

A Very Neutral Voice: Teaching about the Holocaust

by **Jane Clements** (jane@ccj.org.uk)

Contextualisation

The Holocaust is a significant event in the history of twentieth century Europe and, as such, is an important topic for pupils to encounter in classroom lessons. Aside from the acquisition of skills helpful for historical enquiry and evaluation, some teachers and educationalists, as well as those outside the educational world, make claims for the topic in terms of its promoting anti-racism or Citizenship. However, this paper suggests that a particular learning experience is to be found in the dynamics of the relationship between teacher and pupil.

Abstract: *This paper is concerned to address the question of 'What are The Lessons To Be Learnt in the study of the Holocaust?' Very little research has been done in this field, although both the literature and classroom teachers tend to cite rationales from countering racism to promoting engagement with Citizenship issues. Research in related areas, together with the experience of the teachers themselves, indicates that such grand outcomes are unlikely. This paper suggests that the main outcome of Holocaust Education is the enabling of a re-examination of pupil discourses about humanity and society. The relationship between teacher and pupil in the course of these lessons, issues of shared language and a lowering of the barrier of emotional restraint all contribute to produce this outcome. This paper further suggests that, while the facts of the events themselves are important in terms of historical understanding, the main value of the lessons comes not from these but from an experience of empowerment as both teachers and pupils engage with the concept of 'difficult knowledge'.*

Background

The events of the Nazi genocide of the Jews are taught in Key Stage 3 (KS3) of the National Curriculum (NC) of England and Wales History lessons (KS3 History, Unit 19). In addition, the topic may arise in the teaching of English at KS3 and is sometimes selected by teachers, as part of syllabi, in Religious Education and Citizenship. The topic is well resourced and supported by specialists from organisations like the Holocaust Educational Trust and the Imperial War Museum.

In 1987, a survey was conducted for the University of Leicester by Fox (1989) on the teaching of the Holocaust as part of History syllabi, prior to the National Curriculum. Short (1995) had interviewed thirty-four teachers, also of History, in the context of Holocaust Education, looking at the issues of anti-Semitism as opposed to non-specific racism. No research is currently available, however, which addresses issues of the learning process with respect to this topic.

Holocaust Education (HoE) forms a significant strand of my own, day-to-day, work, although it is not my sole focus, and includes the provision of training and advice for teachers and PGCE students on the subject. In the course of this, there have been many opportunities to reflect on the practice and rationale of Holocaust Education (HoE) with those who are engaged in it, or concerned with it, including survivors, professionals in the field, government ministers and national religious leaders. As a result I began to be curious about the learning process in classroom lessons which dealt with this topic; how did teachers define or 'assess' this?

In October 1999 the Government sent out a consultative document published by the Home Office Communications Directorate. The consultations took place with a number of relevant bodies canvassing opinion on the subject of declaring an annual national Holocaust Memorial Day. The aims of such a day were clearly stated as being primarily educational:

“Britain was affected less than mainland Europe by the Holocaust, but the period of Nazism and the Second World War remains of fundamental importance to both our national values and our shared aspirations with our European partners centred on the ideals of peace, justice and community for all. [The] troubling repetition of human tragedies in the world today restates the continuing need for vigilance, and serves to remind us that the lessons of the Holocaust need to be learnt and learnt again. The time is always right to examine our past and learn for the future. [A] Holocaust Remembrance Day provides a national focus for education, and promotes a democratic and tolerant society, free of the evils of prejudice and racism”. (HMSO, 1999, p 1)

The suggestion that learning about genocides could have a beneficial effect on society was of particular interest in the light of the introduction of Citizenship into the curriculum. I wondered whether this link could be justified.

The sensitivity of the subject of Holocaust Education (HoE) meant that critical questions about pedagogy are not often raised among those closely involved in it. However, anecdotal evidence, and my own experience, suggested that teaching about the Holocaust can be an enormously empowering experience, for both pupils and teachers, often promoting a strong ‘working partnership’ (Lenga, 1998).

