milot, Micheline and Tremblay, Stéphanie. *Religion in the Quebec Public School System: A Change for Equality and Diversity*, p.1. Policy Research Initiative. 2004 www.policyresearch.gc.ca/page.asp?pagenm=2009-0008_08.

[9] Etziony, Dr. M.B. *History of the Montreal Clinical Society*. Montreal Clinical Society, Montreal, 1963.

[10] Approximately 4,875 North African Jews settled in Montreal during that period. Kage, J. *A Brief Account on the Admission of Jewish Immigrants from North Africa*. Paper prepared for JIAS. Montreal.

[11] Shahar, C. and Magonet, H. *2001 Census Analysis Series: The Jewish Community of Montreal. Part V Immigration & Language*. Montreal. 2005 p.20.

[12] Gouvernement du Québec Ministère de l'Éducation, Quebec Education Program, p.10, Quebec, 2001.

[13] Gouvernement du Québec Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport, Working Document, Quebec 2009.

[14] https:// www7.mels.gouv.qc.ca/DC/ECR/index_en.php.

[15] 12 videos offer both historical footage and testimonies based on different themes, highlighting more than one survivor story.

[16] Tison, Marc, La Presse, *Ces survivants de la Shoah, nos voisins*, November 15, 2008 Montreal.

[17] Excerpt from an evaluation completed by Stéphanie Guay, Polyvalente Marcel-Landry. Visit December 8, 2008.

[18] Excerpt of an evaluation completed by Richard Williams, North Hatley School. Visit April 22, 2008.

[19] Excerpt from an evaluation completed by Renée Lozoff, Ste Agathe Academy. Visit April 9, 2008.

[20] Excerpt from an evaluation completed by Hazel Kaupp, Hillcrest Academy. Visit April 24, 2008.

[21] Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation—III. Holocaust*, p. 49. Translated by Sheila Faria Glaser, University of Michigan Press. 1994.

[22] This has also led to an adapted Museum guided tour for younger students.

HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL DIMENSIONS OF RESISTANCE TO HOLOCAUST EDUCATION POLICY IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE: THE CASE OF ESTONIA

E. Doyle Stevick (stevick@mailbox.sc.edu) is assistant professor of educational leadership and policies at the University of South Carolina, where he serves as director of the Office of International and Comparative Education (http://www.ed.sc.edu/ice/). He is an active member of the Comparative and International Education Society, where he founded the Special Interest Group in Citizenship and Democratic Education (CANDE), serving for 3 years as Chair. His research interests include education policy, democratization and education, and international teacher migration. His books include Reimagining Civic Education: How Diverse Societies Form Democratic Citizens (Rowman & Littlefield) and Advancing Democracy through Education? U.S. Influence Abroad and Domestic Practices (Information Age). Currently, he is preparing a volume on Holocaust Education across Central and Eastern Europe.

ABSTRACT

The failure of foreign efforts to promote Holocaust education in Estonia and other parts of Central and Eastern Europe can be attributed in part to a failure to understand the historical and cultural factors that contribute to national resistance to Holocaust education. The Estonian non-implementation of its Holocaust Education policy is examined in order to elucidate the importance of historical and cultural context in attempts to advance Holocaust education in post-communist societies.

Holocaust education efforts have often lagged—if not failed miserably—in Estonia and many other countries of Central and Eastern Europe. They have failed despite intensive foreign efforts, in part because those making these efforts failed to understand the cultural and historical roots of resistance to Holocaust education in post-communist socities. These roots must be well understood if renewed efforts to promote the teaching of the Holocaust in the contexts of Central and Eastern Europe are to be more successful.

Central and Eastern European countries often share characteristics that contributed to a different trajectory in societies' historical awareness and understanding of the Holocaust. The communist legacy in particular had many facets. Communist countries generally ignored the Holocaust, or if it was mentioned, emphasized the political rather than the racial dimensions of the persecution. To the extent that it was dealt with at all, the Holocaust was represented not as the product of anti-Semitism, but as a natural consequence of fascism and capitalism. In addition, historical inquiry was generally suppressed. Societies were not forced to grapple with the history in the same way that the countries of Western Europe, the United States and Israel had. Further, the fresh memories of long suffering under communist rule rooted in direct personal and family experience often take precedence in people's minds. This feeling of victimization often framed people as powerless, while the historical reality

of collaboration on the contrary insists that individuals were responsible for their actions under tyrannical regimes. These dynamics were exacerbated by the strict censorship of foreign materials, denying residents access to the unfolding understanding of the Holocaust in the West.

Despite these commonalities, there is considerable diversity in the history of the Holocaust in post-communist countries, and in the contemporary levels of Holocaust awareness and receptivity to Holocaust education. For these reasons, the author and Deborah Michaels of Grinnell College have assembled a group of scholars who work in the region to produce a book, to be completed later this year, on issues surrounding Holocaust education in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

For the author, research into Holocaust education in Estonia was somewhat accidental and indeed circuitous, but came full circle to the encounters with racism and anti-Semitism that spurred the original research project. A former doctoral student in Classical languages and cultures at Indiana University, the author experienced at one degree of separation three racially-motivated multiple homicides in a period of nine months, including one perpetrated by his former Latin student. That experience challenged fundamental assumptions about the power of education to transform deeply held anti-social attitudes and dispositions: how could a student from an excellent high school and university subscribe to an utterly discredited racial ideology? A research agenda emerged that explored the relationship between individual attitudes, social transformation and systemic change.

It was possible for students to emerge from otherwise excellent American schools with racist ideologies intact because there was nothing in the curriculum to engage and challenge such anti-social dispositions. Indeed, the American Supreme Court Decision to outlaw the segregation of black and white students into different schools, Brown v. Board of Education in 1954, represented a profound legal and institutional transformation. But its success faltered: the institutional transformation was never fulfilled by a parallel social and psychological transformation. There had never been a nation-wide attempt to overcome racism in American schools. What would such an attempt to fulfill profound institutional and political transformations through education look like? I selected an oblique case: the attempt to fulfill the profound democratic and market-system transformations that emerged in the wake of the Soviet collapse by cultivating citizenship in schools in the most successful post-Soviet state: Estonia.

It was unsettling to encounter graffiti swastikas soon after arriving in Estonia during September, 2001, the first of 27 months spent in Estonia researching civic education in its international context and local practice. For the author, the swastikas were symbols of hate and of the greatest evil in human history. How then, to understand that this graffiti was directed not at a Jewish community, which never exceeded 4,000 in Estonia, but rather targeted the large Russian minority? Relations between ethnic Estonians and ethnic Russians, never easy, reached their nadir during the Second World War, when the Soviet's triumph over Nazi Germany meant for Estonians a half-century of Soviet occupation. For the Russians, the Estonians—most of whom perceived with the Nazis as liberators from their first experience of Soviet occupation—were no more than fascist collaborators. The attacks of September, 2001, seemed to herald a geopolitical shift towards Russia, which was n longer seen to be an enemy to be contained by NATO, but rather an ally in the War on Terror.

"American policy in the region shifted towards two ends: improving relations between Estonia and Russia and advancing Holocaust education."

American policy in the region shifted towards two ends: improving relations between Estonia and Russia and advancing Holocaust education. The Baltic defense ministers were presumably stunned when they were told in April, 2002, that the "hard work—not just words but concrete action" that would make them "ready and able to contribute to European security in tangible ways" and hence worthy of accession to NATO, meant not upgrading their weaponry or training, or sending troops to Afghanistan, but rather "dealing with the history of the Holocaust" and "fully integrating ethnic Russian-speakers into society" (Embassy, 2002). The paradox of these two directives is that the history of the Holocaust hit squarely at the root of ethnic tensions between the Russians and Estonians in the country, and assumed a hierarchy of evil that aligned much more closely with Russia's (and the Soviet's) understanding of history than with Estonians' own.

A Holocaust education day policy was understood to be the fundamental criterion for security from Russian aggression—in the words of one commentator, "Holocaust day is the entry-ticket for NATO " (mauri [sic], 2003)—and despite broad public resistance, it was officially adopted by the Estonian government on August 6th, 2002. While the U.S. recognized that such efforts might entail "significant political cost" (Embassy, 2002), it apparently did not

anticipate that the policy would be not only an utter failure, but would actually be designed to fail.

The historical context of the Holocaust in Estonia and of Estonia's experience between the Nazis and Soviets from 1933-1991 shed light on the contemporary attitudes towards Holocaust education today. Estonian national identity took shape in a context of Russian domination during the 19th century. Estonians faced pressure to Russify, and rebelled unsuccessfully against the Russian empire in 1905, finally gaining independence after World War I while Russia was reeling from the aftereffects of the October revolution. Independence was short-lived: within two decades, unknown to Estonians, the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact allotted the Baltic states and part of Poland to the Soviet Union. Unaware of German complicity in their loss of independence, Estonia was quickly overrun.

Estonians endured a difficult year of occupation under the Soviets, losing approximately 60,000 of its million people to Soviet murder and deportations, including 10% of the pre-occupation Jewish community of approximately 4,000. When the Nazis broke the pact and attacked the Soviet Union, driving its forces out of Estonia, the prospect of recovered independence and the opportunity to fight the Soviets led many Estonian men to enlist with the Germans. More than 3,000 of the remaining Jewish population withdrew into the Soviet Union when the Soviet army retreated, and because the relevant archives are not open to inspection, their fates are still generally unknown. 969 of Estonia's Jews are known to have lost their lives, and at the Wannsee conference, Estonia was declared Judenrein.

The Nazi occupation lasted three years before the Soviets returned in 1944, renewing their annexation of Estonia and, years after the Soviet collapse, Russia finally withdrew its troops in 1994 from a much changed country. "[B]etween 1940 and 1945 the population seems to have declined by a minimum of 200,000" (Raun 1991: 181). If this toll was terrible, the "demographic consequences of Stalinism in peacetime proved even more devastating to the population of Estonia than the upheavals of World War II" (Raun 1991: 181). By the time the Russian troops left the country a half-century later, Estonia—formerly a homogenous country with a 90% ethnic Estonian population—had approximately 1.4 million people, nearly 40% of them ethnic Russian or Russian-speaking. The sense of national victimization and powerlessness under overwhelming foreign power is quite strong among Estonians, and was exacerbated by the Soviet Union's attempts to Russify the population. For Estonians, like the other Baltic states, this history is known as the "Soviet genocide."

With Estonia's experience of Soviet occupation, it isn't difficult to understand why the country would be ill-disposed towards embracing a version of history much more closely in alignment with Soviet propaganda than with its own national self-understanding. The emphasis on the Holocaust seemed to Estonians to create a hierarchy in which some victims were more important than others—namely, Jews were more important than Estonians—and a corollary that Nazi Germany was a greater evil than the Soviet Union, a position that Estonians were unwilling to concede. They felt instead that many nations had suffered, and that each nation should recognize and commemorate its own suffering.

More problematic for Estonians, however, was that the premise underlying the promotion of a Holocaust day included an acknowledgement of culpability in Nazi atrocities, a view they could not reconcile with the fact that Estonia had lost its independence. A history that held Estonians responsible as perpetrators could not co-exist with the country's view of itself as a nation of powerless victims. This discrepancy between Western European, American and Israeli understandings of the Holocaust and Estonians' understanding unfolded in a broader context of Estonian resentment of foreign interference in its domestic policies, its feeling that no one understood or respected its language, culture, history or suffering, a continuing fear of Russian aggression, and a frustration with its Russian minority, "who have been here for half a century and never learned Estonian," a sentiment heard regularly around the country (Stevick, 2007, p. 226).

"More problematic for Estonians, however, was that the premise underlying the promotion of a Holocaust day included an acknowledgement of culpability in Nazi atrocities."

The government formally adopted the policy that it felt was necessary to secure EU and NATO membership, despite the fact that, on a straight domestic vote, it could never have gained the support necessary to pass. Estonia paid lip service to Holocaust education, particularly in English-language press releases for foreign audiences, while both subtly challenging the premises of Holocaust education supporters and systematically ensuring that virtually nothing would actually be done in schools.

The clearest example of the struggle over the meaning of the Holocaust came in choosing a day for the Holocaust. Estonia chose January 27th, the day of the liberation from Auschwitz. This choice, however, was a way of rejecting culpability and denying an Estonian connection to the

events of the Holocaust. No Estonian Jews were sent to Auschwitz, and no Estonians worked at the camp (Zuroff 2005). Efraim Zuroff of the Simon Wiesenthal Institute, the leader of the attempt to prosecute Nazi war criminals from the Baltic states and an advocate for Holocaust education, had advocated for a locally meaningful day:

> Estonian officials rejected a suggestion by the Simon Wiesenthal Center that they choose either 20 January, the date of the infamous Wannsee Conference in 1942, at which the implementation of the Final Solution was discussed and Estonia was declared Judenrein (free of Jews), or 7 August, the date on which the 36th Estonian Security Battalion murdered Jews in Nowogrudok, Belarus. (Zuroff 2005)

The announcement itself was made on the August 6th, the timing of which could well have been symbolic since it was both the anniversary of the annexation of Estonia into the Soviet Union and the day before the anniversary of the atrocities at Nowogrudok.

The government justified its decision not on the basis of the importance of teaching its children about the Holocaust, but instead, "According to a Ministry of Education statement, its observance would foster understanding of genocide and would underline 'as an important foreign policy factor, solidarity with the European and trans-Atlantic community'" (City Paper's Baltics Worldwide 2002). While the decision was justified on foreign policy grounds, the choice of the word genocide instead of Holocaust was deliberate; since Estonians see themselves as victims of a Soviet genocide, they could refer to their own experience, not that of Jews or other victims of the Holocaust. This more inclusive use of language to challenge the foreign notion that the Holocaust is unique was a persistent feature of the rhetoric surrounding Holocaust education day in Estonia.

School directors from two of Estonia's most elite high schools promptly condemned the policy, announcing publicly that they would not observe the day in their schools (Baltic News Service, August 26, 2002). The Ministry was silent; there was no public reprimand, an early indication of the Ministry's intentions. Teachers followed suit later in the academic year (Nielson 2003). The Ministry offered no support about how one might teach the Holocaust, and it soon purged the announcement of Holocaust education day from its otherwise intact press release archive (Stevick, 2007, p. 230).

The Ministry of Education continued to struggle against the notion that there was anything intrinsically unique about the Holocaust that merited special attention. As the date of the first Holocaust education day approached,

> 'Education Minister Mailis Rand in a circular sent to the schools…noted that not only the Nazi crimes against Jews but also all other victims persecuted for ethnic, racial, religious, and political reasons should be remembered. The ministry gave the schools a free hand in deciding how and in which classes the subject should be handled' ("Baltic States Report," 2003).

Victims of the Holocaust were not to receive any special attention, but were to be lumped together with all other victims of persecution.

More notable, however, is the selective deployment of a choice mechanism. The Minister gives teachers and schools "a free hand in deciding how and in which classes the subject should be handled." Knowing that the population was overwhelmingly opposed to Holocaust education day, this 'choice' was a phony one. It merely affirmed teachers' general intentions to do nothing. If people's behavior will be almost completely predictable, than offering a choice is in effect a form of policy fiat. In this case, it was a license to do nothing, and that is what happened. A specialist in the national curriculum center was interested in how the day was implemented, so he provided as a homework assignment to 30 school directors with whom he was working,

> to examine the way the Holocaust Day was spent the first time in Estonia in 2003. We asked them to get the information from another school: to ask how it was spent and what people were thinking about the Holocaust Day. People were very bitter, most of the people in their responses, they were very direct and very honest, saying that this is not the day that is celebrated in Estonian school, and not in a nice way. But public opinion and the opinion of teachers and head directors was that this came from outside…and from these 30 answers that we got, we had zero responses that this was an important day that we need to have in our school system (Interview transcript).

"Basically, Holocaust Day does not exist in Estonia."

Although very little occurred on January 27th, Holocaust issues stayed in the public eye during 2003 as the Simon Wiesenthal Center conducted "Operation Last Chance" to find and to prosecute Nazi war criminals. Issues of collective vs. individual responsibility stayed at the fore. The text, which included the line "During the Holocaust, Estonians murdered Jews in Estonia as well as in other countries" (City Paper's Baltics Worldwide 2003) was perceived to be so inflammatory that Estonia's Jewish community opposed its publication:

> Chairwoman of the Estonian Jewish community Cilja Laud, Chairman of the Association of Former Prisoners of Ghettos and Concentration Camps Vladimir Perelman, and Rabbi Shmuel Kot sent a letter to the Media House advertising agency asking it not to publish the advertisements of the Simon Wiesenthal Center. ("Baltic States Report," 2003).

While Zuroff found the refusal "shocking" and "unheard-of" ("Baltic States Report," 2003a), Peeter Torop, the chair of the Semiotics Department at Estonia's top university, felt "that although the text of the advertisement does not call for violence, it instigates ethnic hatred and 'accuses Estonians as a nation of murdering Jews'" (City Paper's Baltics Worldwide 2003).

The foreign pressure and investment in Holocaust education had accomplished little, and there was no sign in the public discourse that understanding and awareness of the Holocaust had improved as a result. It had instead become intensely politicized, and hit at the heart of ethnic tensions between Russians and Estonians in Estonia.

Estonia was admitted into NATO and the EU, and the government became more adept at dealing with the foreign perspective on the Holocaust. In an English-language press release, the Foreign Ministry wrote just what foreign advocates wanted to hear:

> During the Second World War, the Nazi regime systematically eliminated on the occupied Estonian territory both Estonian Jews, and those that had been brought here from elsewhere. There is no justification for the participation of anyone in these shameful and morally condemnable acts. Even if they have not directly shed the blood of anyone, they are nevertheless morally responsible. Knowing the past teaches tolerance and helps to achieve that the crimes of the last century will never be repeated. (Estonian Ministry 2006)

With the context of the Holocaust firmly established, the Foreign Ministry immediately notes that, "The Ministry of Education and Science called on all Estonian schools to explain to students the tragic events of the last century.'" Indeed it did. But this was a sleight of hand: foreign readers would inevitably conclude from the context that the "tragic events" referred to the Holocaust, but the phrase is a shifting signifier: Estonian listeners would immediately think of Estonians' suffering, not the Holocaust.

The author returned to Estonia in the same year for some follow-up research. This time, the curriculum specialist confidently pronounced that, "Basically, Holocaust Day does not exist in Estonia."

REFERENCES

Baltic News Service (BNS). 2002. "Koolijuhid Taunivad Holokaustipaeva. " õhtuleht, August 26. www.sloleht.ee/index.aspx?id127279&r4.

"Baltic States Report." 2003. RFE/RL Reports 4, no. 5 (February 10). www.rferl.org/reports/balticreport/2003/02/5-100203.asp.

City Paper's Baltics Worldwide. 2003. "News Highlights from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia." January 28. www.balticsww.com/wkcrier/2003-01-12.htm.

