

A Necessary Holocaust Pedagogy: Teaching the Teachers

David H. Lindquist
Indiana University Purdue University, Fort Wayne

You have elected to study the history of the Holocaust. The subject matter you will investigate will make some extraordinary demands of you. The facts, even when told without embellishments in bare-boned words, will pull you into a world of such savagery that you may doubt their truth. But facts cannot be altered to ease our pained sensibilities. (Botwinick, 2001, p. xvii)

Botwinick is not alone in noting the special demands that educators face in teaching the Holocaust. Farnham (1983) begins his essay “Ethical Ambiguity and the Teaching of the Holocaust” by stating, “Having taught a college course on literature of the Holocaust four times, I will soon begin my fifth guided tour through hell” (p. 63). Schilling (1998) guards himself from the topic’s pressures by teaching it only once every two years, while Klein (1995) holds that “Holocaust education is also burdened by unique problems” that place “extraordinary demands on teaching” (p. 2). Langer (1995, p. 3) posits that “Most literature—indeed, most history—does not estrange its readers with startling remarks about a remote way of being” (p. 3), thus problematizing teaching the event. These voices indicate that one does not *teach* the Holocaust as much as one *confronts* it.

David H. Lindquist is an assistant professor in the School of Education at Indiana University Purdue University, Fort Wayne, Fort Wayne, Indiana. He can be reached at lindquid@ipfw.edu

Background of the Problem

The axiom “You can’t teach what you don’t know” carries considerable truth within its simple logic, and the corollary statement “You can’t teach what you don’t know how to teach” should also be acknowledged as central to any instructional situation. While both statements are true concerning the teaching of any subject, teaching the Holocaust involves unique demands, pressures, and potential pitfalls that make both caveats critical as teachers consider the *if*, the *what*, and the *how* of Holocaust education as well as the moral implications that arise from any meaningful and appropriate study of the event.

The unique nature of Holocaust education and potential problems evolving from that factor were evident to Holocaust scholars even as the topic was moving from the periphery to the center of school curricula. Holocaust education was in an early stage of rapid growth when Friedlander (1979, pp. 520-521) wrote that “The problem with too much being taught by too many without focus is that this poses the danger of destroying the subject matter through dilettantism. It is not enough for well-meaning teachers to feel a commitment to teach about genocide; they must also know the subject.” A decade and half later, Shawn (1995, p. 16) described actual occurrences about which Friedlander had given warning, stating “But the negative side of this positive summary [the growth of Holocaust education] requires examination as well. Such rapid, broad-based popularization could conceivably dilute and diminish the impact of the Holocaust, hurrying it to its educational demise.”

Stressing the need for Holocaust educators to be certified in teaching the subject, Shawn proposed that “... those who teach the subject ought to be able to explain the importance of their work, and should be knowledgeable about Holocaust history and literature. Educators must be articulate and realistic about their teaching and learning goals, and conversant with age-appropriate materials” (p. 16). More recently, Schweber (2006, p. 44) discusses “Holocaust fatigue” on the part of students and her concern that a growing trivialization of the way the Holocaust is taught diminishes students’ abilities to understand the event’s significance.

Responding to this problem, many Holocaust workshops are organized annually by various organizations and institutions throughout the country. Such programs may last from a few hours or one day to intensive institutes that last a week or more. Given the range of experiences that teachers encounter through such diverse offerings, one must ask, “How should pre-service and in-service teachers of the Holocaust be trained in

both the history and the pedagogy of the event?" This question is critically important because the training teachers receive in both Holocaust history and pedagogy will affect directly the way the event is presented to the students in those teachers' classrooms.