The use of capital letters in this paper, for the term ‘Holocaust Education’, is deliberate, suggesting a theoretical framework which encompasses aims, and objectives, as well as defining what constitutes good practice. I want further to suggest that the term (HoE) indicates a system of value judgements and normative statements which those engaged with teaching the subject come to acknowledge. It is indeed possible to see HoE in terms of discourse in the Foucauldian sense (Foucault, 2003, p 121), whereby the processes and rationales of teaching pupils about, and through, the text of genocide are not simply described by the term but, in effect, constituted by it.

Rationales

Discussions about the educational value of studying the Holocaust first received public attention when the National Curriculum History Working Party Interim Report (June 1989) was produced. The remit of this working party was to design the History element of the forthcoming National Curriculum. Its decision to omit any study of Nazi Germany and, indeed, of the Second World War was a controversial one. A number of groups, including ex-service organisations, made representations to the working party, but it was the involvement of an all-party group of MPs which appears to have been particularly influential. In their letter to John MacGregor, Secretary of State for Education (29 September 1989) at that time, they pointed to the events of the Holocaust when they wrote:

“We believe that comprehensive study of this extreme example of prejudice and discrimination will give pupils an insight into the suffering experienced by minority groups in many parts of the world today.” (Rubenstein and Taylor, 1992, p 48).

This point of view – namely that the study of the Nazi genocide of the Jews provides lessons in the nature (and, implicitly, the avoidance) of racism – is a recurring theme in rationales presented for including the topic in syllabi (Levi, 2003, Short, 1991). However, it is clear that

a few classroom lessons will not, by themselves, achieve changes in approach or behaviour with regard to eliminating prejudice (Cullingford, 2000; Lynch, 1987).

Totten and Feinberg (2001), and especially Totten (2002), identify and discuss, as many as 17 different rationales for Holocaust Education (HoE) cited by teachers and educationalists. Among these is the desire to educate pupils in order that '...it should never happen again...' (Adorno, 2003). Totten (2002) points out that further genocide has indeed occurred in the world since 1945; included among these are instances, such as that in Rwanda, when countries which knew about the events of the Holocaust, such as the USA, still prevented action by the UN - until most of the victims had been murdered. Other rationales include the importance of being 'tolerant' of others, although, as Jolly (1995) and Lang (1990) point out, the question of what it means to be tolerant is more complex than it might appear and, in some cases, being tolerant may not mean being 'virtuous'.

On the subject of teaching 'virtues', there are caveats here also: Carr (1991) and MacIntyre (1981) caution against attempts to simplify lessons in morality. While pupils can learn about the nature of courage, for example, through the narrative of the Holocaust, to accuse 'bystanders' of lacking this particular virtue may be seen as unfair, given the extreme circumstances in which individuals found themselves at the time.

Useless Knowledge

Some writers consider the events of the Holocaust to be either too horrific or too specific to provide any lessons at all. French resistance member Charlotte Delbo (1995) spoke, in relation to Auschwitz, about 'useless knowledge'. By this she meant that as one learns about the events, they become so terrible as to be overpowering. The acquisition of this knowledge may therefore overwhelm the student to the extent that it confers no benefit and, indeed, may have a negative effect. Novick (1999) expresses doubts on both pedagogic and pragmatic grounds. He argues that the extremity of the Holocaust detracts from its value as an illustration. The sheer scale of the horror threatens to overwhelm the student to the extent that it confers no benefit and, indeed, may have a negative effect. No amount of engagement with the material, or a visit to a museum, will "...make one a better person..." (p 13). The engagement of the emotions, Novick suggests, does not denote that a lesson of any sort has been learnt. He is sceptical that Holocaust Education (HoE) sensitises the student to injustice because the atrocities go beyond issues of 'social injustice'. Novick also argues that the considerable number of lessons, which study of the Holocaust is said to teach, threaten to trivialise the events. He notes, for example, the tendency of feminist writers, animal rights activists, and even 'the gun lobby' in the United States, to use aspects of the Holocaust in pursuing their own agenda.

Others, such as Langer (1998), believe that, while the Holocaust does not provide new lessons, the value of teaching from the narrative is found in the opportunity to re-evaluate moral or religious values and, rather than accept what has been offered by society 'as a package', to consider for oneself the important principles by which one can live. The role of the teacher, Langer believes, is to provide keys to doors which, when opened, widen moral horizons. Pupils are invited to re-evaluate their world-view by considering the events from all perspectives – bystanders and perpetrators, as well as rescuers and victims.