Embassy of the United States in Estonia. 2002. Remarks by Heather Conley, U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs at Stockholm Security Conference—The United States and Northern Europe: A Continuing Commitment. April 24. www.usemb.ee/conley.php.

Estonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2006. The Holocaust Day Was Commemorated in Estonia. January 26. www.vm.ee/eng/kat_137/7304.html.

Mauri [sic]. (2003, April 10). *Holokaustipäev kui NATO pileti konts* Last retrieved May 10, 2006 from http://www.minut.ee/article.pl?sid=03/04/10/2249239&mode=nested

Nielson, I. 2003, January 25. Holokaustipäev jätab koolid ükskõikseks. *Pärnu Postimees.* http://vana.www.parnupostimees.ee/index.html?op=lugu&rubriik=77&id=15996&number=457

Raun, T. 1991. Estonia and the Estonians. 2nd ed. Stanford, Calif.: Hoover Institution.

Stevick, E. D. "The Politics of the Holocaust in Estonia: Historical Memory and Social Divisions in Estonian Education," pp. 217-244, in Stevick, E. D. and B. A. U. Levinson, Reimagining Civic Education: How Diverse Societies Form Democratic Citizens, Rowman and Littlefield, 2007

Zuroff, E. 2005. "Eastern Europe: Anti-Semitism in the Wake of Holocaust-Related Issues." Jewish Political Studies Review 17, no. 1–2 (Spring). www.jcpa.org/phas/phas-zuroff-s05.htm.

ENACTING HOLOCAUST EDUCATION INITIATIVES: THE PROMISES AND CHALLENGES OF CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION IN POST-COMMUNIST SETTINGS

Thomas Misco is an Assistant Professor of Social Studies Education in the Department of Teacher Education and a member of the Adolescent and Young Adult teacher preparation team. His research efforts address controversial issues, moral education, and citizenship education in domestic and international contexts. His current projects include pre-service teacher perceptions of controversial issues, social studies instructional time, reverse chronological history instruction, and Holocaust education in post-communist countries. Professor Misco is a former high school social studies teacher and department chair (San Rafael, CA) who came to Miami in 2006.

ABSTRACT

This paper responds to a practical problem scholars and curricularists face when they confront painful and controversial histories. Any substantive historical remediation includes initiatives to change the way in which history is taught in primary and secondary education. Most of these efforts involve the creation and dissemination of new curriculum, with the expectation of changes in teaching behaviour. Yet, the implementation of new curriculum and resultant educational change is not so straightforward, especially in post-totalitarian states. Therefore, this essay explores the issue of curriculum implementation and the ways in which teachers' use of new curricular efforts provides obstacles and pathways to educational change with regard to gaps in historical knowledge and cursory coverage of topics. To accomplish this task, I situate curriculum implementation within the larger context of normative entrepreneurs and historical memory. I then complicate how we might think about implementation, unique paradigms of implementation, conditions leading to implementation, assumptions and expectations, and local context. Finally, I conclude with remarks on the pivotal role implementation plays within curricular initiatives designed to disrupt historical silences.

INTRODUCTION

Confronting a painful or controversial history, including Holocaust history, is difficult for any society, but doubly so for post-totalitarian states that incurred generational efforts to undermine "occasions for doubt" (Griffin, 1942, p. 84) and instead promote a state-sponsored, uncomplicated, and singular historical narrative. But in order to build and enhance free societies, remembrance of the past with a critical lens that invites contestation and multiple perspectives are obligatory. The main route best outfitted for this charge is the educational experience that only secondary education is obligated to offer. Outside this intellectual space, ideological, political, and sectarian influences can easily grab hold of hot topics and pervert them for their own provincial aims. Only the school offers protection from these forces in the form of rational inquiry into the past.

To that end, a surfeit of normative entrepreneurs, including foreign governments, NGOs, and foundations have sought to change the course of Holocaust history instruction in schools throughout post-totalitarian educational spaces by designing and disseminating new curricula (e.g. Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research). Given these efforts aimed at changing the public's understanding of history, state-sponsored narratives, and historical memory, this paper explores the issue of *curriculum implementation* and the ways in which teachers' use of new curricular efforts provides obstacles and pathways to educational change with regard to painful and silenced histories. As more post-Soviet and post-communist states attempt to build pluralistic, tolerant, and open-minded societies, their treatment of historical silences and the renegotiation of their past becomes a critical feature for the development of democratic citizens. The representation of these unique histories changes over time as the particular culture or society recreates different relationships with their past. Similar to most controversial issues, historical memory is situated within these cultures and societies (Simon, 2000).

Historical memory is a function of what societies choose to remember and forget (Auron, 2005), but often this is neither a conscious nor deliberate choice. For many post-communist countries, citizens had only limited choices due to the truncation and bounding of the past. Many societies have inherited and built a collective memory that is "textually mediated" (Wertsch, 2002, p. 5), whereby narratives negotiate the event and memory of the event. An instructive framework for understanding narratives in post-communist states is Simon's (2000) view of historical memory as the "commingling between present consciousness and the staging of evidentiary traces of past experiences" (p. 10). This angle is suggestive of an interaction between the past and present which becomes disrupted as more historical facts are drawn into social consciousness through education (Misco, 2008). But to what extent do our best efforts and government resources translate into breaking silences and deepening students' understandings of complicated Holocaust history? This question is one of curriculum implementation as it responds to the anecdotal problem found among many projects—that of a curriculum "gathering dust" (Cho, 1998, p. 8).

CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation constitutes a substantive educational change. Educational changes of this kind are both socially complex and normative (Fullan, 2007). Understanding the nature of curriculum implementation is significant primarily because all democratic societies require citizens who can make judgments about controversial issues (Engle & Ochoa, 1988) as these judgments pay a democratic dividend by increasing civic participation, critical thinking skills, interpersonal skills, and political activity. Moreover, educational experiences that engage Holocaust history promote tolerant societies free from prejudice, racism, and bigotry, while simultaneously inclusive of others, justice-oriented, and committed to peace (Salmons, 2003). But simply providing teachers with curriculum responsive to heretofore "gaps in coverage" does not equate to change. Rather, we need to think deeply about the kinds of changes that may occur and the ways in which teachers interact with curricular interventions.

"There is insufficient data describing the process of implementation and implementation paradigms."

There is insufficient data describing the process of implementation and implementation paradigms (Cho, 1998; Carless, 1998; Fullan, 2008) and the longitudinal studies on implementation of any sort of curriculum do not examine how curriculum projects in post-communist states fare. In addition, research is needed that illuminates how curriculum designs and teacher requirements influence the process of implementation (Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, 2007).

A facile approach to determining implementation might explore the extent to which teachers are *using* the new Holocaust curriculum. But implementation is not this

straightforward—it means different things to different people and this variability is compounded within different ontological eras of curriculum theory. For example, only since the 1970s have we witnessed more wide-ranging thought about what implementation might mean (Fullan, 1982). Prior to that that time, implementation primarily focused on outcomes of learning in terms of the intended curriculum instead of the *process* leading to a variety of possible realities promoting an array of educational experiences (Leithwood, 1990).

A purely utilitarian approach to implementation might look for the "actual use of an innovation or what an innovation consists of in practice" (Fullan & Pomfret, 1977, p. 336). This view was eventually criticized for its simplicity in constructing implementation as the delivery of an innovation (Hord & Huling-Austin, 1986). Some have taken a more expansive approach to implementation, thinking of it as "not an event but a change process," which is highly dependent on context (Cho, 1998, p. 29). In this sense, those features informing curricular change within a particular context include the teacher, the curriculum, the curriculum developer's intentions, strategies used, and pupil responses (Carless, 1998, p. 353). Other curricularists focused on implementation as an event where teachers learn new roles and unlearn old roles. These *events* are marked by changes in behavior, as well as attitudes and beliefs (Van Den Akker, 1988).

We might also think of implementation as getting Holocaust curriculum to do *what we want it to do* in terms of "congruence between purpose and action," which includes teachers as curricularists exercising judgment and where implementation serves as a "point of departure" (Hlebowitsh, 2005, p. 217-18). This last view embraces the idea of many possible outcomes, variables, and processes involved in implementation. If implementation is about what needs to change for an innovation to be employed, then we need to keep in mind that implementation can be nonexistent, superficial, partial, substantive, or occur in some other form (Fullan, 2007). From these diverse manifestations of implementation, the expectation for a particular kind of implementation—and really, the degree—is very much informed by three paradigms of implementation.

PARADIGMS OF IMPLEMENTATION

If we think about implementation simplistically, we might imagine curricularist *x* creating materials *y*, which are adopted by teacher *z*, culminating in the precise and exact use of the curriculum in the classroom *as envisioned by the curricularist* without modification. The *fidelity* paradigm offers this congruence of what is intended and achieved, which fits within a producer-consumer model (Aoki, 1984). In general, this view of implementation is uncomplicated and unproblematic—there is little need to describe processes of fidelity implementation for it is largely "successful" or it is not (Leithwood, 1990). Although largely discredited (Aoki, 1984), the *fidelity* paradigm is distinct from the main competing paradigm, *mutual adaptation*, which takes into account local contexts, honors the professionalism of the teacher, and assumes diverse realities, meanings and agents adapting curriculum in different ways. A third paradigm also exists called *curriculum enactment*, which is the antipode of the fidelity paradigm. This paradigm emphasizes teachers and students as the designers and implementers of a curriculum and discounts many normative concerns external to the classroom (Hlebowitsh, 2005).

I ultimately chose to use the mutual adaptation paradigm as a lens for this essay, primarily because the fidelity approach does not expect teacher modification of the curriculum, which in the context of many post-totalitarian schools that enjoy little support to teach this topic from centralized education authorities, would be a fatuous expectation or at least constitute a null curriculum. Moreover, a fidelity lens sharpens our attention to the extent the curriculum is implemented as is, rather than understanding the process of how teachers used the curriculum and what factors played into their decision making. Finally, the curriculum enactment paradigm does not encompass the full compliment of variables external to a classroom.

"Other curricularists focused on implementation as an event where teachers learn new roles and unlearn old roles."

In contrast to the fidelity and curriculum enactment paradigms, mutual adaptation emphasizes the "complexity of the context in which change takes place" (Cho, 1998, p. 3) and the reduction of space between 'what is' and 'what should be' through a series of tradeoffs. Within this paradigm, we cannot explore the teacher's role as "resisting" curricular changes—resistance is really a part of the fidelity lexicon. Nor can we think of materials as "teacher proof." Instead, within a mutual adaptation framework, we view practitioners as having authority and autonomy as curricularists with full decision making capacities and expertise. Part and parcel of this paradigm is relying on the "'the wisdom of the practice' that is situational and implicit within the context in which a pedagogical judgment should be made by the teacher" (Cho, 1998, p. 20).

For example, in a recent study (Misco, 2009), the context of one Baltic country's Holocaust education is one of post-communism, nascent democratic government, little instructional time in history, and a lack of a social studies tradition that leverages history to meet citizenship aims and goals. Found in these classrooms are what Guba and Lincoln (1994) called "modified dualism" (p. 109) whereby the user (teacher) needs to transform curriculum into a unique context. Honoring of the local context, which is inherent in mutual adaptation, dovetails with the design theory that guided the curriculum-making process. Both design and implementation were predicated on a "dialectical relationship" among teachers, students, and curriculum (Aoki, 1984, p. 114)

Mutual adaptation takes into account the "slippages" that occur as teachers in all national educational systems deviate from "official" curricular policies, including time and topic allocations (Benavot & Resh, 2003, p. 172). Because implementation in this paradigm is not about compliance, but rather about balancing the normative and emergent while being responsive to the needs of children and society within the judgment of the teacher (Hlebowitsh, 2005), curriculum becomes filtered, rendered, and owned *by* the teacher, *for* the students, and *within* a local context. When designing Holocaust curriculum with mutual adaptation in mind, it does not necessarily mean that the materials should be entirely open and devoid of structure. In addition, it would seem that offering "procedural specification" in the curriculum might seem to be more closely related to fidelity expectations. Yet, offering some structure and specifications of how it might unfold acts as a point of departure for the "internal dialogue" teachers need to have concerning the what, when, how, and why of their teaching role in relation to the innovation (Van Den Akker, 1988).

CONDITIONS LEADING TO IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of a new curriculum requires support for teachers, identification of facilitation responsibility, and an understanding that it takes time, sometimes years, before any change is registered in instructional behavior (Hord & Huling-Austin, 1986). By examining the kinds of instructional change and different forms of evidence suggesting change (Fullan, 2008), any factor might influence implementation, including the three categories and nine critical factors Fullan (2007) advanced:

1. Characteristics of change (need, clarity, complexity, quality);
2. Local characteristics (district, community, principal, teacher);
3. External factors (government and other agencies).

Each of these factors should inform the membership of the curriculum writing team, the design of the curriculum, and the expectations for success.

In terms of a priori expectations, the literature suggests that implementation is strengthened by developing materials locally, providing a regimen of ongoing training, and regular staff meetings dedicated to the curricular change (McLaughlin, 1976). Yet, the key feature for implementation is the teacher (Cho, 1998) and having collaborative colleagues at a school site helps to facilitate implementation through momentum and generativity (Hord & Huling-Austin, 1986; Penuel, et al., 2007). Most curriculum reforms that fail, do so because they have ignored local context and culture. They are rather incomplete by placing too much emphasis on planning and not enough action, or they are not open to multiple realities that exist (Fullan, 2007).

The particular problem of curriculum implementation of controversial Holocaust history naturally entails the problem of changing teaching behaviour. In this case, a finding of weak or limited implementation may very well be more an issue of planning and coordinating of the curriculum project and less an issue of dogmatic resistance (Fullan, 2007) due to teacher time constraints and limited endorsement from central education authorities. Sometimes the critical obstacle hinges on the "social and political winds" that blow through the school and "grab hold of the curriculum in a way that limits the range of expression that can emerge" (Hlebowitsh, 2005, p. 222). This challenge and others can ultimately be diluted by supportive school administrators and principals (Benavot & Resh, 2003), as well as teachers and community members.

Generally, it is difficult for teachers to change their roles, especially with new instructional strategies and lack of background knowledge on the topic (Van Den Akker, 1988). In addition, time becomes an expensive price to pay for implementation (Hord & Huling-Austin, 1986). Trainings and support are important to mitigate these challenges (Carless, 1998), but single trainings are not as effective as those that try to anticipate all problems at the outset, as these often miss their mark (McLaughlin, 1976). Ideally, there is monitoring, coaching, and professional development that dovetail with what teachers currently do in order to release the potential of adaptive work (Penuel, et al., 2007).

Schooling is supposed to challenge local traditions (Hlebowitsh, 2005), but this is often easier said than done. Even those ebullient about change can be disillusioned if there is not sufficient support (Carless, 1988). In order to have change occur, teachers need to have a good understanding of the proposed curricular change, as people will "always misinterpret and misunderstand some aspect of the purpose or practice of something that is new to them" (Fullan, 1991, p. 355).

Another key undermining element is the lack of time to plan for implementation (Penuel, et al., 2007). Because the intention of a curriculum is to unleash a more substantive treatment of the topic, we hope that not only will students

have the opportunity to ask questions and engage in protracted discussions and essential forms of inquiry, but also that teachers will become more confident and comfortable with the topic (Penuel, et al., 2007). If being confident comes about through greater knowledge of the Holocaust, this depends on teachers having the time to explore the curriculum. Again, a central issue guiding the way implementation could unfold is the issue of teacher planning time.

Another key issue is that teachers do not exist *sui generis* in implementation. The essence of change relies upon the development of meaning – meaning in terms of people working together and of ideas and individuals enjoying connections (Fullan, 2007). Given the importance context plays in implementation, the post-totalitarian residue very much informs the reality when "teachers transform curriculum materials into learning experiences available to the students by means of teachers' personal knowledge, shaped by pervious experiences and their belief systems" (Cho, 1998, p. 25). Historical and intellectual heritage are part of the meaning that teachers make about education, curricular expectations, and the role of history.

"Another key issue is that teachers do not exist *sui generis* in implementation."

ASSUMPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

A great deal of sagacious advice from implementation theory and practice scholars helps to frame the assumptions and expectations. Chief among the tocsins are to not "be seduced into looking for the silver bullet" (Fullan, 2007, p. 125) and to be skeptical of the "façade of change," whereby some form of implementation appears to have occurred, but with very little actual impact (Carless, 1998, p. 353). In addition, Fullan (2007) offered the following assumptions to consider:

1. Don't assume your version of change should be the one that is implemented – engage others in their realities;
2. Assume that any innovation requires implementers to make their own meaning as implementation is really a "process of clarification" (p. 123);
3. Assume conflict is inevitable and part of successful change;
4. Assume people need pressure to change but this depends on other factors too;
5. Assume effective change takes time—it may take 2-3 years;
6. Do not assume the reason for lack of implementation is a rejection of the values of the change—there are many possible reasons for lack of implementation;
7. Do not expect all or most people to change;
8. Assume you will need a plan based on these assumptions;
9. Assume that change depends not only on knowledge, but politics, context, intuition, etc.;
10. Assume that changing the culture is the real agenda, not implementing single innovations.

Given what we know about a nuanced view of implementation within the paradigm of mutual adaptation, just what might we consider to be successful implementation? Clearly this will depend on who is making the judgment and deciding on the parameters of success. Because gauging success is such a normative and slippery affair, success through the lens constructed here may very well be different from success for others given the great variability of what is elevated as desirable and important (Hord & Huling-Austin, 1986).

For example, we could look at the conditions leading to implementation, the problems teachers faced, strategies for resolution, feasibility, capabilities, policy changes needed, or other factors (Leithwood, 1990). Instead, we might favor understanding the processes taking place within multiple realities with the primary purpose of informing future curriculum projects dealing with controversial issues in newly minted democracies. Therefore, the curriculum projects do not attempt to judge teachers or community contexts. Rather, it attempts to better understand the practices and phenomena that are desirable for leading to implementation that releases the full and ready use of the curriculum to prepare democratic citizens and identifying what needs to be done to make implementation realized, as well as describing teacher practices in relation to the stages of implementation (Leithwood, 1990). This approach moves beyond the exactness of the teachers' implementation, which would fit more closely within a fidelity paradigm study (Cho, 1998), and instead squarely focuses on the generative value for future projects.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Too often, students learn history in cursory ways that do not include a full compliment of reflective thinking accorded to silenced and controversial historical topics. The beliefs and "supposed form of knowledge" (Dewey, 1933, p. 9) in every democracy require persistent subjection to reason and reflection. It is this ultimate aim that keen attention to implementation hopefully strengthens and one that future projects are obligated to consider. It is easy to promote increased remembrance of the past that invites contestation

and multiple perspectives, but this requires difficult and exceedingly practical work with schools and educational agencies. Consciously and deliberately attending to implementation within a context of history-based curricular initiatives complicates our assumptions of change and sharpens our goals and objectives for reform.

