



12-2007

“Because It Happened Here”: Holocaust Education in Contemporary Poland

April Marie Crabtree

University of Tennessee - Knoxville

Recommended Citation

Crabtree, April Marie, “Because It Happened Here”: Holocaust Education in Contemporary Poland. " Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 2007.

https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes/114

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by April Marie Crabtree entitled "'Because It Happened Here': Holocaust Education in Contemporary Poland." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Instructional Technology and Educational Studies.

Diana Moyer, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Barbara Thayer-Bacon, Janice Harper

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by April Marie Crabtree entitled “‘Because It Happened Here’: Holocaust Education in Poland”. I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Instructional Technology and Educational Studies.

Diana Moyer, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Barbara Thayer-Bacon

Janice Harper

Acceptance for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records)

“Because It Happened Here”: Holocaust Education in Contemporary Poland

A Thesis Presented for the Master of Science Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

April Crabtree

December 2007

DEDICATION

W pamięci...

... Doktora Janusza Korczaka i jego dzieci,

... Powstańców w gettach i lasach,

... Ratowników,

... Przeżyjących,

... i sześciu milionów bez nazwy.

In memory of...

...Dr. Janusz Korczak and his children

...Resisters in the ghettos and forests

...Rescuers

...Survivors

...and six million without a name.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A number of people and institutions have been invaluable in the research and writing of this thesis. I would like to thank the members of my thesis committee, Dr. Diana Moyer, Dr. Barbara Thayer-Bacon, and Dr. Janice Harper, for their support in all phases of this project. Without the guidance of Piotr Trojński with Akademia Pedagogiczna, I would not have had the inspiration to begin or complete this work. The university and his personal support were instrumental in completing my research while in Poland. I would also like to thank Jaime Ashworth and Karolina Komorowska for their last minute translations and support during the fieldwork phase of this research as well as the Galicia Jewish Museum in Kraków for being a center of focus for the various phases of my research project. This project would not have been possible without the generous funding of the Fulbright Fellowship Program who afforded me this experience. However, it is to the teachers and students of Poland that I am most grateful for their patience and participation in this research. To everyone, you have my enduring gratitude.

ABSTRACT

Each year, we move away from the Holocaust as active history. On each subsequent anniversary, we carefully repackage this atrocity in history with claims of ‘never again’ or ‘remember.’ The focus on this past should be crucial to our actions in the present and important to our future. One of the biggest questions asked has been ‘what have we learned?’

As students today grow further and further away from the Holocaust era, it remains to be seen if these lessons in humanity and inhumanity will simply fade away. With the danger of the Holocaust falling solely into history textbooks, Poland has instituted compulsory Holocaust Education to promote the teaching of this material. Yet, the lessons from this period in history extend beyond a glance into the past into an understanding of changing human obligations. The hope is that Poland’s efforts in Holocaust Education will build upon values and ideas that seek to integrate human beings on similar, simpler levels. Ultimately, the goal of Holocaust Education is not to teach about the period of history from 1933 to 1945. The aim is to instruct and critically examine the implications of hate and intolerance.

Based on fieldwork in Poland, this research explores the current teaching strategies and attitudes toward Holocaust Education. This thesis will discuss aspects of the educational evolution of Holocaust Education with a special emphasis on how teachers are teaching the subject. Using a survey of 155 Polish teachers, this project looks at what teachers are teaching about the Holocaust, what they hope students gain from learning about the subject, and why they teach it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 1 |
| Statement of Research Purpose/Problem | 1 |
| Personal Statement..... | 3 |
| Chapter 2: Contextualizing Holocaust Education | 5 |
| Teaching about the Holocaust..... | 5 |
| Curriculum Theory and the Holocaust..... | 8 |
| Pedagogical Concerns..... | 10 |
| Holocaust Education Research | 11 |
| Chapter 3: Holocaust Education in Poland..... | 22 |
| Chapter 4: Research Design and Methodology..... | 33 |
| Research Design..... | 33 |
| Methodology | 34 |
| Survey Design..... | 40 |
| Site Selection and Access | 43 |
| Data Analysis | 44 |
| Ethnographic Sketch of the Setting..... | 44 |
| Chapter 5: Teacher Surveys | 47 |
| Profile of the Population | 47 |
| Thematic Coverage | 47 |
| Background Information Taught..... | 47 |
| 1939-1945 Subjects Taught | 48 |
| Poland and the Holocaust..... | 49 |
| Discussion..... | 49 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Ranking Importance..... | 51 |
| Comparisons | 51 |
| Student Gains | 52 |
| Why Teach about the Holocaust? | 53 |
| Teacher Trainings | 55 |
| Chapter 6: Recommendations and Conclusion..... | 57 |
| Recommendations and Reflections..... | 57 |
| Conclusion | 59 |
| Bibliography | 61 |
| Appendix..... | 71 |
| Ankieta dla Nauczycieli (Teacher Survey)..... | 72 |
| English Version of Teacher Survey | 77 |
| Vita | 81 |

Chapter 1: Introduction

Personal Statement

“There’s a hole in the heart of Poland,” says one. “I can’t put my finger on it, but there just seems to be something missing,” voices another. Still more say, “It seems there is a void here, one that was once filled but is now so deep and engulfing.” It is the same no matter who you speak to about it. You can walk the streets of Kraków and see hundreds of people. Even in Kazimierz, the former Jewish heart of Kraków, you are never truly alone. You can sit on Szeroka Street, surrounded by the kitsch of an invented Jewish past. Restaurants and shops abound, staking their own claim to Kraków’s Jewish past. Hundreds of tourists pour through Kazimierz in the summer from all across the world trying to capture a glimpse into 1938 Poland. Some seem to be able to find it, some look hopelessly disappointed, but despite their best efforts to find something tangible to hang on to, there is nothing there but whispers and shadows.

Yet, at the same time, these shadows do have a form, in the tiny, struggling Jewish community of Kraków. From time to time, you can see pious Jews wandering into Remuh Synagogue on a Friday evening, and if you look carefully, you might even be able to find a bit of the real Jewish past of Kraków. There is never truly emptiness in the physical sense in Kazimierz; there always seems to be people about, walking, talking, laughing. But when the warm weather ends, the last of the tourists disappear, leaving Kazimierz and Kraków to the Poles once again. You still see people about, on their way to work or to meet with friends. Some people see what they want to see, find what they want to find in Kraków. I talked to some tourists who are still looking to find 1938

Kraków, pious Jews with side curls or synagogues with the beadle tidying up the sidewalk. Yet most of what they find is created because what they are looking for vanished sixty years ago in a maelstrom.

When I came to Poland in September 2004, I came bound with my own biases and suspicions, with my own baggage. I could not see myself in Poland or Europe, finding no place for myself there other than objective researcher. It would be easy, I thought, to distance myself from the task at hand, to research Holocaust Education in Poland. As I look back now, I realize how foolish that was to think I could remain so distanced, in so many ways. I am deeply bound to the subject that I study, to the people's memory I hope to sustain, and I also became deeply entwined with the lives of the Poles living out the attempt to resurrect and preserve the memory of a forgotten Polish-Jewish past. I swayed from casual disregard of the Polish legacy during the Holocaust to anger over the seeming neglect of Polish history in the new Holocaust narrative, finally finding a place somewhere in the middle. I am not objective; I never was.

However, it was my subjectivity that allowed me to probe in a different way, a deeper, richer way than objectivity might allow. As an almost complete outsider to Poland, culturally and religiously, I was able to look at the workings of a relatively homogenous society in their dealings with the phenomenon of study. In this way, my specific interests, my personal directives, and my own beliefs allowed me to see the ordinary workings of the culture in a vastly different way. From something as simple as using the Mogen David as the 'o' in the Cracovia soccer team graffiti or being instructed on the 'secret Jewish names' of high ranking Polish political figures, I was in a unique

position of inquiry and discovery which may not have been afforded someone else.

Statement of Research Purpose/Problem

Historical representation in teaching about the Holocaust has been a central concern in the Polish educational system over the past fifteen years. During communism, the narrative of the Holocaust was written to reflect a propaganda campaign against the West and solidify a mindset amongst Poles, concretizing a victimhood of Polish suffering under Nazi oppression. The identities of Jews and other victims of Nazism were suppressed and educational policy reflected a whitewash of history written by the Soviet victors in Eastern Europe. However, after the fall of the Iron Curtain, the history of World War II and the Holocaust were subject to close scrutiny and the identities of those other victims resurfaced and had to be rewritten into the Holocaust narrative. To further complicate an already delicate situation, Poles also had to face their own complicity in the Holocaust past as perpetrators and bystanders.

The past fifteen years have proven tumultuous as Poland has sought to rewrite their history with a more complete and balanced portrait of the Holocaust narrative. Preliminary research on Holocaust knowledge in Poland has shown that much headway has been made in transforming the social consciousness and knowledge base of Poles in regards to their own history (Freeman & Kucia 2001; Kucia 2001; Kucia 2002). However, the problem is more complex as teachers must relearn their own history in order to be able to pass on that knowledge to students. The reforms must take place at institutional levels but must extend throughout the schools with teachers willing to

relearn and pass on knowledge denied them as students themselves.

Today, Poland is one of the few nations with mandatory Holocaust Education and has chaired the International Task Force on Holocaust Education (Task Force). The changes in Poland have been rapid, but have they been successful? Can history be rewritten so quickly? Can those lost victims find their places, be remembered as easily as they had been forgotten? How can Holocaust Education go from being an item of historical disregard to one of such national importance? All of these questions form the impetus for my investigation into the issues of Holocaust Education in Poland in its broadest sense.

The central research question asks: what are teachers teaching about the Holocaust in contemporary Poland? Much has been written on Holocaust Education – pedagogically, as a moral tool, and even from the specific perspective of Poland. We do not yet know how teachers engage students with the material, what they choose to include or exclude, and how they present students with the historical data and in what ways. A place exists for qualitative research focusing specifically on teachers work with students. What this research proposes is an investigation of teacher practices in Holocaust Education. This study examines how teachers have incorporated new information into their curriculum by way of an expanded survey focusing on three central questions:

This project seeks to answer three central questions:

1. How has Holocaust Education changed in Poland?
2. What are teachers teaching in the classroom?
3. Why do teachers teach about the Holocaust?

Chapter 2: Contextualizing Holocaust Education

Educators supporting Holocaust Education generally appear from two camps. The first are those who purport that learning history is an end unto itself. Yet, the lessons from this period in history extend beyond a glance at the past into an understanding of changing human obligations and negligence. The second camp hopes that Holocaust Education will build upon values and ideas that integrate human beings on similar, simpler levels. Ultimately, the aim of Holocaust Education is to instruct and critically examine the implications of hate and intolerance. With character education as motivation, the lessons of the Holocaust seek to educate students on all levels not to be better scholars but to be better world citizens. It is from this perspective that I base my own work.

This chapter examines some of the critical issues involved with Holocaust Education, specifically looking at how Holocaust Education has been used to combat hate and prejudice while building foundations for dialogue and tolerance. Beginning by addressing broader notions of Holocaust Education, this section goes on to examine theoretical underpinnings for Holocaust Education and further to analyze previous research on character and moral education research. This provides a framework for further inquiry into the utility of Holocaust Education as a character or moral education project.

Teaching about the Holocaust

Many collected volumes have focused on teachers' experiences of teaching the Holocaust (Totten 2002, 2003; Simon et al 2000). These works have primarily addressed

pedagogical trials and triumphs of the educator struggling to bring the Holocaust to students across disciplines. Anecdotes of particular successes and reaffirming notions of ‘breaking through’ to students have littered much of the literature on Holocaust Education. Filled with quotes of ‘Never Again,’ ‘Never Forget,’ and Santayana’s immortal words of those condemned to repeat history, testimonies provide necessary motivation for unsure teachers struggling with the questions ‘why teach about the Holocaust?’ and more importantly, ‘How do I teach about the Holocaust?’

Noted Holocaust Education expert Geoffrey Short offers, “the most compelling reason for studying the Holocaust is to help secure the future against further violations of human rights whether based on ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or disability” (Short and Reed 2004, p. 2). In his view, the Holocaust can be used to deter future violence by providing students with a conduit into the past by which they can view the results of such hate and bigotry. He argues that in order to do this, students must deepen their understanding of racism and the racist mindset (ibid). Holocaust Education, for Short, moves students to develop a political literacy by being forced to consider what must be done to maintain liberal democracies (ibid). In this instance, Holocaust Education serves successfully as both value education and citizenship education.