Rationale for the Course

The Holocaust is perhaps the most compelling topic studied in American schools today. Many students state that their study of the event is the most intensive and meaningful investigation in which they are involved during their academic careers. Teachers who include the subject in their courses often find that their students want to spend large amounts of time immersing themselves in studying the event. As a result, Sydnor (1987) discusses the popularity of his Holocaust course by noting that:

The freshmen, most of them Protestant, Southern, middle-class, conservative young people, scramble to get into the class in numbers that simply cannot be accommodated, motivated by something far beyond simple curiosity about a course on mass murder. This generation of students seems to me ready to come to grips with the Holocaust in a manner that will challenge and tax the moral and intellectual capacities of those of us who teach it. (p. A52)

Thus, teaching and studying the Holocaust is a profoundly challenging task from various academic, intellectual, ethical, and moral perspectives. Given this fact, it is appropriate that pre-service and in-service teachers and liberal arts students from various academic disciplines examine the Holocaust together because studying the event involves considering both the historical record as well as the manner in which individuals living in the contemporary world study that record.

Many educators who consider teaching the Holocaust feel deterred from doing so for several reasons. First, they lack the confidence needed to develop a Holocaust unit since they feel that they do not have the subject matter knowledge necessary to teach the event successfully (Donnelly, 2006). Second, they often feel that the subject's complexity is overwhelming historically and pedagogically because the Holocaust "... is a thorny subject. Teaching it can be like trying to find one's way through a minefield" (Wieser, 2001, p. 62). Third, and perhaps most important, they worry about whether or not they can present such an emotionally charged subject in a way that does justice to the topic while observing the sensitivities that must be considered in planning a course of study for middle, junior high, or senior high school students. As Wieser (2001) notes, "How far are teachers entitled to go in making

their students aware of the horrors of the Holocaust?” (p. 76). Planning a unit of study on the subject must, therefore, involve a highly developed understanding of the complexities that are central to both the history and the pedagogy of the event.

A Negative but Defining Experience

In August, 2001, the dean of the school of education at a midwestern public university asked the author, who was then teaching high school history, to develop a course on the Holocaust that would focus on preparing middle, junior high, and senior high school educators to teach the subject. The initial offering of the course, to be titled “Topical Exploration in Education: Teaching the Holocaust,” was scheduled for June, 2002.

The author, who had considerable experience in Holocaust education and who had earlier participated in several high-level programs on teaching the subject, had just finished an intensive five-day institute on teaching the Holocaust that was offered at a major southern university. The institute was advertised as a means by which teachers could develop both the historical knowledge and the pedagogical skills needed to teach the event effectively and properly. Unfortunately, the institute failed to achieve either of its stated goals.

The institute had four major shortcomings. First, many content-area professors who presented lectures were not Holocaust specialists. As a result, they often failed to provide the inferential knowledge needed to deal with this most complex topic. Second, many lectures focused on such limited topics that no overall frame of reference about the Holocaust was presented, thus preventing the institute’s participants from developing a unified sense of the event’s overall scope. Third, the lectures were presented in a random order that failed to display any coherent, historically contextualized pattern. As a result, institute participants were inundated with a mass of information that was not framed around any central theme from which they could develop their own knowledge of the Holocaust’s history.

Fourth, despite its stated goal of stressing the event’s pedagogy, the institute paid little attention to that vital aspect of being a Holocaust educator. Throughout the week, large stacks of reference materials were displayed on a table in the back of the classroom. Virtually no use was made of these items, however. Of particular concern was the fact that the institute’s co-director in charge of the pedagogical portion of the program displayed a lack of knowledge about the historical content and the teaching of the subject as well as an inability to grasp the dilemmas and issues involved in that teaching. For example, during one session,

the co-director turned on a videotape of survivor testimony and then left the room. Returning as the tape was ending 45 minutes later, she noted that her absence while the tape was playing was due to the fact that "I can't bear to watch it anymore." Such comments indicate a failure to confront the subject adequately on either a professional or a personal basis. Beyond that, how can one justify showing material to students if she cannot "bear to watch it" herself? (Referenced from class notes taken by the author, June 19, 2001).