REFERENCES

Aoki, T. (1984). Towards a reconceptualization of curriculum implementation. In D. Hopkins and M. Wideen (Eds.) *Alternative perspectives on school improvement.* New York: The Falmer Press.

Auron, Y. (2005). *The pain of knowledge*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Benavot, A., & Resh, N. (2003). Educational governance, school autonomy, and curriculum implementation: A comparative study of Arab and Jewish schools in Israel. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35(2), 171-196.

Carless, D. R. (1998). A case study of curriculum implementation in Hong Kong. *System, 26*, 353-368.

Cho, J. (1998). Rethinking curriculum implementation: Paradigms, models, and teachers' work. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath & Company.

Engle, S. H., & Ochoa, A. S. (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship: Decision making in the social studies*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M., & Pomfret, A. (1977). Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. *Review of Educational Research*, 47(1), 335-397.

Fullan, M. (1982). *The meaning of educational change*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2008). Curriculum implementation and sustainability. In F. M. Connelly (Ed.) *The Sage Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Griffin, A. F. (1942). Teaching in authoritarian and democratic states. In W. C. Parker (Ed.), *Educating the democratic mind* (pp. 79-93). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Effective evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hlebowitsh, P. S. (2005). *Designing the school curriculum*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hord, S. M., & Huling-Austin, L. (1986). Effective curriculum implementation: Some promising new insights. *The Elementary School Journal*, 87(1), 96-115.

Leithwood, K. A. (1990). Implementation evaluation. In T. Husen and T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.) *International encyclopedia of education research and studies*. New York: Pergamon.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1976). Implementation as mutual adaptation: Change in classroom organization. *Teachers College Record*, 77(3), 339-351.

Misco, T. (2009, April). "*They know nothing about this time": A study of implementation fertility in Latvian history classrooms.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association's Annual Meeting in San Diego, California.

Misco, T. (2008). "We did also save people": A study of Holocaust education in Romania after decades of historical silence. *Theory and Research in Social Education,* 36(2), 61-94.

Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 921-958.

Salmons, P. (2003). Teaching or preaching? The Holocaust and intercultural education in the UK. *Intercultural Education*, *14*(2), 139-149.

Simon, R. I. (2000). The paradoxical practice of zakhor: Memories of "what has never been my fault or my deed." In R. I. Simon, R. Rosenberg, & C. Eppert (Eds.), *Between hope & despair* (pp. 9-26). New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Van Den Akker, J. J. (1988). The teacher as learner in curriculum implementation. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 20(1), 47-55.

Wertsch, J. V. (2002). *Voices of collective remembering*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

HOPE, REMEMBRANCE AND UNDERSTANDING: DEVELOPING CIVIC LEADERS THROUGH AN EXPERIENTIAL HOLOCAUST EDUCATION PROGRAM

Dr. Carol Clyde is the Director of Leadership and Community Involvement at Southern Methodist University, where she also teaches classes in Leadership for the Annette Caldwell Simmons School of Education and Human Development.

ABSTRACT

This article examines the result of an experiential learning program, the March of Remembrance and Hope (MORH), on the development of civic leaders. The program was established a multinational effort to raise awareness and understanding of the event and to encourage students' growth as future leaders. Additionally, this article seeks to connect the concepts of experiential education and leadership development with the impact that this intensive program had on participants.

INTRODUCTION

In 2001, hundreds of college and university students from more than 20 nations travelled to Poland to learn about the Holocaust through a program called March of Remembrance and Hope (MORH), "an educational leadership program that brings together university and college students in Poland in order to teach about the 'dangers of intolerance' through the atrocity of the Holocaust, and to promote positive cross-cultural relationships" (Rosenblum, 2007, p. 3). Participants were from a variety of ethnic, cultural and religious backgrounds—including survivors of the Rwandan genocide residing in Canada. The experience involved visits to historical sites, lectures from prominent scholars, interaction with Holocaust survivors and multiple forms of reflection. This program provided an opportunity for collegians to learn more about the tragedy that claimed more than 6 million lives through an intensive experiential program. Additionally, it offered a glimpse into the culture and traditions of Judaism through ceremonies and traditions (i.e. Kabbalat Service, Shabbat Dinner, and an inclusive service/ceremony for Havdallah)—for relatively few participants were Jewish (Clyde, 2002; Rosenblum, 2007).

Itin (1999) believes that if institutions of higher education truly wish to develop students who have the potential to be contributing members and leaders of society, efforts must be made to develop aptitudes for critical thinking, self-motivation and problem solving. This trip offered such an opportunity by creating an interactive and moving experience for participants. Hopkins (1994) suggests recent events in world history indicate "fundamental social structures can change in very short order when minds change. Minds change when questions are asked differently, when information flows around the barriers directed to keep it out, and when the issues are reframed" (p. 71). Experience has the potential to be a powerful influence when used to enhance student development. John Dewey, believed by many to be the father

of experiential education, asserted that education was not only the transmission of facts but more so the education of the individual which prepared them for participation in a democratic society (Kraft, 1985). This program focused on experiential activities in order to develop civic leaders who benefitted from remembrance of the past while providing hope for the future.

EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

In 1938, John Dewey's publication *Experience and Education* set the stage for educators to scrutinize the role of experience as an element of the learning process. Jacobs (1999) notes, "experiential [learning] intentionally provides opportunities for students to be actively engaged in the learning process. Students move from being recipients of information to seekers of knowledge" (p. 50). For the purpose of this paper, experiential learning "refers to learning in which the learner is directly in touch with the realities being studied. It is contrasted with learning in which the learner only reads about, hears about, talks about, or writes about these realities but never comes in contact with them as part of the learning process" (Keeton and Tate, 1978, p. 2).

Kolb (1984) explains that experiential learning as a theory of development is focused on the transaction that occurs between external circumstances and internal characteristics—between social knowledge and personal knowledge. "It is the process of learning from experience that shapes and actualizes developmental potentialities. This learning is a social process; and thus, the course of individual development is shaped by the cultural system of social knowledge" (p. 133). For the individual, experiential learning provides the opportunity "to engage with the interrelatedness of self and the social context, inner experience and outer experience, content and process, and different ways of knowing" (McGill and Weil, 1989, p. 246).

John Dewey's philosophy of experiential learning focused on linking experience with reflection; essentially making the connection between doing and understanding. Simply knowing without doing was not sufficient, and understanding without doing is not possible (Itin, 1999). Therefore, reflection is an essential element for effectiveness. "Reflection in the context of learning is a generic term for those intellectual and affective activities in which individuals engage to explore their experiences in order to lead to new understandings and appreciations" (Boud, Keogh & Walker, 1985b, p. 19).

The process of reflection requires a re-examination of the experience "in the light of the learner's intent, associating new knowledge with that which is already possessed, and integrating this new knowledge into the learner's conceptual framework. It leads to an appropriation of this knowledge into the learner's repertoire of behaviour" (Boud, 1989, p. 27). There are identified objects and starting points in the process of reflection, including "the totality of experiences of learners, the behaviour in which they have engaged, the ideas of which learners are aware and the feelings which they have experienced" (p. 20) which serve to designate outcomes of reflective practice. The outcomes may take many forms, such as the appropriation and integration of knowledge, validating personal knowledge, a personal synthesis, an altered affective state, or a conscious decision to engage in further activity.

> "An educational leadership program that brings together university and college students in Poland in order to teach about the 'dangers of intolerance' through the atrocity of the Holocaust, and to promote positive cross-cultural relationships."

Kuh, Douglas, Lund and Gyerneck (1994) refer to a number of studies (Astin, 1993; Astin and Kent, 1983; Smart and Pascarella, 1986) that indicate a positive correlation between the interaction between students and faculty outside the classroom and development in students in areas such as leadership, intellectual self-esteem, social activism, social self-concept and academic self-concept. Experiential learning is an optimal way to develop that interaction for both collegians and citizens. Chickering (1977) believes experiential learning elicits broad-based interest, spanning a vast array of institutions and organizations associated or interested in higher education. Boud (1989) notes that the area of experiential learning is rapidly developing in a variety of contexts. The influence of experiential learning in areas outside of higher education to address social issues is also high. "Governments and institutions are discovering the potential for dealing with complex problems by the use of new forms of learning through experience" (p. 48).

DEVELOPING CIVIC LEADERS

The importance of creating change in individuals is essential to the MORH program, which aspired to create change in individuals which would transpire to meaningful action in a community context. It is believed that random

activity or projects to satisfy others do not promote true personal growth. "Development and growth occur when the objects of learning are associated with lived experience of learners" (Hopkins, 1994, p. 104). Empowering individuals through personal development "can have profound consequences for the role they play in society" (Evans, 1994, p. 4).

Democratic experiential learning is oriented towards community and service by students. Experiential learning projects often promote active participation by students in the process of democracy. There is a clear link between America's traditional civic and democratic values and experiential learning. With nearly half of the participants on MORH hailing from the United States, a democratic approach to development was considered. A number of experiential features have been noted as contributors to the creation of responsive citizens. These include active participation in civic activities and the political process, consensus building ability and communication and human relations skills inherent in experiential learning (Lempert, 1996).

Higher education perpetually faces public scrutiny, Chickering (1977) asserts that the integration of concrete experience with active application provides the opportunity for higher education to potentially improve its usefulness and quality. The issues experiential learning tends to raise "go to the heart of the academic enterprise" (p. 86). Experiential learning forces higher education to look beyond the time spent learning subjects and credit hours earned. Instead, institutions begin to explore issues of competence, working knowledge, and information most pertinent to life (such as jobs, family relationships, community responsibilities and larger social issues). Higher education is capable of much more than depositing information into students; it contributes to higher level intellectual development which is a requirement for successful citizenship. When social stratification experiences "are projected against the rhetoric of democracy, then the foundations for more enlightened citizenship and more active contribution are strengthened" (Chickering, 1977, p. 63).

Henry (1989) suggests that the real challenge to education is in developing competent individuals. These individuals must have initiative, sensitivity to others and consciousness of practical realities. They must also have sufficient flexibility, insight, confidence and skill to act effectively in a continually changing world. They must be adaptable, self-motivated, assertive communicators who serve as situation improvers –knowing how to find and apply pertinent information. Experiential learning methods intrinsically provide these opportunities.

A study by Bennis (1980) on effective leaders, notes a common trait of "centeredness" among many leaders in any stage of life. "With centering comes the experience of transcendence, the conscious experience of hierarchic integration where what was before our whole world is transformed into but one of a multidimensional array of worlds to experience" (p. 20). Transcendence allows the capacity for integrated judgments, where conflicts potentially interpreted as win-lose are reformulated into that which either makes everyone involved a winner or makes the act of winning and losing irrelevant. Centering conveys a commitment to integrate abstract ideals in the present life of a leader. "The dawn of integrity comes with the acceptance of responsibility for the course of one's own life. For in taking responsibility for the world, we are given back the power to change it" (p. 20).

Studying the Holocaust "cannot be and must not be an intellectual exercise alone. The way to bring home the realities of the Holocaust is to confront students with its horrors and allow them a vision of a world bereft of moral concern" (Gregory, 2000b p. 58). Abrams (1981) notes that in the context of learning about other cultures, independent study is "not only a proved tool for exciting learning but an ideal instrument through which off-campus learning can be brought back to campus and integrated into the student's continuing education" (p. 70). MORH organizers hoped that participants would return from this experience with a capacity to become involved in cultural tolerance activities and that the program would develop leadership abilities in the students. As noted by a number of students, this was accomplished (Clyde, 2002).

"The dawn of integrity comes with the acceptance of responsibility for the course of one's own life. For in taking responsibility for the world, we are given back the power to change it."

REMEMBRANCE AND HOPE: THE JOURNEY

The prominent intention of the MORH program was the education of students at the college and university level about the atrocities of the Holocaust. Participants began the learning process during pre-departure seminars let by distinguished faculty university at local institutions. Other educational elements potentially included reading prominent Holocaust Literature (such as *Survival in Auschwitz* by Primo Levi or *Night* by Elie Wiesel). Lectures

and discussions addressed issues such as the rise and establishment of the Nazi party; Europe before, during and after the Holocaust; and survival methods for prisoners. Educational elements were also included throughout the trip; convening participants for lectures by distinguished religious leaders, governmental representatives and faculty (Clyde, 2003; Rosenblum, 2007).

MORH is a multinational education program designed to inform students of the Holocaust and encourage leadership and involvement towards a better of society (MORH, 2001). The inaugural trip, held during summer 2001, involved nearly 270 students from 22 nations who were involved in an eight-day journey through historical sites and cities in Poland. Program activities included lectures and presentations by renowned Holocaust scholars and dignitaries. Of particular note was the high level of involvement with Holocaust survivors, who shared their personal experiences allowing for intense interaction and discussion. Guided tours were also given of Jewish ghetto sites, Polish cities and death camps. Activities were selected to provide a rich experience to participants, thereby meeting the objective of developing community leaders who would work against prejudice and intolerance.

Elsaesser's (1996) statement that history "is not just what's past, but what is being passed on" (p. 145) was poignant for the development of this program. Reading a memoir or poem about the a death camp is very different than walking through a barrack at Majdanek or Birkenau, and hearing personal accounts of what transpired in the yards—to not only see and touch the buildings or artifacts; to smell and explore and reflect. Watching a harrowing scene from the movie *Schinder's List* takes on new meaning when you hear the first-person story of a man who experienced some of the atrocities perpetrated by the Commandant of Płaszów. A university student, involved in another travel program to learn about the Holocaust, remarks "what would it be like for visitors [to Holocaust sites], thirty or fifty years from now? With the absence of survivors and eye-witnesses, who will see to it that the Shoah does remain in our collective memory?" (Gilbert, 1997, p. 405).

Romi and Lev (2007) believe emotional-cognitive experiences, such as travel programs to Poland, require active participation, thus enabling a more authentic and broad understanding of the Holocaust. A MORH participant explained:

> My entire perspective has changed on the effects of genocide and the Holocaust (Shoah). Before the March, World War II and many of the events surrounding it were historical, but not real to me. Being able to put a name and a face to those who died and survived made everything more personal to me. I now feel like I have a vested interest in the lives and stories of my brothers and sisters who can not share theirs. (Clyde, 2003, p. 134-135) Haydn (2000) argues that in order to convince students of the Holocaust's importance, connections must be made with the present. Part of the Canadian contingent on the trip represented a group of survivors from the Rwandan genocide. Their own story of fear, anguish and death left participants overwhelmed and determined to learn more. Hearing a story of the loss of family and friends due to identity was for many, a harrowing example of why the Holocaust is an essential lesson in history. To go beyond the words of "never again" to a level of interest and involvement that suggests they will work to live the words. One MORH participant commented "We also had students from Rwanda who greatly influenced my concerns for genocides [and] my perception of the US international policies" (Clyde, 2002, p. 112-113).

"All universities of the 21st century… have to redefine their missions to include the needs and problems of the communities in society of which they are part."

CONCLUSION

An essential task of higher education is to take a leadership role in defining the critical issues of society in a provocative way. "All universities of the 21st century… have to redefine their missions to include the needs and problems of the communities in society of which they are part" (Ladner, 1996, p. 22). Chickering (1976) notes "the disciplinary and interdisciplinary subject matters, the areas of vocational and professional preparation, and the programs oriented toward social problems and social concerns will remain the practical focus of most students, and the bread and butter of higher education" (p. 98).

Only when each generation articulates it's own personal relationship with the event will memory be preserved and passed on (Baum, 2000). When studying the Holocaust, each individual must confront the myriad of issues which surround responsibility. "The issues of moral indifference, failing to stand up and be counted, being a bystander to such appalling

events, need to be addressed with a view to understanding better the nature of the responsibility humans enjoy one for the other" (Gregory, 2000a, p. 40). As we move toward a more tolerant world with the hope of greater peace, we must remember the past. "The twentieth century's strange roads show that people will not be equipped to live well in the twenty-first century unless teaching and learning pay attentions to the dimensions, principles and practice of Holocaust education" (Roth, 2000, p. xi).

A fundamental human lesson from the Holocaust is "the importance of participation and the consequences of passive acquiescence" (Haynes, 1997, p. 148). The current "desire for interracial and international harmony is a prominent theme in our society and, subsequently, throughout the mass media. Virtually all educators and public leaders support a broad agenda of cooperation, toleration, and peaceful conflict resolution" (Roth, 1998, p. 179). Programs such as MORH provide the opportunity for such development in college and university students. "Through an awareness of the competing traditions of experiential learning and the importance of making creative responses to unique situations, experiential learning can be a potent influence for human development and social change" (Boud, 1989, p. 48).

Lempert (1996) challenges us to imagine the potential of creativity and spirit that are enhanced through "building and implementing the vast panorama of potential student adventures" (p. 215). As reported by one MORH participant:

> I could have never anticipated the changes that the program had on my personhood. Yes, it met the objectives of heightened awareness, increased exposure, an active attempt at understanding. But, I could have never anticipated the conversations I had with survivors, the feeling of walking through the barracks in Majdanek, of being confronted with the Polish people leisurely walking through the camps as if they were a public park. These images and events have both haunted and inspired me—I never could have foreseen such a profound impact. (Clyde, 2002, p. 137)

This was not just evident of the initial trip—a 2003 program study of MORH reported "even two years post-trip the participants still grappled with powerful emotions related to how to put all this multilayered information into perspective and, in turn, transform it into social action" (Rosenblum, 2007, p. 185). Profound impacts such as these give us hope that Holocaust education is a perpetual process of teaching students about human rights, dignity, tolerance and leadership—and therefore creating the civic leaders of tomorrow.

REFERENCES

Baum, R. N. (2000). Never to forget: Pedagogical memory and second-generation witness. In Simon, R. I., Rosenberg, S. & Eppert, C. (Eds.). *Between hope and despair: Pedagogy and the remembrance of historical drama* (pp. 91-115). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bennis, W. G. (1980). Interview. *Group and Organization Studies, 5*, 18-34.

Boud, D. (1989). *Some competing traditions in experiential learning.* In Weil, S. W. & McGill, I. (Eds.). *Making sense of experiential learning: Diversity in theory and practice* (pp. 38-49). Philadelphia: Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.

Chickering, A. (1976). *Developmental change as a major outcome.* In M. Keeton (Ed.). *Experiential learning (pp. 62-107).* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A. W. (1977). *Experience and learning: An introduction to experiential learning*. New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press.

Clyde, C. (2002). *Influences of an experiential learning program for Holocaust education.* Doctoral Dissertation, Florida Atlantic University. UMI Dissertation Publishing: Ann Arbor, MI.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: McMillan.

Elsaesser, T. (1996). Subject position, speaking positions: From Schindler's list. In Sobchack, V. *(Ed.). Persistence of history: Cinema, television and the modern event* (pp. 145-483). New York: Routledge.

Gilbert, M. (1997). *Holocaust journey.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Gregory, I. (2000a). The Holocaust: Some reflections and issues. In Davies, I. (Ed.). *Teaching the Holocaust: Education dimensions, principles and practice* (pp. 37-47). New York: Continuum.