As an early proponent of Holocaust Education as anti-racist education, Short sees the episode of the Holocaust as a way to illustrate to students the “dangers of allowing the growth of an incipient xenophobia to go unchecked” (Short and Reed 2004, p. 3). It is thus necessary to understand the events as well the ideas behind the events in order to glean any lesson from the events themselves. Looking at Santayana’s quote, these authors

note, “Santayana was wrong to emphasise [sic] memory rather than understanding and naïve to imply that all who learn about the Holocaust will necessarily come to revile it and all it represented” (Short and Reed 2004, p. 6). Teaching about the Holocaust to a group of students will not necessarily move all students to become more tolerant, open human beings. There is a possibility that learning about such events may help some students understand racism but it is unlikely to have this effect on all students (Short and Reed 2004).

From this conceptual base, Beth Aviv Greenbaum (2001) argues “before we can teach tolerance we need to teach an understanding of hate – of what leads to intolerant acts” (p. 21). In her experiences as a Holocaust educator, she has her students begin by researching genocide in the twentieth century. She notes their amazement that so much has been allowed to happen so easily (p. 22). Although careful to avoid feelings of impotence, she recognizes that students must learn the antithesis of peace, freedom, and tolerance before examples of it can be understood. As part of a class project, her students are asked to define hate and hate crimes and then conduct research on specific examples. She notes, “It was a dose of reality [for them], of seeing just how deeply hate still runs” (p. 35). Her methodology for teaching does not romanticize. However, unless the lesson is conducted effectively, it could have the potential to defeat and alienate students in the face of such horrors.

Balancing concepts and historical contexts can be a daunting task for educators. Pinner’s research with Holocaust Education in Appalachia has demonstrated the obstacles many teachers face. In his work, he perceives two main obstacles: a lack of knowledge

about history and a lack of knowledge of Jewish history and Judaism (Pinner 2004, p.162, 163). From his base, he fears the prospect that fundamentalists may interpret the Holocaust as punishment on the Jews for rejecting Jesus (p. 165). Educators must find ways to relate their students to concepts so foreign. As a pedagogical method, he suggests finding meaningful historical contexts (i.e. the Melungeons) and to use devices such as stories and testimonies that have a personal appeal. (Pinner 2004, p. 165).

After finding a “meaningful cultural conduit,” educators are able to move through resistance to historical fact building into more constructive conceptual pursuits (Pinner 2004, p.167). Pinner argued, “teaching the Holocaust should, of necessity, provide students and instructors with unique opportunities to address cultural, social, religious, and moral issues in the context of applied ethics” (p. 171). The conduit exists then to discuss issues of race, violence, and other social problems, however large or small, faced today. The purpose for Holocaust Education is both to inform and influence values and beliefs about ‘the other.’

Curriculum Theory and the Holocaust

Achieving a balance in teaching about the Holocaust is crucial to its effectiveness. Trying to teach the subject both historically and emotively has generated a great deal of debate. Howe’s interview with Wolfe highlighted an important aspect of peace education theory, to ensure that it is not defeating by balancing it with knowledge and skills aimed at prevention (2004). One of the more radical dissenters of this perspective is Marla Morris who argues for a dystopic curricular approach in learning about the Holocaust.

She considers the subject beyond understanding, where there is no meaning:

We know that we cannot understand the event of the Holocaust no matter how much knowledge we may acquire. Studying historical and literary representations of Auschwitz does not mean we understand them. Reading history does not mean we understand it. Reading novels about the Holocaust does not mean that we understand it. Still, we understand at the limits of our own situatedness, at the limits of our own horizon. (p. 6)

To further clarify, she vehemently argues, “there is nothing meaningful about Auschwitz; there is nothing about Auschwitz which is redemptive, salvific, or hopeful” (Morris 2001, p. 10). From her perspective, the Holocaust can provide no moral lessons and must be learned but not necessarily understood. She criticizes Anne Frank’s diary and American education generally as psychologically consoling not informing, sheltering against pain and suffering (Morris 2001). For her work, there is no emotive link between the suffering of those who died in the Holocaust and their places historically. She continues to argue:

A limited sense of empathy must keep the alterity of Auschwitz intact. I can empathize with the other, but I cannot feel what she feels. I will never wholly be able to translate her suffering as if it were my own. Her suffering always remains a stranger suffering than mine. We must always remain strangers to one another in our grief. The memory of the Holocaust lies at the limits of understanding, representation, and empathy. (p. 12)

While other authors argue that the lessons of the Holocaust create meaningful dialogues for exploration of moral topics, Morris proposes “notions of communicative dialogue, representation, and understanding cannot help us fathom that which is discontinuous, that which moves beyond representation, and that which we really cannot understand after all” (Morris 2001, p. 16). Not only does she claim that the Holocaust cannot be understood, but she also argues that it should not, and the notions of courage and hope proposed by most educators should be discarded as mere psychological defense mechanisms (Morris 2001).

Issues of hope, courage, rescue, and resistance as integral parts of the Holocaust story must be included, as most Holocaust education experts will propose (Riley 1998; Totten; Marcus 2003; Brand). The notion that the utopic curriculum reduces the tragedy and its complexity is unfounded. In order to foster understanding, develop dialogue, and move students to act, there is the recognition that there are lessons to be drawn from the history of the Holocaust. Morris argues, “there are no universal messages to be drawn” (Morris 2001, p. 19). Perhaps the truth is somewhere in the middle.

Pedagogical Concerns

Contrary to Morris’ claims, the need for historical empathy is particularly important and relevant to our notions of knowledge construction. Some argue that developing this historical empathy can lead to reconstruction of other beliefs, values, and goals, again as a way to make the ‘other’ more understandable (Riley 1998). In order to achieve this goal, it becomes necessary to move away from the reliance on ‘big voices’ in Holocaust

education and move toward material that gives voice to ordinary people. Caricatures of Anne Frank and Oskar Schindler tend to dominate and leave out the voices of the millions of others whose lives and experiences seem unremarkable, but are remarkable in their very unremarkableness. Using other sources deromanticizes and creates a greater understanding of others. The voice that is developed, to be successful in Holocaust Education, must contextualize by including the history of the Jewish people and the history and legacy of antisemitism to construct a base for understanding the people affected by the Holocaust (Riley 1998). Simply starting and ending with the destruction of the Holocaust does not provide context on how such an atrocity could be committed, on the base of antisemitism already present in Europe, but also the rich cultural and religious communities that were present and then absent in Europe. Students must find a way to understand that “the Jews didn’t win the war. We lost. The thousand year-old cultural and spiritual center of Jewish life was wiped out. Perhaps if we could start with this fact as a given, and teach the Destruction with a little bit of humility, curricula of a different nature could be produced” (Roskies 1975, p. 48). While this complicates notions of moral development, it provides important insights into the complexities of the Holocaust as history and as a lesson for humanity. In the end, all of these ideas help construct the moral lessons. These lessons “about the past should generate critical thinking about the present and future” (Auron 2005, p. 115).

Holocaust Education Research

Before examining research related to Holocaust Education and its effects on students, it is necessary to understand what is meant by Holocaust Education and what

educators feel is important in bringing the subject into the classroom. Many misconceptions by students and pedagogical errors by teachers can impede a successful implementation of a Holocaust unit. When objectives and aims are unclear, historical accuracy flawed, and emotive lessons executed haphazardly, Holocaust Education can not only fail in its effectiveness, it can also be counterproductive.

Samuel Totten is the leading expert in Holocaust Education in method and concept. In his research (2000), he found that one of the primary obstacles to successful implementation of a Holocaust unit were gross misconceptions by students. Among those, he specifically takes note of the “Evil/Crazy” or “One-Man Theory” of the Nazi murder of the Jews. The centralization of madness belies the fact that ordinary people planned and participated in the process of discrimination and murder. He notes that teachers must work to bring the evolution of the Holocaust into perspective. Students in his research held the view that German Jews controlled the economy, were uniformly wealthy, and were the cause of the economic depression in Germany (Totten 2000). Totten also poses that students are not aware of the ‘war within a war’ (the place of the Holocaust in World War II history) and are still unclear how Jews were defined and their role as primary victims. He notes that many of the students thought that Jews were persecuted because of their religious beliefs (Totten 2000). As a part of this dynamic, he argues that students must have an understanding, both biologically and sociologically, of the concept of race in order to be able to understand the events of the Holocaust. Short (2000) argues that teachers fail to achieve the antiracist goal without attention given to psychological and sociological underpinnings of racism.

Kalau (1996) also comments on the importance of deconstructing the notion of 'race.' In her teaching, she begins with the notion that there is one race, the human race and then moves her students to examine their own perceptions of the idea of race. From this perspective, she helps make students aware of their own prejudices (Kalau 1996). This discussion precedes her Holocaust instruction and she finds this most helpful. In the end, she describes her work as "helping students to confront and to abandon their biases; for teaching them to speak out when individuals are humiliated and assaulted simply because of who they are" (Kalau 1996, p. 230). Using a conceptual basis combined with historical precision allows the value lesson to be executed unconsciously as well successfully, rooting ideas of justice and tolerance by moving students to confront their own conceptions of the world around them.

Unfortunately, Holocaust Education is often a subject either romanticized by rescue and resistance or dogged by overwhelming victimization. For many educators, there is no balance and therefore no usable lessons are extracted. Geoffrey Short (2004) contributes to Totten's suggestions by noting the importance of introducing concepts into the curriculum in order to explore values. He argues "students should certainly learn about the victim experience, but they should also be inspired by those who had the opportunity, the courage, and the determination to confront the evil in their midst" (Short 2004, p. 185). Holocaust Education must include historical fact and appropriate conceptual groundings in order to be successful as a unit for bringing lessons on value to the fore.

Further research by Totten (1998, 1999) has illustrated a myriad of problems with

contemporary Holocaust Education. Through an analysis of curricula, he claims that too many are weak and simply rely on describing what and not why (Totten 1998). From here, he explores notions of clichés and their usage in curricula. Instead of focusing on ideas of ‘Never Forget,’ ‘Never Again,’ or ‘Remember,’ students and teachers should be asking why they should learn and remember and dispose of tired clichés. He expounds on this idea in further work (1999) that examines the ‘null curriculum’ or the teaching of other genocides and the Holocaust. Totten proposes that teachers encourage students to examine genocide perpetrated since 1945, reasons for passivity to genocide occurring around the world, examine first-person accounts, research the meaning behind clichés, and most of all to have students examine what these phrases truly mean for them today (1999). He is critical of the exclusion of comparison in the Holocaust curriculum and argues, “ignoring ‘other genocides’, either by excluding them from the curriculum or by simply mentioning them in passing, sends an implicit message that such historical events and their victims are not as important as the Holocaust” (Totten 2001, p. 309). To this end, he proposes that students should learn about genocide historically and contemporarily, the preconditions necessary for genocide to occur, and how internal affairs are involved. Using this as a base, it provides an excellent foundation for the examination of current events, the real and ideal role of the international community, and the importance of human rights organizations (Totten 2001).

Gregory Wegner’s (2000) research in Germany provides a different perspective on educating about the Holocaust. For Totten and those teaching in the diaspora, it is too easy to condemn as proximity does not remind. In this, it is easy to teach about

Auschwitz because it is so distant, but for Europeans, existence within the sacred spaces of the Holocaust makes coming to terms with the past and Holocaust Education a more complex process. Germans have been fighting with *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (confrontation with the past) for more than fifty years. This term has come to signify the difficulties young Germans have in understanding their nation's role in one of the largest mass murders of the twentieth century. To do so, the "task of interpreting and preserving historical legacies for the presumed benefit of the young falls heavily on German schools" (Wegner 2000, p. 229).

Wegner (2000) worked with German students at the former Buchenwald concentration camp near Weimar on archaeology or archive projects related to the history of the camp. He hypothesized "young people studying the Holocaust at places like Buchenwald will participate in building a society based on a greater sense of justice than that of previous generations" (Wegner 2000, p. 235). Archaeology digs of former barracks sites put students into contact with artifacts buried or used by prisoners in their daily lives, bringing a degree of authenticity and reality to the project. These lessons were perhaps the most meaningful and enlightening for students, as illustrated in his informal interviews, but Wegner's greatest contribution is in an understanding of the way in which confronting the past directly can profoundly impact young Germans' present. The town of Weimar with its troubled history and connection with events at Buchenwald made the Holocaust in Germany less of a Hitler-dominated mythology and more of a recognition of ordinary complicity in the grander scope of the Holocaust. Furthermore, Wegner's argument of placing students within history has merit. When students connected with

artifacts from the lives of prisoners, the overwhelming numbers could be reduced to something tangible, something real that gave life to the cloud of repressive statistics. Connecting with the past in this way made it more likely that these young Germans would be more involved with the democratic process and contemporary issues plaguing the new state.