The initial study

In order to begin to address some of these issues, I designed a research programme. With such a range of ideas, seemingly unrealistic rationales and so little research, a qualitative methodology was selected to address the research question. The study would first explore the perceptions, and experience of lessons, about the Holocaust in greater depth, in the

hope that a theory, or theories, could be constructed to explain what exactly was happening and, perhaps, suggest why. The nature of the research was therefore seen in terms of a recontextualising process, affording opportunities to explore various hypotheses which might emerge as the process progressed. My own role as a Holocaust Educator could hardly be divorced from this process and, although I believed myself open to whatever I might find, it was important – and painful – to acknowledge how I positioned myself with respect to the teachers, pupils and subject material.

A pilot study was set up with two small groups. One comprised experienced teachers in the USA (America teachers – AT) who were attending a symposium on Holocaust Education (HoE) in New Jersey. The second group comprised PGCE English students (PGCE) on a compulsory inter-discipline day course on teaching the Holocaust (in the UK). I chose these groups because their interest in the subject was entirely elective and because they would have had less exposure to the language and culture of HoE which could be assumed to be more familiar to the target group of the bulk of the research – that is, experienced teachers in UK schools.

The methodology involved a qualitative approach, based on semi-structured interviews. (An outline of the questions used appears in Appendix 1.) The aim was to explore the perceptions of those who were teaching, or about to teach, the topic in the classroom, and specifically the language used by them to describe the rationales. The sample was small – ten interviewees in all – but the aim was to suggest paths for further exploration. An initial interest in ‘What the lessons might achieve’ required that any statements, or clues, about future behaviour, or changes in attitude, be carefully included in the analysis.

In preliminary analysis, two factors in particular seemed to stand out. One was the shared perception that emotional engagement with the topic was a necessity. Encouraging an immediate emotional response *to the subject material* was, almost all interviewees said, something to be avoided. However, at least seven of the ten clearly felt that, unless the pupils were emotionally engaged in the process at some level, learning was not taking place. As one PGCE student put it,

“This is the principle which underpins all my teaching. You can’t engage fully with anything unless emotions are involved; you have to feel it.” (Pilot: PGCE 1)

The second factor was that although all interviewees were clear about lessons they thought ‘could be learnt’ from Holocaust Education, there was a degree of confusion or uncertainty; quite what was happening in the lessons – and why – could not be clarified. One American teacher spoke about this in terms of ‘deferred benefits’ (Pilot: AT1) or of benefits to those already receptive to such ideas. While she could not perceive any altered behaviour as a result of the lessons, and cited pupils going out into the corridor and engaging in name-calling, she was clear that:

“I would say I have to say - for my sanity I have to say - I hope that the lessons are in the long run.” (Pilot: AT1)

Her comment indicated a sense of doubt in terms of outcome, although this did not diminish her desire to continue the lessons in the hope or *belief* that learning had somehow taken place despite all appearances to the contrary.

Although the interviewees were able to theorise and to borrow the language of thought-out objectives and written rationales, it seemed that the practical outcomes remained elusive. Classroom assessment concentrates predominantly on subject skills or knowledge; the teachers had little evidence to help them gauge the social or moral objectives attained. They were reduced to using verbs such as ‘think’, ‘believe’ or ‘hope’, or to use ‘hindsight’.

Further Questions

The main body of the research took place in three schools, where both teachers and Year 9 (14 year-old) pupils were interviewed in semi-structured small group interviews (see Appendices). In the first school (Main A), the Religious Education department staff were interviewed (Main A: MR, TS, MH) and twenty-five pupils in groups of five (A1, 2, 3, 4, 5). In the second school, a girls' selective school (Main B), the History department staff (Main B: HoD, AN, JD) included two teachers who were dubious about what Holocaust Education (HoE) might achieve. Here it was only possible to interview one group of five girls (B). Work at the third school (Main C), with History teachers (CM, VH, JU), interviews with 24 pupils and lesson observation, will be completed during the course of 2005.

