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Learning Objectives

• To provide a general background to, and current contexts of, Holocaust Education, remembrance and research
• To demonstrate the complexity in defining the Holocaust
• To discuss the different meanings of antisemitism
• To provide authors’ definitions of the Holocaust and antisemitism
• To provide an outline of the following chapters

It is now more than fifteen years since 46 government representatives, including 23 heads of state and prime ministers, attended the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust (2000), and discussed the importance of Holocaust Education, remembrance and research in the twenty-first century. Their discussions led to the Stockholm Declaration, which recognised the unprecedented nature and magnitude of the Holocaust, and that this should never be forgotten. Committed to this Declaration, the intergovernmental organisation, the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA), formerly known as the Task Force for International Co-operation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research, is committed to encouraging the political commitment of governments to support education, remembrance and research of the Holocaust and to fostering international co-operation in this area by developing multilateral partnerships amongst its member countries. Before the establishment of this organisation in 1998, the Holocaust was principally of interest to people who had obvious connections to it; the IHRA brought about a shift in expectations that conveyed the relevance and remembrance of the Holocaust to a far wider international audience.
One approach to impacting on collective memory is the establishment of an annual day of Holocaust Remembrance. Prior to the establishment of this Day, Holocaust remembrance had, since the 1950s, been principally commemorated by Jewish communities and individuals worldwide on Yom HaShoah. Established in the UK in 2000 and adopted by the United Nations in 2006, Holocaust Remembrance (or Memorial) Day, which falls on 27 January (the date, in 1945, of the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau), has contributed significantly to Holocaust Education in schools, colleges, universities and in other institutions such as prisons, libraries, and corporate organisations. Today the Holocaust is remembered and taught in a wide range of innovative and engaging ways, in different languages by people of different religions, cultures, and ethnicity. This provides sound evidence that the Stockholm Declaration’s objectives continue to be taken seriously.

Yet the politicisation of the Holocaust is not beyond criticism. For example, Peter Novick (1999) accused the US government of hypocrisy when former US President Bill Clinton spoke of the lack of help given to victims of the Holocaust, at the opening of the state-funded United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington DC in 1993, but as Head of Government did not intervene to stop the genocide of the Tutsis in Rwanda in 1994. In the UK, Mark Levene (2006) criticised the intentions of former Prime Minister Tony Blair’s decision to establish a national Holocaust Memorial Day. Levene claimed that this was an attempt to bring together shared Western values after the Cold War, conveniently avoiding the UK’s failure to prevent recent genocides and the controversies of providing financial support to genocidaires, most notably Saddam Hussein in the 1980s, when hundreds of thousands of Kurds were murdered in Iraq.

Similarly is the recognition that in the early twenty-first century while Holocaust Education and remembrance has been developing worldwide, there has been little intervention from world states and the United Nations with regard to the ongoing genocide in Darfur which, to date, has claimed the lives of some 400,000 people, and displaced nearly three million since 2003. While questioning the agendas of governments and political leaders is healthy, these agendas do not necessarily negate governmental contributions to developing Holocaust Education and remembrance. The authors’ experiences of learning about the Holocaust in Scotland in the 1960s, 70s and 80s were that it was very infrequently taught in schools. Even students who chose History as one of their subjects, and studied the Second World War, found that their programme focused on the causes of the War. Students who studied Judaism in
Religious and Moral Education programmes were more likely to learn about the Holocaust and did so, though from a religious and/or philosophical perspective, i.e. without the assurance of a historical foundation. Hence an understanding of the Holocaust for generations of young Scots was heavily reliant on individual personal interest that occurred outside schools. We, the authors, therefore share the Holocaust historian Yehuda Bauer’s view (2002) that the contribution of politicians to the Holocaust Education effort is necessary. In the UK, governmental support in the form of subsidising the national Holocaust Memorial Day ceremony and resources for schools and wider communities to support this (see for example DfEE, 2000; LTS, 2000, 2002b; Gathering the Voices, 2012) has impacted on Holocaust Education and remembrance across the country. Our research findings demonstrate that Holocaust Education has the potential to impact on young people’s values and attitudes towards minority groups (Maitles et al., 2006). Today’s young people are tomorrow’s politicians and government officials. It is possible that by applying an open and engaging attitude to Holocaust Education, the next generation of politicians and government officials will be better equipped than their predecessors to address topics of prejudice and genocide.