The burden of Holocaust Education, obviously, falls to the teachers. Pre-service teachers are unprepared to deal with the complex subject matter and many resources have been developed to assist teachers in preparing lessons on the subject. In an experimental study, researchers found that access to the Teacher's Guide to the Holocaust significantly impacted knowledge or attitudes of pre-service teachers on teaching about the subject (Calandra et al 2002). However, there are still many obstacles to be overcome, access to pedagogical materials is not the issue, implementation in the curriculum is.

Short (2000) conducted interviews with teachers to examine how much time was spent on the subject, what resources were used, any pedagogic issues faced, and teachers' views on Holocaust Education as well as specific content areas. Most teachers identify their reasons for teaching it either following the Santayana creed or simply feeling it part of historical accuracy; regardless, all teachers interviewed felt the Holocaust should be taught to students (Short 2000). As far as content, Short (2000) found that none of the teachers examined students' beliefs or knowledge about Jews and Judaism, consistently underplayed or ignored Jewish resistance, and "failed to take advantage of the opportunity to introduce their students to the conceptual underpinnings of racism" (Short 2000). However, when asked what they would do with more time, teachers noted they

would address the history of antisemitism, causes of Holocaust, the response of the West, links between Holocaust and other genocides, and resistance and rescue. In his research, it is worth noting that even those teachers claiming higher moral goals for teaching the Holocaust failed to include any conceptual base for discussion. Using the Holocaust for antiracism still has many problems.

The biggest proponent of the use of the Holocaust as an antiracist vehicle has been Geoffrey Short. In a combined research project with Reed (2004), he proposed that antiracist goals could only be realized if students could identify with the victims by examining concepts of stereotyping and scapegoating (Short and Reed 2004). The primary goal should be in developing a concern where racism can lead and to ultimately “cultivate among the young an interest in citizenship and human rights that extends beyond their own country’s geographical borders” (Short and Reed 2004, p. 84). Shiman and Fernekes (1999) support these ideas in their research on connections between the study of the Holocaust and universal human rights. They indicate that themes on democratic citizenship, forced students to examine issues of ethnocentrism, relativism, universalism, responsibility, conflict, and justice and aid students in developing an understanding of human rights in the contemporary world (Shiman and Fernekes 1999). Using the Holocaust as a backdrop, students are able to examine the relationships between human rights and democracy as well as to understand the legacy of the Holocaust as a part of human rights work (Shiman and Fernekes 1999). The goal, however, is not accumulation of a fact base, but rather to encourage care, responsibility, and critical thinking. Short supports this by arguing that the goal is to “broaden students’

understanding of stereotyping and scapegoating, make them aware of some of the political, social and economic antecedents of racism and provide a potent illustration of both the bystander effect and the dangers posed by an unthinking conformity to social norms and peer group pressure” (Short 2000, p. 291).

Wegner’s (2000) research in Germany sustains the importance of conceptual foundations in learning about the Holocaust. He claims it is crucial for students to understand historical themes and more so “contemporary social tendencies toward racism, xenophobia, the acceptance of violence in everyday life, and various forms of extremism” (Wegner 2000, p. 240). He hopes to help students understand “not only the meaning of what happened in Buchenwald under the Nazis but also the legacy of the camp and its implications for the contemporary problems of xenophobia and racism in the new Germany” (Wegner 2000, p. 252). The Holocaust becomes then a vehicle for exploration of contemporary issues.

Clyde, Walker, and Floyd (2005) conducted research on four models of Holocaust Education to see if a relationship existed between participation in a learning program and students’ perceptions of worldview, academic interests, leadership activities, and reflection (Clyde et al 2005). They hoped not just to inform students of the history but to educate with emphasis on its relevance today. However, in their analysis of the implementation, they found that only a small portion (18%) had a change in worldview. Academically, they did find that a change in major/minor was statistically significant, and also found a very weak relationship between the program and leadership activity but involvement in organizations increased significantly (Clyde et al 2005). From this study,

it is not clear whether or not learning about the Holocaust has a significant impact on students morally although it does suggest that it promotes more active involvement with society.

Carrington and Short (1997) conducted research on the teaching of the Holocaust as part of a human rights curriculum in the United Kingdom. In interviews with 43 students between 14 and 16 years old who had learned about the Holocaust the previous year, they found that as a group, students were unfamiliar with stereotypes generally and did not know the stereotype of the Jew in Nazi occupied Europe (Carrington and Short 1997). Only a quarter of the students felt that learning about the Holocaust had contributed to their understanding of racism and felt that they were not provided with opportunities to discuss racism in the context of the Holocaust unit. Despite this, all interviewees felt that students should learn about the Holocaust and two-thirds felt they had been changed as result of learning about the Holocaust some claiming a heightened awareness of racism increased or enhanced capacity to recognize stereotypes (Carrington and Short 1997).

Cowan and Maitles (2002) conducted research in one council district in Scotland on Holocaust teaching. They begin with an assertion that racism and racist attitudes exist today, that racist stereotypes are learned, and that Holocaust Education can challenge these notions (Cowan and Maitles 2002). Out of the twenty-two responding schools, twenty-one indicated that they teach about the Holocaust and many use Holocaust history to delve into issues of citizenship. Brown and Davies in a similar study in 1998 had similar findings, notably that many teachers teach the Holocaust under headings of

prejudice, moral choices, respect, and tolerance. From a more skeptical perspective, they note, “there is some evidence that even when there has been a decline in the incidence of anti-Semitic [sic] behaviour this has been short term and not consistent with an improvement in toleration towards all groups” (Brown and Davies 1998: ¶ 6). Holocaust Education, from their perspective, is not attaining those higher antiracist goals.

In Cowan and Maitles (2002) research, teachers indicated that they did not perceive a dramatic response from pupils, leading the researchers to note that although the intentions of Holocaust Education are often to reduce racism, this goal is not often met. How, then, can teachers move students toward more empathetic and sympathetic relationships with the victims? First, this should be done cautiously and can be achieved most easily through writing. Wegner (1998) found in essays written by middle school pupils that students were able to write about the Holocaust in terms of morals and values such as what humans should not do to each other, behaviors for change, dehumanization and discrimination, attitudes toward the government, bystander mentalities, and proactive citizenship (Wegner 1998). The literature-based approach has received much attention and Thomas (2000) argues that the Holocaust is an excellent way to encourage students to engage in emotional writing because of the accessibility, emotional force and distance, as well as moral and historical complexity. His research with students and writing about the Holocaust brings the ideas of moral lessons, empathetic responses, and antiracist goals into perspective by asking, “can we foster tolerance and empathy through a study of the Holocaust? To the extent that this is possible at all in a writing course, I would say that the answer is yes. But we should not expect to change students’ thinking in direct

ways” (Thomas 2000, p. 13). Although research has indicated that there is an ability for the Holocaust to be used as an exercise for moral lessons, it is complex, requiring devotion and sound pedagogy by the teachers, support from the administrators, and a degree of an openness from students. To achieve them all at once is a difficult task.

Teaching about the Holocaust is indeed a matter of pedagogy, but it is also to a larger degree a matter of sensitivity and morality. Morris (2001) argued that the Holocaust should not be generalized and compared, that “it is the Jewish tragedy, a particular tragedy to Jews, around which we need to attend” (p. 11). Yet, Totten, Short, Davies, and others argue that the very point of learning about the Holocaust should not be to store away more historical dates, but to draw on these experiences as ways to explore racism, antisemitism, and prejudice, as well as love, hope, and tolerance.

Raul Hilberg calls the events of the Holocaust, a “culmination of a cyclical trend” (cited in Greenbaum 2001: 25). The lessons for today are very real and the Holocaust is an excellent place to discuss citizenship, values, and the need for action in the face of heinous acts. Greenbaum (2001) notes, “It’s easier to speak of anti-Semitic [sic] acts sixty years ago than to directly address what is going on today. What can we do? I ask, Most shake their heads. We agree that at least we can stay informed and inform others” (p. 27). It is easier to speak of yesterday than to speak of today but it is the dialogue about what is transpiring presently that must be attended to.

Chapter 3: Holocaust Education in Poland

Understanding the dynamics of Holocaust Education requires moving beyond the Ameri-centric confines entrapping much of the literature. Holocaust educators would argue that the Holocaust is not a Jewish issue but instead a human one. Those nations feeling the direct impact of the Holocaust are especially worthy of survey. Poland's history has been complicated by communist propaganda and deeply rooted antisemitism. However, after the Solidarność movement in the 1980s, the stage was set for writing the past, especially the Holocaust past, with real history. Holocaust Education in Poland has moved from being a taboo topic to one nationally recognized and mandated.

Of the literature written about Holocaust Education in Poland, three major themes emerge: the change in Holocaust Education, research on general knowledge, the place of peripheral education, and Polish perspectives on teaching about the Holocaust. Two major authors focus on the changing face of Holocaust Education in Poland – Piotr Trojński and Robert Szuchta. Trojński's works typify the movement from historic disregard to abstraction on thematic issues. For instance, he notes,

In the explanation of teaching aims it is stressed that the history lessons should cultivate attitudes of tolerance and openness toward different beliefs, attitudes and value system, should inculcate respect for democratic and human values... and should inculcate a readiness to oppose manifestations of the pathologies of public life such as fanaticism, xenophobia, racism, totalitarianism, etc. These aims correspond with issues connected with Nazism and the Holocaust. (p. 65)

The purpose of Holocaust Education occupies a particular niche in Trojánski's view, but he never underscores the importance of the Holocaust as a tenet of history, as a fact for Polish young people. He points out, "pupils meet problems connected with Nazism and the Holocaust during lessons of Polish language and history" (Trojánski 1998, p.65).

Trojánski is critical of Holocaust Education policy and its lack of presentation as a separate subject, instead imbedded in the discourse of World War II, or in the misrepresentation or omission in Polish textbooks (1998, p. 66-67; 2003). The primary purpose of the discourse on the movement toward Polish historical honesty about the Holocaust remains central to Trojánski's tenet on providing a more universal approach for "finding eternal educational values connected with defense of human rights and fight with prejudices and stereotypes" (1998, p. 67). He proposes that to solve this problem, Holocaust Education is a key component but also notes that it cannot end here. To permanently change stereotypes and misunderstandings, the history must be understood but young Poles need to understand the Jewish present and he advocates for exchange to increase the understanding between groups (Trojánski 1998, p. 68; Trojánski 2003).

Trojánski's historical interpretation is important to understanding the role of Holocaust Education in contemporary Poland. His major focus in "Teaching about the Holocaust in Changing Poland: A Historical Perspective" (2003) challenges the notion of historical honesty and the representation of Jews and the Holocaust through Polish textbooks. He notes a survey he conducted in 1995 amongst students in Krakow and reported that students "showed a relatively low level of knowledge about the Holocaust." Knowledge that students had about the Holocaust came not from school, but from

television, film, and newspapers (Trojński 2003). He claims this is why “the students’ information had the character of common knowledge that strengthened stereotypes and even prejudice, which of course helped neither learning nor understanding the nature of the Holocaust” (Trojński 2003). Trojński concludes that the lack of information was due to years of negligence and distortion of history.

One of the problems Poland had with relearning the Holocaust involved a competition for the pain and suffering endured during Nazism. Trojński notes “the image of a suffering Pole oppressed by the Germans became rooted very deeply in the Polish mentality” (Trojński 2003). Communist propaganda pushed this as a way to solidify their stronghold, bash Fascism, and provide Poles with a common pain. In doing so, the suffering of Jews vanished from history and from the awareness of Poles (Trojński 2003). The new historical fabric is seen at odds, at times with Polish national identity formation. Trojński notes that many “fear that their suffering might be forgotten, obscured by the suffering of the Jews... which in extreme cases could lead to a complete rejection or at least partial denial of unworthy deeds perpetrated by Poles, also should be taken into consideration in teaching about the Holocaust” (2003).

The goal of Holocaust Education, according to Robert Szuchta and Piotr Trojński (2002), is to rectify past interpretation and more importantly, to serve as a warning. In their assessment of education on the Holocaust, they argue, “one might get the impression that this problem is slowly slipping out of teachers’ fields of attention in the crush of skills checks and examinations that come one after the other, and for which teachers must prepare their students” (Szuchta and Trojński 2002, p.31). A place for the

Holocaust might appear to be slipping away; however, the converse is true. The Holocaust occupies a particular and important niche in Polish education with the subject crossing from history into Polish language and literature, civics, and religious instruction. Szuchta and Trojński see the Holocaust as a place to discuss the larger societal issues of civics, ethics, and morals (Szuchta and Trojński 2002, p.34). They also hope that the new efforts in Holocaust Education will help to put Poles within the historical continuum. Both authors argue that students must be aware of the continuum of Polish actions during the Holocaust – collaboration, perpetration, bystanding, and rescuing (Szuchta and Trojński 2002, p. 32). Further to this, they agree that the events of the Holocaust must be contextualized within Polish-Jewish history (Szuchta and Trojński 2002, p. 33). Although they point out certain instances where further work needs to be done, their primary goal is in prompting students to work toward prevention (Szuchta and Trojński 2002, p. 31).