When asked what they thought 'the lessons to be learnt' from the study of the Holocaust might be, both teachers and pupils tended to cite the familiar rationales, such as 'racism kills' (eg, Main A:TS; A4:Anna) and that 'one person can make a difference' (eg, A4:Bobby; B:Claire). The issue of emotion in the learning process was also referred to by both groups. In one school, two of the three teachers interviewed offered the idea that the ability to respond emotionally, or to exhibit emotional responses publicly, was in fact 'The Lesson to be Learnt' (see below).

The impetus to act against prejudice was also a common theme in pupil responses. In this respect, pupils in both schools suggested that knowledge about how the Holocaust progressed might act as an 'early warning system', whereby society could recognize the signs of moral degeneration in this way (eg, A1:Polly; B:Fatima). This recognition was not left to the facelessness of 'society as a whole' but was part of the moral imperative to each of those so educated.

The nature of the emotional responses, and what occasioned them, appeared to differ. However, identification with the suffering of others, together with horror at what fellow humans meted out to them, resulted in a sense of shock. As with the pilot study, participants reported confrontation or confusion reactions – attempts to 'make sense' of what had been learnt, without a clear indication of what that might be. In Main A, when pupils were asked initially what they remembered from the lessons, most first responses dealt with feelings rather than factual knowledge; indeed, the most consistent phrases heard, across the pupil groups in both schools, were words such as 'shocked' or 'disgusted'. There was a sense in which the events concerned were 'incomprehensible' and could not be fitted into a recognisable framework. Pupils expressed difficulties in understanding the nature of humanity - their speech patterns showed a tendency to become less fluent at these times.

The difficulty and confusion which arises from the topic led to an understandable reluctance on the part of some teachers to spend any longer on it than the curriculum demanded: "I find it very difficult to teach it. I don't think it's the easiest thing to do. It can turn into..." (Main B:HoD) - the sentence remained unfinished, despite prompting.

Not only do responses such as this indicate an inability to make sense of what happened, they also make clear the confusion engendered by the inexplicable actions of the perpetrators. The frequency of responses in the pupil interviews suggests that, in the pupils' minds, the issue is not so much 'what happened?' but 'what sort of view of humanity does this presuppose?' ("I was just kind of shocked that one human being could do that to another one." A2:Tom). Furthermore, some pupils chose to introduce the moral complexities involved for 'perpetrators':

"What really shocked me was that on some videos you had the prison guards talking about how they had to put the dead bodies into the – into the oven. But you have to feel how they must have felt. You can't exactly – it's not a really nice

thing to do and you can't appreciate them for being a nice person but you have to feel how horrible it must have been for them. It's not easy to do something like that and talk about it on a video as well. It's a horrible, it's like a horrible thing to agree to do but you need to think of it from their point of view as well. You can't just be like 'oh, they did that so we're not going to like them at all'. You have to think that they had feelings too." (A2:Barnaby)

The sense of moral ambiguity was present in many of the interviews – both pupil and teacher, highlighted by an American teacher: "We even talk about what makes people good. This is a difficult question. I teach in the Bible Belt and people have a strong idea about goodness, but if you look at someone like Oskar Schindler, how was *he* good?" (Pilot: AT2). One pupil described his inability to understand why the allies had not bombed the camps: "I found that quite – striking" (A3:Jack).

One question to the pupils (Appendix 2) concerned whether any other topic that they had studied might produce similar responses. Some of them mentioned 'The Slave Trade'. However, the vast amount of resources available, archival film footage and, crucially, the use of survivor testimony, were cited as reasons for its particular effectiveness as a text. In Main B, the pupils who had spent extra time visiting an exhibition about the Holocaust, and meeting a survivor, showed markedly different responses from their peers who had not. While one pupil attempted to fit the awful text of the Holocaust into a recognisable framework by asserting that all totalitarian regimes are much the same in nature, her peer, who had met the survivor, was resistant to the idea of comparisons.