The Process of the Holocaust

It is now more than seventy years since the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau, a place that was inconceivable eighty years ago but today has become synonymous with evil and the worst example of man’s inhumanity to man. Archive footage and images of the Holocaust are hard for people, irrespective of their age and/or heritage, to digest. Similarly, words such as annihilation and extermination may not be commonly referred to on Holocaust Remembrance Day, or in a classroom, yet are important in understanding the destructive process of European Jewry.

Hilberg (1985) categorised six sequential stages of the Holocaust process:

1. definition
2. expropriation
3. ghettoisation
4. mobile killing units
5. deportation
6. death camps

The definition of Jews was achieved through the Nuremberg Laws (1935) which deprived German Jews of their citizenship. Prior to this, antisemitic
legislation had been passed (1933–34) in Germany restricting the number of Jewish students in German schools and universities, and Jews from working in the medical and legal professions. Also, confiscation of Jewish property and possessions began at this time and continued until 1945. Although Jews were forced to emigrate, expansion of the Third Reich in central and western Europe, and the unwillingness of countries to open their doors to Jews, together with immigration policies that did not allow massive immigration to Palestine, meant that they found it increasingly difficult to leave Germany and German-occupied countries. Jews were initially deported to ghettos as an interim arrangement before their deportation to camps. One year before the discussion and finalising of the ‘The Final Solution of the Jewish Question’ at the Wannsee Conference (1942), the systematic annihilation of Jews had already begun, with mobile killing units, the Einsatzgruppen, murdering more than 1.3 million Jews in the newly German-occupied Soviet Union. As effective and efficient instruments of the ‘Final Solution’, the death camps were killing factories that were designed to exterminate Jews. They were fitted with gas chambers and crematoria, and employed techniques of mass production. It is worth noting that commanders of the Einsatzgruppen included Dr Otto Rasch, an intellectual with two PhDs, an economist and lawyer, Otto Ohlendorf, and that Dr Josef Mengele (who had a PhD in physical anthropology in addition to an MD) was one of 23 German doctors at Auschwitz. This summary serves to highlight the unprecedented nature of the Holocaust.

The above summary explains the following question that we were asked after presenting a paper at a national educational research conference on senior school students’ responses to visiting the camps at Auschwitz. One member in the audience commented that the questions in our research about the impact of the visit on students’ understanding of the Holocaust, genocide, the Second World War and human rights were deeply flawed as ‘understanding’ was too subjective. He explained that irrespective of what he read, or what he saw, because of its complexity, he could never really understand the Holocaust. He claimed that if he could not understand this, how can we, or anyone else, expect school students to do so? We argued then, as we do so in this book, that it is precisely because of the complex nature of the Holocaust, this ‘ungraspable nature of the Holocaust’ that Ruth Gilbert refers to (Gilbert, 2010), that not only should teenagers study the Holocaust in their junior and senior years, but that Holocaust learning should also begin at primary school. We also argued that the Holocaust is not the only complex area of learning in a school’s curriculum. Teachers may consider child obesity, and the current treatment and plight of refugees, to be equally difficult to understand. While we are resolute in this issue, it is worth reflecting
that if this audience member is correct, then what can the purpose of Holocaust Education and remembrance possibly be?