Having thus experienced what *not* to do in introducing educators to Holocaust teaching, the author began developing a course that would discuss the *if*, the *what*, the *how*, and the moral implications of Holocaust education in ways that would be historically and pedagogically consistent with good teaching practice in general and with the unique demands of teaching the Holocaust in particular, thus allowing teachers to build Holocaust curricula that could be presented appropriately in various classroom settings. The result was the course "Teaching the Holocaust," which has now been offered very successfully five times to undergraduate and graduate students.

The Structure of the Course

After discussions between the author, faculty from the school of education, and personnel in the Department of Continuing Studies, the university office in charge of administering the course, it was decided that an intensive format would be scheduled. In this format, the class would meet for three hours per day, five days per week, for three consecutive weeks during the early part of summer vacation. This schedule allowed the course to meet the university's 45-contact hour requirement for a three-credit hour course. A graduate education course title would be used, thus allowing hours earned to be applied to master's programs in education and/or for purposes of teacher recertification.

Conceptualizing the Course

Several questions evolved as the course's initial development began. First, what historical content should be included? Second, what core text(s) should be used to ensure that the proper historical content was covered? Third, how could the many diverse pedagogical approaches used by successful Holocaust educators be discussed adequately during the course? Fourth, what pedagogical source(s) should be used to guarantee that adequate treatment would be given to those approaches while avoiding inappropriate teaching strategies? Fifth, how should concerns

involving balancing historical content and pedagogical needs be met given the intensive time frame in which the course would be taught? Sixth, on what topics should readings beyond the course text(s) be focused and what readings would address those topics adequately? Seventh, what student work should be required, thus providing a means of assessment? Eighth, how could the course be designed so that teachers could make practical classroom use of what they had learned? Ninth, how could the moral issues that are implicit in any consideration of the Holocaust be brought into the discussion in ways that would enhance the course's treatment of the event while making that treatment relevant given the socio-political milieu in which the Holocaust is taught today?

Historical Content and Supporting Resource Materials

The guiding principle driving the course's format was that topical foci identified by the education department of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) should be central to all aspects of the course's dual curricula (i.e., historical content and pedagogy). Thus, historical content covered had to correlate directly to the USHMM's "Suggested Topic Areas for a Course of Study on the Holocaust," found in the museum's core pedagogical publication *Teaching About the Holocaust: A Resource Book for Educators* (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2001, p. 17). Next came the task of selecting a suitable core history text, which had to meet two criteria: (1) provide adequate coverage of most, if not all, of the USHMM's suggested topics; and (2) be manageable given the compressed time factor in which the course would be taught.

After examining several texts and giving consideration to the intensive time frame in which the course would be offered, *A History of the Holocaust: From Ideology to Annihilation* (2nd Ed.) (Botwinick, 2001) was selected. This edition was used again in 2003 but was replaced with the newly released third edition in 2004. With the exception of the liberation of the camps, that text provides at least adequate coverage to each of the USHMM's suggested topics. It was also determined that supporting core historical content would come from various sources, notably the USHMM's website.

Pedagogical Approaches and Supporting Resource Materials

Teaching about the Holocaust holds that Holocaust education can be incorporated into many existing course offerings, including: (1) United States history; (2) world history; (3) world cultures; (4) government; (5)

contemporary world problems; (6) literature; and (7) art and art history (USHMM, 2001, pp. 9-15). Thus, pedagogical resources discussing these subject areas (or combinations of them) had to be identified for use within the course curriculum. Also, it was imperative that materials discussing the unique dynamics and demands inherent in teaching the Holocaust be presented to current and prospective teachers of the subject.

Upon examining available materials, it soon became apparent that *Teaching and Studying the Holocaust* (Totten & Feinberg, 2001) was the source that best met and exceeded the course's pedagogical requirements. The book contains tightly written articles discussing the *if*, the *why*, and the *how* of teaching the topic while addressing the imperative to avoid pedagogically unsound approaches. In addition, chapters conclude with reference lists that direct readers to extensive pedagogical information. An annotated bibliography provides additional suggestions for further study.