Gregory, I. (2000b). Teaching about the Holocaust: Perplexities, issues and suggestions. In Davies, I. (Ed.). *Teaching the Holocaust: Education dimensions, principles and practice* (pp. 49-60). New York: Continuum.

Haydn, T. (2000). Teaching the Holocaust through history. In Davies, I. (Ed.). *Teaching the Holocaust: Education dimensions, principles and practice* (pp. 135-149). New York: Continuum.

Henry, J. (1989). Meaning and practice in experiential learning. In Weil, S. W. & McGill, I. (Eds.). *Making sense of experiential learning: Diversity in theory and practice* (pp. 25-37). Philadelphia: Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.

Itin, C. M. (1999). Reasserting the philosophy of experiential education as a vehicle for change in the 21st century. *The Journal of Experiential Education, 22* (2), 91-98.

Jacobs, J. (1999). Experiential education: The main dish, not just a side course. *Selected Monographs from the Association for Experiential Education International Conference.* Boulder, CO: Association for Experiential Education.

Keeton, M. T. & Tate, P. (1978). *Learning by experience—What, why, how.* San-Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Kraft, R. J. (1985). A Century of experiential learning. In Kraft, R. J. & Kielsmeier, J. (Eds.) *Experiential learning in schools and higher education* (pp. xi-xiii). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co.

Kuh, G. D., Douglas, K. B., Lund, J. P. & Gyerneck, J. (1994). *Student learning outside the classroom: Transcending artificial boundaries.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 8. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Ladner, J. (1996). Ethics, higher education and social responsibility. In Ladner, J.A. & Gbadegesin, S. (Eds.). *Selected papers from the proceedings of the conference on ethics, higher education and social responsibility* (pp. 15-24). Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

March of Remembrance and Hope. (2000). *Information brochure and application packet for applicants.* Bayside, NY: Queensborough Community College, Holocaust Resource Center.

McGill, I. & Weil, S. W. (1989). Continuing the dialogue: New possibilities for experiential learning. In Weil, S. W. & McGill, I. (Eds.). *Making sense of experiential learning: Diversity in theory and practice*, (pp. 245-272). Philadelphia: Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.

Rosenblum, M. B. (2007). *Holocaust education as a journey for students to social justice?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.

Romi, S. and Lev, M. (2007). Experiential learning of history through youth journeys to poland: Israeli jewish youth and the holocaust. *Research in Education,* 78, 88-102.

Roth, J. K. (2000). Foreword. In Davies, I. (Ed.). *Teaching the Holocaust: Education dimensions, principles and practice* (pp. xi-xiii). New York: Continuum.

CONFLICTING HISTORIES: THE CASE OF GENOCIDES IN UKRAINIAN HISTORY

Johan Dietsch, PhD, Department of Literature and Languages, East and Central European Studies, Lund University, Sweden.

A classic motif in general educational literature is the problem of how the school can aid their pupils in finding their place as responsible citizens in democratic societies. In recent years, several trends point to the employment of the Holocaust as a demonstrative illustration or rather pedagogical example. For example, in 2005 the Presidency of the Council of the European Union declared that the "significance of the Holocaust is universal. But it commands a place of special significance in European remembrance… it is out of that dark episode that a new Europe was born." Future generations could not be allowed to forget, and "lessons" drawn from the Holocaust were advanced as crucial for the prevention of future genocides.[1]

As an educational issue, the lesson of the Holocaust is a relatively new phenomenon.[2] Prior to the trial of Adolf Eichmann in 1961, it was difficult to find the Holocaust on the educational agenda of any community, even those in Israel and the Jewish communities throughout North America. Since the trial in Jerusalem, interest in including the Holocaust as part of curriculum content has grown. The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, of the OSCE concluded in a survey that a majority of member states indicated that the Holocaust is a mandatory subject within official school curricula.[3]

However, beyond political statements and glimpses of textbooks, Holocaust education is actually an extremely difficult and complicated issue which can not be reduced to formulas or universal programs. No matter into what country's or community's history the Holocaust is incorporated, it is bound to be placed within an existing historical culture that offers its unique possibilities and constraints.[4] After the fall of the Soviet Union, the experience from many states formerly behind the Iron Curtain show that the different national contexts are indeed imperative for how the Holocaust is taught and propagated in various states and communities.[5] Actual wartime experiences and events, together with subsequent developments come together to determine what kind of Holocaust will be conveyed, and this is especially effected by how different states formulate their own national history.

Ukraine presents a very interesting and ambiguous case. Out of the approximately six million Jews murdered in the Holocaust, about quarter came from areas which today belong to the independent state of Ukraine. Yet, under the veil of Soviet censorship, little was officially made common knowledge. Authorities rather often excelled in underlining the treacherous character of Ukrainians and Ukrainian organizations who had collaborated with the invading Germans or orchestrated anti-Semitic, so-called "anti-cosmopolitan" or "anti-Zionist," campaigns of their own. Likewise, in Holocaust studies in general, the image of the Ukrainian *pogromchik* was often uncritically mediated in widespread publications.[6]

After independence, all Ukrainian presidents have underscored the need to teach the country's young about the Holocaust and enlighten them in order to combat racism and xenophobia. At the fiftieth anniversary of the Babi Yar massacre, Leonid Kravchuk, the country's first president, repeatedly emphasised the government's strong will to combat anti-Semitism and acknowledged the governments share in the guilt of the Holocaust. Ten years later, President Leonid Kuchma reiterated his predecessor's claims.[7] Similarly, the present president, Victor Yushchenko has pledged that the history of Holocaust must be learned and

extensively explained so that a similar tragedy would never happen again and that the Ukrainian government was doing their best to educate the young about it, so that "inter-ethnic conflicts" could be prevented.[8]

Political statements should of course not be regarded as necessarily reflecting real existing conditions. That is to say, that the average Ukrainian pupil does not necessarily study or learn a great deal about the Holocaust simply because the presidents have emphasized its importance. A study on what Ukrainian tenth and eleventh grade students knew about the Holocaust concluded that most were at least informed about the Holocaust, or rather the destruction of the European Jews. Nearly all students who participated in the study demonstrated sharp and negative attitudes towards the Holocaust, even though the overwhelming majority had a murky idea, at best, about anti-Semitism. Most importantly however, the study concluded that the students had to create an "independent public discourse" on their own, since there was no official "model at hand."[9]

However, recent trends in Ukrainian politics of history point in a completely different direction. On October 12, 2007, in order to mark the 65th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) and the centennial of the birth of its commander Roman Shukhevych, Viktor Yushchenko posthumously awarded him with the highest honor of the Ukrainian state, the order of Hero of Ukraine, "in recognition of his special contributions to the national liberation struggle for the freedom and independence of Ukraine."[10] Shukhevych remains a highly controversial and divisive person in Ukrainian history. A freedom fighter and martyr to some, and a Holocaust perpetrator, *pogromchik*, to others. The decision to bestow him with honors re-opened the issue of the ideological use of history by the current presidency. However, such awards are simultaneously in line with the more general trend to nationalize history.

> "After independence all Ukrainian presidents have underscored the need to teach the country's young about the Holocaust and enlighten them in order to combat racism and xenophobia."

NATIONALIZING AND EXTERNALIZING THE HOLOCAUST

The Ukrainian state quickly launched national policies in the sphere of education. From the guidelines and programs produced by the state, it is possible to discern two overarching political messages: the claims of democratisation and nationalisation.[11] The content of education was to be adjusted to contemporary needs of the individual, to society, and to the task of building an independent Ukrainian state. At the same time as these democratic pedagogical approaches were affirmed, the restoration of traditional "national spirituality" and "historical needs" were advanced as important guidelines in the process of establishing a new national curriculum.[12] The adoption and publication of new history textbooks was part of an effort to create an all-encompassing Ukrainian national identity. However, many teachers disliked the use of history for ends they perceived as political, but nonetheless regarded the process as to be expected.[13]

Even though the Holocaust was only made a required topic as late as the 2001 Program of the Ukrainian Ministry of Education, references to the Jewish tragedy during the Second World War found its way into the first new history textbooks published after independence which dealt with Ukrainian history. This was of course a significant departure from Soviet textbook practice and general ideology, which incorporated the Jewish experience into the epic suffering of the entire Soviet population, ignoring its own uniqueness.[14] Simply mentioning Jews in the new Ukrainian history textbooks can thus be regarded as a considerable departure from Soviet history textbooks. However, the various mentions and allusions to both Jews and the Holocaust are anchored in a hesitant historical culture often preoccupied with the Ukrainian nation.

Ukrainian historian Mykhailo Koval has argued that Ukrainian independence made it possible for Ukrainian historians "to leave the swamp of dogmatism" that had prevailed under Soviet rule. The new found scholarly freedom made possible the reconsideration of the genocide of the Ukrainian Jewry during the Second World War. However, Koval emphasised that "the extermination of the Jews was just part of the Holocaust that all Ukrainian people went through".[15] Thus, not ignoring the Jewish fate during the war, Koval emphasised that Nazi-German occupational policies, and in fact the Holocaust, were something which the whole Ukrainian people suffered through. The Jewish tragedy was only a part of the national tragedy.

Such nationalization of the Holocaust has been common. The first new history textbook for the tenth grade provides a striking example and vivid account of the occupier's harsh regime in practice. During "the 103 weeks of the occupation, each Tuesday and Friday military and civilian residents of various ethnic identities were shot at

"Unlike previous Soviet treatment, the new history textbooks differentiate between the victims."

Babi Yar, primarily Jews. Virtually every Ukrainian city had its own Babi Yar. In the first months of the occupation a total of 850.000 Jews fell victim to the Nazis." In total, the reader is informed that almost four million people perished in Ukraine during the war. A little more than a million of these were civilians.[16] Another textbook informs its readers that around 150 concentration camps, "factories of death," and 50 ghettos were built in Ukraine in order to exterminate the population. But other methods were used as well. At the beginning of the occupation, "special units" *(Einsatzgruppen)* of the SS murdered 800,000 Jews. "In Kiev, as early as during the two first days of occupation, 33.000 people were murdered at Babi Yar".[17]

Unlike previous Soviet treatment, the new history textbooks differentiate between the victims. However, prominence is implicitly given to Ukrainian victims. Jews are only portrayed as targets for destruction at the beginning of the occupation. There is no information given about what happened to the Jews prior to 1941 in the rest of Europe, to racial anti-Semitic policies, or to what happened to the Jewish population after the first months of occupation. Not a single clue is obtainable why the Jews were targeted, other than that they happened to live on the territory of what today is Ukraine. Furthermore, the Jewish victims are implicitly deemed less important, though not marginal, since the total number of victims is estimated to around four million.

It is reasonable to assume that the Jews are treated as a separate category of victims because if they were presented as the majority of civilian casualties, the impact of Nazi-German occupational policies directed against Ukrainians would be diminished. In essence, this amounts to a "victimhood theft," whereby the victims of the war are all portrayed as exclusively Ukrainian. This tradition goes back to wartime propaganda, when Russians, Poles and Jews were all considered less desirable peoples.[18]

In contrast, textbooks devoted to world history treat the Holocaust as an exclusive and distinct phenomenon during the Nazi regime in Germany, conceptualised as "the catastrophe for a large part of the Jewish population in Europe, as a result of an organised destruction by the Nazis and compatriots to Germany in their and other conquered territories 1933-1945," and a trauma affecting the whole of Europe. In this interpretation, the victims of Nazi-German racial policies and concentration camps are not conflated and interpreted as "Ukrainians" or "Soviet citizens" as in previous interpretations. Focus is exclusively on Jewish victims, illustrated in one account by the famous photograph of a little polish boy in the Warsaw ghetto in 1943. Because the horror was not only geographically confined to Germany and Poland, but also affected Russia, Belarus, Ukraine and others, the Holocaust is seen to "contain lessons for all of humanity that need to be reaffirmed forever so that such an event can be prevented in the future." By attaching significant and fundamental values to the Holocaust, it becomes enlarged, as this makes it an important moral touchstone for NOT ONLY Jews but gentiles as well.[19]

In this narrative, the victims of Nazi-German racial policies and concentration camps are not conflated and interpreted as "Ukrainians" or "Soviet citizens.". The history of the Holocaust is thus basically seen as a history of the destruction of the European Jewry in all countries except Ukraine.

WE KNOW ALL TOO WELL WHAT GENOCIDE MEANS

As a pedagogical example and demonstrative illustration of a negatively imagined future Europe, the Holocaust has been put to use for the understanding contemporary tragedies.[20] As a historical event, it has become crucial for many contemporary communities and individuals, serving as a cognitive blue-print to make sense of genocidal events in Bosnia, Rwanda, Kosovo and Darfur, among others.

In Ukraine, as in many other states from the former Eastern Bloc, an obvious point of emphasis has been the Soviet experience in general, and the Stalin era in particular. When Victor Yushchenko, then Prime Minister, delivered an official speech on behalf of the Ukrainian state at the conference *Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust*, in 2000, he said that the Holocaust was indeed a tragedy of universal scale and that millions of Ukrainians "passed through all circles of the Holocaust hell" and that Ukraine knew "all too well what genocide means," as the Ukrainians themselves had been subjected to it in the 1932–1933 famine.[21]

Since independence, the 1932-1933 famine, the so-called *Holodomor*, had become one of the centres around which a new integrative historical national narrative has revolved, with the aim of creating loyal Ukrainian citizens.[22] The famine is often integrated into to an interpretation of long oppression of the Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian

people. Perpetrated by the Soviet authorities, or rather Stalin, and aimed at the heart of the Ukrainian nation, the famine is easily interpreted as genocide.[23] This conceptualisation is further strengthened since most history textbooks interpret the famine as a weapon whereby the authorities tried to physically destroy Ukraine's "troublesome population," especially the intelligentsia. The term genocide is often explicitly used to denote the horrible event.[24] In fact, the terms "genocide" and "Holodomor" are deemed of central importance to history education and introduced already in the fifth grade.[25]

Many historians in the newly independent Ukraine endorsed the thesis, advanced by Robert Conquest and James Mace a decade earlier, that the famine was a genocide directed against the Ukrainian nation. In turn, these two scholars from the west used the Holocaust as a cognitive basis upon which to interpret the Ukrianian tragedy. Robert Conquest, for example, compared Ukraine in the early 1930s to "one vast Belsen" in order to convey the magnitude of the historical tragedy to his readers.[26] But it was not until 2003 that the parliament voted in favour of officially labelling the *Holodomor* a genocide.[27]

Genocides always require perpetrators. In the Ukrainian 1990s the search and need for those who had instigated the famine coincided with the more general search for scapegoats for the Soviet system. Jews and supposed Jewish conspiracies became an appreciated topic. The Jewishness of Stalin's right hand man in Ukraine, at the time of the famine, Lazar Kaganovich, was regularly pointed out. Accusations and statements by the chairman of the Holodomor Researchers' Association in Ukraine, Levko Lukyanenko are among the more candid. He has accused the "Zionist government" in Ukraine in the 1930s and the "satanical Soviet government," controlled by Jews, of having put Ukraine and Ukrainians through all sorts of horrors and hardships.[28] More moderate accounts, and almost all history textbooks in use, point to Stalin, Kaganovich, Molotov and Postyshev as the perpetrators. But by ignoring lower levels, such as the local Soviet administration, these accounts are made to fit into an already existing historical narrative of Ukrainian suffering at the hands of external enemies.[29]

Victor Yushchenko expanded on his interpretation of the meaning and usefulness of the famine, already alluded to at the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust, in a newspaper article in February 2003. By that time a hearing about the famine had since long been scheduled in the parliament. Yushchenko argued that the lessons of the famine were indeed the need and role of a free press. Also, that the country needed to integrate into the democratic European structures, which would implicitly guarantee Ukrainian sovereignty. If there had existed a politically independent Ukraine in the 1930s, the Communist regime could never had instigated such wide spread starvation and withheld the population relief.[30] Aside from being an overt attack on the Communist Party of Ukraine, Yushchenko implicitly, but highly deliberately, made comparative use of the *Holodomor* in order to render the transfer of political lessons between the past and the present simple and unproblematic.

This exemplary use of the *Holodomor* closely resembles the ways in which the Holocaust has been presented as containing values and norms important for the future of Europe.

HISTORY IN DISCORD

"We are sticking to the provisions of relevant documents by the Council of Europe which requires that the history of Holocaust must be taught in the educational establishments of the European countries as an event of the modern history which influenced the development of the continent and of the world in general," proclaimed Victor Yushchenko at the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust in 2000.[31] But the Holocaust has in practice been divided between nationalized and externalized versions. In Ukraine, it is propagated as a tragedy that much more easily fit in to the national history.

> "The famine is often integrated into to an interpretation of long oppression of the Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian people."

The two catastrophes here discussed do not only share the fact that they both took place in areas which today make up Ukraine, both have also been labelled as genocides. But while one can be said to be the paradigmatic genocide, the other's status as one is contested. Even though an emphasis and presence of the *Holodomor* increases genocide awareness, it also steers attention away from the Holocaust. The two genocidal histories in Ukraine are in discord. Both tragedies make for an uneasy fit in Ukrainian historical culture. Formulaic Holocaust educational programs become superfluous as the Ukrainian historical reality already has another dark episode to which democratic values and other "lessons" can be ascribed.

NOTES

Unless otherwise specified, this article builds upon Johan Dietsch, *Holocausts. Nazi and Stalinist Terror in Ukrainian Historical Culture*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, forthcoming 2010.

[1] "EU Presidency Statement—Holocaust Remembrance", http://www.europa-eu-un.org/articles/en/article_5224_en.htm (accessed 2009-05-12)

[2] See Dianne K. Rosking, "Teaching the Holocaust to children: A Review and Bibliography", New York: Ktav 1975 and Chaim Schatzker, "Formation vs. information: Trends in Holocaust Education in Israel." *Forum*, Spring/Summer 1978, pp. 30-31.

[3] *Education on the Holocaust and on Anti-Semitism. An Overview and Analysis of Educational Approaches*, Warsaw: OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights 20006, p. 41

[4] See, Klas-Göran, Karlsson, "Making Sense of the Holocaust after Sixty Years. An Introduction", in Karlsson, Klas-Göran & Zander, Ulf (eds), *Holocaust Heritage. Inquiries into the European Historical Cultures*, Malmö: Sekel 2004. A very informative example of the programmatic formula approach is Jean-Marie Lecomte, *Teaching about the Holocaust in the 21st Century*, Strassbourg: Council of Europe Publishing 2001.

[5] See for example Tomas Sniegon, "Their Genocide, or Ours?. The Holocaust as a Litmus Test of Czech and Slovak Identities", in Klas-Göran Karlsson & Ulf Zander (eds), *Echoes of the Holocaust. Historical Cultures in Contemporary Europe*, Lund: Nordic Academic Press 2003; Kristian Gerner, "Hungary, Romania, the Holocaust and Historical Culture" in Klas-Göran Karlsson & Ulf Zander (eds), *The Holocaust—Post-war Battlefields. Genocide as Historical Culture*, Malmö: Sekel bokförlag 2006; Kerstin Nyström, "The Holocaust and Croatian National Identity", in Klas-Göran Karlsson & Ulf Zander (eds), *The Holocaust—Post-war Battlefields. Genocide as Historical Culture*, Malmö: Sekel bokförlag 2006.