The Holocaust led to the adoption of the term ‘genocide’ (1944), the UN General Assembly’s declaration of genocide as a crime under international law (1946), the UN Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948), and the establishment of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (1950). Our opinion is that Holocaust Education and Holocaust remembrance can help learners, young and old, understand the past, as well as contribute to their understanding of the historical event that has become known as the Holocaust. While it is inappropriate for young learners to study each of Hilberg’s stages, we consider that teachers should have this understanding and that it should inform their teaching. Feedback that we have received from teachers suggests that teacher knowledge and pedagogy are serious barriers to teaching the Holocaust. As the title of this book suggests, our focus is on teacher pedagogies and practice. Readers who would like to develop their knowledge of the Holocaust should refer to our suggested Further Reading texts at the end of this chapter.

Defining the Holocaust

The literal meaning of the word ‘holocaust’, a ‘burnt offering’ or a ‘sacrifice by fire’, is problematic, as these biblical connotations suggest that the genocide of the Jews, under Nazi rule in what has become known as the Holocaust, was a sacrifice, which it clearly was not. A sacrifice can be a loss of something one gives up usually for the sake of a better cause. The connotation that the murder of European Jews could be explained by achieving a ‘greater good’, or a better society, is repugnant. This is one reason why the word ‘Shoah’ is often preferred, and has been adopted in several countries such as Israel and France. Meaning ‘catastrophe’, this word conveys a sense of the horror and devastation that ensued. Yet the murder of European Jews was not a catastrophe in that it was not a natural occurrence, a tsunami or an earthquake, that humans could not foresee or control. This man-made catastrophe could have been prevented. We (the authors) will adopt the usage of the capitalised word ‘Holocaust’ as this is the word that is commonly used in the UK, where Holocaust (not Shoah) Memorial Day is annually commemorated, and where the Holocaust (not the Shoah) is included in the school curriculum in England.

The central aim of this book, as its title suggests, is to support teachers and educators in their teaching of the Holocaust in schools. One of the
first pieces of advice offered by the IHRA to teachers is to ‘define the term Holocaust’ (IHRA, n.d.), yet this presents challenges as definitions are influenced by cultural and historical narratives. While the Holocaust was a catastrophe for Jews, it is also considered by many Muslims, and in particular Arab Muslims, as a catastrophe for Palestinians, which they call the Nakba. Many Palestinians consider that the Holocaust led to the displacement of nearly one million Palestinians as a result of the United Nations approving the establishment of the State of Israel in 1947 (Werbner, 2009). Other historical sources provide different definitions.

The IHRA provide the following two definitions on their website.

**Definition 1**
The Holocaust refers to a specific genocidal event in twentieth-century history: the state-sponsored, systematic persecution and annihilation of European Jewry by Nazi Germany and its collaborators between 1933 and 1945. Jews were the primary victims – 6 million were murdered; Gypsies, the handicapped, and Poles were also targeted for destruction or decimation for racial, ethnic, or national reasons. Millions more, including homosexuals, Jehovah’s Witnesses, Soviet prisoners of war, and political dissidents, also suffered grievous oppression and death under Nazi tyranny.

(From the Imperial War Museum, London)

**Definition 2**
The Holocaust was the murder of approximately six million Jews by the Nazis and their collaborators. Between the German invasion of the Soviet Union in the summer of 1941 and the end of the war in Europe in May 1945, Nazi Germany and its accomplices strove to murder every Jew under their domination. Because Nazi discrimination against the Jews began with Hitler’s accession to power in January 1933, many historians consider this the start of the Holocaust era. The Jews were not the only victims of Hitler’s regime, but they were the only group that the Nazis sought to destroy entirely.

(From the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, DC, USA)

It is hardly surprising that these definitions are strikingly similar as they are both historically accurate. They agree that the year when the Holocaust began was 1933: not 1939 when the Second World War began; not 1941 when the mobile killing squads began wiping out entire Jewish communities; and not 1942 when the implementation of the Final Solution was agreed. The above definitions also agree on the number of Jews murdered, acknowledge that the perpetrators or victimisers were Nazis (or Nazi Germany) and their collaborators, and that Jews were the
primary victims. Aside from obvious age-appropriateness issues in teaching this to young learners which can be challenging for teachers, there are significant differences between these definitions.