A course reader including 20 articles was also developed and was made available for use as individual student needs warranted. This collection provided participants with access to information that supported and expanded upon the coverage provided by Totten and Feinberg. Many of the articles focused on broad overview pieces that teachers should consider in developing and implementing Holocaust curricula, thus supplanting the specific discussions found in Totten and Feinberg.

An important aspect that is central to teaching the Holocaust involves examining potential dilemmas that may be involved in including the subject in classroom curricula. As a result, it was determined that an on-going consideration of such circumstances should permeate the pedagogical discussions occurring throughout the course, with specific attention being given to the matter of the appropriateness of various approaches that are used in teaching the Holocaust.

Balancing the Coverage of Pedagogy and Historical Content

One major shortcoming of many Holocaust teacher-training programs (especially those of the one or two-day variety) is their focus on instructional strategies to the virtual exclusion of framing the event within a clearly defined historical context. As a result, teachers who attend such programs often return to their classrooms with a potpourri of activities that are neither coherent with each other nor contextually based from the historical perspective. As a result, many teachers who attend such programs fail to understand either the event's pedagogy or its importance as a seminal historical event. Thus, "... these workshops, good intentions notwithstanding, have little long-term, measurable effect on professional practice or student learning" (Shawn, 1995, p.16).

The course was designed to alleviate this problem by dividing most class sessions into two distinct parts. On most days, one segment of the class was to focus on Holocaust history, while the other was to concentrate on the event's pedagogy. This plan was developed so that teachers would develop expertise regarding both of the platforms, content and pedagogy, necessary for teaching the subject effectively and appropriately.

Separate daily assignments were created for content and pedagogy. Readings from Botwinick were supplanted by reading guides to which participants developed in-depth written responses. Geared to lead to evaluation at the upper levels of intellectual taxonomies, these guides became the basis of class discussions. They also allowed participants to play an active role in directing class discussions toward topics of particular interest, thus bringing an element of constructivism to the course while highlighting those topics not clearly understood by participants. Similarly, chapters from Totten and Feinberg were assigned on a daily basis. While no reading guides were developed to amplify these readings, the discussion process used with Botwinick also occurred as pedagogical matters were examined.

While this approach has been maintained each time the course has been taught, an interesting dynamic has occurred each semester. As the course progresses, a seamless merging of the discussion of pedagogy and the historical record develops so that in-depth historical discussions occur during pedagogical sessions and vice versa. The discussion of content and pedagogy often becomes so intertwined that it is not possible to identify which focal point had been the starting point for the given class session.

This approach, which involves considerable peer sharing, helps participants focus on how they will approach decisions regarding both content and pedagogy as they create their own Holocaust units. Participants thus develop an approach to teaching the event based on five interrelated criteria: (1) building a solid knowledge of Holocaust history; (2) analyzing the Holocaust as a seminal historical event; (3) examining Holocaust pedagogy from a variety of perspectives and methodologies; (4) considering the complexities involved in teaching the subject; and, most importantly, (5) understanding the need to merge effective pedagogy with detailed historical content.

The emphasis given these five criteria placed the course's structure in contrast to the fragmented approach taken in the institute mentioned earlier. Unlike the random order in which topics were presented during the institute, the course presented the event's history as an evolving story, with special attention given to its chronological path as a means of organizing the historical record. Key themes rather than narrowly

focused topics were discussed. Emphasis was given to drawing inferences about the event in addition to presenting critical content rather than historical minutia. Most importantly, the seamless merging of content and pedagogy that occurred in the course created a far different learning situation than did the institute's treatment of pedagogy as more-or-less an afterthought.