Holocaust Education has grown so rapidly that a book was published in 2003 by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) entitled “Why Should We Teach About the Holocaust?” The contributors to the volume varied from sociologists, historians, and scholars to teachers. Each essay attempts to convey the reasons for teaching about the Holocaust in Poland. Jolanta Ambrosewicz-Jacobs (2003) argues that the subject is especially important in education for “reconciliation between nations, democracy, and peace” (p. 9). She too argues that students must undo the notions of suffering and be able to see the differences between Polish and Jewish victims and their experiences (Ambrosewicz-Jacobs 2003, p. 14). She reasons, “the genocide took

place amidst us, before our eyes. That is why it should be taught, in the knowledge that if we pass over those difficult and painful events in silence, our children and grandchildren may ask us about them” (Ambrosewicz-Jacobs 2003, p. 13). Jerzy Tomaszewki (2003) expands upon this by noting:

To learn and understand the causes of the catastrophe, and Polish-Jewish relations those years, is not only a moral obligation to our murdered neighbors. It is also a duty to Polish culture and tradition, to our future. The Holocaust came from the outside, but whether and how society was prepared for this test of attitudes remain open questions. (p. 23)

The question for Polish educators today is how to teach about the Holocaust to students so far removed from the direct history and to what purpose. Malgorzata Tracz, a Polish high school teacher, pushes for three part lessons that revolve around a visit to the Auschwitz-Birkenau complex in Oswięcim. Two of the units are conducted before the visit and one post-visit. In the first lesson, she frames the unit around the question “How could have people have prepared such a fate for other people?” (p. 26) This unit looks at the history of the Jews broadly and then specifically in Poland and the events leading up to the Holocaust. This unit also deals with the questions: “How could the Holocaust have happened? Who murdered millions of people and with what motivations? How could such a crime have occurred in twentieth-century Europe?” (p.26). In her second unit, she begins to focus more specifically on the Auschwitz camps as her students prepare for their visit and looks at the various functions of the different camps. She suggests for this

part of the unit using a variety of media and assignments to augment the experience for the students (p.26). After the visit to the Auschwitz complex, her third unit employs the use of archive documents and dramatic techniques to examine “The Fate of the Poles and the Fate of the Jews on the Auschwitz camp on the Basis of Archive Documents” (p.26). Her goal, overall, is to help the students to empathize, “we want to bring out the students’ ability to empathize, that is, the ability to understand the situation of another person and to emotionally identify with him or her” (p.27).

Pani Tracz is not the only Polish educator becoming more involved with Holocaust education. Michael Marrus has argued for the inclusion of Jewish resistance in the curriculum, while Tadeusz Sobolewicz has questioned the motives of fellow teachers on whether they are teaching it or just ‘getting through it.’ For him, the changes in generations, and the distance of young people away from the events of the Holocaust and World War II, has a profound effect on education. He says, “One thing which can be stated objectively is that in schools in which the teacher appreciates the role of history the youth have an attitude toward it, completely different from that prevailing where the teacher restricts history teaching to just getting through the topics in the syllabus” (p.69). He goes further to argue on the need for conceptual level instruction for students stating, “Perhaps it sounds grandiloquent, but I don’t think that a sensible teacher fails to see the need to raise the level of youth education by confronting good with evil- the elements that have always determined the behavior of people in every circumstance.” (p.71).

Jozef Brynkus presents an interesting, if not almost over-nationalistic and somewhat reckless, article on Polish perspectives on teaching about the Holocaust in a

special issue of *Pro Memoria*. Despite my ambiguity about many of his claims, he does make several good arguments about Holocaust Education, specifically the need to remember the Polish perspective in considering it within the global lens. He begins by asserting, “the question of why the history of the destruction of the Jews ought to be taught is, in the Polish case, far from unambiguous or simple.” (p. 69). Brynkus has an understanding that escapes many authors as he argues, “Poles, after all, must come up with answers to questions that are not asked of other countries, the origins of which are connected not only directly with the destruction of the Jews during the occupation, but also with its subsequent perception.” (p.69). To this end, he begins by examining Polish Holocaust Education from a methodological perspective.

Methodologically, the question is whether the Holocaust is a phenomenon of which the knowledge is necessary to an understanding of Polish history. Brynkus claims, without exception, yes, “No special justification beyond the rational need be sought to show that the history of the destruction of the Jews may not be omitted from the presentation of Polish history” (p.69). At the same time, he sees the Holocaust as an event within a continuum of tragic events in the history of Poland. He notes, “...one should not fear analogies; rather, there is a need to refer to events of the same epoch, of the same tragic scale, and of a similar structure... The past cannot be divided from the present” (p.70). To this end, his perspective in Holocaust Education is vastly different from Trojński or Szuchta’s but retains its merits and shows a level of commitment among Polish teachers to the history of the Holocaust.

On a cognitive level, Brynkus points to problems in Holocaust Education rooted more deeply in the changes in the historical narrative. For example, he points to the controversy at Auschwitz where the number of victims was changed due to new evidence being discovered. This change also reflected that the largest group murdered at the Auschwitz complex was not Poles. He notes, "It is hard for Poles to accept today that they were not the nationality that suffered the most in Auschwitz" (p.70). This is part of the historical narrative that has begun to change with new information being introduced after communism. At the same time, Poles must become more aware, according to Brynkus, of the reasons for the representation existing in its forms as well as why the Holocaust was carried out as it was. Brynkus argues, "school students, and surely not they alone, must be made clearly aware that the treatment of the Poles as sub-humans by the Germans was one of the reasons that Germans carried out the genocide of the Jews on Polish soil" (p.70). Further to this, it is important for Brynkus to extend the cognitive lessons beyond the creation of the historical narrative and its rationale. From a pedagogical perspective, he looks to the reliance on overused historical 'lessons' in Polish Holocaust Education that have begun to take on an untouchable nature that cannot be criticized. For example, he writes, "the reliance on Auschwitz and the Warsaw ghetto means that these facts have begun to assume an almost sacred nature" (p.71).

For Brynkus, Holocaust Education in Poland places a number of conditions on the Polish-Jewish dialogue. Poland is not held solely responsible for rebuilding the relationship between Poles and Jews. He argues, "The Holocaust cannot be separated from the tragedy of Poland and the Poles [and] cannot deprive Poles of the enormous

sufferings of their forebears during the Second World War” (p.72). There must be some pedagogical consideration between the representations of Jewish suffering with the inclusion of Polish suffering during World War II. To deny Polish suffering now is no better than denying Jewish suffering during communism.

Marek Kucia has spearheaded most of the efforts in research on general knowledge of the Holocaust amongst Poles. In three separate studies, Kucia has examined how historical fact is understood specifically regarding KL-Auschwitz. Primarily, his focus has been to understand how Poles respond to Auschwitz as a place, a city, and a camp in helping students locate their own history within the troubled Auschwitz continuum. This work augments Trojánski and Szuchta’s reports and helps to develop an understanding of how Poles see themselves within Holocaust history, something especially difficult in post-communist Poland.

Peripheral education research has focused on the role of the museum as an educator and Holocaust Education as a part of tolerance education. Jolanta Ambrosewicz-Jacobs has done considerable research on the latter. In her work, she has one central argument- that there must be a two-sided attempt to understand, to reconcile, and to teach about the Holocaust. We are talking about American conceptions and Polish conceptions, Polish and non-Polish, Jewish and non-Jewish perspectives taking into account the other in order for this education to be used to its fullest extent.

Speaking of education specifically, Jacobs quotes Trudy Gold from the Spiro Institute of London saying, that she calls for teachers “to create a situation in which the students will pose questions.” (Ambrosewicz-Jacobs p. 68) This is clearly an important

aim. She then goes on to discuss the teaching of the Holocaust in schools. Her earlier point outlines her objectives for teaching the Holocaust: “What kind of relation toward Jews the generation of democratic Poland will have depends in large measure on efforts in the field of education.” (Ambrosewicz-Jacobs p. 68)

Museum education is central in Poland due to the number of major camps and ghettos found within its borders. Alicia Białeczka, the education director at the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum, recognizes the problems museum educators face in teaching about the Holocaust. She notes, “a short visit of a few hours to the Museum, while it acts strongly on the emotions and imagination, cannot replace teaching about Auschwitz in the classroom.” (Białeczka p. 21) In her opinion, it seems teachers can often rely solely on the museum visit to tell the entire story of the Holocaust, but Białeczka cautions that education at the site is Auschwitz education and cannot necessarily be generalized to cover the entire history of the Holocaust as an event. Despite this, she feels strongly that “education at memorial sites, among which Auschwitz is in a special position as an exceptional symbol for different national, ethnic, and religious groups, is work of importance to contemporary societies.” (Białeczka p. 25) She links museum and Holocaust education into the push for tolerance education. Białeczka argues, “on the basis of what they [the students] have seen and heard they should learn to recognize in their own lives such phenomena as intolerance, succumbing to stereotypes, or persecution.” (Białeczka p. 22) Museum education as a vehicle for Holocaust education and subsequently tolerance education occupies an important and central niche in placing the Holocaust within the Polish educational system.

Much has been written on Holocaust Education – pedagogically, as a moral tool, and even from the specific perspective of Poland. However, there are some gaps in the literature remaining. What we do not know is how teachers engage students with the material, what material they choose to include or exclude, and how they present students with the historical data and in what ways. While Trojński’s work has focused on what Holocaust Education in Poland has been and should be, there still remains a place for qualitative research focusing specifically on teachers and their work with students. What this research proposes is an investigation of teacher practices in regards to material presented to students as part of their Holocaust curriculums.

Chapter 4: Research Design and Methodology

Research Design

The Holocaust is referred to as a watershed event in the history of humanity, a singular event that defined Europe and the world in the twentieth century. Over the past fifty years, our understanding of ‘The Holocaust’ has continually evolved around the globe. Holocaust Education has served in many nations as a vehicle of character, moral, or citizenship education and remains central in European history. In Poland, the Holocaust has been a source of constant debate amongst scholars, historians, teachers, and citizens. The shift from Holocaust written as Communist history to a more complete telling of events has created a niche for a new generation of scholars, historians, and teachers to retell the story but this time to tell the truth. What is the truth? What are students learning about the Holocaust? This was the starting point for a nine-month research project in Poland focusing on efforts in Holocaust Education.

This project seeks to answer three central questions:

4. How has Holocaust Education changed in Poland?
5. What are teachers teaching in the classroom?
6. Why do teachers teach about the Holocaust?

In the first phase of the research, a thorough examination of recent literature on Polish Holocaust Education was assessed and interviews were set up with leading scholars and policy makers. Probing issues of historical change and contemporary issues with experts in the field allowed for a general orientation to services offered by individual organizations concerned with Holocaust Education. To this effect, I interviewed education experts at major institutions in Poland such as the Jewish Historical Institute in

Warsaw, CODN (teacher training organization), the Institute for National Memory, the Jewish Cultural Center in Krakow, the Ministry of Education, the Auschwitz State Museum, and the Auschwitz Jewish Center, among others. This orientation to major efforts in education provided the backdrop for the development of a two-part questionnaire (both open and closed questions) for Polish teachers on how they teach about the Holocaust, what they teach, and why. The combination of methods provided a firm basis for exploration and analysis of the variety of facets of Holocaust Education in Poland.

Methodology

Qualitative research provides a richer and thicker source of discovery for this project than would a base quantitative survey outlining Holocaust knowledge. For qualitative researchers, the actual setting as a source of data is particularly important and as Poland was a particularly crucial impact point during and after the Holocaust, it is especially important to examine the setting as a source of data itself (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998). Bogdan and Biklen (1998) note, “the data are collected on the premises and supplemented by the understanding that is gained by being on location,” something that cannot be gained by sending out mass surveys and coding them without context (p. 4). Concern for context is extremely important for qualitative research (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998). My project, with its historical specificity, relies on a social and cultural understanding that cannot be gleaned from quantitative inquiry. Qualitative research also relies on a descriptive element that is also crucial for this project. For this type of project, “data collected take the form of words or pictures rather than numbers. The written

results of the research contain quotations from the data to illustrate and substantiate the presentation” (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998, p. 5). The use of interviews, field notes, and photos are of particular importance in augmenting the research findings instead of relying on numbers to illustrate raw data. Given the nature of the inquiry, it is important “qualitative researchers do not reduce the pages upon pages of narration and other data to numerical symbols” (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998, p. 5). Finally, qualitative research best serves this project from an analysis of meaning. The Holocaust happened to people and happened in Poland where people still live today. People must make sense of their past and present and how they make sense of their lives now is important and this meaning making is important to the research, something that cannot be gathered from quantitative inquiry (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998, p.7).