The question of whether Holocaust Education (HoE) can effect behavioural change in pupils would appear to have been addressed by much of the literature (Lynch, 1987). However, while pupil responses suggested that they saw their own moral choices as being 'better informed', rather than radically altered, their teachers did speak about behavioural change, as an indication that '*something happened*' during the process:

"But you can play the piece from the end of Schindler's List just because they've finished their work, their research. And you can mention that one of them is going to look at Schindler as a rescuer, and explain this clip at the end when they all visit his grave and they're people that he saved. The bell will go and they don't move an inch. And they will sit and they will wait for the piece of music to finish. Then they'll quietly pick up their bag and stand behind their desk. Now that's effect." (Main A:MR)

The whole question of the relationship between pupils and teacher, together with the imperative to learn through controlled emotion, seemed to be especially significant in terms of Holocaust Education. This was highlighted by one boy's comment:

"You didn't cry. Well, Mr S_, like. He's probably been teaching it for years, but even when he was telling us about it at the beginning, he didn't like, cry, but his eyes filled up. None of us actually broke down – well, a couple of people – sort of – but it really made us think." (A4: Piers)

This last comment was particularly interesting since Mr S_, himself suggested a different memory of the same event:

"I consciously, as far as I can, keep a very neutral voice, very matter-of-fact – 'well, you know this happened' - and I think that's important. Because it carries its own emotion, apart from anything else". (Main A:TS)

Significantly, his perception was of his role as an impassioned facilitator. For the pupils, however, he had been a significant part of the emotional experience. Despite the boy's assumption that years of teaching would have rendered Mr S_ less susceptible, this pupil, at least, appeared to see the teacher's reaction as an indicator of appropriate response to the material. This disparity in perception seemed to raise a number of interesting questions to be addressed.

Discussion

Any presentation of the Holocaust in the classroom, for all its power, is a restrained text, since it is an article of faith, within the discourse of HoE, that the horrific details are not made explicit (Pilot: AT3; Totten and Feinberg, 2001, p 75/76). This is, of course, accepted practice in any school situation where the material can be traumatic. Nonetheless, the apparently familiar framework of European society, of institutions and bureaucracy increase the sense of horror; how much more shocking is the abnormal which appears normal – the banality of evil (Arendt, 1965). The text of the Holocaust is not merely 'difficult', but is deeply challenging. Pupils are confronted with an economic and social reality. The 'Final Solution', and the 'Euthanasia' programme, both developed and operated successfully within the Nazi socio-political framework, was built on the basis of prejudice and discrimination.

Attempts to fit the events of the Holocaust into a discourse about 'good and evil' may render the text impotent, since the moral and social dilemmas raised can be extremely complex (as with A2:Barnaby, above). Moreover, the questions asked cannot easily be answered; indeed, the asking of difficult, even impossible questions, is at the heart of the topic. One teacher in the study (Main A:TS) wondered whether the pupils should be offered the 'answerless questions' at the beginning of the course.

The text of the Holocaust has no narrative framework and certainly no 'conclusion'. In removing the familiar framework of society, ethical action and an 'ascent of man' view of humanity, it appears to present the ultimate post-modern horror story. Going a step further, Žižek considers how postmodernism, in the eschewing of the meta-narrative and thereby revealing any supposed central reality – 'the Thing' – as being no more than the sum of its parts, and implies that:

"Such a postmodernist procedure seems to us so much more subversive than the usual modernist one because the latter, by not showing the Thing, leaves open the possibility of grasping the central emptiness under the perspective of an "absent God". The lesson of modernism is that the structure, the intersubjective machine, works as well if the Thing is lacking, if the machine revolves around an emptiness; the postmodernist reversal shows *the Thing itself as the incarnated, materialized emptiness*." (Žižek, 1991, p 144/5)

To consider, at whatever level, that basic questions about oneself and one's humanity and one's place in society have no answers at all – and that this is itself 'The Answer', must constitute 'difficult knowledge'. The realisation of this, even unconsciously, is indeed shocking. Pupil responses which involve being 'shocked' are viewed by teachers as a desirable outcome, possibly signifying that 'learning', albeit unspecified, has taken place:

"The trip [to the Imperial War Museum Holocaust exhibit] is *invaluable*. The people they have there – it just shocks the students unbelievably by saying, 'I just want to tell you a little story' and then they do." (Main B:JD – author's italics)

and, further:

"If you can teach them something that moves them at that kind of level, then I think they've learnt a tremendous lesson that this is learning – an important part of learning. [If] we can break that down then I think it's an excellent lesson." (Main A:TS)