[6] See for example Raul Hilberg, *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders: the Jewish Catastrophe 1933-1945*, New York: Harper Collins 1992, pp. 60–61; Leni Yahil, The Holocaust: *The Fate of the European Jews*, New York: Oxford University Press 1990, p. 265.

[7] Yohanan Petrovsky-Stern "Reconceptualizing the Alien: Jews in Modern Ukrainian Thought", *Ab Imperio*, No. 4, 2003, s. 520.

[8] Victor Yushchenko, "Message by the Prime Minister of Ukraine at the Plenary Session, 27 January, 2000", The Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust. A Conference on Education, Remembrance and Research, Stockholm, Sweden, 26-28 January 2000, Proceedings, Stockholm: Svensk Information 2000, pp. 75-76.

[9] Elena Ivanova, "Ukrainian High School Students' Understanding of the Holocaust", *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3, 2004, pp. 402-420.

[10] "Ukaz prezydenta Ukraïïny No. 965/2007 pro prysvoennia R. Shukhevvychu zvannia Heroi Ukraïny," Oct. 12, 2007. http://www.president.gov.ua/documents/6808.html (Accessed 2009-05-12).

[11] *The Law of Ukraine on Education*, Preamble. The original law was published in *Vidomosti Verkhovnoyi Rady*, No. 34, 1991, pp 451–452. During the 1990s several amendments have been made.

[12] See Dershavna natsionalna programa "Osvita": Ukraina XXI Stolittia, Kiev: Raiduga, 1994.

[13] Peter. W. Rodgers. "Compliance or Contradiction'? Teaching 'History' in the 'New' Ukraine. A View from Ukraine's Eastern Borderlands" *Europe-Asia Studies*. Vol. 59. 2007. Pp. 503, 507.

[14] Zvi Gitelman, 1997. "Soviet Jewry before the Holocaust", in Zvi Gitelman (ed), *Bitter Legacy. Confronting the Holocaust in the USSR*, Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997, pp. 14-42

[15] M.I Koval "The Nazi Genocide of the Jews and the Ukrainian Population, 1941-1944', in Zvi Gitelman (ed.), *Bitter Legacy. Confronting the Holocaust in the USSR,* Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press 1997, p. 51.

[16] F.G Turchenko, Novitnia istoriia Ukrainy. Chastyna perscha (1917–1945). Pidruchnyk dlia 10 *klasu serednoi schkoly,* Kiev, Heneza 1994, p 295.

[17] I. Koliada, O. Suschko & O. Ilkova, Istoriia Ukrainy (1917–1944 rr). 10 klas: Zoschit-konspekt temp, Kiev: A.S.K. 1997, p. 113

[18] John-Paul Himka, "Victim Cinema. Between Hitler and Stalin: Ukraine in World War II—The Untold Story", in Georgiy Kasianov & Philipp Ther (eds) A *Laboratory of Transnational History. Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography*, Budapest & New York: CEU Press. 2009, p. 218.

[19] Ia.M. Berdichevskyi, T.V. Ladichenko & Y.Ia. Shchupak, *Vsemirnaia Istoriia. Uchebnoe posobie dla 11 klassa srednei obshcheobrazovatelnoi shkoli*, Zaporozhe: Premer 2000, pp. 50-55

[20] Daniel Levy & Nathan Sznaider, "Memory Unbound. The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory", *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol 5. No. 1, 2002; William F. S. Miles, "Third World Views of the Holocaust", *Journal of Genocide Research*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 2005.

[21] Victor Yushchenko, "Message by the Prime Minister of Ukraine at the Plenary Session, 27 January, 2000', The Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust. A Conference on Education, Remembrance and Research, Stockholm, Sweden, 26-28 January 2000, Proceedings, Stockholm: Svensk Information 2000, pp. 75–76.

[22] Georgii Kasianov, "Razritaia mogilia: golod 1932-1933 godov v ukrainskoi istoriografii politike i massovom soznanii", Ab Imperio, No 3, 2004. On the formation of the famine as a "Ukrainian Holocaust" by the Ukrainian diaspora in the 1980s see Johan Öhman (Johan Dietsch), "From Famine to Forgotten Holocaust. The 1932–1933 Famine in Ukrainian Historical Cultures", in Karlsson, Klas-Göran & Zander, Ulf (eds), *Echoes of the Holocaust. Historical Cultures in Contemporary Europe*, Lund: Nordic Academic Press 2003.

[23] It should be pointed out that there is serious scholarly disagremeent over the genocidal character of the 1932-1933 Ukrainian famine. See for example Michael Ellmann, "The Role of Leadership Perceptions and of Intent in the Soviet Famine of 1931-1934", *Europe-Asia Studies*, Vol. 57, 2005; R.W. Davies & Stephen G. Wheatcroft, "Stalin and the Soviet Famine of 1932-1933: A reply to Ellmann", Europe-Asia Studies, Vol 58, 2006; Yaroslav Bilinsky, "Was the Ukrainian famine 1932-1933 genocide?", *Journal of Genocide Research*, Vol 1, No 2, 1999; Hiroaki Kuromiya, "The Soviet Famine of 1932-1933 Reconsidered", *Europe-Asia Studies*, Vol 60, No 4, 2008

[24] Valeriy Smolii, "1933 rik v nashiy pamat i v nashiy istorii", in Holod-genosid 1933 roky v Ukraini. Istoryko-politolohichnyi analiz sotsialno-demohrafichnikh ta moralno-psykholohichnykh naslidkiv, in Stanislav Kulchytskyi, Oleksandra Veselova, Levko Lukianenko &, Vasyl Marochko (eds), *Holod-henotsid 1933 roky v Ukraini: istoryko-politolohichnyi analiz sotsialno-demografichnikh ta moralno-psykholohichnikh naslidkiv*, Kyiv & New York: M.P. Kots, 2000. pp. 11-15.

[25] Victor Mysan, *Opovidannia z istoriyi Ukrainy*, Kiev: Heneza 1997, pp. 175-177

[26] Robert Conquest, The Harvest of Sorrow. Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine, New York: Oxford University Press 1986, p 3

[27] Resolution No. 789-IV, May 15, 2003. *Verchovna Rada Ukrainy*. http://www.rada.gov.ua (accessed 2009-04-30). See also *The Ukrainian Weekly* June 1, 2003.

[28] Levko Lukyanenko. "Do Evreiskoho pytannia abo Chy isnuie v Ukraini anti-Semitism?", *Personal Plius*, 2004: 26, p. 4. See also Rudling 2006.

[29] Johan Dietsch , "Struggling with a 'Nuremberg Historiography' of the Holodomor", *Ab Imperio*, No 3, 2007.

[30] See *Holos Ukrainy*, February 11, 2003.

[31] Victor Yushchenko, 2000, pp. 75-76

TEACHING THE HOLOCAUST TO NON-TRADITIONAL AUDIENCES: THE SOUTH AFRICAN EXPERIENCE

Richard Freedman was born in Johannesburg, South Africa where he completed his primary and secondary schooling and went on to major in Drama, History, English and Social Anthropology at the University of the Witwatersrand. He completed postgraduate studies in Education at the University of Cape Town and has also pursued studies in Psychology through the University of South Africa (UNISA).

He taught History and English in Cape Town high schools and was appointed principal of Herzlia Weizmann School in 1990, a position he held until 2005. He served as chairman of the Association of Principals of Jewish Day Schools of Southern Africa and also served on the Executive committee of the Independent Schools Association of South Africa (Western Cape).

Outside of formal education he has been a member of Rotary International, board member of Mothers to Mothers (an NGO which serves to provide counselling, mentoring and support to pregnant mothers living with HIV), board member of Union International de la Marionette (SA) and several Jewish communal organisations including the outreach arm of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies (Cape) MaAfrika Tikkun.

He has had the opportunity to attend several international programmes, including the Harvard Principals' Institute; Yad Vashem International School for Holocaust Studies; United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Educators Fellows programme and March of the Living.

In 2006 he was appointed director of the Cape Town Holocaust Centre and in 2007 National Director of The South African Holocaust Foundation. He continues to hold both positions.

He lives with his partner of 16 years, Daniel, in Cape Town.

ABSTRACT

The South African Holocaust Foundation, through its three centres in Cape Town, Durban and Johannesburg, is dedicated to using the prism of the Holocaust and antisemitism to address the deep-seated issues at the basis of South Africa's fragmented society.

The challenge is that teachers themselves have to address their own attitudes and histories before they are able to bring awareness to the learners. In addition the teachers have a lack of content and methodological knowledge and do not understand the reason for the inclusion of the Holocaust, as a case study of Human rights abuse, into the National Schools curriculum.

Our ultimate aim is to support the development of a Human Rights culture and contribute towards the building of a society that is compassionate, caring and embracing of diversity - a society in which the tenets of the South African Bill of Human Rights are experienced and lived in a meaningful way.

This article explores some of these aspirations and challenges and the way in which the South African Holocaust Foundation has responded.

The manipulation of the education system was a key component in the apartheid regime's process of creating a racial state. Schools reflected the broader South African society in that they were divided along racial lines defined in terms of colour into four separate Departments of Education—one for those classified as whites; one for blacks; one for Indians and one for coloureds. But it did not end there; whichever group you were defined as belonging to impacted upon the quality of the education you received and the resources which the State allotted to your education. Those classified as white enjoyed first world resources, while the majority of the population—those classified as black—received third world facilities in overcrowded conditions, taught by under-qualified and poorly trained teachers. The content of the curriculum, which differed according to the racial classification, was carefully designed to perpetuate the divisions in society and the expectations and aspirations of pupils. (The legacy of all of this is with us still, 14 years after apartheid was removed from the statute books).

It is no wonder therefore that one of the key tasks confronting the first democratically elected South African government in 1994 was to dismantle both nearly 50 years of apartheid education and the nearly 300 years of colonial education which had gone before it. This was an enormous challenge which was informed and underpinned by the new South Africa's constitution and Bill of Rights. The resultant curriculum is one which has human rights at its core.

In the overview to the National Curriculum statement it contains the following:

'The National Curriculum Statement Grades 10-12 (General) seeks to promote human rights, social justice and environmental justice as defined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. In particular, the National Curriculum Statement Grades 10-12 (General) is sensitive to issues of diversity.

The kind of learner that is envisaged is one who will be imbued with the values and act in the interests of a society based on respect for democracy, equality, human dignity and social justice as promoted in the Constitution.'

The curriculum designers felt that the inclusion of the Holocaust as a case study of human rights abuse was very important, given that the curriculum was to be based on the Constitution and Bill of Rights. This in turn was directly influenced by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which had arisen out World War II and the knowledge of the Holocaust.

High school education in South Africa is divided into two phases: grades 7-9 General Education and Training and Grades 10-12 Further Education and training. Grade 9 is a possible exit point from the education system. From grade 10 learners are required to make a narrower subject choice selection. There is thus no guarantee that learners will study History. It is for this reason that the Curriculum designers included the Holocaust in grade 9. From 2007 teachers were required to teach the Holocaust in all schools across the country. The other area of study that is also included in this exit year is that of apartheid for, after all, the learners' parents and grandparents lived through apartheid, but they did not.

Most of the currently serving teachers received their professional education and entered teaching when education was an integral part of the apartheid project and organised in racially and ethnically divided sub-systems. The current generation of teachers is the first to experience the new non-racial, democratic transformation of the education system. Since 1994 they have had to cope with the rationalization of the teaching community into a single national system, the introduction of new curricula, which emphasise greater professional autonomy and require teachers to have new knowledge and applied competences (including the use of new technologies) and radical change in the demographic, cultural and linguistic composition of the classrooms. Those who are teaching bring with them the baggage of apartheid.

The first Holocaust Centre in South Africa was established in Cape Town in 1999 as a not for profit educational Trust. Its establishment was prompted by an 18-month tour of South Africa and Namibia of *The Anne Frank in the World* exhibition in 1993/1994. A number of special panels about South Africa's own history of Human Rights abuse were developed as part of the exhibition. The exhibition was attended by thousands of South Africans of all ages but especially by high school learners and their teachers. The response of these teachers was extraordinary. 'Emerging out of a society where possession of a pigmented skin was a sign of degradation and stigma, the knowledge of the existence of antisemitism gave a perspective that racism was not only dependent on skin colour, and that even white people could be victims of stereotyping, discrimination and persecution. It was clearly demonstrated that there was a role in the new South Africa for Holocaust education that would raise the issues of race prejudice and the abuse of power when taken to its extremes.'

"Most of the currently serving teachers received their professional education and entered teaching when education was an integral part of the apartheid project and organised in racially and ethnically divided sub-systems."

The Centre has teaching facilities and also a permanent exhibition. The designers knew that they could not create an exhibition on the Holocaust without acknowledging South Africa's recent emergence from a racial state and its own history of gross human rights abuses. Thus the exhibition examines the history of racism and antisemitism and makes direct reference both textually and visually to South Africa's own history.

From the start the education team at the Centre worked closely with the local Department of Education and based on the developing new school curriculum developed programmes and classroom support materials in line with its human rights focus. These materials, entitled *The Holocaust: Lessons for Humanity*, now form the basis of our teacher training programmes across the country and are used in many schools in all regions.

Apartheid left a legacy of high numbers of unqualified and under-qualified teachers. The President's Education Initiative research project (1999) on South African education indicates that the majority of teachers have not yet been sufficiently equipped to meet the education needs of a growing democracy in a 21st century global environment. The report concluded that the most critical challenge for teacher education in South Africa was the limited conceptual knowledge of many teachers. This includes poor grasp of their subjects as evidenced by a range of factual errors made in content and concepts during lessons. This in turn contributes to low levels of learner achievement. This has been borne out through our experience in teacher training.

The report makes the following points: 'South Africa has the second most developed economy in Africa, with a highly evolved economic infrastructure, but it also has huge social inequalities. The most profound and enduring effects of these apartheid inequalities are to be found in education, including poor infrastructure and facilities for poor people, a lack of proper amenities, and inadequate training for teachers, the persistence of poverty and unemployment, the debilitating effects of illness and premature death, (especially as a result of HIV and AIDS).'

"The first Holocaust Centre in South Africa was established in Cape Town in 1999 as a not for profit educational Trust."

Our ultimate aim is to support the development of a Human Rights culture and contribute towards the building of a society that is compassionate, caring and embracing of diversity—a society in which the tenets of the South African Bill of Human Rights are experienced and lived in a meaningful way.

To meet this aim, we strive to:

- provide accurate content knowledge of the Holocaust to participants;
- facilitate the making of connections between the Human Rights atrocities committed during the Holocaust and present realities and in so doing, to encourage commitment to the protection of Human Rights.
- develop social awareness and engagement in schools through facilitating the identification by the participants of strategies to prevent and resist prejudice and promote Human Rights.

Our educators' programme is designed to provide support to educators in achieving this goal in their classrooms and to support a Human Rights culture.

There are some anomalies in the South African political and educational arena which pose particular challenges to the teaching of the Holocaust in the South African context. Firstly, the teachers have little or no knowledge of the Holocaust. It is a history far removed from them both in time and space. For the majority of South Africans, any European history is approached with a degree of scepticism as it is often viewed through the devastating impact of colonialism. (In apartheid South Africa whites were described as Europeans and everyone else as non-white).

South Africa has eleven official languages. Most teachers are required to teach in the language of instruction which is often their second or third language. The same can be said of the learners. Thus, although there is generally an aspiration to speak English as a lingua franca more and more, it is being understood that if pupils are not taught in their mother tongue they are placed at a tremendous disadvantage. The Cape Town Holocaust Centre has responded to this by publishing material at this stage in two of the official languages other than English. The facilitation of workshops is more of a challenge. Usually they are conducted in English but where possible we make use of mother tongue speakers to augment the discussion. One of the Departments of Education has seconded a mother tongue Xhosa-speaking teacher to the Centre who works exclusively in disadvantaged schools where most of the teachers and learners are Xhosa speakers. She team-teaches and is involved in teacher in-service development.

South Africa is a vast country with a population of some 46 million. Most schools will have no access to the permanent exhibitions that the South African Holocaust Foundation has established and there are still many schools without electricity or equipment for audio-visual teaching.

We have responded by making available low tech classroom posters and a portable exhibition based on the posters. Eventually all nine provinces will own copies of these resources which can then be used for teacher training and can be sent into schools (with the assistance of the Claims Conference).

The South African Holocaust Foundation may be viewed as the major resource in the country for Holocaust education but it is not the only source and neither should it be. Yet there is cause for concern if the locus of control for teacher education and resource materials falls outside of the Foundation. There has been a frenzy of textbook writing and all of those which are devoted to Social Sciences in Grade 9 and History in Grade 11 cover the Holocaust. In some there is merely a footnote to World War II as it was in the old curriculum. Others have gone into more detail but there is little or no control over the accuracy of information which appears in the textbooks. On occasion we are approached by publishers and editors to review the content before it goes to print. We are often most concerned about the trivialisation and the historical inaccuracies. As a non-governmental not for profit organisation we have no control over an individual teacher's decision to use inappropriate material.

It is through the relationship with the Departments of Education that we can hope to influence the way in which the Holocaust is taught. It is the Department of Education which has endorsed and, to a varying extent, supported the in-service training workshops which are being conducted by the Foundation across the country. The only way we can reach the teachers is through the workshops we conduct ourselves and through a Fellowship programme for senior educators which we established in 2008.

Another challenge which we face is the impact of the Israel/Palestinian crisis. Although there has over the years been relatively little antisemitism in South Africa, and the South African government endorses and supports a two state solution, Israel is viewed with suspicion and there is both official and popular support for the plight of the Palestinian people. This has its roots in both the support of the PLO for the apartheid struggle and also the fact that Israel supplied arms and military intelligence to the apartheid government. There is also a relatively large Muslim population (about 2 million) which until the second Intifada enjoyed a cordial relationship with South Africa's small and largely Zionist Jewish population (about 85 000). Until we are able to unpack the relevance of the inclusion of the Holocaust into the curriculum, it is viewed by some as having a Zionist agenda. The question is often posed: 'How can you teach this history of Holocaust without condemning the State of Israel for what it is doing to the Palestinian People?' If we are not careful in our responses the whole programme can be derailed and the focus shift to the Middle East. We stress that the Foundation condemns all human rights abuses, no matter who the perpetrators. We also point out that the situation is complex and has a long history which is too detailed to deal with in the seminars and training, where we focus on historical sources and looking at the questions which relate to contemporary issues in South African society.

The South African Holocaust Foundation, through its three centres in Cape Town, Durban and Johannesburg, is dedicated to using the prism of the Holocaust and antisemitism to address the deep-seated issues at the basis of South Africa's fragmented society.