Definition 1 identifies the main groups of people who were targeted by the Nazis and their collaborators; definition 2 acknowledges the murder of other groups of peoples but only names the Jews. This clearly emphasises the distinctive treatment of the Jews, although some may consider that this marginalises the treatment meted out to many other victims. Definition 1 also includes the term ‘state sponsored’ to emphasise that such actions and behaviour were national policy. Another difference is their conveying the genocidal nature of the event. In definition 1 this is the first feature of the Holocaust to be brought to the reader’s attention, and the point is made explicitly. In contrast, this point is made at the end of definition 2 where the genocidal nature is described but not labelled as such. Of the two, we prefer Definition 1 as we consider Jews to be the major victims of the Holocaust and that the systematic and barbaric way in which they were treated is crucial to understanding and teaching the Holocaust. This does not diminish the persecution and murder of other groups of victims but serves to understand the tragedy of what has become known as the Holocaust.

One aspect of the Holocaust which is overlooked in Definition 1, and not as well documented as the Jewish genocide, is the genocide of the Roma and Sinti (sometimes referred to by others as Gypsies). Also referred to as The Forgotten Genocide, it has taken decades for this genocide, also known as Porajmos, to be recognised, with scholarly estimates of 220,000–500,000 Romani people murdered. The nature of this genocide, like all genocides, was distinctive but similar to that of the Jews: they were systematically persecuted when the National Socialists came to power in 1933; defined by the Nuremberg laws in 1935 as ‘enemies of the race-based state’, and murdered in the gas chambers alongside Jews in death camps such as Auschwitz. The other group who were systematically murdered were children and adults with mental and/or physical disabilities. This was the Nazis’ first programme of mass murder which began in 1939, and though officially stopped in 1941 due to protests by the Catholic Church and victims’ parents, continued in secret. It is estimated that 200,000 people were murdered through this programme of euthanasia which was known as ‘T4’. For these reasons, the definition of the Holocaust that we adopt in this book is not identical to Definition 1, as our definition includes recognition of the genocide of the Roma and Sinti and the systematic murder of the disabled.

Another aspect is that the Holocaust was not an exclusively European tragedy. While not included in the above definitions, hundreds of thousands
of Jews living under colonial rule in North Africa were also victims of the Nazis. At that time, 400,000 Jews lived in Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia under the Vichy regime, and 30,000 Jews lived in Fascist Italian-controlled Libya. Of these, Tunisia was the only country to be Nazi occupied. Because Morocco was a protectorate and not a colony of France whose citizens were not considered to be French citizens, the implementation of anti-Jewish laws was not as extreme there as it had been in Algeria. Algerian Jews were stripped of their rights, lost their jobs, expelled from schools, and required to wear a distinguishing mark: approximately 2,000 Algerian Jews were sent to labour and concentration camps in Algeria; 2,100 Moroccan Jews were sent to work camps in Morocco; and around 5,000 Tunisian Jews were sent to labour camps in Tunisia. In Libya, anti-Jewish laws had been enforced since 1938. Thousands of Libyan Jews were sent to concentration camps in Libya and camps in Europe, most to Bergen-Belsen. Hence thousands of North African Jews died from hunger, punishment, exhaustion and disease in labour and concentration camps that were not on European soil.

It is clear from evidence from previous research (Russell, 2006; HEDP, 2009) that many teachers’ definitions are quite different from the ones we have presented, and there is a lack of consensus amongst teachers as to what they perceive to be the Holocaust. In a study carried out by the Holocaust Education Development Programme (renamed the Centre for Holocaust Education in 2012) into teaching the Holocaust in English secondary schools, teachers were presented with a list of seven statements about the Holocaust and asked to select one that best presented their understanding. More than 50% of the teacher respondents (n = 1,976), indicated that the definition which reflected their understanding was significantly different from both the definitions we have presented. The definition that they selected was as follows:

The Holocaust was the persecution and murder of a range of victims perpetrated by the Nazi regime and its collaborators. They were targeted for different reasons and were persecuted in different ways. Victims included Jews, Gypsies, disabled people, Poles, Slavs, homosexuals, Jehovah’s Witnesses, Soviet prisoners of war, Black people, and other political and ethnic groups. (HEDP, 2009: 65)