Readings from Beyond the Core Texts

Totten and Feinberg focus on practical matters in discussing teaching the Holocaust. To supplement the articles found in their work, a course reader including 20 articles was also developed. These articles focus on many of the unique, and in some cases potentially troublesome, dynamics involved in Holocaust education. While several of these articles are now somewhat dated, they still suggest many thought-provoking ideas that offer course participants much to consider and debate. Given the compressed time frame in which the course is offered, these articles are not assigned as course readings. However, participants are urged to examine them as time allows and particular interests or concerns arise. In addition, many references to points raised in these articles are discussed during class sessions. Many of these articles would be assigned as required readings if the course were to be offered during a regular sixteen-week semester.

Student Work: Assignments, Assessments, and Applications

Work to be completed by participants needed to fulfill two distinct goals. First, assignments had to ensure that adequate historical and pedagogical knowledge was developed, and that this development was at a level appropriate to a graduate level course. Second, student work had to result in products that teachers could use in their classrooms. In order to fulfill these goals, three assignment tracks were implemented.

First, as noted earlier, discussion guides focusing on the core historical text were developed. Students developed detailed written responses to these guides, with the guides and responses providing structure for class discussions. The discussion guides focused on interpreting the historical text rather than simply recounting what the text said factually, thus encouraging students to consider the subject at higher-order taxonomic levels. This process encouraged the growth of critical thinking processes that could be transmitted to classroom settings. These discussion guides were assessed on a Satisfactory/Non-Satisfactory basis. (Examples of discussion guides appear in Appendices A and B.)

Second, each participant read, reviewed, and critiqued five journal articles about one specific Holocaust or Holocaust-related topic. This activity provided experiences in using educational journals, thus adhering to the school of education's vision of developing classroom teachers who view their professional activities within the scholar-practitioner framework. It was suggested that students focus their journal work on articles that would be useful as they developed their end-of-course curricular units. These articles were graded on a 1-10 scale.

Third, each participant created a curricular unit appropriate to his/her teaching situation and designed to cover a two-week instructional period. A primary goal of the project was that each curricular unit developed should be of practical benefit to the teacher who had created it. Units could focus on a general historical or literary treatment of the Holocaust or on one specific aspect of the event. Each unit had to include: (1) a rationale statement; (2) a description of the teaching situation in which the unit would be taught; (3) a list of resources used in developing the unit; (4) a list of resources used in teaching the unit; (5) daily lesson plans; (6) descriptions of assignments to be completed by students; (7) a description of how student work would be assessed; (8) an evaluation of the curriculum development process; and (9) a speculative description of how the unit's effectiveness would be evaluated once it had been taught. The units were graded on the basis of how completely they met the criterion noted above as well as their probable effectiveness when used in actual classroom settings.

Evolution of the Course

The course's original structure was maintained during 2002 and 2003. For 2004, however, a major change was made in order to expand the potential participant base and to encourage a diverse student body. The course was cross-listed under three numbers for credit purposes: (1) graduate credit in education, as had been the case during previous offerings; (2) upper-level undergraduate credit in education, especially designed for students majoring in social studies or English/language arts education; and (3) upper-level undergraduate credit in history through the College of Arts and Sciences, with history majors being especially encouraged to enroll.

Allowing undergraduate (pre-service) education students to enroll gave those individuals an opportunity to explore Holocaust history and pedagogy at a formative stage of their careers. Since most of these students were approaching student teaching and graduation, they would be able to apply their newly-gained knowledge in both content and pedagogy

during their upcoming student teaching experiences. In addition, participation in the course would allow them to interact on a professional collegial basis with in-service teachers in their subject areas. In order to develop the end-of-course curricular unit, pre-service teachers first developed hypothetical teaching situations in which their units could be taught. Several pre-service teachers who had already received their student teaching assignments developed units that would be usable in those settings.