At the core of the Foundation's classroom support material is the examination of the Holocaust in order to confront issues facing contemporary society. For example, in the pages which document the flight of Jews from Nazi-occupied Europe in the 1930's, the questions directed at the learners include the following: Should governments help refugees from countries where there are severe human rights violations? And how are refugees in South Africa viewed and treated? Unfortunately questions like these do not in themselves lead to changes in attitude. This largely depends on the effective facilitation of the educator in the classroom. The challenge is that teachers themselves have to address their own attitudes before they are able to bring awareness to the learners. At a teacher training workshop in March 2008 which was conducted for the Gauteng Department of Education by facilitators from the South African Holocaust Foundation and the Apartheid Museum, participants were required to examine the key theme of 'Choice and Responsibility' while teaching apartheid and the Holocaust.

> "To help the learners develop their own moral compasses the educator has to develop the ability to retain neutrality in the classroom. "

This is done through examination of sources and by engaging with set case studies. Each group was given an appropriate and real situation that educators might confront in their work environment. They were asked to reflect on a controversial situation where someone's human rights were abused, identify what they should do in the situation, explore possible problems that might arise, and decide how to deal with these problems.

The groups presented their issue to the forum as a whole. In theoretical situations where the educators did not feel personally threatened, they tended to answer the questions well and come up with positive suggestions.

However, there were two instances where the groups concerned and the wider audience allowed their own personal feelings to intervene.

In a situation discussing xenophobia, where the problem of the case study was that one of their colleagues had complained that foreigners came to South Africa and took South African jobs, a substantial number of participants agreed that this was the case. It was as if all barriers had come down as the participants raged about foreigners in South Africa. There was a great deal of rage among the participants, and feelings of prejudice were largely evident. It is clear that many of the educators had bought into the values and moral lessons of history only insofar as they did not affect them personally.

To help the learners develop their own moral compasses the educator has to develop the ability to retain neutrality in the classroom. The Holocaust, as a case study of human rights abuse, because it is so removed from the experience of both educator and learner, has the possibility of bringing to the surface personal attitudes and prejudices such as xenophobia which otherwise remain repressed. Only when these issues are exposed can they begin to be addressed.

Whilst the inclusion of Holocaust History has presented enormous challenges, it is clear that through effective teacher training and classroom teaching the study in South African schools of this particular area of history has the very real possibility of helping our emergent democracy to becoming a more caring and just society, respecting diversity and healing the injustices of our past. Now, more than ever, the value of the inclusion of the study of the Holocaust into South Africa's schools curriculum has assumed an urgency and relevance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The National Policy Framework For Teacher Education and Development in South Africa (National Department of Education, 2006).

South African Human Sciences Research Council: *Education Hearing Report Part II,* 2006.

C2005 Revised National Curriculum Statement, Gazette no. 23406 Vol. 443, May 2002.

JET Education Services The President's Education Initiative Research Project Makhosi Sigabe and Elizabeth Mphithi *A descriptive study of the nature and effectiveness of in-service teacher training and support in the implementation of OBE.* University of the Witwatersrand (1999).

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996.

Marlene Silbert and Dylan Wray: *The Holocaust: Lessons for Humanity*, 2004 New Africa Books.

Michelle Friedman *Report on Follow-Up Workshop: Understanding Apartheid and the Holocaust* 2-4 March 2008.

ANALYSIS OF HOLOCAUST DISCOURSE WHILE VISITING THE AUSCHWITZ-BIRKENAU MUSEUM

Dr. Zehavit Gross is a senior lecturer and the head of the graduate program in social education in the School of Education at Bar-Ilan University in Israel. She studies religious, secular, feminine and civic socialization processes among adolescents. She is currently participating in four international projects based in Australia (Melbourne, Sydney), Canada (Montréal, Toronto), and Europe (Brussels, Paris, Geneva, and Germany).

ABSTRACT

The aim of this article is to analyze a holocaust discourse between a jew and a non-jew visiting the Auschwitz-Birkenau museum. It tackles the issue of ownership – who owns the memory of Auschwitz? A basic assumption is that the way people interpret the meaning of the holocaust is connected to the way they define their Jewish identity as well as the meaning of the state of Israel. Any holocaust museum can be a site where contesting powers and knowledge bases struggle over the ownership of its visitors' holocaust vision. A visit to a holocaust museum can also be seen as a quest for meaning and interpretation.

My first visit to Auschwitz was accidental. One usually doesn't go to Auschwitz by accident; it is usually a planned and organized trip.

Such a visit calls for significant psychological and emotional preparation, especially for a second generation daughter of survivors. Yet, I was invited to Krakow to lecture at a conference for rabbis and because everything was organized at the last minute, I didn't have time to prepare myself.

I called a non-Jewish colleague of mine to tell him that I would have a day off while in Krakow. He suggested taking me to Birkenau and Auschwitz since "both of us lost our relatives there." It was impossible for me to acknowledge the fact that a Polish non-Jew would show me Birkenau. When I arrived in Krakow, I told him that I preferred to go to Le_ajsk, but he insisted: "You can go to Le_ajsk with your friends, but to Auschwitz, you will go with me – one million Poles were killed there. It is not only a tragedy for the Jews; it is our tragedy as well."

This led to a discussion about the issue of ownership – who owns the memory of Auschwitz? The main question I asked myself was "does a non-Jew have a right to the memory of Auschwitz?" During our discussion, my colleague spoke about the *shoah,* whereas I referred to it as the holocaust in order to differentiate myself from him. Then I thought that this was a mistake; using the same name shows some commonalities in both our hidden assumptions and points of departure. There are several terms used for the holocaust: destruction [in Hebrew and Yiddish, *hurban*], holocaust [originally stemming from the Greek *holokauston*, a translation of the Hebrew words *korbam olah* meaning a burnt sacrifice offered whole to God ("Holocaust,"

Encyclopedia Britannica, 2009)]; shoah [catastrophe] and genocide. Poet Uri Zvi Greenberg, who views the holocaust as part of a continuum of disasters, uses the word *destruction. Holocaust* is the historical name for this event. The term *shoah* indicates that it is unique, while genocide makes the holocaust an event amongst others. Then I thought I should also use the term *shoah*. My colleague and I reached an important consensual point of departure by using the same term.

I explained to my colleague that for Israelis, the holocaust is the cornerstone of our identity; it is the main justification for the need to establish the state of Israel. I treated it as both a political concept and epistemological myth. He, on the other hand, treated the holocaust as an historical event.

When we arrived in Auschwitz and I saw a group of Israeli boys draped in the flag of Israel, I started to cry. It was the first time that I had an explicit emotional reaction during the tour. In Birkenau, I was frozen; in Auschwitz, I cried. The way they wrapped themselves in the flags and held them close to their bodies made it seem as if the Israeli flag was an anchor to keep them sane. I asked one of the boys why they did it and he answered, "Here we understand that the state of Israel is the only solution for the Jewish people all over the world."

This experience, which is also described in the literature (Herman, 1977; Oron, 1993), showed me that the way people interpret the meaning of the holocaust is connected to the way they define the meaning of the state of Israel. According to Neuberger (1994), there are six approaches to defining the meaning of the state of Israel: (1) a religious *(hallachic)* state, (2) a religious national state, (3) a national Jewish cultural state, (4) the state of the Jewish people, (5) a state of the Jews, and (6) a state of all its citizens. In the brief and casual conversations I had with Israeli adolescents I met in Auschwitz, they identified with the second, third, fourth and fifth meaning. This merits further investigation. Whereas the five first options describe an ethnic nationality, the sixth view refers to a political nationality. Each approach interprets the meaning of the holocaust differently. While the ethnic national approaches use a mainly epistemological interpretation, the sixth approach has a civic nature and uses a national political interpretation.

Research has shown that the holocaust was the major component of Jewish identity (Herman, 1977; Frago, 1989; Gross, 1999; Levi, 1987). Liebman and Don Yihye (1983) view the holocaust as the main component of civic religion in Israel. For the religious population in Israel, the holocaust is the most important component in the construction of Jewish identity. It strengthens the connections between the state of Israel, the Jewish nation and the Jewish tradition.

One of the main questions concerning the holocaust is whether to relate to the particularistic or to the universalistic aspect of the event. I questioned my own understanding of the narrative of the holocaust. Is it a narrative of destruction and redemption in keeping with the Zionist narrative that was constructed from the establishment of the state of Israel? Or is it a humanistic narrative that concentrates on the stories of individuals? Whereas my discourse was a national narrative of destruction and redemption, my colleague's discourse was humanistic because he concentrated on the story of his uncle. These two different viewpoints set us apart and made communication nearly impossible. While he told the story of his uncle, I told him about our nation, my people and the demographic implications of the holocaust. I saw myself in this moment as a representative of my country and my nation, whereas he saw himself as a simple human being who wanted to share his story. During the discourse, he referred to himself as "I" while I referred to myself as "we." He wanted to talk about the holocaust as a global narrative but I saw it as a particularistic narrative. I then asked myself why the shoah had become a case study of genocide. Standing in front of the ramp in Birkenau, I became overwhelmed and lost my patience. I wanted to be alone and I wanted the holocaust to be a particularistic-specific creation. I felt that if I shared the holocaust with other people, I would lose my intimacy with the concept and with it, my personal responsibility to my relatives who were killed. I understood while interacting with my colleague that in doing so, I was losing the empathy of the other meaning that the holocaust would cease to be a meaningful traumatic issue to other people. By making it a global issue, other people can share in it and cope with its viciousness. I soon understood that my exclusive approach also lessened the possibility of making the story of the holocaust a basis for anti-racist education.

"One of the main questions concerning the holocaust is whether to relate to the particularistic or the universalistic aspect of this issue."

Trigano (2008) posits that the negation of the universal aspect of the shoah indicates that sympathy is for the victims of a human tragedy. In this case, sympathy towards the human beings and not toward the Jews. This distinction is important to the Europeans. They tend to blame the Jews for

using the holocaust as a reason for their particularism. For Trigano, Jews are only accepted in Europe if they are victims. Hence, in his eyes, Europe is ready for a second holocaust.

The the discussion with my colleague was a struggle to construct and deconstruct reality through the power of words. Using Michel Foucault's approach can be very useful to this end. According to Foucault, words construct realities. Language is the "direction of meaning." Thus, language hypothesizes a direct correspondence between signifier and signified; it pretends to be mimetic of the world. In *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, Foucault continues his definition of discourse in terms of its effect. More than being merely a simple speech act, he interprets discursive practices as both verbal and non-verbal means of defining and manipulating the hierarchy of power within a society. They are both tools and weapons. In Foucault's view, "Discursive practices are not purely and simply ways of producing discourse. They are embodied in technical processes, in institutions, in patterns for general behavior, in forms for transmission and diffusion, and in pedagogical forms which, at once, impose and maintain them" (1981, p. 61).

Foucault studied discourse as a system of representations (Hall, 1997). Foucault was interested in the rules and practices that produced meaningful statements. Discourse is not perceived as a linguistic concept. Foucault defines discourse as "a group of statements which provide a language for talking about a way of representing the knowledge about a particular topic at a particular historical moment. Discourse is about the production of knowledge through language … Meanings shape and influence what we do" (Hall, 1994, p. 291).

We first went to Bikenau and then to Auschwitz. My reaction to Bikenau was very strong, I was shocked. Birkenau has been restored, you can see the barracks, the chimneys, and the railway lines. It was very cold. I wondered how people could survive naked or only wearing thin shirts in even colder weather. We then accompanied a group from Scandinavia who went into one of the barracks with a guide. The guide explained that this specific barrack had originally been used as a stable for 52 horses, but the Nazis used it to hold about 400 people. The guide tried to describe the everyday life of the prisoners, concentrating on the question of how they managed to keep themselves sane. The group was deeply moved. One of the participants asked how many people committed suicide in this barrack, the guide explained that she had no accurate information but suspected that no suicides occurred. Jews hardly committed suicide, she continued, as they were religious and suicide is forbidden according to Judaism. To me, this was a very special question. It reminded me of the fact that in Hebrew we talk about "shoah and gvura" [heroism]. When I was a child at school, the teacher used to tell us that heroism is embedded within the shoah. This also has to do with Viktor Frankl's theory in *Man's Search for Meaning* (1963) that those who found meaning in life could survive. Survival is spiritual, it is the victory of the spirit over the physical, which basically a religious view.

My main emphasis in our discussion was that we were victims. My colleague liked this notion even though he referred to us as shadows of God rather than Jews. We then asked ourselves if it could happen again. My colleague said that it was impossible in our time. I insisted that if we look at the current situation and the explicit words of Iranian president Ahmadinejad, it could happen again. This is the main justification for the need for holocaust education all over the world. I quote the words of Primo Levi, an Italian writer and a holocaust survivor, "we cannot understand the holocaust but we can and must understand from where it springs and we must be on our guard. If understanding is impossible, knowing is imperative because what happened could happen again" (Levi, 1987, p. 396).

My colleague said there is a lot of mysticism surrounding the issue of the holocaust. I felt it was a mistake to use mystical conceptions in relation to the holocaust. In my eyes, it was a mistake to describe the Nazis as monsters; it is important to describe them as regular human beings in order to show that this monstrous potential resides in every human being. If it happened again, one could find themselves in any of the following roles; victim, perpetrator, collaborators, bystander, or rescuer. Only education can guarantee that the holocaust will never happen again. The term mystification was defined in relation to the holocaust by Yehuda Bauer (1982): "Recent treatment of the Holocaust has contributed much ambiguity and vagueness—and no wonder. The event was of such vast proportions that it cannot be grasped by a normal human mind. It is therefore natural to run away from the subject, to deny it, and to reduce it to forms and dimensions that we can understand from our life experiences. I refer, of course, to attempts at mystification that have no other motives" (p. 71). Bauer describes the paradox that lies within such an interpretation because it can sometimes be described with religious connotations. He believes that there is a need to find the balance between the unique borders of the shoah and to perceive it as a universal historic event with an existential interpretation.

We agreed that we have to foster holocaust education. The most compelling reason for studying the holocaust is to help to secure future generations from further violations of human rights, whether based on ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation or disability. As Short and Reed (2004, p. 2) claim, "At a time when many societies, culturally more diverse than ever before, are threatened by a rising tide of nationalism and xenophobia, study of the holocaust seems to deserve the highest priority." We also agreed that holocaust education is important as a means to combat holocaust denial. It is well known that much of the physical evidence of the camps was

deliberately destroyed by the Nazis in the latter stages of the war and as a result, their ideological heirs have felt free to maintain that all talk of death camps is a fiction invented by Jews for political and financial gain (ibid, p. 4).

As a daughter of holocaust survivors, who sees the consequences of the holocaust, imprinted on my father's body and soul as well as its impact upon my children's world view, I can tell you that for many years the words Nazi and German were synonymous in our private language. Polish people were included within the Nazi category, because they were all suspected of collaboration with the Nazis. Paradoxically, the visit to Auschwitz-Birkenau brought me to a site where I could attempt reconciliation with the perpetrators and the collaborators. It is perhaps the only place where such a thing could happen. We must raise awareness about the need to maintain and cultivate a culture of remembrance worldwide.

A holocaust museum, regardless of location, is a site where contesting powers and knowledge bases struggle over the ownership of its visitors' holocaust vision. The struggle is over the diverse possibilities of construction and deconstruction of the narrative (or narratives) of the shoah. This discussion begines with the museum designers who construct the message they want to convey and is accompanied and continued by the the visitors who interpret this message differently. The museum is an agent for education and socialization. Thus, according to Foucault, "any system of education is a political way of maintaining or modifying the appropriation of discourses, along with the knowledge and powers which they carry" (Foucault, 1981: 64).

A visit to the museum can also be seen as a quest for meaning and interpretation. The dialogue I had with my colleague in Auschwitz-Birkenau was a discourse of authorities and borders inspired by the sights. The museum enabled us to visualize sparks of the catastrophe, while challenging our historical perspective and competence. The ability to visualize made the discussion and our understanding of this issue more meaningful, powerful and profound.

REFERENCES

Bauer, Y. (1982). *The holocaust: Some historical aspects*. Tel Aviv: Sifriat Hapoalim [Hebrew].

Buber, M. (1958). *I and thou* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Frago, U. (1989). Jewish identity of Israeli youth, 1965-1985. *Yahadut Zmanenu (Contemporary Judaism*), 5, 259-285 [Hebrew].

Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader* (pp. 48-78). London: Routledge.

Frankl, V. E. (1963). *Man's search for meaning*. New York: Washington Square Press, Simon and Schuster.

Gross, Z. (1999). *A typology of secularism and religiosity among secular high schools in Israel*. Unpublished Ph.D. diss., Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan [Hebrew].

Hall, C. (1994). *White, male and middle class: Explorations in feminism and history.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices.* London: Sage; The Open University.

Herman, S. N. (1977). *Jewish identity: A social psychological perspective.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Levi, P. (1987). *If this is a man*. London: Abacus.

Levy, S., Levinsohn, H., & Katz, E. (2004). The many faces of Jewishness in Israel. In U. Rebhun & C. I. Waxman (Eds.), *Jews in Israel: Contemporary social and cultural patterns* (pp. 265-284). Hanover and London: Brandeis University Press / University Press of New England.

Liebman, C. S., & Don-Yehia, E. (1983). *Civil religion in Israel: Traditional Judaism and political culture in the Jewish state*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Neuberger, B. (1994). *State and religion in Israel.* Tel Aviv: The Open University [Hebrew].

Short, G., & Reed, C. A. (2004). *Issues in holocaust education.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Trigano, S. (2008). Europe is morally ready for a second holocaust. *Kivunim Hadashim, 17*, 81-95 [Hebrew].

EDUCATION AFTER GENOCIDE: THE CASE OF BOSNIA

Tine Brøndum holds a MA in the Sociology of Religion from University of Copenhagen. She currently works as head of section at the Danish Institute for International Studies, where she works with Holocaust and genocide education. This article is based on her master thesis that analysed the current politics of education in Bosnia-Herzegovina and how this politic influences the narratives on identity and belonging of Bosnian youth in Mostar.

ABSTRACT

Schools are important arenas for the development of identity, basic values and the notion of belonging. Social identities are negotiated and developed through education and interaction in schools. Due to the close relationship between education and identity, politics of education and the content of curricula can be important political tools for national identity building in multiethnic societies. This is especially true in multiethnic societies with a recent history of genocide or identity-based violence.