The implication is that this learning is a psychological process rather than the acquisition of knowledge. Such an approach to the value of HoE is worlds away from that which sees the events as part of 20th century history to be studied and analysed (NC, KS3 History, Unit 19). The learning would appear to be taking place in the pupil's mind at a level beyond 'knowledge and skills' and, if any assessment of such learning can be contemplated, it may be that the process rather than the content must be valued. Although the text itself is of vital importance and needs to be known and taught in a number of different contexts, the discourse of Holocaust Education (HoE) ultimately uses the text to confront the emptiness around which discourses of humanity and society are built. In Foucauldian terms, this is a polyvalent discourse – it liberates and enslaves, empowers and subjects (Ball, 1994, cited in Ball, 1997, p 56).

The question remains as to how the process of HoE can be 'successful'. While it may be that the actions, and reactions, of the teachers are central, they themselves appear unclear concerning the rules of reception of the material by the student. They observe the effects and are forced into speculation as to what is going on, as the discussion at Main C indicates:

JU: "I think [the pupils] just appreciated the seriousness of what we're doing." VH: "That's really an impression basis. I don't know how much is my interpretation of what I want to think happened."

In a sea of confusion, emotion and exploration, both pupils and teacher appear to flounder together. It is perhaps for this reason that HoE 'works'. In abandoning a position of 'knowledge', the teacher initiates a change in the pedagogical relationship, specifically in terms of 'power'. I would want to suggest that the positive responses to Holocaust Education (HoE) from pupils, evident in the interview materials gathered in the study, for which neither they, nor their teachers can satisfactorily account, may perhaps come from an experience of empowerment. Offered an opportunity for reflection, the teachers (Main C) begin to explore these ideas tentatively:

JU: "Well, I think that's another reason why they respond so well – because *they realise that we're learning every time as well* when we do it. Because we don't have all the answers, do we - to this? We don't - I don't – and I'm sure you don't either – ever pretend to, and I think it makes them more open to –

VH: - and we do make it that much more explicit, don't we?

JU: - because *we are really just like them*. We have a bit more background knowledge, but as far as humanity's concerned –" (author's italics).

Since the content of HoE deals with issues of society, human action and responsibility and racism, it is assumed that pupils must be affected *in these spheres*. But perhaps it is what teachers teach the pupils *next* which really affects what they take away from the lesson such as the use of emotion in work, empathy, critical analysis of right and wrong, and so on. Guerra (2002) believes teachers have a role in offering a solution in such situations, if prepared to pass on their own 'mastery' of learning in didactic forms. However, if – and it is a big 'if' – teachers are able to assist the development of replacement discourses of society and humanity, then the creative moment in the process is also the destructive moment. When the teacher begins to 'offer solutions' or, at the very least, ways to approach issues such as humanity, society, identity, she regains her normative role and the relationship alters. The creative moment of power-loss / empowerment, between teacher and pupil, vanishes and the teacher regains her role in the power relationship.

The apparent 'success' of Holocaust Education (HoE), it is suggested, not from the awfulness of the text itself, traumatic though that may be, but from two elements - the horror experienced by the pupil when her safe frameworks of humanity and society are removed, and the unconscious recognition of the abandonment of power by the teacher in the face of this terrible knowledge. Therefore it is impossible to say precisely what will be 'taught' and what will be learnt. Any reading of text is a creative process; reading the Holocaust text is both a destructive and creative process. As the pupil learns *about* the Holocaust, she is also required *to position herself* as the reader. This involves placing herself in the position in which she either wishes to be or imagines herself to be. In other words, she is both affirming and developing her sense of identity, as well as determining what she will, ultimately learn *from* the experience (Britzman, 1998, p 95). This and other issues need to be addressed in further research.