Similarly, offering undergraduate credit in history attracted students with a non-pedagogical perspective to the course. History majors bring a different set of concerns and backgrounds to the course than do in-service and pre-service teachers, forcing educators to focus on content knowledge. Given the fact that pre-service teachers often lack substantial content area knowledge, a situation that is especially true regarding social studies majors (Brown & Patrick, n.d.), it could be surmised that interactions between history and education majors would result in positive experiences for both groups. This proved to be beneficial to the education majors as the history students often challenged the education students to rationalize and defend their teaching practices. At the same time, the history majors learned to analyze content materials through a new lens.

The inclusion of history students in the course meant that alterations to the end-of-the-course project were necessary since asking non-education majors to develop curricular units would neither be meaningful nor practical. As such, history students were given the option of developing projects that followed the design, research protocols, style, and structure typically associated with upper-level undergraduate papers. These students were asked to read the pedagogical essays from Totten and Feinberg and to participate in discussions related to those articles.

A second major change was implemented for 2005. The Botwinick text was replaced by *War and Genocide: A Concise History of the Holocaust* (Bergen, 2003). As with Botwinick's text, Bergen's book provides good coverage of all of the USHMM's suggested core topics with the exception of liberation. However, while Botwinick tends to focus on a chronologically-based development of the Holocaust and related events, Bergen takes a more topically-oriented approach that allows for more incisive interpretations than are found in Botwinick. In addition, Botwinick, who fled Germany during World War II, sometimes loses the historian's focus and slips into the survivor mode, thus causing occasional inconsistencies in perspective. As such, a good text (Botwinick) was replaced by a superior one (Bergen).

Student Evaluations of the Course

Student evaluations of the course have been consistently strong during the five semesters it has been taught. A questionnaire developed by the Office of Continuing Studies for use in all teacher workshop courses has been administered on the last day of the course each time it has been offered (Table 1). Scored on a five-point Likert scale, the cumulative mean over five semesters has been 4.93, with 92.3% of all individual responses being 5 (very high rating) and the remaining 7.7% of responses being 4 (high rating). The cumulative standard deviation over five semesters is 0.22.

Analysis of student responses each semester and from semester-to-semester indicates no significant statistical variation, nor does any significant variation occur when contrasting responses from the three student sub-groups. One reason for this consistency may be the fact that many of the undergraduate history majors taking the course were also working on certification as social studies teachers.

Narrative comments submitted by students have been similarly positive. A sample of such comments includes: (1) “This has been the BEST class I have EVER taken through [name of university] or for that matter in college!!!”; (2) “... the most informative course I have ever taken”; (3) “this course should be a recommended elective for ALL social studies and language arts teachers”; (4) “this was by far the most relevant and interesting class I’ve taken through the graduate program at [name of university]”; (5) “the course was very intense but interesting and challenging”; (6) “putting down all 5’s [on the Likert-scale evaluation form]

Table 1
Course Evaluation Questionnaire, Summer Semesters 2002-2006

Evaluation Item	M	SD
1. The instructor’s presentation style was effective and engaging.	4.88	0.34
2. The instructor responded to questions and comments in a timely manner.	4.89	0.31
3. The instructor encouraged the integration of theory and practice.	4.89	0.31
4. The instructor helped me to think critically.	4.91	0.28
5. The instructor challenged me to think on my own.	4.97	0.12
6. The materials used were useful and appropriate for course purposes.	4.95	0.17
7. The syllabus explained course objectives and requirements clearly.	4.92	0.26
8. Activities in the course were helpful and relevant.	4.97	0.12
9. Overall, this course was excellent.	4.97	0.12
10. I would recommend this course to others.	4.95	0.17
	4.93	0.22

was not because it was quick and easy but because all 5's are needed for this class"; (7) "I feel as though I have an excellent foundation for teaching the Holocaust but, more importantly, I know a variety of resources for further study"; and (8) "I loved this course—I wouldn't change a thing." It should be noted that the format for the reporting of anecdotal comments does not allow for student sub-group comparisons.