This article examines how education in post-genocide Bosnia-Herzegovina is influenced by the nationalistic logic of the war, and how this has resulted in three ethnically based school systems where students are divided according to ethnic or national background. Furthermore, the article shows how the Holocaust, the war in Bosnia[1] and the concept of genocide are dealt with in Bosnian history books. In conclusion, through an analysis based on fieldwork done in the multiethnic city Mostar, the article sketches out ways in which Bosnian youths are influenced by these segregated politics in the educational system.[2]

AN INSTRUMENTALIZED HISTORY

History education played a profound role in the formation of a common multiethnic identity in former Yugoslavia. As a part of the Tito slogan "Brotherhood and Unity", solidarity and political loyalty were favoured, while ethnically based conflicts in the region were censored. This was the case when teaching about the Holocaust and the immense ethnic conflicts in the Balkan area during the Second World War. Hence, teaching about those subjects was either taboo or was presented and reinvented in mythical terms.[3]

During the brake up of Yugoslavia, insecurity and nationalistic sentiments increased and a new form of extreme nationalism arose in each of the republics as the state unravelled. An important element in the nationalistic propaganda, which was especially strong in the Serbian media controlled by Slobodan Milosevic, were the atrocities in the region during the Second World War and the mythical battle of Kosovo Polje in 1389 that were invoked and commemorated as being directly connected to the contemporary conflict. Perhaps facilitated by the fact that the common public understanding of historical events in the area was rather weak, historical narratives and myths were used to develop an identity based on feelings of danger and the need for protection. The effect, according to Mary Kaldor, was, that "the Serbian public experienced a virtual war long before the real war was to take place – a virtual war, that made it difficult to distinguish truth from fiction so that war became a continuum in which the 1389 battle of Kosovo, the Second World War and the war in Bosnia were all part of the same phenomenon."[4]

WAR AND PEACE IN BOSNIA

A short outline of the war is necessary in order to understand the connection between the logic of the war and the logic of the current Bosnian educational system. The Bosnian war ran from 1992 to 1995 and was fought by the Serb dominated Yugoslavian National Army (JNA) against various paramilitary Bosniac[5] and Croat armies. In the beginning, Croat and Bosniac forces fought side by side against Serbia-dominated JNA and Bosnian Serb Army. In 1993 this balance changed, as Croat paramilitary troops

"The consequence of the Bosnian state structure is that Bosnia today holds no less than 13 ministers of education."

turned against their former allies, the Muslim Bosniac troops. During the war, atrocities were committed by each of the three ethnic groups. However, the vast majority of civilians casualties were Muslim Bosniacs.[6] The war culminated in the 1995 Srebrenica genocide, where more than 8000 Muslim Bosniacs were killed while under the protection of UN troops in the Srebrenica "safe area".

In 1994, the signing of the Washington Agreement ended the war between the Croat and Bosniac forces. This agreement established the Bosniac-Croat Federation, consisting of ten cantons, each with a clear mono-ethnic composition. Since the cantons were based on the ethnic divisions, the agreement has been widely accused of recognizing and awarding the ethnic cleansing that took place during the war. Furthermore, the agreement has served to perpetuate the power structures that grew from the war in the current administration of the federation.[7] The Dayton Peace Agreement that ended the war in 1995 also established the new state Bosnia and Herzegovina. The establishment of a Croat Bosniac federation and a Serb republic has served to make the peace and reconciliation process extremely difficult.[8] The severe problems with education can be linked back to the peace agreements, to the ethnic composition of the state and to the simple fact that education was not explicitly mentioned as a part of the peace and reconciliation process. Education has been widely neglected and left to nationalistic politics in each of the ten cantons and the mono-ethnic Serb Republic.[9]

EDUCATION IN BOSNIA TODAY

A consequence of the Bosnian state structure is that Bosnia now has 13 ministers of education. Since they each represent a certain ethno-national enclave, regional politics are dominated by a highly politicized nationalistic discourse and major differences in education exist between the three ethno-national groups. Furthermore, the system has let three different educational systems develop, in which children and youths are divided according to their ethnic group. Children from mixed marriages are forced to choose one identity.[10] This means that Bosnia's Serb, Bosniac and Croat young generations attend different schools and follow different curricula, each with pedagogical materaial designated to that specific ethno-national group. In fact, until recently several of the school books used in the Serb and Croat curricula was developed for pupils in the neighbouring countries Serbia and Croatia, and have Serbia and Croatia as their point of reference in subjects as history and geography.

The main argument for the three program school system is the three languages that have developed from the former Serbo-Croatian since 1996. The three program school system that was developed in 1996 was inspired from the Swiss bilingual school system.[11] However, the divided schools and different curricula are highly problematic because they allow nationalistic and hostile agendas to thrive.

CONTENT OF THE EDUCATION: HIDDEN MESSAGES AND INSTRUMENTALIZED WARS

Dealing with the break up of Yugoslavia and the war in Bosnia is highly sensitive and politicized throughout Bosnia today. This is reflected in Bosnian schoolbooks in two ways. Due to the controversial nature of the subject, many school books make no mention of the war in Bosnia. The recommendations from the Counsel of Europe in 2000 suggest a moratorium on teaching about the period from 1992 to 1995 until historians in Bosnia have reached a common approach towards the teaching of this period.[12] Where school books do include the subject, the war is most often described in an unbalanced way. The suffering, atrocities and actions described only reflect one group's perspective. In an analysis of seven of the most often used books, Heike Karge concludes that the war in Bosnia is present in some books through "hidden messages" even if the book does not explicitly cover the subject.[13]

While the recent war in Bosnia is left out of many Bosnian school books, all deal with the Second World War, which also is viewed very differently by the Bosnian population. It has thus become relevant to investigate the role of the Second World War and the Holocaust in these books. In many countries, Holocaust education is seen as a way to introduce human rights education to students and promote tolerance, while also serving to help prevent prevent future atrocities. A different approach seems apparent in several Bosnian school books. Here the Holocaust is described in the same hostile way as during the brake-up of Yugoslavia, narrated through detailed descriptions of mass killings, the perpetrator group and the suffering of one particular group. From this Karge concludes that the analysed books "serve the aim not of delivering a historic account, but of denouncing 'the other', the perpetrator, as a brutal enemy".[14] In the same way, he points out the existence of "hidden messages" in several of the books that relate to the term "genocide". In some of the books the term is used only with reference to the national

group to which the book is directed and without any historical explanation of the term. In other examples, references to genocide committed against European Jews by the Nazi regime are marginal or absent. Hence, Karge concludes that: "These narratives obviously are developed to serve the purpose of establishing a hierarchy of victims, whereby their own group is presented as having suffered the most from the crimes committed by the other".[15]

Since 1996, the international community has been widely involved in pushing for various reforms in the area. However, there is no minister for education at the state level, and each of the canton or republic level ministers are interested in maintaining the status quo, so adopted agreements on school book reforms and the like are not necessarily implemented.[16] This has been confirmed by the 2008 school book study, that investigated whether the history school books approved for the 2007/2008 school year met the standards formulated in the "Guidelines for writing and evaluation of history school books in BiH" from 2006. Karge concludes that only two out of seven books analyzed met the standards, and that even though notable progress has occurred in the recent years, numerous examples of hate speech and hidden messages denouncing "the other" still occurs in some of the most widely used books.[17]

THE EFFECT OF SEPARATE SCHOOL PROGRAMS ON PUPILS

While examining school books can give an indication about the messages that are being delivered in the classroom, analysing the actual effect on the students is a much more difficult task. How can one measure how education is being perceived by the pupils? Is it possible to identify the actual effect on students? Regardless of the methodological challenges, it is highly relevant to ask how Bosnian students are influenced by their education, and how lessons in "identity based" subjects such as history and religion are reflected in their thoughts on identity and belonging. While researching in the multiethnic but now highly divided city Mostar, I conducted interviews with, and collected questionnaires from, Croat and Bosniac pupils. As these students attended three different types of high schools, including the most common "mono-ethnic" schools, a "semi-integrated" gymnasium as well as the first fully integrated high school program in Bosnia, it was possible to compare student responses across the different school types and across their ethno-national groupings.[18]

The student's narratives are complex and reflect ordinary problems of youth, such as thoughts on identity, as well as concerns for the future. It must be mentioned that it is not possible to state one single source for the narratives, since the students are influenced by family, friends and society in different ways. However, tendencies in the 10 interviews and 111 questionnaires indicate certain similarities in the narratives expressed that cross national and educational boundaries.

An analysis of the student responses suggests that the differences in student perception of national and religious identity as well as their view on history are related to the school they attend. In the answers from the Croat school, the importance of separate classes, separate languages, and the differences in history are stressed. Several students in the Croat school express rather nationalistic tendencies and almost all understand the term "multicultural" as something undesirable. Some students said that they always present themselves as coming from Croatia and not from Bosnia. The majority of the students do not wish to integrate with the Bosniacs and reject the possibility of integration. As is also the case with the Bosniac mono-ethnic school, most of them rarely or never cross the river to the part of town where "the other" group lives.[19] It seems as if the ongoing division in society is something that the students live with, and have become accustomed to, without giving it much attention. Many students wish to integrate with Croatia and move on without having to worry about Bosnia's troubled past. At the Bosniac mono-ethnic school, the students do not express the same desire to move on. The students give more importance to history as a source of identity and express more interest in learning from the past. Here, just as at the Croat school, it is evident that there is a lack of interaction with "the others" that has led to a lack of knowledge and understanding of the war in the 1990's as well as the current situation.. Many do not know the facts of the war and those who do have only heard about the conflict from family or friends. Likewise, some do not know why the schools are separate, but hold strong personal opinions on the matter. As an explanation of the separation of the schools, one Bosniac respondent said "I don't know, maybe it is due to the war. Maybe the Croatians and Serbians hate us. Because *they* made this war. We didn't. *They* wanted to

> "When analysing the answers of the students, several factors points to the tendency that differences in the students perceptions on national and religious identity and in their general view on history are related to the school they attend."

take everything from us. They wanted to take all the Muslim places". After examining all the schools, it has become clear that the majority of the Bosniacs wish, unlike the Croat students, to have integrated classes and more interaction with others. These findings are supported by recent research showing that students who have been taught by the Croat curriculum have an increased tendency to develop nationalistic and exclusive attitudes. This contrasts with the students studying under the Bosniac program. Interestingly, this is also the case when Bosniac students follow the Croat curriculum. In those cases, the Bosniac students expressed stronger Bosnian nationalistic orientation than the students following the Bosniac program.[20]

The students who show the strongest wish to integrate and interact with students from the other group are the students at the integrated and international United World College, that opened in 2007 with a program for youths from all national groups. Due to the international curriculum, they use different school books than their peers and are expected to express independent thought and demonstrate critical thinking. This seems to be reflected in their responses which show an open, positive and reflexive attitude towards their relationship with their peers from the other group. Furthermore, those students are amongst the strongest voices against the separation of the schools and the general division of society. Instead, many of them express a strong belief in the integration of Bosnian schools. On another note, it is also worth mentioning that these students express strong ties to their national group and they show the strongest responses in religious affiliation. These answers indicate that school integration will not undermine national identity. This is important since it often is precisely this fear of losing national identity and national rights that serves as the main arguments in favour of separate schools.[21]

CONCLUDING REMARKS – EDUCATION TOWARDS PEACE

The immense political focus on differences and the division of the school systems has intensified and hardened the contendgin positions of the ethnic groups that developed in former Yugoslavia during the 1980's. Furthermore, the situation in the Bosnian schools creates severe problems for the future integration of younger generations. The seriousness of the present situation in Bosnia is evident. Some scholars report that the ethnic tensions between the groups are as immense today, fourteen years after the war ended, as just before the war. Several reports state that education and the segregated school system plays a significant role in this tension.

Needless to say, the war in Bosnia is of high importance for the educational situation in the country today. However, I find evidence for the fact that the war is also used as an argument for dividing the Bosnian society in order to resist future integration. Thus, the war was the culmination of an extreme nationalism and also serves as an argument for the continuation of the exact same nationalism. Following this argument, there seems to be a danger of creating a self-fulfilling argument where ethnically neutral interaction becomes impossible.

Results from my fieldwork indicate that younger generations express no reasons for disliking each other but do not find ways to interact with each other or express themselves in ethnically neutral ways. The findings from my interviews with young Bosnians stress the urgent need to neutralize this politicized area and to work more actively towards an anthropology of multiple identities that can coexist instead of being seen as mutually exclusive. One important way of obtaining these results can be through an approach to education where Holocaust education as well as teaching about the Bosnian war is used in an inclusive manner to promote tolerance, understanding and empathy instead of exclusiveness and hostility.

NOTES

1 For simplicity's sake I will use the name Bosnia as a synonym for the official name of the country, Bosnia-Herzegovina.

2 The article is based on the master thesis "separate identities. An analysis of school politics and identity in Bosnia". The thesis, written in Danish can be found at the webpage: http://diis.dk/sw29903.asp.

3 Levy 2004, 8.

4 Kaldor 2001, 39-40.

5 The term Bosniac is the official name for Bosnias Muslim population. Due to the fact that this group also includes a great number of secular Muslims, the term is in general viewed as referring to nationality and ethnicity as well as religion.

6 Weiss 2008.

7 Ficher 2006, 301. Campbell 1998, 151.

8 Kaldor 2001, 63-64, Torsti 2003, Campbell 1998.

9 Torsti 2003.

10 Karge, 2008, chapter 3. Torsti 2003.

11 Torsti 2003.

12 Karge 2008, 7.

13 Karge 2008, 27-33.

14 Karge 2008, 14.

15 Karge 2008, 15.

16 OSCE 2005, 1-5. Kaldor 2003, 169.

[17] The 7 books examined in the OSCE study are the most often used books for primary schools in both the Serb republic, and in the Croat and the Bosniac programs in the federation.

[18] Since almost al of the Serb population living in Mostar before the war left the city during or after the war, my focus was only on the Croat and Bosniac population in Mostar.

[19] Mostar is separated in two parts by the Neretva river. During the war and in the years following many inhabitants moved or fled to the other side. This means that the city today is divided in a Croat western side and a Bosniac eastern side. For many, there is almost no interaction between the two.

[20] Levi 2007.

[21] Levi 2007, Friedmann 2004.

REFERENCES

Campbell, David, National Deconstruction. *Violence, Identity, and Justice in Bosnia*. University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Freedman, Sarah Warshauer et. al., Public education and social reconstruction in Bosnia and Hercegovina and Croatia. In: Stover, Eric and Weinstein, Harvey M. (Eds.): *My Neighbor, My Enemy. Justice and Community in the Aftermath of Mass Atrocity*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Kaldor, Mary, New and Old Wars. *Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Polity, Cambridge, 2001.

Karge, Heike, *20th Century History in the Textbooks of Bosnia and Hercegovina: An analysis of books used for the final grades of primary school.* The Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research, Braunschweig, Germany 2008.

Levi, Naomi, *Learning Identity: A Structural Equation Model of Secondary School Students' State and Ethno-National Identities in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia.* 2007. (At the time of research, unpublished part of the future Ph.d. of the auther).

OSCE: "Raising Debate: Is BiH Respecting its International Commitments in the Field of Education Questions for the Citizens of BiH". OSCE, Sarajevo 2005.

OSCE: Compendium of Selected Reports on Education in Bosnia-Herzegovina 2004-2005. OSCE, Sarajevo 2005.

Torsti, Pilvi, *Divergent Stories, Convergent Attitudes. A study on the presence of history, History textbooks and the thinking of youth in post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina.* Taifuuni, Helsinki, 2003.

Weiss, Birte, Krigens arvinger. Gyldendal, København 2008.

HOLOCAUST AND GENOCIDE EDUCATION IN ISRAEL

Yair Auron is a professor in the field of genocide and contemporary Judaism at the Open University of Israel and the Kibbutzim Collage of Education. Professor Auron has published numerous essays, mainly on genocide and the impact of the Holocaust on Jewish identity in Israel and Europe. He is the Author of books in Hebrew such as *Between Paris and Jerusalem (Selected Passages of Contemporary Jewish Thought in France), Jewish-Israeli Identity, Sensitivity to World Suffering: Genocide in the 20th Century* and *We Are All German Jews: Jewish Radicals in France During the 60s and 70s* (also on French). His book The *Banality of Indifference: Zionism and the Armenian Genocide* was published in both Hebrew and English (Transaction, 2000). Auron published a book that is also part of a curriculum for The Open University of Israel, MA course, named *The Pain of Knowledge: Reflections on Teaching the Holocaust and Genocide.* The book was also published in English (Transaction, 2005), Russian and German. He is currently editing a series of twelve books entitled *Genocide* which includes theoretical volumes regarding the phenomenon of genocide, as well as the analysis of case studies such as the Holocaust, the genocide of the Gypsies, the Armenian genocide and other historical and contemporary genocides such as Rwanda, Tibet and the Indian population of the Americas. In this series, he published *Reflections on the Inconceivable: Theoretical Aspects of Genocide Studies* and the *Armenian Genocide: Forgetting and Denying*. In 2009, will be published in this series also his book *Genocide: preventing, Resistance and Rescue.* His book The Banality of Denial: Israel and the Armenian Genocide was published in Hebrew and English (Transaction 2003). Auron is the co-authored *A Perfect Injustice: Genocide and the Armenian Theft* (Transaction, 2009) with Hrayr S. Karagueuzian.
Yair Auron was born in 1945, is married and has three children.

ABSTRACT

The struggle about knowing and remembering the acts of genocide has a unique significance for the State of Israel, which is a country of people who were the victims of the Holocaust. The way in which the Holocaust and other genocides are taught in Israel is crucial and is influenced by the concept of the uniqueness of the Holocaust in world history, which is widely promoted in Israel. Two forces have led to the current attitude of the state of Israel and its leading institutions toward teaching and remembering acts of genocide other than the Holocaust. The pressure of the Turkish government against remembering and teaching the Armenian Genocide and the opposition of several high-powered Jewish-Israeli groups which are afraid that dealing with other genocides could damage the concept of the uniqueness of the Shoah.

In 1979, the Holocaust was introduced as an independent unit in high school curriculum and then, in 1981, it was introduced as a unit of the matriculation exams. In 1989, the Ministry of Education initiated a program for high school students that included a visit to Poland and the extermination camps. The program has become common in the last few years with about 25 000 high school students traveling to Poland every year.

Concerning the teaching of other occurrences of genocide in general, and the Armenian Genocide in particular, there has been practically no change over the years, at least in the official attitude; nothing is taught.

There was once an initiative to introduce teaching and remembering other genocides in the Israeli educational system but it was rejected by the Ministry of Education even though the minstry had initially supported the idea. The Ministry of Education promised that genocides would be taught but nothing has been done during the 14 years since that time. Some history teachers in high schools teach about the Armenian Genocide or other genocides, like the genocide of the Gypsies by using the rejected program. We can estimate that hundreds of high school and college students are learning in one way or another each year, since 1995, about genocides including the Armenian case.

Can an Israeli high school student learn anything about the Armenian Genocide or any other genocide through his regular textbooks?

Under these circumstances it is not surprising to discover that Israeli students possess little knowledge of other peoples' genocides. Nonetheless, the private initiatives undertaken by teachers and school directors who have decided to deal with other genocides in their schools are encouraging. Their influence is limited but it is a long-term influence. Furthermore, two university curricula are being studied in the Open University of Israel.