The qualitative study I propose relies on a “dialogue of action and interaction” (Spindler and Spindler, 1997, p. 51). Educational anthropology relies on qualitative methodology, and particularly ethnography to explore difficult culturally bound questions. For many of these questions, “we try to determine how teaching and learning are supported and constrained by understandings, many of them implicit, that govern the interaction of teachers and students” (Spindler and Spindler, 1997, p. 51). Outside the classroom, however, students and teachers are bound in a sociocultural system that dictates their larger perceptions. This is reinforced in the classrooms in a metanarrative created by society. As such, “we [anthropologists] see education as cultural transmission, and of course cultural transmission requires cultural learnings, so learning and transmission are never separated except by convention” (Spindler and Spindler, 1997,

p.52). In this way, to try to gain insight into the social understandings of specific concepts, in my case, Holocaust knowledge/perceptions, it is important to gain access to student and teacher understandings of the Holocaust history in Poland. It is “education in the broad sense, schooling in the narrow sense – as a calculated intervention in the learning process” (Spindler and Spindler, 1997, p. 52). The question remaining is how best to achieve this goal. Spindler and Spindler (1997) would offer the ethnographic study:

Ethnographic study requires direct observation, it requires being immersed in the field situation, and it requires constant interviewing in all degrees of formality and casualness. From this interviewing, backed by observation, one is able to collect and elicit the native view(s) of reality and the native ascription of meaning to events, intentions, and consequences. (p.53)

Ethnography means something to the anthropologist that may mean something different to the psychologist or political scientist. From the educational anthropologist perspective, a good ethnography should involve direct observation, sufficient time on the site, a volume of recorded data, quantification, and a clear object of study (Spindler and Spindler, 1997). In the first instance, Creswell (1998) argues:

As a process, ethnography involves prolonged observation of the group, typically through participant observation in which the researcher is immersed in the day-to-day lives of the people or through one-on-one interviews with members of the

group. The researchers studies the meanings of behavior, language, and interactions of the culture-sharing group. (p. 58)

While most of his points are valid, Spindler and Spindler (1997) do make the note that while direct observation “is the guts of the ethnographic approach... This does not always mean *participant* observation” (p. 65). It is certainly valid to be able to step back at time to simply observe. For my project, it will be necessary to be able to slide along the continuum and be both participant-observer and observer to gather data for a full ethnography. Balancing this will be difficult due to the nature of ethnographic fieldwork. Participation and the pull of the field sometimes can be overwhelming. To this end, Peacock (1986) notes:

In ethnography, detachment is impossible to sustain. The ethnographer is necessarily involved – to varying degrees – in the human encounter that is fieldwork. Rather than standing aloof, observing and recording in a detached way, the ethnographer distills his ethnography from his own experience in the flow of native life. (p. 67)

There is no pure encounter to be had and I must keep this in mind when I begin my fieldwork. As I try to capture the holistic, looking for the cultural and social dynamics that affect the educational encounters, there is some degree of artificiality that must be understood. Peacock argues there are two qualifications to be understood in this context for the ethnographer. “The first qualification is that the ethnographer does affect his encounter with the other; he is actively engaged in constructing his data... The second qualification, which tempers the first, is that the natives themselves tend to standardize

their acts, utterances, and things” (Peacock, 1986, p.70). Despite this, ethnography offers an opportunity to explore more broadly the influences on the educational system.

Looking at education singularly, especially for this project, does not offer the fullest perspective. Holocaust Education in Poland cannot be confined to the classroom. The media, church, nationalism, and social climate all play important roles in understanding how Poland is changing and coming to terms with the past. A quick scan of a few classrooms is not going to give the fullest picture. Speaking with teachers, students, education experts, and experiencing the culture firsthand will give a better ‘feel’ for what is going on in Poland in regards to Holocaust Education.

The second qualification for a good ethnography is spending sufficient time on the site. Spindler and Spindler (1997) note, “there is no hard-and-fast rule regarding what constitutes sufficient time on the site” (p. 66). Backing up slightly, the selection of the ethnographic site is of extreme importance. Creswell (1998) argues, “in an ethnographic study, however, a single site is important where an intact culture-sharing group has developed shared values, beliefs, and assumptions. The researcher needs to select a group to study, preferably one to which the investigator is a ‘stranger’ and can gain access” (p. 114). For my project, Poland is a homogenous group with a solid, shared history and culture, almost to the point of xenophobia. My position as an outsider, but one with the ability to gain access allows me to observe and participate at times in seeing how Holocaust Education can be executed informally or formally. Participation in the culture remains central as “ethnography is the study of the culture of a group, usually as that culture is revealed, again, through the course of ongoing events” (Preissle and Grant,

2004, p. 164). My goal must be balance the emic and etic perspectives in the ethnography. Preissle and Grant (2004) wrestle with a similar problem as they “regard ethnography as a specialized form of fieldwork, in which culture is a central concept, where deep engagement over time with a culture is expected, and where a central goal is the presentation of an insider’s view of that culture” (p. 165). To this end, understanding Poland’s contemporary relationship with the Holocaust and their Polish suffering during the Nazi occupation will be of extreme importance if I am also to understand the Polish knowledge and perspective on Jewish suffering in Poland at the hands of Poles during the Holocaust.

What is the ‘object of study’ then? The “object of ethnographic research by anthropologists is to discover the cultural knowledge that people hold in their minds, how it is employed in social interaction, and the consequences of its employment” (Spindler and Spindler, 1997, p. 71). Similarly, Creswell (1998) argues we are “looking for what people do (behaviors), what they say (language), and some tension between what they really do and what they ought to do as well as what they make and use (artifacts)” (p. 59). As ethnographers, are we culture spies? In my proposed project, in some ways, I am a culture spy. As an ethnographer, I am looking at what students know about the Holocaust, what teachers teach, and what institutions do to help the society and culture heal. However, I am also looking for evidence to how this is being borne out in practice. Only through time and immersion can this be accomplished. Is there guilt here as I look for this ‘tension’? Perhaps, perhaps not. It is here that the problems begin.

Creswell (1998) argues “ethnography is an approach in which researchers bring a strong cultural lens to their study. Although this lens shapes their initial observations and questions in the field, it may be moderated and changed during fieldwork” (p. 86). What lens is it that I bring to the field? When I go to Poland, I go as a young Jewish woman with thousands of years of Jewish baggage. I am also trained as an anthropologist, and approach my research steadfastly as a liberal postmodernist. I expect contradictions and encounters to change me. Peacock (1986) writes in The Anthropological Lens: “the anthropologist in his ethnography tells about the ‘natives,’ the others; but reporting the way ‘they are’ often reveals much about the way ‘I am.’” (p. 57). Yet, ethnography is not just about telling about who I am, shaping who I will become. Training can help me to observe, recount, analyze, and describe with some degree of objectivity. However, “ethnography can never describe with complete objectivity, producing a set of facts that are completely true; but through its portrayals and interpretations it can communicate human truths” (Peacock, 1986, p. 84). I bring to my project a certain set of biases and expectations, but also a degree of openness to new ideas and a will to exploration. These will serve me best in working on this project.

Survey Design

Data were collected for this project through two primary avenues: surveys and interviews. Surveys consisted of an open-ended and closed portion and interviews were developed for teachers with a loose guideline of questions but open for exploration depending on the teachers’ styles and interests. In close consultation with Piotr Trojński with Akademia Pedagogickna in Kraków, I developed a survey to distribute to teachers to

investigate how teachers approach the subject of the Holocaust with their students in the classroom. The survey consisted of two parts, an open-ended section of eight questions asking the following:

- How many class periods do you spend on the study of the Holocaust?
- What materials and activities do you use?
- Are there adequate resources available to you? If not, what would you like to have?
- Have you attended teacher trainings or seminars? If so, which ones and were they useful?
- What do you hope your students gain from a unit on the Holocaust?
- What kind of assignments do they have for this unit?
- Why do you teach about the Holocaust?
- Do you compare the Holocaust with other examples of genocide and racial hatred?

The second part of the survey was closed-question and used to gauge what events or context areas teachers covered with their students. These topic areas were:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. History of Jews in Poland | 20. Postwar trials |
| 2. Antisemitism | 21. Displaced persons camps and emigration |
| 3. Rise of Nazi Party | 22. Creation of Polish ghettos |
| 4. Nazi racist ideologies and policies | 23. Labor camps in Poland |
| 5. 'Euthanasia' program | 24. Warsaw Ghetto Uprising |
| 6. Persecution and murder of Jews | 25. Polish 'Righteous Among the Nations' |
| 7. Persecution and murder of Gypsies | 26. Poles as victims of Nazi occupation |
| 8. Persecution and murder of other victims | |
| 9. Kristallnacht | |
| 10. Mobile killing squads (Einsatzgruppen) | |
| 11. Ghettos | |
| 12. Final Solution | |
| 13. Collaboration | |
| 14. Resistance | |
| 15. Rescue | |
| 16. World Response | |
| 17. Death Marches | |
| 18. Liberation | |
| 19. Pogroms 1945/1946 | |

Topic areas 1-3 were considered background information necessary to a more complete understanding of the Holocaust as an event of history in context. One of the dangers of Holocaust Education, in any nation, is compartmentalizing the events of the Holocaust within their own temporal niche, independent of antecedents or aftermath. One of the aims of museum education in Poland has been to demonstrate the presence of a thriving and important Jewish population before the start of the war as well as the history of antisemitism and the rise of the Nazi Party as precursors to the Holocaust. Topic areas 4-21 examined specific events and policies implemented during the period 1939-1945. These topic areas are in alignment with the recommendations of the International Task Force on Holocaust Education of which Poland is a member and formed the basis for my inclusion of these areas in the survey. Topic areas 22-26 were included to look more specifically at Poland's role during the Holocaust and to see what topics teachers chose to include or exclude as part of their curriculum in regards of Polish national history. In creating this survey, Professor Trojński cautioned me in simply allowing teachers to check boxes to indicate which topic areas they included. He noted that concern that teachers might feel pressured to check all boxes if they felt this is what the researcher was looking for. To remedy this, I added a final section using topic areas 4-21 asking teachers to rank the areas from 1-18 in what they felt were most important to be discussed. The English version of the questionnaire was then translated through a professional translating agency and modified by Professor Trojński for any errors and to ensure accuracy. At this point, I was ready to begin selecting sites to distribute the questionnaires.

Site Selection and Access

I chose two primary sites to collect the majority of my sample: Warsaw and Kraków, both sites of two large ghettos during the Holocaust and also contemporary cities offering a wide range of contemporary activities to commemorate and educate on the events of the Second World War. Serendipitously in touch with a teacher from Warsaw, she volunteered to allow me to survey a group of History and WOS (Knowledge about Society) teachers gathering for an in-service meeting in Warsaw. The morning session of teacher surveys yielded 32 completed surveys and the afternoon session yielded 37 completed surveys. Distributed surveys were anonymous and elective. With permission granted from the coordinator of the meetings, the project was introduced with its intents and then the surveys distributed, explaining that I would also be available for any questions afterward should any arise. The survey asked for identifiers such as age, gender, place of origin, and subject area taught for analysis purposes but could not link any specific teacher to his or her survey. In this way, there was minimal impact of the researcher on the study and minimal risk to the participants of the study, as they were free to include any information they felt comfortable without risk of exposure. Weeks later, I was also fortunate enough to gain access to a teacher training exercise for history teachers in Kraków where I followed the same protocol obtaining a further 41 surveys. I also surveyed a small group of teachers at a workshop at the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum in Oświęcim and sent further out with a contact with the Jewish Historical Institute and CODN giving me a final sample size of 155.

Data Analysis

Data gathered through the survey process was entered into SPSS and analyzed statistically. Frequencies and regression analyses were conducted on a variety of 74 inputted variables to look for relationships between and within information collected during the survey process. In this way, it was easiest to tabulate and correlate variables with this large amount of data.