This suggests that there is a difference between teachers’ popular perceptions of the Holocaust and its historical definitions. We carried out a similar online exercise with our Professional Graduate Primary and Secondary teachers (n = 200) and their views were remarkably similar to those in the HEDP findings. Although several students understood the specific targeting of the Jewish people in the Holocaust, they considered the inclusion and acknowledgement of every group who were persecuted by the Nazis and
their collaborators as vitally important. What we consider as worrying is that many teachers do not regard Nazi policy towards the Jews as substantively different from that for the other groups of people. We consider the distinctive treatment of the Jews to be fundamental to understanding the Holocaust, and are concerned as to the impact that the above perception has on school-based Holocaust Education.

Before the success of Amazon and online shopping, if you wanted to buy a book on the Holocaust in a bookshop in my home town in Scotland, it was located under Jewish History or Jewish Studies and not European History or Second World War (Cowan, 1994). While today there are fewer bookshops on the high street, it is accepted that Holocaust literature is not exclusively about Jews or Jewish history. Yet if the common understanding of the Holocaust is that Jews suffered in the same manner as other groups of people such as homosexuals, communists or Jehovah’s Witnesses, then fundamental truths of the Holocaust are being ignored.

Our students were able to read each other’s comments and saw that some had changed their initial views after reading more about the Holocaust and discussions with their peers. The following comment highlights other factors that impact on teachers’ understandings of the Holocaust:

‘The thing that I cannot get away from is that I see the views of each post and can understand why they [each of the different definitions] are believed by other people – it truly depends on the society you live in, and your own links or experiences with the Holocaust.’

One example of this is the United Kingdom, where in 1945, when the concentration and death camps were liberated, there were few explicit references in broadcasts, newsreels or press articles towards the Jews. It is worth noting that the BBC refused to use leading broadcaster Richard Dimbleby’s script in his report from Bergen-Belsen as it referred ‘explicitly to the Jewishness of the victims’ (Kushner, 2006: 193), yet two-thirds of the survivors at this camp were Jewish. In more recent times, the destruction of the Jews during the Holocaust has been deliberately ignored in Soviet historiography (Dumitru, 2008). One-quarter of the six million Jews murdered in the Holocaust were on Soviet territory, yet the Holocaust was not regarded as a special phenomenon, and it was not until perestroika in the 1980s ‘that the Holocaust gained attention among historians and other scholars’ (Dumitru, 2008: 52). This explains why the victims of the Holocaust in Latvia were usually referred to as ‘Soviet civilians’ prior to its independence in 1991, thereby carefully omitting the antisemitic nature of the Holocaust. Competing perspectives of Holocaust remembrance will be discussed later in this book. These examples also demonstrate how time is a factor that impacts on one’s understanding and definition of the Holocaust.
The word Holocaust is sometimes used as a general term for all the atrocities perpetrated by the Nazis and their collaborators. We consider this to be a misuse of the term ‘Holocaust’, as its lack of recognition of the fundamental truths of the Holocaust is disrespectful to the victims, to the horrors of antisemitism, racism and genocide, and indeed to history. This misuse may be a naïve consequence of over-simplifying the Holocaust, with educators exclusively focusing on universal lessons of tolerance, diversity and humanity that have general appeal, and ignoring the unique lessons of Holocaust history. Another example of its misuse is the term ‘Bombing Holocaust’ (in German, Bomben-Holocaust) that refers to the Allied bombing of Dresden in the Second World War in 1945. This term obfuscates the meaning of the Holocaust as it suggests that the bombing of Dresden was part of the Holocaust and that German civilians were the principal victims of this.