References

- Arendt, H. (1965) *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. New York: Viking Press.
- Ball, S. (1997) Policy Sociology and Critical Social Research: A Personal Review of Recent Educational Policy Research. *British Educational Research Journal*, 23, 3, 257-274.
- Britzman, D. P. (1998) *Lost Subjects, Contested Objects*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Carr, D. (1991) *Educating the Virtues*. London: Routledge.
- Cullingford, C. (2000) *Prejudice; from Individual Identity to Nationalism in young people*. London: Kogan Page.
- Delbo, C. (1995) *Auschwitz and After* (trans. R. C. Lamont). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Foucault, M. (2003) *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (reprinted English edition). London: Routledge.
- Fox, J. (1989) *Report on the 1987 Survey of the United Kingdom teaching on the 'The Holocaust' or the 'Nazi Final Solution of the Jewish question' and related subjects*. Leicester: University of Leicester, National Yad Vashem Charitable Trust.
- Guerra, G. (2002) Psychoanalysis in Education? in J. Jagodzinski (ed) *Pedagogical Desire: Authority, Seduction, Transference and the Question of Ethics*. Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey.
- HMSO (Home Office Communications Directorate) (1999) *Consultation Document for a National Holocaust Memorial Day*. London: HMSO.
- Jolly, A. (1995) Tolerance: Implications for Educators, in A. Osler, H-F. Rahenow, H. Starkey (eds) *Teaching for Citizenship in Europe*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Lang, B. (1990) *Act and Idea in the Nazi Genocide*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Langer, L. (1998) *Preempting the Holocaust*. New York and London: Yale University Press.
- Lenga, R. A. (1998) Holocaust Education: The Search for a Suitable Pedagogy. *The British Journal of Holocaust Education*, 7, 3, 51-60.

- Levi, T. (2003) *Did You Ever Meet Hitler, Miss?* London: Valentine Mitchell.
- Lynch, J. (1987) *Prejudice Reduction and the Schools*. UK: Cassell.
- MacIntyre, A. (1981) *After Virtue*. London: Duckworth.
- DfES (Department for Education and Skills) (1995-2005) *National Curriculum for England: Unit 19: How and Why did the Holocaust Happen?* www.standards.dfes.gov.uk
- Novick, P. (1999) *The Holocaust in American Life*, New York: Mariner Books (published as *The Holocaust and Collective Memory*, 2001, London: Bloomsbury)
- Rubenstein, P. and Taylor, W. (1992) Teaching the Holocaust in the National Curriculum. *The British Journal of Holocaust Education* 1, 1, 47-57.
- Short, G. (1991) Combating anti-Semitism: a dilemma for anti-racist education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 39, 1, Autumn, 33-34.
- Short, G. (1995) The Holocaust in the National Curriculum: a survey of teachers' attitudes and practices. *Journal of Holocaust Education*, 4, 167-188.
- Adorno, T. W. (2003) *Can One Live After Auschwitz: A Philosophical Reader*. (Ed. R. Tiedemann; translated R. Livingstone) Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Totten, S. (2002) *Holocaust Education*. Boston, MA.: Allyn and Bacon.
- Totten, S. and Feinberg, S. (2001) (eds) *Teaching and Studying the Holocaust*. USA: Allyn and Bacon
- Žižek, S. (1991) *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Appendix 1

Summary of questions used in the pilot study, and as basis for main study with teachers.

1. What, in your opinion, are the lessons to be learnt from the Holocaust? How would you describe your rationale for teaching this topic?
2. Are these lessons for the benefit of the individual or are they ultimately intended to benefit society as a whole?
3. Could any other historical event or genocide be used as effectively? Is there anything in particular about the Holocaust which teaches these lessons differently?
4. To what extent do you think it is necessary for pupils to be emotionally engaged by the events? How do you deal with the emotional responses of the pupils?

Appendix 2

Summary of questions used in pupil interviews.

- (Focus) What do you remember particularly about your lessons on the Holocaust?
- (Emotions) How did you feel when you saw [or read or listened to] the resources? Do you remember how you felt at the time? Did anything affect you emotionally?
- (The particularity of the Holocaust as a tool) Have you studied any other topics about people in difficult situations / prejudices or injustices? Is there anything about the Holocaust particularly that helps you to think about these things?
- ('Useless' or overwhelming knowledge) Should people learn about the Holocaust in schools? Does it just make people depressed?
- (Has anything changed?) Has it made you think differently about things now?
- (With relation to citizenship) Do you think learning about the Holocaust helps to make you a better citizen? Can it help us in our society to be better?