Additional Comments

While anecdotal in nature, the impact of in-service teachers on their pre-service colleagues was noticeable in several ways, not all of which were directly related to course content. First, collegial relationships began to develop as the pre-service teachers first observed and later participated in sophisticated professional discussions. Second, pre-service teachers began to develop a sense of how in-service teachers wrestle with both content and pedagogical concerns. Third, in at least two instances, pre-service teachers later obtained their first teaching contracts as a result of professional relationships that began during the course as in-service teachers alerted them to faculty openings in their schools and recommended them to their principals.

Regarding the course specifically, in-service teachers drew on previous classroom experiences as they brought diverse topics into class discussions. These topics included such matters as: (1) logistical concerns (e.g., time to be allotted to the Holocaust given various scheduling formats and the already overloaded nature of curricula); (2) aligning teaching the Holocaust to state-mandated curricula in various subjects and at differing grade levels; (3) selecting resources for use and obtaining such resources given limited budgets; (4) determining valid assessment techniques; and (5) the curriculum development process in general. The pre-service teachers thus observed their more experienced colleagues making the everyday decisions that all teachers must make as they plan and implement curricula.

Students who have taken the course continue to be in frequent contact with the instructor. Communications routinely include: (1) comments on how curricula developed in the course have been modified and expanded; (2) reports on experiences in teaching the Holocaust in various middle school and high school settings; (3) questions about both pedagogy and content; (4) requests for the use of various resources; and (5) inquires regarding additional professional development opportunities.

Summary

The course is now an established offering on the university's class schedule. Enrollment has remained strong, and many participants have implemented Holocaust units in their classrooms or have refined existing units. On-going collegial relationships have developed between participants, many of whom report on their own successful teaching of the Holocaust in a variety of classroom settings that include diverse subject areas, grade levels, and school settings. Thus, the course's original goal of providing a venue in which the *if*, the *what*, and the *how* of Holocaust education can be explored has been met and exceeded. As such, the course could become a model for other historical/ pedagogical courses dealing with many complex historical topics.

References

- Bergen, D. L. (2003). *War and genocide: A concise history of the Holocaust*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Botwinick, R. S. (2001). *A history of the Holocaust: From ideology to annihilation (2nd Ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, S. D., and Patrick, J. J. (n.d.). *History education in the United States: A survey of teacher certification and state-based standards and assessments for teachers and students*. Retrieved May 24, 2006: <www.oah.org/reports/surveys/50state>.
- Donnelly, M. B. (2006). Educating students about the Holocaust: A survey of teaching practices. *Social Education*, 70(1), 51-54.
- Farnham, J. F. (1983). Ethical ambiguity and the teaching of the Holocaust. *English Journal*, 72(4), 63-68.
- Friedlander, H. (1973). Toward a methodology of teaching the Holocaust. *Teachers College Record*, 80(3), 519-542.
- Klein, D. (1995). Extraordinary demands on teaching. *Dimensions: A Journal of Holocaust Studies*, 9(2), 2.
- Langer, L. (1995). Opening locked doors: Reflections on teaching the Holocaust. *Dimensions: A Journal of Holocaust Studies*, 9(2), 3-7.
- Schilling, D. G. (1998). Introduction. In D. G. Schilling (Ed.), *Lessons and legacies, Volume II: Teaching the Holocaust in a changing world* (pp. 3-9). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Schweber, S. (2006). "Holocaust fatigue" in teaching today. *Social Education*, 70(1), 44-50.
- Shawn, K. (1995). Current issues in Holocaust education. *Dimensions: A Journal of Holocaust Studies*, 9(2), 15-18.
- Sydnor, Jr., C. W. (1987, September 16). "How can you bear to teach the Holocaust?" "How can we not?" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 34(3), A52.
- Totten, S., & Feinberg, S. (Eds.) (2001). *Teaching and studying the Holocaust*.

- Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Wieser, P. (2001). Instruction issues/strategies in teaching the Holocaust. In S. Totten & S. Feinberg (Eds.), *Teaching and studying the Holocaust* (pp. 62-80). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (2001). *Teaching about the Holocaust: A resource books for educators*. Washington, DC: Author. (Available online at <www.ushmm.org>).