"The entire history of the brief 'millennial Reich' can be reread as a war against memory, an Orwellian falsification of memory, falsification of reality, negation of reality" – Primo Levi, 1986.

Education has an extremely important role in keeping historical events in the collective memory of specific groups. One of its most significant goals is the transmission of a nation's collective memory to the next generation, and it has a great influence on the crucial question of if and how a certain historical event will be remembered in the future.

The struggle about knowing and remembering the acts of genocide has a unique significance for the State of Israel, which is a country of people who were the victims of the Holocaust. Since the Holocaust plays such an important role in Jewish identity, memory and in education in Israel, it wil also be involved in this discussion. The way in which the Holocaust and other genocides are taught in Israel is crucial and is influenced by the concept of the uniqueness of the Holocaust in world history, which is widely promoted in Israel. Part of the struggle against the occurrence of any case of genocide in the future is education, so that it would "never happen again," although, surely, teaching is not enough. But the reality is, of course, much more complex.

"The terrible tragedies that befell the Jews at the hands of Nazi Germany became, historically, an important element of Jewish and Zionist education."

TEACHING HOLOCAUST IN ISRAEL

Two forces have led to the current attitude of the state of Israel and its leading institutions toward teaching and remembering acts of genocide other than the Holocaust. The pressure of the Turkish government against remembering and teaching the Armenian Genocide and the opposition of several high-powered Jewish-Israeli groups which are afraid that dealing with other genocides could damage the concept of the uniqueness of the Shoah. We will elaborate a little on the subject of Holocaust education in Israel, because it seems indispensable to understanding the attitude of the Israeli educational system towards teaching other genocides in general and the Armenian genocide in particular.

The terrible tragedies that befell the Jews at the hands of Nazi Germany became an important element of Jewish and Zionist historical education. The educational institutions of the secular Jewish community in Israel, both before and after the establishment of the State of Israel, undertook the mission of constructing "the new Jew" as a moral, conceptual and political entity. Building Israeli collective was considered, and probably was in many respects, the continuation of the struggle for survival after the Holocaust. However, the roots of Zionist educational ideologies were so ethnocentric and goal-orientated that they did not enter into the moral dilemmas of the very foundations of Zionist education. This nation building project reflected and produced a special ideological philosophy in which there was no place for essential issues, such as the rights of the Palestinians.

After the end of the Second World War, Zionist historiography used knowledge about the Holocaust to build Zionist moral education.[1] This hegemonic version of Holocaust memories became the central educative apparatus. Historical memory was mobilized for constructing the new Jew as one whose ethnocentric collective identity would be ensured by a particular historical memory, in which the term "Auschwitz" was understood as an immanent and determinist characteristic of not realizing the essence of Judaism in its modern form – namely, strong, independent and part of a Jewish sovereign national state. The obligation to remember the Holocaust that served as the justification of Zionist morality and practice, was based on the biblical word *zachor*. One context of *zachor* is that of war, be it against Pharaoh or against the *Amalek*, the implacable enemy who lived in Canaan, the Promised Land, before the exodus of Israel from Egypt. *Zachor et asher asah lecha Amalek* [remember what Amalek did unto thee] (Deuteronomy 25: 17) refers to the remembering of God's command to be devoted to His teaching in order to reach the Promised Land and to exterminate *Amalek* men, women, children and even their animals. Gur-Ze'ev claims that:

> This zachor et asher asah lecha Amalek is part of the formation of the secular halutz and sabra myth in the collective Israeli identity. The zachor, remembering of the Holocaust victims, had merged into the zachor et asher asah lecha Amalek: the victim of Nazi Germany merged into the concept of "eternal victim," seeing every "other," every goy (other people), as "Amalek." Implicitly, it means that the Amalek's just fate is to be the just fate of "the other" in days to come.[2]

Some Israeli scholars divide the history of dealing with the issue of the Holocaust in the formal educational institutions of Israel into periods according to their orientation. Ruth Firrer and Dalia Ofer make the distinction between the "Zionist Period" (1948-1977) and the "Humanistic Period," characterized by its "Humanistic Approach" (1979 to the 1990s).[3] Firrer proposed what might also be called the "intermediate incubation years" between 1961 (the Eichmann trial) and 1977, including the wars of 1967 and 1973.[4]

In 1979, the Holocaust was introduced as an independent unit in high school curriculum, and in 1981 it was introduced as a unit of the matriculation exams, thereby sanctioning its teaching to graduating classes.

The genuine participation of Israeli youth in the dialogue about the Holocaust became more meaningful in the 1980s and 1990s. The opportunities for young Israelis to engage in the shaping of this dialogue also increased as the Holocaust became a more frequent topic of reflection in Israeli cultural life and because of political changes in Eastern Europe including the collapse of the Soviet Union. In 1989, the Ministry of Education initiated a program for high school students that included a visit to Poland and the extermination camps. The program has become common in the last few years with about 25 000 high school students traveling to Poland every year and a number of studies have demonstrated the strong impact these visits have had on students' understanding of themselves and their Jewish identity.

I accept, in principal, the chronological distinction between the "Zionist period" and the "humanistic period," but I have reservations about the definition of the second period as a "humanistic period" or a "humanistic approach." Three facts should be mentioned regarding this period that reveal the ongoing Zionist oriented face of this attitude. First, the State Educational Law of 1953, which established the goals of the educational system in Israel, was changed only once, in 1980, when the Knesset decided to add the following statement: "The goal of the state educational system is to base education in the state on the consciousness and the memory of the Holocaust and heroism." The spirit of change in the State Education Law is clear; to base or to foster the consciousness and the memory of the Shoah and heroism, from a Jewish-Zionist perspective, as was the case with the law of Yad Vashem in 1953. Second, even in the "humanistic period," the Holocaust was taught, until 1999 and sometimes even later, in the framework of "Jewish history," which was separated from "general history." These aspects limit by definition the scope of the "humanistic approach." Third, the high school trips to Poland that began in the late 1980s do not foster the "humanistic approach," but rather the particularistic approach. They foster the Zionist perspective and sometimes, to a lesser degree, a Jewish perspective. The visits to Poland are perhaps the ultimate example of the goals of "teaching and mourning" colliding with each other.

Essentially, the major dilemmas facing the teaching of the Holocaust in Israel are similar to the dilemmas faced by all pedagogues in all subjects who must determine why to teach, what to teach, how to teach, what the student has to remember and how to help him to remember as well as when to teach and when to remember. In all cases, the danger lies in transforming the Holocaust into an instrument, a means, rather than an end in itself. In my opinion, the Holocaust is not over taught or excessively commemorated in Israel. Rather, it is being used for too many goals of Zionist ideology, such as renewing the sense of Zionism and Israeli pride among young Israelis. Accordingly, other Nazi victims and victims of other genocides are rarely mentioned in Israel.

Concerning teaching other occurrences of genocide in general, and the Armenian Genocide in particular, there has been practically no change over the years, at least in the official attitude. We will now turn to analyze this topic.

TEACHING ABOUT GENOCIDE IN ISRAEL

In the following paragraphs, we will describe and briefly analyze the controversies that exist regarding teaching and remembering other genocides in the Israeli educational system.

"Awareness of world suffering – Genocide in the 20th century" (subsequently referred to as A.W.S.)[5]

Genocide is a crime that we must struggle to prevent or reduce as best as we can. It is my belief that the essential first step is to learn about, and be aware of, its existence.

It was the conviction of those who prepared this study program that Israel, the national home of the Jewish people, who were the victims of the most horrendous of all genocidal acts, has a special moral and political responsibility to place the issue of genocide on the world agenda; to take part in attempts to preclude it from happening; to limit its scope when it does occur and offer aid to its casualties; to demand that the perpetrators be brought to justice and the victims be compensated for their sufferings; and to thwart the efforts of all those who attempt to deny its occurrence. First and foremost, we hold that this topic needs to be learned and discussed by young people in Israel, because the history of the Jewish people is replete with centuries of persecutions that culminated in the Holocaust. We also believe it is essential that our youths

"The genuine participation of Israeli youth in the dialogue about the Holocaust became more meaningful in the 1980s and 1990s."

develop sensitivity to the suffering of others and strengthen the universal humanistic values that are well grounded in Jewish tradition. In this sense, I personally perceive teaching the Armenian Genocide as a very important matter for Israelis as well as for the cause of the Armenians.

My proposal was, at first, warmly received in November 1993 by the ministry in Rabin's government, then controlled by a member of the Meretz Party. The proposal suggested that the program be expanded to include the genocide of the Gypsies during the Second World War and more recent cases of genocide, such as in Bosnia or Rwanda.

The panel subsequently requested that I plan a special educational program, designed for high school, seminary and college students while organizing a supplementary instructive program for teachers.[6]

The program was set to begin in mid-December 1994, with the blessing and support of the Ministry of Education. A few weeks before the program was set to commence, the director of the Pedagogical Secretariat informed the special committee, the country's highest pedagogic panel, that the Minister of Education would personally have to approve the program and that meanwhile, it would be put on hold. Later it was said that his decision would depend on the approval of the Academic Committee on History, which was scheduled to meet at the end of January 1995. When the teachers were notified, they protested and claimed it meant the cancellation of a program which they had prepared to teach, and which the pupils were to be tested on within the framework of their matriculation exams. It was then decided to have the chairman of the committee make the decision, pro tempore, until the entire committee could convene to decide the issue. In December of 1994, the chairman decided to reject the proposed program, claiming it to be flawed and that it did not meet academic standards. The official statement was that "from a professional point of view" the program was unsuitable and should be abolished immediately.[7] It should be noted that all the textbooks in Israel are under the control of the Ministry of Education, which provides an annual list of official required and supplementary books.

This time the ensuing media storm exceeded previous levels of protest. The Ministry of Education was accused of succumbing to political pressure and using a thin "fig leaf" of pedagogical reasons to justify its actions. It was argued that even if there were flaws in the program, which is to be expected from experimental programs, the course was aimed at a small test audience and should be implemented, evaluated and then corrected for future use.

Things became more apparent when the protocol of the meeting of the Academic Committee became available to the press. At the meeting held on 19 January 1995, one professor rejected the course claiming that "we do not foster sensitivity, we teach," and that the place for education of values is in the youth movements and not in the schools. The main thrust of the criticism was leveled at the presentation of the Armenian Genocide.

As a result of the criticism directed at the Ministry of Education, the minister was quick to state that although the proposed study program was rejected, a new and improved program would be prepared and taught in the following school year. As promised, instead of "Awareness of world suffering" a textbook entitled "Minorities in History – the Armenian in the Ottoman Empire" was prepared. The book did not take a stand on the question of whether or not the murders of the Armenians in the years 1915-1916 should be called 'genocide.' The two contending views on the matter were represented but the question remained open. The second program was not implemented because of the criticism it had received. The Ministry of Education promised that the second program would be corrected, but nothing has been done during the 14 years since. In 2000, the Minister of Education at the time, Yossi Sarid, promised that the Armenian Genocide and the subject of genocide would be taught however he lost his post, but not because of this public declaration.

Some high school history teachers teach about the Armenian Genocide on their own initiative when they teach the period of the First World War. Others teach "Genocide in the 20th century" as a special subject in one way or another. More than 100 students from two high schools in Kibbutzim have been taught the subject in the framework of their enlarged history courses. Some high school teachers choose to use another section of the program, the section about the Gypsies. Virtually nothing about the genocide of the Gypsies appears in the curricula of Israel, including the many textbooks and educational programs about the Holocaust.

We can estimate that hundreds of high school and college students have been learning in one way or another about genocides, including the Armenian genocide, since 1995.

"Things became more apparent when the protocol of the meeting of the Academic Committee became available to the press."

The students and their teachers have become aware of the subject, at least partly, from the public discussions about the program and the Armenian genocide.

What can an Israeli high school student learn about the Armenian Genocide through his regular textbooks? The answer is quite clear; practically nothing.

Under these circumstances, it is not surprising to discover that Isaeli students lack of knowledge of genocides that involved other groups of people. A 1996 survey about attitudes toward genocide, which was the first study conducted in Israel about the subject, clearly demonstrates this lack of knowledge. The study sample consisted of 800 B.A. students from seven universities and colleges in Israel. The students were asked about their knowledge, feelings and attitudes concerning genocide. Among other questions, they were asked to assess their knowledge of the Armenian Genocide. Forty-two percent answered that they did not have any knowledge, 44% had little knowledge, 13% had some knowledge, and 1% reported that they are well informed about it.

When asked about their knowledge of the genocide of the gypsies, their answers were quite similar. Thirty-six percent reported having no knowledge while 49% had very little knowledge, 14% possessed some knowledge, and 1% had quite a bit of knowledge about the genocide.

I have given this questionnaire during the first lesson of my course on genocide, an optional B.A.-level course, attended by approximately 650 students for each of the last ten years. The student responses have yielded similar results with 85% to 90% reporting they know nothing or very little about the genocide of the Armenians. Between 85% and 90%, also answered that they know nothing or very little about the genocide of the Gypsies.

One of the achievements of the program, from my point of view, is that students are shocked when they discover and internalize their ignorance of the Armenian Genocide. They are usually shocked when they begin to understand, even partly, why they did not know about the Armenian genocide and even more appalled when they learn about the attitude of the State of Israel towards the Armenians.

Significant changes have occurred over the years regarding Holocaust education in Israel. Practically no changes have occurred over the years in the official teaching of other genocides, and the Armenian genocide in particular. Furthermore, the formal educational system has claimed that avoiding the topic of other genocides could be defined as "innocent." After many years of struggle, which has not achieved any practical change, it is clear that the official attitude is a conscious one, that wants to affirm the uniqueness and perhaps also the exclusivity, of the Holocaust.

The chances that there will be any changes in the official educational attitude are now more remote than ever. The forces in the political system that support the humanistic approach, that includes the recognition and teaching of the Armenian Genocide, have lost their influence due, in part, to the dependency of the educational system on the political system. The failure of the Israeli academy to deal with these trends, which we analyze through a different framework is another issue.

Nonetheless, the private initiatives undertaken by teachers and school directors who have decided to deal with other genocides in their schools, are encouraging. Their influence is limited but long-term. Recently, some achievements have been made. Currently, two university curricula are being studied in the Open University of Israel. *The Pain of Knowledge: Teaching the Holocaust and Genocide in Israel and the World* has been taught since autumn 2001. The second, *Genocide*, has been taught since 2005 and includes analysis and theories of the different aspects of the genocide phenomenon, as well as case studies of the Holocaust, the genocide of the Gypsies, the Armenian Genocide, the genocides in Rwanda and Tibet as well as the case of Native Americans. Each year, about 600 students choose to take the course.

I believe that it is essential to develop greater sensitivity among Israeli youth to the suffering of others and to strengthen universal and humanistic values, which are well grounded in the best of Jewish tradition. As we have seen, the Shoah constitutes an important and central component of the Jewish identity.

However, I argue that Israel must work towards finding a more suitable balance between the Zionist, Jewish and universal lessons of the Holocaust. When teaching the Shoah and inculcating younger generations with its memory, the basic approach must be that the value of human life is the same for everybody, whether they are Jews, Gypsies, Armenians or Palestinians. The way to work towards this goal is by combining some basic principles that appear to be contradictory. Emphasizing the unique historical characteristics of the Shoah and its uniqueness for us as Jews is important but relating to the other human catastrophes and genocides is also necessary. There are no contradictions between these approaches because they represent the integration between the unique and the universal that we struggle for.

NOTES

* To more elaborate and detailed analyze see Yair Auron, The Banality of Denial – Israel and the Armenian Genocide, Transaction, New Brunswick, 2003, Chapters 6 and 7: Genocide Education in Israel and A Moralistic-Humanistic Attitude—Sarid's Statemen,2000, pp. 137-199.

[1] Illan Gur-Ze'ev, "The Morality of Acknowledging / Not Acknowledging the Others' Holocaust/Genocide," *Journal of Moral Education*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 1998, p. 164.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 165.

[3] Dalia Ofer, 1996 (op. cit.), pp. 889-890.

[4] The following paragraph is based mainly on Dalia Ofer in The World Reacts to the Holocaust, 1996, pp. 890-894, and Ruth Firer, Agents of Lessons, Tel Aviv, Hakibbutz Hmeheuhad,1989, pp. 177-187.

[5] Due to my deep personal involvement in this controversy, I will try to be exceptionally careful in presenting the events in this case (Y.A.). The following paragraph is based largely on a lecture given by Dr. Ariel Hurwitz, a member of the team that was set up to draft the program, which included also Orly Tzarfati and myself.

[6] Official protocol of the meeting held on November 11, 1993, the Ministry of Education, December 20, 1993.

[7] The Pedagogical Secretariat, Ministry of Education, December 28, 1993.

Ruth Firer, 1989 (op. cit.), p. 190.

Yad Vashem's survey, 1999 (op. cit).

✓ **YES** I would like to subscribe to ACS publications
OUI J'aimerais m'abonner aux publications de l'AEC

ACS • AEC
Association for Canadian Studies • Association d'études canadiennes

RECEIVE All new issues of **Canadian Issues** and **Canadian Diversity**
RECEVEZ Tous les nouveaux numéros de **Thèmes canadiens** et de **Diversité canadienne**

And automatically become a member of the **Association for Canadian Studies**
Et devenez automatiquement un membre de l'**Association d'étudescanadiennes**

Name/Nom : _____

Address/Adresse : _____

City/Ville : _____ Province : _____

Postal Code/Code postal : _____ Country/Pays : _____

Phone/Téléphone : _____

PAYMENT/PAIEMENT

Send with/Envoyer avec

☐ **Check/Chèque**

☐ **Visa credit card/Carte de crédit visa**

Visa Card no./N° de la carte visa :

Exp. Date/Date d'expiration :

month mois | years année

Amount/Montant : _____ $

CANADIAN ISSUES
THÈMES CANADIENS

CANADIAN DIVERSITÉ CANADIENNE

MEMBERSHIP FEES/FRAIS D'ADHÉSION

Magazine shipping included/Envoi postal des revues compris

	Canada	USA/États-Unis	International
Regular—1 year/ Régulier—1 an	$55	$90	$125
Regular—2 years / Régulier—2 ans	$100	$170	$240
Institutional/institutionnel	$90	$125	$160
Student or Retired/étudiant ou retraité	$25	$60	$95

PLEASE SEND FORM TO:

Association for Canadian Studies
1822-A Sherbrooke W, Montreal, Quebec, H3H 1E4
By fax: 514 925-3095

Or become a member through the ACS website at www.acs-aec.ca

ENVOYER FORMULAIRE À :

Association d'études canadiennes
1822-A, rue Sherbrooke O., Montréal (Québec) H3H 1E4
Par télécopieur : 514 925-3095

Ou devenez membre sur le site web de l'AEC à www.acs-aec.ca

For more information on our past and future publications, please visit us at www.acs-aec.ca

Pour plus d'informations sur nos autres publications, visitez www.acs-aec.ca