I spent a total of nine months in Poland working on this project. The survey part of the project took the bulk of the time with travel, site selection and access, translation, and data entry. Interviews were approximately one to two hours long and were done in Warsaw, Białystok, Kraków, and Powiat Oświęcim. Several of the teachers spoke English so no interpreter was necessary but where one was needed, a PhD student at Jagiellonian University served as interpreter. He was a British student studying photographic representations of the Holocaust and an expert on the Auschwitz museum. With this, his vocabulary of Holocaust specific language was very useful. Translations for documents/surveys were done either by Karolina Komorowska, the education director of the Galicia Jewish Museum and masters degree student at Jagiellonian University or the translation agency in Kraków. Translations for distribution were checked for accuracy by Professor Trojński or Akademia Pedagogiczna.

Ethnographic Sketch of the Setting

The quest for more complete historical representation has relied heavily on the revitalization of Jewish memory present in Poland. Like much of Europe, Poland has undergone a transformation in regards to Jewish issues. The presence of Jewish cultural

festivals as in Krakow or the growth of Jewish Studies programs in Polish universities is a testament to the growing interest of Poland's Jewish population before, during, and after the Holocaust. Warsaw's Jewish Historical Institute, the memorials in the former ghetto, and synagogues provide places of remembrance but are used most often by teachers for educational purposes. Tykocin Synagogue in Białystok is used by many teachers to help students understand Jewish culture and religion, as well as to share the regional history of Polish Jews. Although there is no Jewish community in Białystok today, there are dozens of individuals recognized as Righteous Among the Nations by Yad Vashem for their efforts in hiding Jews during the Second World War. A special project has been set up between several Białystok schools and these individuals in an effort to remember the Holocaust.

By far, Kraków has the most to offer as far as Jewish and Holocaust Education. Stara Synagogue, Izaaka Synagogue, and the Jewish Cultural Center provide a melding of Jewish history, culture, and religion within the context of the thousands of years of Polish-Jewish history. As an extension of this, the Galicia Jewish Museum offers contemporary snapshots of the remains of the once prominent Jewish life, asking visitors to reflect on the presence of absence in understanding the destruction of this culture. Nearby *powiat*¹ Oswiecim is home to the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum as well as the Auschwitz Jewish Center, each presenting a different piece of the history of Poland Jews, one on the former Jewish life and culture, and the other on the last acts of destruction wrought by Nazism. All of these organizations and more focus on giving

¹ A Polish administrative district, roughly comparable to a US county or UK borough in role if not size.

voice to the victims of the Holocaust, their lives and culture before, during, and after the Second World War.

Chapter 5: Teacher Surveys

Profile of the Population

In the sample, where $n=155$, data was collected to provide a profile of the population. Information was gathered on the subject's gender, age, subject taught, birthplace, and current location. For the purpose of this project, it was most significant to examine the first three. Of the 155 participants, 117 (75.5%) were female and 30 (19.4%) were male, with 8 (5.2%) declining to answer. Age of the participants ranged from 25-65, with mean and mode of 40. Only 14.8% of the participants were under age 30, with 24.5% between 31-39 years of age, 32.9% between 40-49 years of age, and 27.7% of participants over age 50. This indicates a considerable 'graying' of the teaching population in Poland and also plays into previous discussions on the necessity of retraining teachers who had taught about the Holocaust and World War II under Communism. When analyzing subject areas teachers taught in, 81.4% of teachers taught in history or history and another subject such as Knowledge about Society with a further 15.2% teaching Polish Language and Literature.

Thematic Coverage

Background Information Taught

The background topic areas included on the survey were History of Jews in Poland, Antisemitism, and Rise of the Nazi Party. Surveys asked teachers to indicate which aspects they covered with their students. When asked about these areas, 83.2% of teachers indicated that they taught about the History of Jews in Poland, 90.3% claimed to teach about antisemitism, and 76.1% claimed to teach about the Rise of the Nazi Party.

1939-1945 Subjects Taught

The next section of the survey asked teachers to indicate which of the following topic areas teachers covered with students during instruction about the Holocaust:

- Nazi racist ideologies and policies
- ‘Euthanasia’ program
- Persecution and murder of Jews
- Persecution and murder of Roma and Sinti (Gypsies)
- Persecution and murder of other victims
- Kristallnacht
- Mobile killing squads (Einsatzgruppen)
- Ghettos
- Final Solution
- Collaboration
- Resistance
- Rescue
- World Response
- Death Marches
- Liberation
- Pogroms 1945/1946
- Postwar trials
- Displaced persons camps and emigration

In reference to Nazi racist ideologies and policies, 80% of participants indicated they include the subject in their Holocaust coverage yet only 27.7% of teachers teach about the Euthanasia program. A full 91% of teachers teach about Jewish victims with 70.3% teaching about Roma and Sinti, and 68.4% claim to include instruction about other victims. In reference to Kristallnacht, 74.8% of participants indicated they included this topic in their instruction and 97.4% included instruction on ghettos. However, only 35.5% include any instruction at all on Einsatzgruppen in their Holocaust units. When asked about the Final Solution, 85.2% of teachers indicated they teach about this subject area with a further 72.9% discussing collaboration and 82.6% including resistance and

91% adding rescue into their curriculums. World response to the Holocaust was also included by 71.6% of participants while death marches were only included by 49.7% of respondents. Liberation was included by 64.5%, the pogroms of 1945/1946 by 65.8%, postwar trials by 61.9%, and displaced persons camps and emigration by only 39.4%.

Poland and the Holocaust

The final section of the survey included items specific to Poland during the Holocaust. These items were:

- Creation of Polish ghettos
- Labor camps in Poland
- Warsaw Ghetto Uprising
- Polish ‘Righteous Among the Nations’
- Poles as victims of Nazi occupation

Results of the survey indicated that teachers included discussion of the creation of Polish ghettos 91%, labor camps in Poland 78.1%, the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising 91%, Polish ‘Righteous Among the Nations’ 71%, and Poles as victims of Nazi oppression 89%.

Discussion

The survey data revealed surprising insight into pedagogical trends among Polish teachers in their instruction on the Holocaust. As a whole, when teachers were asked to indicate which of the themes they included when teaching about the Holocaust, the results in Table 1 were gathered.

Table1: Themes Covered

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Less than 8 themes | 9 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 5.8 |
| Between 9-18 themes | 54 | 34.8 | 34.8 | 40.6 |
| More than 19 themes | 92 | 59.4 | 59.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 155 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

On the average, teachers claimed to be teaching about 19 of the 24 themes and a surprising number (10%) claimed to be teaching all 24 themes. It is worth cautioning, however, that the average number of hours spent teaching about the Holocaust was roughly two. Precursor topics or background information were all surprisingly well covered, over 75% of teachers claiming to teach each of the themes. In the second category, the most covered topics were ghettos (97%), Rescuers (91%), Jews as Victims (91%), Final Solution (85%), and Resistance (83%). On items pertaining specifically to Poland and the Holocaust, 91% of teachers claimed to be teaching about Ghettos in Poland and the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising.

Trends appeared in analyzing least-covered topics as well. In the 1939-1945 category, the T4 and Euthanasia Program, Einsatzgruppen, and DP Camps and Immigration were least covered. These particular events have not been covered for a variety of reasons. Bialecka offers that Einsatzgruppen is not covered because it is a particularly painful subject especially for those in Eastern Poland while Trojanski claims that the T4 Program is not covered as a legacy of communist doctrine (Personal

Communication 2004). Despite this, it is unclear why these particular subjects receive little to no attention.

Ranking importance

In addition to having teachers indicate which themes were covered, they were also asked in the section 1939-1945 to rank the themes on a scale of 1-18 with 1 being most important and 18 being least important. Teachers consistently ranked Jews as Victims, Ghettos, Racist Ideology of the Nazi Party, Final Solution, and Other Victims as most important topics. At the same time, surprising numbers of teachers felt DP Camps and Emigration, Einsatzgruppen, T4 Euthanasia Program, Death Marches, and Pogroms 1945/1946 least important in teaching about the Holocaust.

Comparisons

Teachers were asked on the open-ended section of the survey whether or not they compared the Holocaust with other examples of genocide or racial hatred. Most teachers, 81.3%, claimed they compared the Holocaust in their units. The most commonly cited examples provided by teachers were the Armenians, former Yugoslavia, Gypsies, Cambodia, references to Africa, and fate of the Poles in a variety of contexts. There were also a variety of other mentions of communism, Stalinism, Indians, etc. but these former were more commonly cited as examples provided to students. One teacher wrote more broadly of her attempts to compare about racial hatred and noted, “we often discuss terrorism and examples of intolerance; my students, for example, often watch the news and do not understand many things... I try to explain.” For teachers, in the survey data, it became clear that it was important for students to become aware of the implications of

genocide and racial hatred in a conceptual context as well as a historical one. Teachers wanted students to place the Holocaust and other genocides as events in context but also wanted their students to examine the events as evidence of intolerance, hatred, antisemitism, xenophobia, etc.

Although a surprising number of teachers claimed to offer comparisons to the Holocaust in their lessons, 11.6% of teachers answered that they did not provide any comparisons in their units. Some simply answered ‘no’ to the questions, but others expounded on their feelings on why this could not be done. One participant noted, “you can’t in my opinion, you can’t compare; you can bring certain things to the students’ attention but you can’t compare; evil cannot be compared.” Another teacher wrote, “I don’t compare (can this be done?) but I cite examples.” It appears from most participants responses that there is a deep conviction on the necessity of teaching not only about the Holocaust as a historical fact but to bring its conceptual elements into contemporary focus for students.

Student gains

One of the open-ended questions on the survey asked teachers what they hoped students took away with them from a unit on the Holocaust. Most teachers understood this to mean what students gained from learning about the Holocaust and responses in their answers were fairly consistent. There were 67 references to ‘knowledge,’ 22 to both ‘memory’ and ‘tolerance,’ 11 to ‘respect,’ 10 to ‘sensitivity,’ and 9 that indicated that they hoped students used this lesson as a warning so the Holocaust would not be repeated. Of the myriad of responses, there were 75 separate references to gains in facts or knowledge

of certain types of information while there were 87 references to conceptual categories such as hatred, tolerance, attitudes, stereotypes, etc. Teachers wrote such responses as “historical truth which is sometimes kept in the dark” or “for pupils to study with interest.” One teacher noted, “knowledge of facts.” In this case, the teacher used *faktografia* for ‘facts’ to refer to a very discrete set of data that s/he hoped the student would come away with. These types of responses were fairly common across the spectrum. Overall, teachers seemed to want students to come away with both an awareness of the historical information of the Holocaust as history as well as the concepts behind the tragedy.

Why teach about the Holocaust?

Teachers were also asked in the open-ended section of the survey why they teach about the Holocaust. Many of the teachers were very blunt, answering quite simply “Because I have to – it’s in the program” or “Because it is part of the curriculum and there exists a need to teach about such phenomena”. Many teachers indicated that they teach about the Holocaust because they feel “it is a part of the history of our state and nation” or “it is inextricably connected to the history of Poland during the Second World War, and it concerned Polish citizens.” One teacher wrote, “to make students aware of the tragic fate of, among others, Polish Jews.” Teachers often saw the history of the Holocaust as something difficult to avoid teaching. Another teacher wrote, “It is hard not to teach young Poles, living in the land where World War II happened, about the Holocaust...” Still another connected the historical link with hopes for making students more aware of conceptual issues of tolerance: “Because it is connected with our history. I

want to teach my students tolerance and understanding of other nations and religions.” Others, had more specific reasons for teaching about the Holocaust. One teacher noted, “because the school backs onto the Warsaw Jewish Cemetery, and in order to fight antisemitism.” Another teacher wrote that she teaches about the Holocaust “because of the spread of xenophobia, lack of tolerance and lack of consciousness (even the most basic) among young people)” while another noted “to preserve the memory and develop attitudes, to resist stereotypes and the appearance of antisemitism, to develop open attitudes toward others.” Despite the fact that few Jews are left in Poland, the problem of antisemitism is still present and many teachers noted in their surveys that they hoped teaching about the Holocaust was a way to combat antisemitism and xenophobia.

Many teachers responded to this question in the survey with notions of truth and duty. Teachers would write, “because it is a historical truth,” “it’s an important subject,” or “from a feeling of responsibility to historical truth.” Others responded from a sense of duty to their profession or their nation. One teacher wrote, “from a feeling of duty in regard to the memory of our neighbors” while another noted “because it is the duty of every teacher. Because I do not want it to be repeated.” Another teacher responded, “Pro memoria, it was the murder of citizens of the Second Polish Republic, it is part of the curriculum.” For this teacher, the sense of duty was to those murdered, those fellow citizens that had been forgotten and also a sense of duty to the program that hopes to preserve the memory of the Holocaust for Poland today. Still others wrote, “Because one must! My decision and choice!” and another, “Not because I must, it is a painful and tragic historical truth. It is a duty from history.”