Appendix A

Taken from *War and Genocide: A Concise History of the Holocaust*, D. L. Bergen (2003)

Chapter 7: "The Peak Years of Killing: 1942 and 1943"

Page in text	Prompt
162	Define <i>euphemism</i> . Note several euphemisms used by the Nazis in order to promote their policies. Explain why the use of euphemisms can be so effective.
163	Explain how "Germanization" policies in Czechoslovakia show the artificiality of Nazi racial ideology.
165	Discuss the anti-Christian bias in Nazism. Note why the Nazis had to move slowly and carefully when it came to expounding their anti-Christian ideas.
167–168	Explain why the Battle of Stalingrad was the turning point of the war in Europe. How did the loss at Stalingrad affect the German war effort at home.
168–169	As people in Germany began to find out (to one degree or another) about the mass killings, the regime had to be concerned with public opinion at home. Discuss the far different scenario that presented itself in conquered regions, especially those in the East.
170	Analyze the vital importance of the statement that reads "People often wonder ... from place to place." With reference to this statement, complete the following phrase: "Trains to _____, not to the _____" (Historian Stephen T. Katz).
174	Discuss Levi's contention that dehumanization was the ultimate Holocaust crime. What is meant by the statement that Auschwitz killed Levi 40 years later"?
174–182	Identify the six killing centers and then write a brief description of each.
182	Describe how the Nazis combined their economic needs with the goal of killing as many Jews as possible. How did they view their slave laborers?
183	Discuss the critical importance of the statement that "Presumably perpetrators, bystanders, and onlookers found ways to live with their knowledge of the killing centers."
184	Explain why it was hard for victims to comprehend what was happening to them.
191	Complete the following statement: The Nazis viewed the Romans as a _____, but they saw the Jews as a _____. However, the intended result was the _____. Explain the significance of this statement.

Page in text	Prompt
193	Develop a definition of the term resistance. Why is it so hard to develop a firm definition of resistance as it occurred during the Holocaust?
196	Bergen states that “Nevertheless, it is probably fair to assume that many people simply could not grasp the unprecedented nature of this war of annihilation” Discuss why this was the case.
200	List and discuss several obstacles that prevented or inhibited resistance from taking place at various time and in various places during the Holocaust.

Appendix B

Taken from *War and Genocide: A Concise History of the Holocaust*, D. L. Bergen (2003)

Conclusion: “The Legacies of Atrocity”

Page in text	Prompt
221	Those who had survived asked the question, “How can life be rebuilt after the terror of 1933-1945?” List and discuss several of the problems faced by survivors in the immediate postwar period.
223	The liberators of the camps often say that, upon entering the camps, they realized “What we have been fighting for.” Explain the meaning of this rather cryptic statement. Describe the average American liberator as of the time of liberation (late March—early May, 1945).
223	Describe the situation that affected millions of DP’s (Displaced Persons), some of whom will spend many years in postwar camps.
225	Two fundamental questions were asked as the war ended. The first was “Where should the Jewish survivors go?” Give several examples of how this question was answered.
225	The second fundamental question was, “What should happen to key Nazi officials?” Give several examples of how this question was answered. Note some of the tricky elements that had to be considered as this question was considered.
226–227	Postwar war crimes trials were held across Europe, with the Nuremberg Military Tribunal being the most famous. Key German officials were charged with “crimes against humanity,” but can there be any real justice given the enormity of the crimes that had been committed? Develop a rationale for your answer.
227	The war had been won, but there was really no happy ending, no message of _____. Explain why this was the case.
228	Lawrence Langer, America’s preeminent scholar of Holocaust literature, frames much of his writing in terms of “choiceless choices.” Explain what Langer means by this phrase. Then give some examples of this concept in action. In what way does this concept go against all tenets of logical and rational thought?