Further misuses of the word include its highlighting and sensationalising singular issues, unrelated to the Second World War or Nazi ideology, which are regarded by some to be evil: for example, Holocaust on Your Plate, a (2003) campaign organised by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), which compared modern agricultural practices and eating meat to the Holocaust; and an anti-abortion group, Survivors of the Abortion Holocaust, whose name arouses people’s attention. These misuses are offensive to the victims of the Holocaust and the families of those victims. They also trivialise the magnitude, horror and heroism of the Holocaust, and challenge the unprecedented nature of its character.

It is now two years since four Jewish people were shot dead and fifteen others held hostage in the Hyper Cacher kosher deli in Paris, and after the copycat murder where one Jewish man was shot outside a synagogue in Copenhagen. In the UK, 2015 began with a heightened realisation that antisemitism in Europe was not restricted to mainland Europe and was a subject of focus in the media. For the first time in our lifetime, in the UK, antisemitism dominated the headlines of television and radio news, was a topic for phone-in discussion programmes and the leader article in some newspapers, and featured in magazines. This interest was additionally sparked by the publication of two reports on antisemitism in the UK. The first was the Annual Antisemitism Barometer (Campaign Against Antisemitism [CAA], 2015) which reported the results of a survey on people’s attitudes towards British Jews; the second was The All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism (All-Party Parliamentary Group Against Antisemitism [APPGAA], 2015) which included a review of the state of antisemitism in the UK.

Both the above reports included references to the Holocaust in the reviews and analysis of their findings. In the first report, which contained data from more than 3,000 participants, one of the findings was that 13%
believed that ‘Jews talk about the Holocaust too much in order to get sympathy’ (CAA, 2015: 4). The second report provided an insight into the contribution of social media on antisemitism, one example being the Twitter hashtag ‘Hitler was right’. Other examples of the link between current antisemitism and the Holocaust in 2015 were the daubing of Jewish cemeteries with swastikas and the decision by two cultural institutions in Iran, the House of Cartoon and the Sarcheshmeh Cultural Complex, to hold their second Holocaust International Cartoon Contest, a prizewinning competition that satirises the genocide of the Jews.

**Defining Antisemitism**

At this point it is important to clarify our meaning of the word antisemitism as the origins of this word can obscure its true, though not universally accepted, meaning. Its biblical origin comes from the the Book of Genesis where ‘semites’ were the descendants of Shem (the second of Noah’s three sons) who was an ancestor of Salah; linguistically, the Semitic category of languages includes several languages such as Hebrew and Arabic. It follows then that ‘Semites’ are then not exclusively Jews, and ‘antisemitism’ can refer to hatred of or hostility towards all Semites, which includes Jews, Arabs and other peoples. We, the authors of this book, do not subscribe to this meaning as there is no such thing as ‘Semitism’, and the only group of people who have ever been included in the hatred and prejudice denoted by antisemitism are Jews. Cowan has previously recognised that the coining of the word antisemitism has been attributed to Wilhelm Marr (1819–1904) by naming his organisation ‘The League of Anti-Semites’ (Cowan in Cowan and Maitles, 2012). Marr used the word *antisemitism* to clearly distinguish between the historical religious hatred towards Jews, and a new racial hatred, in the late nineteenth century, that was emerging towards this same group of people. We have therefore adopted the meaning of antisemitism as a certain perception of Jews which can be expressed by a hatred of, hostility towards, or discrimination against, Jews. This definition is similar to definitions in the Oxford and Merriam-Webster dictionaries, and the working definition used by the European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC).

In addition, because inserting a hyphen in the spelling of antisemitism (i.e. anti-Semitism = opposing or being against Semitism) reinforces the notion of ‘Semitism’, which unlike racism in ‘anti-racism’ and sectarianism in ‘anti-sectarianism’ as stated above does not exist, ‘antisemitism’ is consistently unhyphenated in this book. It follows that those who do not recognise this definition of antisemitism will have difficulties in engaging with Holocaust Education, as Nazi antisemitism was directed exclusively at Jews.
Outline of this Book