Another theme appeared in the answers to the question about why teachers teach about the Holocaust, that this is something one must know about. One teacher wrote, “Because you cannot not know about this!” while another responded, “because it is essential.” Another teacher responded, “I cannot imagine not teaching about this issue. It has to give the students information, but also be a warning, shaping their attitudes.” Above all, whether teachers teach from a sense of duty, historical truth, or because it is in the curriculum, the hope is that students are taking the information with them, concepts as well as historical facts and using them for some purpose. As one teacher wrote in her response to the question, “so a Holocaust will never again have a place in our world.”

Teacher Trainings

The nature and evolution of Holocaust Education in Poland has precipitated a great need for training programs and resources for teachers. Many organizations (too many to be covered here), both governmental and non-governmental, offer a variety of training programs. The Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw offers a permanent exhibit for student groups, provides training programs for teachers around the country, and publishes a series of educational resources for teachers. CODN, the in-service training institute headed by Martyna Majewska, organizes seminars and workshops, cooperates with regional centers, publishes books and texts, implements new ideas of education and methodology, helps teachers to teach sensitive subjects, and cooperates with NGOs and government institutions as well as international institutions to implement new methods. Amongst their major projects was a new publication on Polish-Jewish relations and the organization of a Polish-Israeli seminar on shared remembrance. Their extensive

trainings offer teachers the opportunity to learn more about the Holocaust as an event as well as pedagogical approaches to implementing the Holocaust in the classroom. The Auschwitz Jewish Center offers seminars for teachers on Jewish history, culture, and religion whilst the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum offers a postgraduate program in conjunction with Akademia Pedagogiczna in Kraków on Holocaust training. These, and many more, provide opportunities for teachers to increase their knowledge of the Holocaust and find new ways to pass that on to their students in the classroom.

In the surveys, one of the questions asked teachers if they had attended any trainings specific to the Holocaust and if so, which ones they had attended. Within this group, 50% (78 teachers) said they had never attended a training on the Holocaust, while 41% (63 teachers) claimed to have attended at least one, 9% (14) declined to answer. Of the 63 teachers answering affirmatively, 16 had attended trainings provided by the Auschwitz State Museum, 11 by the Jewish Historical Institute of Warsaw, 8 by IPN (Institute of National Memory), 7 by Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, 6 by CODN, 5 by CEO (Civic Education Organization), 2 by the Jewish Cultural Center in Krakow, and 33 responded with other various programs across the country. Within this sample, many of the teachers who had not attended a training remarked they would be interested in a seminar or training on the Holocaust. Undoubtedly, there is considerable interest in Holocaust studies amongst Polish teachers.

Chapter 6: Recommendations and Conclusion

Recommendations

Responses to the survey indicated a desire by teachers to instill in their students basic knowledge about the events of the Holocaust as well as hope that lessons on the atrocity would serve some conceptual purpose. While most teachers appeared somewhat overambitious in the number of themes they include on a unit about the Holocaust given time constraints, overall there was remarkable consistency in what topic areas they considered most important, namely reincorporating the lost identities of the Jewish victims back into the Holocaust narrative. However, one of the problems with Holocaust Education in its current incarnation in Poland has been the shift from the overcompensation of Polish victimhood during Communism to the almost negligence found now in reference to Polish victims of Nazi oppression. Trojński has offered that *Holokaust* or *Holokaust* is a specifically Jewish related phenomenon, much like its Hebrew form *Shoah*. In fact, the use of the term *Holokaust*, is a relatively recent term, the previous term used to refer to the event was *zagłada Żydów*, destruction of the Jews. *Zagłada* is still a relatively common term used to refer to the events of the Holocaust and are often used specifically within the context of referring to Jewish suffering during the events of 1939-1945. The result of such a specific vocabulary has been a careful erasure, or at least an unconscious neglect, of the suffering of millions of Poles interred, tortured, and murdered during the Nazi occupation. While teachers claim to include discussion of Sinti and Roma victims and ‘other victims,’ there appears to be little taught to students about the fate of the Polish population during the occupation, both good and bad.

Holocaust Education has taught that there are a variety of roles to be played out in the midst of crisis. Perpetrators and victims simplify into a false dichotomy that must be complicated by collaborators, resisters, rescuers, and bystanders. 'Poles,' as a historical group during that period, occupied all of the roles listed above and to exclude these dynamics from the education of the period is negligent.

Teachers felt particularly strongly about the inclusion of the topics of ghettos and Final Solution into their curriculums. Unsurprisingly, many of the most famous ghettos and camps are located on Polish soil and all of the Aktion Reinhardt, or death camps, were located in Poland. It is important for Poland to understand the strategic role of the nation during the occupation. To this end, teachers appear to take particular care in including these topics within their curricular units.

While many of the topics were well-covered, there were glaring omissions that appeared consistent. A low percentage of teachers included the Euthanasia (T4) Program, Einsatzgruppen, DP Camps and Emigration as part of their curricula and these three topics as well as death marches and the pogroms of 1945/1946 fell to the bottom when teachers were asked to rank topic areas in order of importance. It is particularly troublesome to see the lack of instruction the pogroms of 1945/1946 that occurred in Poland as well as much of the aftermath topic areas. The Holocaust does not exist in a vacuum, and while teachers appear to try to contextual the Holocaust with antecedents, it does not appear, in many ways, that it has an aftermath with shockwaves that affect Poland today. Despite the fact that many teachers noted they wanted their students to use the lessons of the Holocaust to combat prejudice, xenophobia, hatred, and even

antisemitism, the role of Poles after the end of the war against their Polish-Jewish neighbors has not been considered. To ask teachers about the purges of the 1960s invites even more quiet stares and skirted responses.

From the research gathered by this project, I make the following recommendations:

- More balanced recounting of victims during the Holocaust
- More complete account of Polish roles during the Holocaust
- Inclusion of fringe topics that directly impacted the suffering of victims: T4 Program, Einsatzgruppen, Death Marches
- Inclusion of aftermath topics that help to place the Holocaust within a context with an aftermath

Overall, Poland appears to be making significant progress in their efforts in providing Holocaust Education for their young people. To this end, perhaps the hopes of many of the teachers to combat hate, prejudice, xenophobia, and intolerance will lead to improved relations between not just Poles and Jews, but between human beings of all backgrounds.

Conclusion

Holocaust Education in Poland is changing rapidly. As Poland continues to commit itself to the cause of more accurate historical representation, the Holocaust narrative contains more and more truth in a nation where the Holocaust was once shrouded in communist propaganda. The danger of a Polocentric Holocaust Education may be a danger as Trojński has cautioned. Yet, at the same time, there is a sense that

Poland's role and her people's history during the Holocaust has been moved aside for more politically correct interpretations. A balance must be struck on the ownership of the Holocaust, on the suffering of Jews, Poles, and others during this epoch of modern history. While it is too easy to be discouraged by some of these findings, it is important to examine the larger picture. The surge of interest in Jewish history and culture in Poland is promising and with an understanding of the Holocaust comes a revitalization of culture that is reshaping the younger generation of Poles. Renewed interest in all of Polish-Jewish history has underlined the importance of placing the Holocaust in Poland within the 700-year-old Polish-Jewish legacy. Poles, and many other Europeans, are coming to understand that all that is Jewish does not find itself within the Holocaust, Jews and Judaism continue to thrive, it is a living, breathing culture with a history marked by one of the most atrocious events in modern history. For Poland, the quest does not end in Holocaust history; it is where it truly begins.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abowitz, D. A. (2002). Bringing the Sociological into the Discussion: Teaching the Sociology of Genocide and the Holocaust. *Teaching Sociology*, 30(1), 26-38.
- Ambrosewicz-Jacobs, J. (2003). Attitudes of Polish Youth Toward the Holocaust: Research from 1997-2000. In J. Ambrosewicz-Jacobs & L. Hondo (Eds), *Why Should We Teach About the Holocaust?* (pp.79-86). Department of Judaic Studies of the Jagiellonian University in Cracow.
- Arwec, E. & Nesbitt, E. (2004). Values Education: The Development and Classroom Use of an Educational Programme. *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(2), 245-260.
- Auron, Y. (2005). *The Pain of Knowledge*. Translated by Ruth Ruzga, New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers.
- Barron, A. & Winkelman, R. (2001). A Teacher's Guide to the Holocaust: An Online Resource. *Social Education*, 65(3), 140.
- Ben-Bassat, N. (2000). Holocaust Awareness and Education the United States. *Religious Education*, 95(4), 402-423.
- Beyer, F.S. & Presseisen, B. Z. (1995). *Facing History and Ourselves: Initial Evaluation of an Inner-City Middle School Implementation*. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Research Report.
- Brown, M. & Davies, I. (1998). The Holocaust and Education for Citizenship : The Teaching of History, Religion, and Human Rights in England. *Educational Review*, 50(1).

Brynkus, J. (1998). The Polish Perspective on Teaching about the Holocaust. *Pro Memoria Information Bulletin, No. 9, June*. Information Bulletin of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum and the Foundation to Commemorate the Victims of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Death Camp.

Cafo, Z. & Somuncuo, D. (2000). *Global Values in Education and Character Education*. EDRS Research Report.

Calandra, B., J. Fitzpatrick, & Barron, A. (2002). A Holocaust Website: Effects on Preservice Teachers' Factual Knowledge and Attitudes Toward Traditionally Marginalized Groups. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 10*(1), 75-93.

Carrington, B. & Short, G. (1997). Holocaust Education, Anti-Racism, and Citizenship. *Educational Review, 49*(3), 271-283.

Clyde, C., D. Walker, & Floyd, D. (2005). An Experiential Learning Program for Holocaust Education. *NASPA Journal, 42*(3), 1.

Covell, K. & Howe, R.B. (2001). Moral Education Through the 3 R's: Rights, Respect, and Responsibility. *Journal of Moral Education, 30*(1), 29-41.

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.

Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Davidson, L. & Stokes, L. (2001). Educators' Perceptions of Character Education. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (30th, Little Rock, AR, November 14-16, 2001).*

Freeman, O. & Kucia, M. (2001). Auschwitz? KL Auschwitz? Oświęcim? *Pro Memoria Information Bulletin, No. 11, January*. Information Bulletin of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum and the Foundation to Commemorate the Victims of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Death Camp 89-94.

Greenbaum, B. (2001). *Teaching about the Holocaust: Bearing Witness*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Halstead, J.M. & Taylor, M. (2000). Learning and Teaching about Values: A Review of Recent Research. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 30(2)*, 169-202.

Harms, K. & Fritz, S. (2001). Internalization of Character Traits by Those Who Teach Character Counts! *Journal of Extension, 39(6)*.

Harris, I. M. (2002). Peace Education Theory. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (83rd, New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).*

Hickey-Schultz, L., D. Barr, & 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.

Holden, C. (2004). 'Heaven Help the Teachers!' Parents' Perspectives on the Introduction of Education for Citizenship. *Educational Review, 56(3)*, 247-258.

Howe, T. (2004). Lessons Learned from Political Violence and Genocide in Teaching a Psychology of Peace: An Interview with Linda Woolf. *Teaching of Psychology, 31*(2), 149-153.

Jones, E., K. Ryan, & Bohlin, K. (1998). Character Education and Teacher Education: How are Prospective Teachers Being Prepared to Foster Good Character in Students? *Teacher Education, 20*(4), 11-28.

Kalau, E. I. (1996). Teaching the Holocaust: Helping Students Confront their Own Biases. In Millen, Bennett, Mann, O'Conner, and Welker (Eds.), *New Perspectives on the Holocaust: A Guide for Teachers and Students*. New York University Press.

Kucia, M. (2002). Auschwitz in the Perceptions of Polish Students. *Pro Memoria Information Bulletin, No. 16, January*. Information Bulletin of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum and the Foundation to Commemorate the Victims of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Death Camp 13-16.

Kucia, M. (2001). KL Auschwitz in the Social Consciousness of Contemporary Poles. *Pro Memoria Information Bulletin, No. 15, June*. Information Bulletin of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum and the Foundation to Commemorate the Victims of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Death Camp 31-44.

Leming, J.S. (2000). Tell Me a Story: An Evaluation of a Literature-Based Character Education Programme. *Journal of Moral Education, 29*(4), 413-427.

Marrus, M. (1998). Good History and Teaching the Holocaust. *Pro Memoria Information Bulletin, No. 9, June*. Information Bulletin of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum and the Foundation to Commemorate the Victims of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Death Camp 33-39.

Massachusetts State Department of Education. (1999). Massachusetts Guide to Choosing and Using Curricular Materials on Genocide and Human Rights Issues. *For Massachusetts History and Social Science Curriculum Framework*.

Mathison, C. (1998). How Teachers Feel About Character Education: A Descriptive Study. *Action in Teacher Education*, 20(4).

Morris, M. (2001). *Curriculum and the Holocaust: Competing Sites of Memory and Representation*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Narvaez, D. (2001). Moral Text Comprehension: Implications for Education and Research. *Journal of Moral Education*, 30(1), 43-54.

Noddings, N. & Slote, M. (2003). Changing Notions of the Moral and of Moral Education. In Blake, Smeyers, Smith, & Standish (Eds.), *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Education*. Blackwell Publishing: Oxford.

Norman, A.D., B. Bear, & George, G. (1998). Moral Reasoning and Religious Belief: Does Content Influence Structure? *Journal of Moral Education*, 27(1), 89-98.

Peacock, J. L. (1986). *The Anthropological Lens: Harsh Light, Soft Focus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pinner, M. (2004). 'Auschwitz in Appalachia:' Pedagogy, the Holocaust, and the Southern Highlands. In S. Sibelman (Ed.) *Teaching the Shoah in the Twenty-First Century: Topics and Topographies*. Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press.

Preissle, J. & Grant, L. (2004). Fieldwork Traditions: Ethnography and Participant Observation. In De Marrais and Lapan (Eds.), *Foundation for Research: Methods of Inquiry in Education and the Social Sciences*.

Revell, L. (2002). Children's Responses to Character Education. *Educational Studies*, 28(4), 421-431.

Rezai-Rashti, G. (1995). Multicultural Education Anti-Racist Education, and Critical Pedagogy: Reflections on Everyday Practice. In R. Ng, P. Staton, & J. Scane (Eds.), *Anti-Racism, Feminism, and Critical Approaches to Education*. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey.

Riley, K. L. (1998). Historical Empathy and the Holocaust: Theory into Practice. *International Journal of Social Education*, 13(1), 32-42.

Roskies, D. (1975). *Teaching the Holocaust to Children: A Review and Bibliography*. KTAV Publishing House, Inc.

Shiman, D. & Fernekes, W. (1999). The Holocaust, Human Rights, and Democratic Citizenship Education. *The Social Studies*, 90(2) 53-62.

Short, G. (2004). Looking Back in Anger: Antiracist Education and the Holocaust. In Totten, Bartrap, and Jacobs (Eds.), *Teaching About the Holocaust: Essays by College and University Teachers*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.

Short, G. (2000). Holocaust Education in Ontario High Schools: An Antidote to Racism? *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30(2), 291-305.

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

Simon, R., S. Rosenberg, & Eppert, C. eds. (2000). *Between Hope and Despair: Pedagogy and the Remembrance of Historical Trauma*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishing Group.

Simoni, J. M. et al (1999). Teaching Diversity: Experiences and Recommendations of American Psychological Association Division 2 Members. *Teaching of Psychology*, 26(2), 89-95.

Sobolewicz, T. (1998). "To Teach It or to 'Get Through It'" *Pro Memoria Information Bulletin, No. 9, June*. Information Bulletin of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum and the Foundation to Commemorate the Victims of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Death Camp. 69-72.

Spindler, G. & Spindler L. (1997). *Cultural Process and Ethnography: An Anthropological Perspective*. Pp. 56-76 In Education and Cultural Process: Anthropological Approaches. Third Edition, George D. Spindler ed. Waveland Press, Inc: Prospect Heights, IL.

Spindler, G. & Spindler, L. (1997) *Ethnography: An Anthropological View*. In Education and Cultural Process: Anthropological Approaches. Pp. 50-55. Third Edition, George D. Spindler ed. Waveland Press, Inc: Prospect Heights, IL.

Szuchta, R. & Trojanski, P. (2002). Help the Students to be Human Beings. *Pro Memoria Information Bulletin, No. 16, June*. Information Bulletin of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum and the Foundation to Commemorate the Victims of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Death Camp 31-36.

Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research. (2007). *About the Task Force*. Available from <http://www.holocausttaskforce.org/about/index.php?content=whoweare/languages/english.htm> (Last visited 10/13/2007)

Thomas, G. (2000). Educating for Empathy and Tolerance: Holocaust Studies and the Teaching of Writing. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (51st, Minneapolis, MN, April 12-15)*.

Tomaszewski, J. (2003). Why. In J. Ambrosewicz-Jacobs & L. Hondo (Eds), *Why Should We Teach About the Holocaust?* (pp. 19-24). Department of Judaic Studies of the Jagiellonian University in Cracow.

Totten, S., ed. (2003). *Working to Make a Difference: The Personal and Pedagogical Stories of Holocaust Educators Across the Globe*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishing Group.

Totten, S., ed. (2002). *Remembering the Past, Educating for the Present and the Future: Personal and Pedagogical Stories of Holocaust Educators*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.

Totten, S. (2001). Addressing the 'Null Curriculum': Teaching about Genocides Other than the Holocaust. *Social Education*, 65(5), 309.

Totten, S. (2000). Student Misconceptions about the Genesis of the Holocaust. *Canadian Social Studies*, 34(4), 81-84.

Totten, S. (1999). Teaching the Holocaust: The Imperative to Move beyond Clichés. *Canadian Social Studies*, 33(3), 84-87.

Totten, S. (1998) A Holocaust Curriculum Evaluation Instrument: Admirable Aim, Poor Result. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 13, 148-166.

Tracz, M. (1998). My Vision of the Lessons. *Pro Memoria Information Bulletin*, No. 9, June. Information Bulletin of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum and the Foundation to Commemorate the Victims of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Death Camp 26-28.

Trojanski, P. (2003). Unpublished work.

Trojanski, P. (1998) Nazism and the Holocaust in Primary School History Education. *Pro Memoria Information Bulletin*, No. 9, June. Information Bulletin of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum and the Foundation to Commemorate the Victims of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Death Camp 65-68.

Veugelers, W. (1997). Teaching and Learning on Moral Dilemmas. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997)*.

Vokey, D. (1990). Objectivity and Moral Judgment: Towards an Agreement on Moral Education Theory. *Journal of Moral Education*, 19(1), 14-23.

Wegner, G. (2000). The Power of Selective Tradition: Buchenwald Concentration Camp and Holocaust Education for Youth in the New Germany In L. Hein & M. Selden (Eds.), *Censoring History: Citizenship and Memory in Japan, Germany, and the United States*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Wegner, G. (1998). 'What Lessons are There From the Holocaust for my Generation Today?' Perspective on Civic Virtue from Middle School Youth. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 13(Winter), 167-183.

APPENDIX

ANKIETA DLA NAUCZYCIELI

Wiek:

Płeć:

Przedmiot(y) nauczania:

.....

Poziom nauczania:

 gimnazjum liceum technikum szkoła zawodowa

Miejsca urodzenia:

Miejsca pracy (miejscowość):

Staż pracy:

1. Ile zajęć/godzin lekcyjnych poświęcają Państwo na realizację problematyki Holocaustu?
2. Jakich materiałów i sposobów (metod) prowadzenia lekcji Państwo używają?
3. Czy materiały, które Państwo używają odpowiadają Państwa oczekiwaniom? Jeśli nie to, jakich innych materiałów chcielibyście używać/wykorzystywać przy prowadzeniu lekcji?

4. Czy brali Państwo udział w jakiś kursach lub seminariach, poświęconych problematyce nauczania o Holokauście? Jeśli tak, to które z nich uważają Państwo za najbardziej użyteczne?

5. Co chcieliby Państwo, by Państwa uczniowie wynieśli z lekcji o Holokauście?

6. Jaki jest wkład i zaangażowanie uczniów w te zajęcia?

7. Dlaczego uczą Państwo o Holokauście?

8. Czy ucząc o Holokauście porównują Państwo to wydarzenie z innymi przykładami ludobójstwa lub nienawiści rasowej?

1. Proszę zaznaczyć, które z poniższych wątków dotyczących okresu sprzed Holokaustu poruszają Państwo ze swoimi uczniami.

- Historia Żydów w Polsce
- Antysemityzm
- Powstanie partii nazistowskiej
- Inne:

2. Proszę zaznaczyć, które z poniższych wątków związanych z Holokaustem poruszają Państwo ze swoimi uczniami.

- Rasistowska ideologia i polityka partii nazistowskiej
- Program eutanazji (T4)
- Żydzi jako ofiary
- Cyganie (Romowie) jako ofiary
- Inne ofiary niemieckiego ludobójstwa
- „Noc Kryształowa”
- Einsatzgruppen
- Getta
- „Ostateczne Rozwiązanie”
- Kolaboracja z okupantem
- Ruch oporu
- Osoby niesiące pomoc Żydom
- Reakcje świata
- „Marsze śmierci”
- Wyzwolenie obozów koncentracyjnych i zagłady

- ___ Pogromy 1945/1946
- ___ Procesy zbrodniarzy hitlerowskich
- ___ Obozy dla przesiedleńców (dipisów) i emigracja

3. Proszę ocenić to w skali od 1-18, gdzie 1 oznacza temat dla Państwa najważniejszy, 18 najmniej ważny.

- ___ Rasistowska ideologia i polityka partii nazistowskiej
- ___ Program eutanazji (T4)
- ___ Żydzi jako ofiary
- ___ Cyganie (Romowie) jako ofiary
- ___ Inne ofiary niemieckiego ludobójstwa
- ___ „Noc Kryształowa”
- ___ Einsatzgruppen
- ___ Getta
- ___ „Ostateczne Rozwiązanie”
- ___ Kolaboracja z okupantem
- ___ Ruch oporu
- ___ Osoby niesiące pomoc Żydom
- ___ Reakcje świata
- ___ „Marsze śmierci”
- ___ Wyzwolenie obozów koncentracyjnych i zagłady
- ___ Pogromy 1945/1946
- ___ Procesy zbrodniarzy hitlerowskich

___ Obozy dla przesiedleńców (dipisów) i emigracja

4. Proszę zaznaczyć, które z wymienionych wydarzeń, dotyczących stosunków polsko-żydowskich w okresie Holokaustu poruszają Państwo z uczniami.

___ Tworzenie gett w okupowanej Polsce

___ Obozy koncentracyjne i pracy w okupowanej Polsce

___ Powstanie w getcie warszawskim

___ Polscy „Sprawiedliwych wśród Narodów”

___ Polacy jako ofiary okupacji niemieckiej

___ Inne:

Dziękuję za wypełnienie ankiety

TEACHER SURVEY

Age:

Sex:

Subject Taught:

Grade Taught:

Birthplace:

Current Location:

1. How many class periods do you spend on the study of the Holocaust?
2. What materials and activities do you use?
3. Are there adequate resources available to you? If not, what would you like to have?
4. Have you attended teacher trainings or seminars? If so, which ones and were they useful?
5. What do you hope your students gain from a unit on the Holocaust?
6. What kind of assignments do they have for this unit?
7. Why do you teach about the Holocaust?

8. Do you compare the Holocaust with other examples of genocide and racial hatred?

Background Information

Which of the following aspects do you cover with your students? Please check.

History of Jews in Poland

Antisemitism

Rise of Nazi Party

1939-1945

1. Which of the following aspects of the Holocaust do you cover with your students? Please check.

Nazi racist ideologies and policies

'Euthanasia' program

Persecution and murder of Jews

Persecution and murder of Gypsies

Persecution and murder of other victims

Kristallnacht

Mobile killing squads (Einsatzgruppen)

Ghettos

Final Solution

Collaboration

Resistance

Rescue

World Response

- ___ Death Marches
- ___ Liberation
- ___ Pogroms 1945/1946
- ___ Postwar trials
- ___ Displaced persons camps and emigration

2. Please number the following aspects from 1-18, with 1 being what you see as most important to discuss and 18 being least important.

- ___ Nazi racist ideologies and policies
- ___ 'Euthanasia' program
- ___ Persecution and murder of Jews
- ___ Persecution and murder of Gypsies
- ___ Persecution and murder of other victims
- ___ Kristallnacht
- ___ Mobile killing squads (Einsatzgruppen)
- ___ Ghettos
- ___ Final Solution
- ___ Collaboration
- ___ Resistance
- ___ Rescue
- ___ World Response
- ___ Death Marches
- ___ Liberation

- Pogroms 1945/1946
- Postwar trials
- Displaced persons camps and emigration

Poland and the Holocaust

Which of the following events do you cover with your students? Please check.

- Creation of Polish ghettos
- Labor camps in Poland
- Warsaw Ghetto Uprising
- Polish 'Righteous Among the Nations'
- Poles as victims of Nazi occupation

VITA

April Crabtree received her B.A. in Anthropology from Eckerd College in St. Petersburg, Florida in May 2004. She was a Fulbright Fellow and conducted research in Krakow, Poland on Polish Holocaust Education. She received the PhD from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in 2007.