Holocaust Education is not universal and the research and experiences that we refer to in this book are predominantly from English-speaking countries, Europe and Israel. We hope that it will be of interest and relevance to teachers and educators from the above countries where Holocaust Education is well established, as well as teachers and educators from countries in Europe, South East Asia, South America, Africa and India, where Holocaust Education is in its infancy. It aims to inform readers of the development of Holocaust Education in the contexts of today’s world and broaden readers’ understanding of the Holocaust as a controversial issue. It focuses on a number of issues in Holocaust Education that are being discussed in today's primary and secondary schools. These issues include curricular considerations relating to the contribution of Holocaust Education, principally within History, Citizenship Education, and Religious and Moral Education, and pedagogical approaches such as the use of survivor testimony, role play, fiction, visits to memorial sites and interdisciplinary learning.

We have inserted learning objectives at the beginning of each chapter to provide readers with clear expectations as to their content and structure, and suggested Further Reading for readers’ interest. Chapters 1–5 focus on theoretical issues; Chapters 6–11 focus on pedagogical and practical issues. We hope that this book will prove useful to teachers and educators who have experience of teaching the Holocaust, to those who have recently entered the teaching profession, to student teachers who plan to teach the Holocaust, to other educators in the wider community who include the Holocaust in their educational programmes, and to international educators and academics who plan teaching programmes or conduct research in this area.

This introductory chapter has provided a background context for these forthcoming issues, as clarity on the meanings of ‘Holocaust’ and ‘antisemitism’ is essential in understanding and teaching Holocaust Education. It follows that clarity as to the meaning of Holocaust Education is similarly important, and Chapter 2 discusses the difficulties in defining this and attempts to provide readers with a suitable definition. This identifies the lessons of learning about the Holocaust and learning from the Holocaust. Chapter 3 focuses on the connection between Citizenship and Holocaust Education by examining ways in which Holocaust teaching can contribute to citizenship values. This considers the lessons from sociology and psychology about the circumstances in which perpetrators, bystanders and rescuers were found.
Although this introductory chapter defines antisemitism, this is developed further in Chapter 4 where the authors consider the contribution of teaching about antisemitism in school-based Holocaust Education. As a means of supporting teachers in their understanding of Nazi antisemitism, the chapter provides a summary of the history of antisemitism. It also identifies various forms of antisemitism and includes expressions of antisemitism that have recently emerged.

Chapter 5 focuses on the collective memory of the Holocaust. While this has expanded in many ways in recent years, it cannot be taken for granted. This chapter identifies competing perspectives on Holocaust remembrance in Europe, and the alternative forms of Holocaust remembrance. It also discusses the challenges of Holocaust commemoration in primary and secondary schools.

Chapters 6–8 focus on broad teaching approaches. Chapter 6 identifies and explains key words in Holocaust Education and discusses the importance of political and emotional literacy; Chapter 7 examines teaching pedagogies that assist in effective Holocaust teaching and recognises ways in which teachers can address the diverse needs of their students; Chapter 8 justifies teaching the Holocaust to students in the upper stages of primary school and provides teachers with support and themes that are suitable for these students.

Chapter 9 focuses on classroom teaching approaches. It explores issues that accompany the use of literature, role play and simulations, and online survivor testimony in Holocaust Education. Chapter 10 focuses on school visits to the Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial and Museum. It discusses the rationale for such visits, and analyses the educational experience provided at the museum.

Chapter 11 summarises the development of Holocaust Education and discusses the legacy of the Holocaust. This concluding chapter also explores the challenges for Holocaust educators, and provides a glimpse into the future by presenting student teachers’ responses as regards addressing intolerance in schools and learning about the Holocaust.

The word Holocaust has dark connotations, and this alone explains why teachers who are not required to teach it will never engage in Holocaust Education. Unfortunately this book cannot remove this darkness. We consider historical content to be at the core of effective Holocaust Education, and hence teachers and educators are required to be true to historical events and the process of the Holocaust. This book provides constructive and practical advice for those who are willing to rise to the challenge, and informs readers of the developments in Holocaust Education in today’s ever-changing world.
Further Reading